

# DMP-TTS: DISENTANGLED MULTI-MODAL PROMPTING FOR CONTROLLABLE TEXT-TO-SPEECH WITH CHAINED GUIDANCE

Kang Yin<sup>1,†</sup>, Chunyu Qiang<sup>2,†</sup>, Sirui Zhao<sup>1,\*</sup>, Xiaopeng Wang<sup>2</sup>,  
Yuzhe Liang<sup>2</sup>, Pengfei Cai<sup>1</sup>, Tong Xu<sup>1,\*</sup>, Chen Zhang<sup>2</sup>, Enhong Chen<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, China <sup>2</sup> Kuaishou Technology, Beijing, China

## ABSTRACT

Controllable text-to-speech (TTS) systems face significant challenges in achieving independent manipulation of speaker timbre and speaking style, often suffering from entanglement between these attributes. We present DMP-TTS, a latent Diffusion Transformer (DiT) framework with explicit disentanglement and multi-modal prompting. A CLAP-based style encoder (Style-CLAP) aligns cues from reference audio and descriptive text in a shared space and is trained with contrastive learning plus multi-task supervision on style attributes. For fine-grained control during inference, we introduce chained classifier-free guidance (cCFG) trained with hierarchical condition dropout, enabling independent adjustment of content, timbre, and style guidance strengths. Additionally, we employ Representation Alignment (REPA) to distill acoustic-semantic features from a pretrained Whisper model into intermediate DiT representations, stabilizing training and accelerating convergence. Experiments show that DMP-TTS delivers stronger style controllability than open-source baselines while maintaining competitive intelligibility and naturalness. Code and demos will be available at <https://y61329697.github.io/DMP-TTS/>.

**Index Terms**— Controllable TTS, Style–timbre disentanglement, Multi-modal prompting, Classifier-free guidance

## 1. INTRODUCTION

TTS systems convert text into natural and intelligible speech. With recent advances approaching human-level quality [1–7], research focus has shifted toward *controllable* TTS [8–14], which seeks independent and flexible manipulation of diverse speech attributes for more natural human–computer interaction. Existing approaches to TTS control mainly fall into three categories: reference-audio [8, 9], discrete labels [10, 11], and descriptive text [12–14]. While these methods improve naturalness and controllability, they often entangle style and timbre, hindering independent control of attributes. For example, when using a reference audio for style control, timbre information from the reference often leaks into the generation, causing the synthesized speech to change timbre rather than preserving the intended target speaker [15]. In addition, most mainstream TTS systems support only a single modality for style prompting (either audio or text), limiting their flexibility and adaptability.

Research into these challenges is at an early stage. Control-Speech [16] demonstrates multi-modal style prompting from both audio and descriptive text and takes a meaningful step toward style–timbre disentanglement. However, some practical considerations remain. First, the method is closely integrated with the NaturalSpeech3 backbone [17] for both architectural design and

the disentanglement procedure, limiting extensibility and transfer to other backbones and deployment scenarios. Second, its textual prompts may include identity-related cues (e.g., gender), so the style channel can carry timbre information, complicating strict style–timbre separation and speaker consistency.

To address these challenges, we present DMP-TTS, a flexible TTS framework built on a latent Diffusion Transformer (DiT) [18] with explicit disentanglement and multi-modal control. At its core, we introduce Style-CLAP, a unified multi-modal style encoder built on Contrastive Language–Audio Pretraining (CLAP) [19], which maps style cues from reference audio and descriptive text into a shared embedding space. We enhance style representation capacity with a multitask objective that predicts style attributes. For fine-grained, independent control at inference, we introduce chained classifier-free guidance (cCFG); trained with hierarchical condition dropout, it permits separate guidance strengths for content text, timbre, and style. Finally, we improve convergence and stability via Representation Alignment [20] (REPA), aligning intermediate features with acoustic-semantic representations from a pretrained model. Our main contributions are:

- We propose DMP-TTS, a DiT-based TTS framework that supports multi-modal prompting and achieves explicit style–timbre disentanglement.
- We build Style-CLAP, a cross-modal encoder that learns a shared, discriminative space for style attributes by aligning audio and descriptive text via contrastive learning and multi-task supervision.
- We introduce cCFG, a chained classifier-free guidance scheme that enables independent, continuous control of content, timbre, and style, and adopt representation alignment (REPA) to stabilize and accelerate training.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

We adopt Conditional Flow Matching (CFM) [21] to train the latent DiT and briefly review it here. CFM constructs a continuous-time flow between a noise sample  $\mathbf{z}_1$  and a data sample  $\mathbf{z}_0$  via a linear interpolation path:

$$\mathbf{z}_t = (1 - t)\mathbf{z}_1 + t\mathbf{z}_0, \quad t \in [0, 1]. \quad (1)$$

The associated velocity along this path is defined as:

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{z}_0 - \mathbf{z}_1. \quad (2)$$

In this setting, we parameterize the DiT as a velocity network  $v_\theta(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{c}, t)$ , which is trained to approximate the ground-truth velocity field. The learning objective is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{flow}} = \mathbb{E}_{t, \mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{c}} [\|v_\theta(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{c}, t) - \mathbf{u}\|^2], \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{c}$  denotes the conditioning information.

<sup>†</sup> denotes equal contribution. <sup>\*</sup> denotes corresponding author.




Fig. 1. (a) Overall architecture of DMP-TTS. (b) Unified multi-modal style encoder.

### 3. PROPOSED METHOD

#### 3.1. Overview

The architecture of DMP-TTS is shown in Fig. 1(a). At its core are stacked DiT blocks operating on mel-spectrogram latents, trained to map Gaussian noise to target latent representations. Conditioning comes from three complementary inputs (content text, timbre, and style), which are provided by a text encoder, a speaker encoder, and a style encoder, respectively. Furthermore, as rhythm is central to speaking style, a duration predictor conditioned on text and style embeddings controls phoneme-level alignment.

In the following sections, we detail the Style-CLAP, the chained CFG mechanism, and REPA.

#### 3.2. Unified Multi-Modal Style Encoder

To enable intuitive control over speech style, we build Style-CLAP, a unified style encoder (Fig. 1(b)) upon the pre-trained CLAP model. The pre-trained model inherently aligns text and audio in a shared embedding space, and we further fine-tune it for TTS style modeling.

We first curate textual style labels covering emotion, energy, and speech rate, while excluding descriptors unrelated to style (age, gender, pitch) to avoid overlap with speaker identity. To refine the alignment between audio and text style embeddings, we fine-tune the model with an InfoNCE [25] loss. Specifically, the contrastive loss  $\mathcal{L}_{con}$  is formulated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{con} = -\mathbb{E} \left[ \log \frac{\exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_a, \mathbf{h}_t)/\tau)}{\sum_{j=1}^N \exp(\text{sim}(\mathbf{h}_a, \mathbf{h}_{t,j})/\tau)} \right], \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbf{h}_a = \mathcal{E}_a(\mathbf{A}_i)$  and  $\mathbf{h}_t = \mathcal{E}_t(\mathbf{T}_i)$  are the embeddings extracted by the audio encoder  $\mathcal{E}_a$  and text encoder  $\mathcal{E}_t$ , respectively.  $\text{sim}(\cdot, \cdot)$  denotes cosine similarity, and  $\tau$  is a temperature parameter.

However, a contrastive loss alone, while aligning modalities, does not guarantee that the learned representations are discriminative for specific style attributes. To address this, we incorporate multi-task supervision into the audio branch to enhance its representations. Specifically, we use cross-entropy loss  $\mathcal{L}_{ce}$  for the discrete attribute—specifically, emotion—and mean squared error loss

$\mathcal{L}_{mse}$  for continuous attributes, including speech rate and energy. The overall training objective is a weighted sum of these components:

$$\mathcal{L}_{style} = \mathcal{L}_{con} + \lambda_c \mathcal{L}_{ce} + \lambda_m \mathcal{L}_{mse}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\lambda_c$  and  $\lambda_m$  are balancing coefficients. This combined objective ensures the style encoder learns cross-modal and discriminative style representations.

#### 3.3. Chained Classifier-Free Guidance

Classifier-Free Guidance [26] enhances generation quality by learning with and without conditions through random condition dropping. Yet the standard *all-or-nothing* setup yields only a global unconditional branch, limiting attribute disentanglement. As a result, the guidance scale strengthens content, timbre, and style *together*, making it difficult to control the expressiveness of any single condition independently.

Inspired by MegaTTS 3 [27], we introduce a chained classifier-free guidance (cCFG) mechanism for independent control over content, timbre, and style. During training of the DiT, we adopt a hierarchical condition dropout strategy inspired by Vevo’s [28] definition of information levels—treating semantics (text) as high-level and acoustic attributes as progressively lower-level. Concretely, we first drop the style condition  $\mathbf{c}_{style}$  with probability  $p_{style}$ ; if it is dropped, we then drop the timbre condition  $\mathbf{c}_{spk}$  with probability  $p_{spk}$ ; finally, we drop the text condition  $\mathbf{c}_{text}$  with probability  $p_{text}$  only when both style and timbre are absent. In addition, we apply a *style* perturbation during training—randomly feeding the speaker encoder with a different utterance from the same speaker to regularize the timbre branch and reduce style leakage. At inference time, this training scheme enables chained guidance, where the final prediction  $\hat{v}$  is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{v} = & v(\emptyset) + s_{text} [v(\mathbf{c}_{text}) - v(\emptyset)] \\ & + s_{spk} [v(\mathbf{c}_{text}, \mathbf{c}_{spk}) - v(\mathbf{c}_{text})] \\ & + s_{style} [v(\mathbf{c}_{text}, \mathbf{c}_{spk}, \mathbf{c}_{style}) - v(\mathbf{c}_{text}, \mathbf{c}_{spk})], \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $v(\cdot)$  denotes the predicted velocity field. For clarity, we omit the sampling timestep  $t$  and the intermediate latent state  $\mathbf{z}_t$ . By tun-

**Table 1.** Comparison with baselines on params, capabilities, MOS, accuracy, speaker similarity, and WER. **Txt@Spk** and **Aud@Spk** denote, respectively, support for text- and audio-based style prompting under a specified target speaker timbre.

Method	Params	Capabilities		MOS $\uparrow$		Accuracy $\uparrow$			Spk-Sim $\uparrow$	WER $\downarrow$
		Txt@Spk	Aud@Spk	NMOS	QMOS	Emotion	Energy	Rate		
GT	–	–	–	3.86 $\pm$ 0.21	3.89 $\pm$ 0.09	0.68	1.00	1.00	–	0.028
GT-Recon	–	–	–	3.74 $\pm$ 0.28	3.62 $\pm$ 0.12	0.62	0.80	0.97	–	0.030
CosyVoice [22]	0.3B	✓	✗	3.83 $\pm$ 0.26	<u>4.02<math>\pm</math>0.13</u>	0.29	0.22	0.51	0.68	0.059
CosyVoice2 [23]	0.5B	✓	✗	<u>3.92<math>\pm</math>0.22</u>	3.95 $\pm$ 0.17	0.33	0.31	0.52	<b>0.80</b>	0.046*
IndexTTS2 <sup>†</sup> [24]	1.0B	✗	✓	<b>4.03<math>\pm</math>0.18</b>	<b>4.09<math>\pm</math>0.13</b>	0.54	0.40	0.70	<u>0.76</u>	<b>0.028</b>
DMP-TTS (Audio)	0.3B	✓	✓	3.82 $\pm$ 0.23	3.83 $\pm$ 0.14	<u>0.55</u>	<u>0.82</u>	<b>0.74</b>	0.72	0.043
DMP-TTS (Text)				3.73 $\pm$ 0.27	3.77 $\pm$ 0.11	<b>0.64</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<u>0.73</u>	0.71	<u>0.038</u>

<sup>†</sup> IndexTTS2 provides textual control *only* for emotion; therefore, we do not evaluate text-style prompting (Txt@Spk) and omit related metrics.

\* CosyVoice2 may concatenate the textual prompt into the synthesized output, inflating WER; we filter prompt text when computing WER.

ing the guidance scales  $s_{\text{text}}$ ,  $s_{\text{spk}}$ , and  $s_{\text{style}}$ , we can independently control the strength of each attribute in the generated speech.

### 3.4. Representation Alignment

To stabilize and accelerate the convergence of our multi-conditional TTS model, we adopt a Representation Alignment strategy. This method injects acoustic-semantic priors into the DiT backbone by incorporating knowledge from a pre-trained model. In particular, we utilize the audio encoder of Whisper [29] as a teacher to guide the learning of intermediate representations within the DiT.

Concretely, we take the final-layer output of the Whisper encoder as the teacher representation,  $\mathbf{h}_{\text{whisper}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T_w \times D_w}$ , and an intermediate-layer output of the DiT as the student representation,  $\mathbf{h}_{\text{DiT}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T_d \times D_d}$ . Since the two differ in sequence length and feature dimensionality, we first upsample  $\mathbf{h}_{\text{DiT}}$  along the temporal axis and then apply a linear projection  $\mathcal{P}$  to match the target dimension  $D_w$ . The alignment is achieved by minimizing a cosine similarity loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{repa}} = 1 - \mathbb{E}_t [\text{sim}(\mathcal{P}(\text{Upsample}(\mathbf{h}_{\text{DiT}}))_t, (\mathbf{h}_{\text{whisper}})_t)] \quad (7)$$

where  $\text{sim}(\cdot, \cdot)$  denotes cosine similarity, and the expectation  $\mathbb{E}_t$  is taken over the temporal dimension  $t$ .

## 4. EXPERIMENTS

### 4.1. Dataset and evaluation

We constructed an internal, high-quality Chinese speech dataset of approximately 300 hours, containing 250k utterances from around 1,000 speakers. Emotion labels (happy, sad, angry, neutral, and fearful) were annotated using Qwen2.5-Omni [30]. To obtain accurate estimates of speech rate and energy, we employed the Silero VAD model<sup>1</sup> to extract effective speech durations. Speech rate was estimated as the number of Chinese characters divided by the effective duration, and loudness was computed in LUFS using the pyloudnorm library. Finally, both energy and speech rate were categorized into three discrete levels. In addition, character-level timestamps were obtained using a forced alignment tool<sup>2</sup>.

For evaluation, we uniformly sampled 100 utterances from the training data to construct a test set with a balanced distribution of

style attributes (emotion, energy, and speech rate); all style labels were manually verified by human annotators, and the synthesis texts were out-of-domain. We conducted *cross-speaker* style transfer to assess disentanglement: each test utterance was randomly paired one-to-one with another utterance from a *different* speaker, where one provided the timbre reference and the other supplied the content text and style. Word Error Rate (WER) was computed using the paraformer-zh [31] ASR model from FunASR. Speaker similarity was measured with Resemblyzer embeddings against the timbre-providing reference. Emotion accuracy was obtained using emotion2vec [32] on the synthesized audio and the style-providing reference. Energy and speech-rate accuracies follow the data-preparation pipeline, with both discretized into three levels. In addition, we conducted subjective listening tests and report NMOS (naturalness MOS) and QMOS (quality MOS).

### 4.2. Implementation details

**Mel-VAE.** Following a Kling-Foley [33] audio codec, 44.1 kHz waveforms are encoded by a mel encoder into 40-dimensional latents at 43 Hz, yielding an effective 1024 $\times$  temporal downsampling.

**Style-CLAP.** We adopt the pre-trained CLAP<sup>3</sup>, inserting MLP auxiliary heads before the audio projector for style supervision. Training is performed on 8 $\times$ A800 GPUs with a batch size of 128 for 50k steps, employing *formant* perturbation to mitigate timbre leakage. The learning rate is  $1 \times 10^{-5}$  with 5k warmup steps.

**TTS model.** The overall architecture follows the F5-TTS [34] base configuration, with DiT and text encoder depths and hidden dimensions aligned accordingly. The speaker encoder is initialized from the pre-trained cam++ [35] model in CosyVoice. The duration predictor consists of Conv1D blocks followed by MLPs, we detach gradients from its inputs. Waveform synthesis is performed by a BigVGAN [36] vocoder. Following the recommendation in the REPA paper, we select the 6th DiT block as the student layer for REPA, and extract the target acoustic-semantic features using Whisper Large-v3. The TTS model is trained on 8 $\times$ A800 GPUs for 85k steps, with 38,400 frames per batch. The learning rate is  $7.5 \times 10^{-5}$  with 20k warmup steps. For chained CFG, the dropout probabilities are set to 0.3 for style, 0.5 for timbre (conditional on style dropout), and 0.5 for text (conditional on both style and timbre dropout).

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/snakers4/silero-vad>

<sup>2</sup><https://github.com/MahmoudAshraf97/ctc-forced-aligner>

<sup>3</sup><https://huggingface.co/laion/clap-htsat-fused>

**Table 2.** Ablation study on multi-task supervision (Sup.) and REPA.

Method	Accuracy $\uparrow$			Spk-Sim $\uparrow$	WER $\downarrow$
	Emotion	Energy	Rate		
DMP-TTS (Text)	0.64	0.85	0.73	0.71	0.038
w/o Sup.	0.54	0.80	0.74	0.71	0.037
w/o REPA	0.63	0.82	0.74	0.70	0.046

### 4.3. Results analysis

#### 4.3.1. Comparison with Baselines

We compare against large-scale open-source TTS baselines pre-trained on  $\sim 100$ k-hour corpora and evaluate them in zero-shot mode, whereas prior controllable-TTS systems (e.g., ControlSpeech) are English-only and lack Chinese releases, precluding direct comparison. As shown in Table 1, our method surpasses open-source baselines in *style controllability*: with text prompts, emotion/energy/rate reach 0.64/0.85/0.73; with audio prompts, 0.55/0.82/0.74—exceeding the best baseline scores (0.54/0.40/0.70). For *intelligibility*, we achieve WERs of 0.038 and 0.043 for text and audio prompts, respectively—second only to IndexTTS2 (0.028). In terms of perceptual quality, our NMOS/QMOS under audio prompting (3.82/3.83) are comparable to ground-truth recordings (3.86/3.89), effectively reaching real-speech-level naturalness. However, our *speaker similarity* (0.71–0.72) remains below CosyVoice2 (0.80) and IndexTTS2 (0.76). We hypothesize that this gap arises from stronger generalization and speaker representations learned via large-scale pre-training in those models; additionally, information loss due to mel-spectrogram compression may attenuate speaker-discriminative cues.

Regarding prompt modality, text prompts yield more stable and higher style control, whereas audio prompts deliver higher naturalness (NMOS 3.82 vs. 3.73), suggesting richer prosodic and acoustic information in audio cues; this pattern also aligns with intuition—text provides discrete, interpretable control targets, while audio carries fine-grained prosody that enhances naturalness. Under the cross-speaker setting, we further observe comparable speaker similarity for audio- and text-conditioned synthesis, indicating that audio style prompting does not leak timbre cues.


#### 4.3.2. Ablation Study

Our ablation study involves two comparisons: removing the multi-task supervision (Sup.) and disabling the REPA strategy. For all experiments, we used text-based prompts during inference.

As shown in Table 2, removing Sup. notably weakens style control: Emotion accuracy drops from **0.64**→**0.54** and Energy from **0.85**→**0.80**, while Rate remains comparable (0.73 vs. 0.74); speaker similarity and WER show negligible change. In contrast, removing REPA primarily impacts linguistic fidelity: WER degrades from **0.038**→**0.046**, with only minor changes in style accuracies and speaker similarity (0.71→0.70). These results indicate that Sup. chiefly strengthens style control, whereas REPA aligns the DiT with Whisper’s acoustic–semantic space and lowers WER. Additionally, we observe that with REPA the model reaches intelligible speech at earlier training steps, indicating faster and more stable convergence.

#### 4.3.3. Effect of CFG Guidance Scales

The CFG guidance scale governs the adherence to conditional inputs. We analyze its specific impact on both speaker similarity and

**Fig. 2.** Effect of CFG strength on (a) speaker similarity and (b) emotion accuracy.

emotion accuracy to understand the inherent relationship between these two attributes under varying guidance strengths.

Specifically, we analyze the impact of individually varying the speaker or style guidance scale from 6.0 to 21.0 in steps of 3.0, while holding the other scales fixed. As shown in Figure 2, as the guidance scale increases, both speaker similarity (Figure 2(a)) and emotion accuracy (Figure 2(b)) show a general upward trend. Subjective listening tests also indicate that a higher style guidance yields more salient expressiveness (e.g., a “sad” tone becomes more pronounced), while a higher speaker guidance makes the synthesized voice sound closer to the target timbre. However, excessively high scales introduce over-conditioning that degrades naturalness and can slightly reduce the non-target attribute. In practice, moderate scales strike a better balance between controllability and perceptual quality.

### 4.4. Discussion

Looking ahead, we outline two natural extensions of DMP-TTS. (i) *Scaling style alignment and descriptions*: we plan to train the CLAP-based alignment on larger, multilingual corpora and to expand the style taxonomy with descriptions produced by Qwen2.5-Omni or stronger multi-modal LLMs, moving beyond static labels to dynamic style descriptors (e.g., energy trajectories) that capture temporal variation. (ii) *Scaling the TTS backbone and enabling semi-supervised learning*: we aim to scale the main diffusion transformer to larger model sizes and datasets, and to support semi-supervised training in which utterances without textual style annotations are trained using only the CLAP audio branch as style embeddings, while maintaining disentanglement via contrastive and consistency objectives.

## 5. CONCLUSION

We presented DMP-TTS, a controllable TTS framework that disentangles speaker timbre and speaking style via a CLAP-based multi-modal style encoder and enables independent attribute adjustment through chained classifier-free guidance; a REPA strategy further stabilizes training and improves convergence. Experiments show that DMP-TTS delivers strong style controllability with both text and audio prompts, competitive intelligibility, and good naturalness. Ablations verify that multi-task supervision chiefly boosts style control, whereas REPA improves intelligibility and yields earlier intelligible speech. Our analysis of guidance scales shows that increasing guidance strength enhances the expressiveness of the targeted attribute (speaker timbre or speaking style). We hope this work catalyzes advances in attribute disentanglement and training paradigms for controllable TTS.

## 6. REFERENCES

- [1] Yi Ren et al., “Fastspeech 2: Fast and high-quality end-to-end text to speech,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04558*, 2020.
- [2] Jaehyeon Kim et al., “Conditional variational autoencoder with adversarial learning for end-to-end text-to-speech,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 5530–5540.
- [3] Chengyi Wang et al., “Neural codec language models are zero-shot text to speech synthesizers,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.02111*, 2023.
- [4] Chunyu Qiang et al., “Minimally-supervised speech synthesis with conditional diffusion model and language model: A comparative study of semantic coding,” in *ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 10186–10190.
- [5] Xiaopeng Wang et al., “M3-tts: Multi-modal dit alignment & mel-latent for zero-shot high-fidelity speech synthesis,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.04720*, 2025.
- [6] Chunyu Qiang et al., “Secousticocdec: Cross-modal aligned streaming single-codecbook speech codec,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.02849*, 2025.
- [7] Chunyu Qiang et al., “Vq-ctap: Cross-modal fine-grained sequence representation learning for speech processing,” *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech and Language Processing*, 2025.
- [8] Ziyue Jiang et al., “Mega-tts 2: Boosting prompting mechanisms for zero-shot speech synthesis,” in *ICLR*, 2024.
- [9] Puyuan Peng et al., “Voicecraft: Zero-shot speech editing and text-to-speech in the wild,” in *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2024, pp. 12442–12462.
- [10] Minchan Kim et al., “Expressive text-to-speech using style tag,” *INTERSPEECH 2021*, pp. 4663–4667, 2021.
- [11] Xiaoxue Gao et al., “Emo-dpo: Controllable emotional speech synthesis through direct preference optimization,” in *ICASSP 2025-2025 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2025, pp. 1–5.
- [12] Zhifang Guo et al., “Prompttts: Controllable text-to-speech with text descriptions,” in *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [13] Dongchao Yang et al., “Instructtts: Modelling expressive tts in discrete latent space with natural language style prompt,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 32, pp. 2913–2925, 2024.
- [14] Chunyu Qiang, Kang Yin, Xiaopeng Wang, et al., “Instructaudio: Unified speech and music generation with natural language instruction,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.18487*, 2025.
- [15] Tianxin Xie et al., “Towards controllable speech synthesis in the era of large language models: A survey,” *arXiv e-prints*, pp. arXiv–2412, 2024.
- [16] Shengpeng Ji et al., “ControlSpeech: Towards simultaneous and independent zero-shot speaker cloning and zero-shot language style control,” in *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, July 2025, pp. 6966–6981.
- [17] Zeqian Ju et al., “Naturalspeech 3: Zero-shot speech synthesis with factorized codec and diffusion models,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2024, pp. 22605–22623.
- [18] William Peebles and Saining Xie, “Scalable diffusion models with transformers,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2023, pp. 4195–4205.
- [19] Elizalde et al., “Clap learning audio concepts from natural language supervision,” in *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [20] Sihyun Yu et al., “Representation alignment for generation: Training diffusion transformers is easier than you think,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.06940*, 2024.
- [21] Yaron Lipman et al., “Flow matching for generative modeling,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02747*, 2022.
- [22] Zhihao Du et al., “Cosyvoice: A scalable multilingual zero-shot text-to-speech synthesizer based on supervised semantic tokens,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.05407*, 2024.
- [23] Zhihao Du et al., “Cosyvoice 2: Scalable streaming speech synthesis with large language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.10117*, 2024.
- [24] Siyi Zhou et al., “Indextts2: A breakthrough in emotionally expressive and duration-controlled auto-regressive zero-shot text-to-speech,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.21619*, 2025.
- [25] Aaron van den Oord et al., “Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748*, 2018.
- [26] Jonathan Ho et al., “Classifier-free diffusion guidance,” in *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [27] Ziyue Jiang et al., “Megatts 3: Sparse alignment enhanced latent diffusion transformer for zero-shot speech synthesis,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.18924*, 2025.
- [28] Xueyao Zhang et al., “Vevo: Controllable zero-shot voice imitation with self-supervised disentanglement,” in *ICLR*, 2025.
- [29] Alec Radford et al., “Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision,” in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 28492–28518.
- [30] Jin Xu et al., “Qwen2. 5-omni technical report,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.20215*, 2025.
- [31] Zhifu Gao et al., “Paraformer: Fast and accurate parallel transformer for non-autoregressive end-to-end speech recognition,” in *Proc. Interspeech 2022*, 2022, pp. 2063–2067.
- [32] Ziyang Ma et al., “emotion2vec: Self-supervised pre-training for speech emotion representation,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, 2024, pp. 15747–15760.
- [33] Jun Wang et al., “Kling-foley: Multimodal diffusion transformer for high-quality video-to-audio generation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.19774*, 2025.
- [34] Yushen Chen et al., “F5-TTS: A fairytaler that fakes fluent and faithful speech with flow matching,” *Proc. ACL*, 2025.
- [35] Hui Wang et al., “Cam++: A fast and efficient network for speaker verification using context-aware masking,” in *INTERSPEECH*, 2023.
- [36] Sang-gil Lee et al., “Bigvgan: A universal neural vocoder with large-scale training,” in *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.