## **Dissecting Efficient Architectures** for Wake-Word detection

Cody Berger, Juncheng B. Li, Yiyuan Li, Aaron Berger, Dmitri Berger, Karthik Ganesan, Emma Strubell, Florian Metze

codyberger@cmu.edu, junchel@cs.cmu.edu Contact:

#### **Methodology:**

We trained eight models from six different architectures for wake-word detection using the Google Speech Commands dataset. Models were trained on GPU using PyTorch, and were not pretrained or fine-tuned.

Models were tested both **digitally and over-the-air** on both GPU and CPU.

In over-the-air trials, **real-time audio data** was sent as input to the models.

# **F1 Scores and Accuracy** PU vs. CPU F1 Scores 50.00% Architectu

Model performance often decreases moving from digital to over-the-air

Almost all models performed better over-the-air on GPU than on CPU.

### Is NAS Efficiency Transferable?

Models designed by Neural Architecture Search on GPU demonstrate poor efficiency on CPU, suggesting NAS GPU optimization isn't necessarily applicable to CPU.



#### **Over-The-Air Percentage Average Runtime GPU vs CPU: Breakdown by Model**



A **practical baseline** exploring real-world performance of **wake-word detection** architectures on parallel vs. sequential devices.

**Efficiency and accuracy** do not linearly translate from CPU to GPU between models. This is due to models' structural differences and varying abilities to exploit hardware optimization.

**Post-training quantization** is a promising option for increasing model efficiency in real-world contexts, noticeably decreasing models' inference time while not harming accuracy.



The fastest model on GPU is not always the fastest model on CPU. Model structure has a strong impact on latency changes between GPU and CPU.

For convolution-heavy models, this results from hardware optimization for matrix multiplication. Regular convolution is more parallelizable than MBConv blocks, but also has higher work, making it perform better on GPU

