## MIR Homework 3 Report

**Question 1.**Fourier Tempogram

+		++   ALOTC   ++
ChaCha	0.3375	0.7658
Jive	0.4554	0.8333
Quickstep	0.4683	0.9024
Rumba	0.1908	0.4286
Samba	0.1105	0.2442
Tango	0.4340	0.8488
Viennese waltz	0.4841	0.9077
Waltz	0.3134	0.6818
+	+	++

## Autocorrelation Tempogram

+	P-score	++   ALOTC   ++
ChaCha	0.5136	0.9910
Jive	0.4523	0.9333
Quickstep	0.4181	0.8537
Rumba	0.4432	0.8980
Samba	0.3701	0.7326
Tango	0.5170	0.9651
Viennese waltz	0.4795	0.8923
Waltz	0.3402	0.6545
+	+	++

The results obtained by using the autocorrelation tempogram shows a significant improvement from fourier tempogram. Especially on the genre 'Rumba', 'Samba', both musica often have complex rhythmic patterns with multiple layers of percussion instruments. The autocorrelation method may be better suited for capturing the intricate rhythmic structures and detecting the periodicities within the music, leading to higher accuracy in tempo estimation.

And ChaCha also shows a notable improvement, in my opinion, the ChaCha rhythm may have strong periodic patterns that are better captured by the autocorrelation method. Autocorrelation is particularly effective for detecting repetitive patterns in music, which could explain the higher accuracy in tempo estimation for this genre.

## Question 2.

4 seconds fourier			4 seconds autocorrelation
+	+   P-score	ALOTC	Genre
ChaCha Jive Quickstep Rumba Samba Tango Viennese waltz Waltz	0.1299   0.4443   0.4885   0.2484   0.0551   0.4932   0.4834   0.2059	0.2973   0.8000   0.8902   0.5306   0.1163   0.9419   0.9231   0.4455	ChaCha
8 seconds fourier			8 seconds autocorrelation
+	+   P-score +	++   ALOTC   ++	++   Genre   P-score   ALOTC
ChaCha   Jive   Quickstep   Rumba   Samba   Tango   Viennese waltz   Waltz	0.3375 0.4554 0.4683 0.1908 0.1105 0.4340 0.4841 0.3134	0.7658   0.8333   0.9024   0.4286   0.2442   0.8488   0.9077   0.6818	ChaCha
12 seconds fourier	r		12 seconds autocorrelation
+	+   P-score +	++   ALOTC   ++	++   Genre   P-score   ALOTC
ChaCha Jive Quickstep Rumba Samba Tango Viennese waltz	0.2482 0.4822 0.4393 0.2182 0.1234 0.4883 0.4535 0.2532	0.5946 0.8833 0.8537 0.4898 0.2558 0.9419 0.8769 0.5636	ChaCha   0.5097   0.9820     Jive   0.4457   0.9167     Quickstep   0.3941   0.8049     Rumba   0.4481   0.9082     Samba   0.3764   0.7442     Tango   0.5171   0.9651     Viennese waltz   0.4793   0.8923     Waltz   0.3510   0.6636

It is interesting that Walts seem to have better performance when the window size is larger, while QuickStep seem to have better performance when the window size is small. So I think the slower songs will be better detected by using larger window size.

## Question 3.

+	+   P-score +	++   ALOTC
ChaCha	0.4954	0.9910
Jive	0.5227	0.9667
Quickstep	0.3971	0.8293
Rumba	0.4094	0.8878
Samba	0.3642	0.7326
Tango	0.6072	0.9884
Viennese waltz	0.4433	0.8000
Waltz	0.4578	0.8182
+	+	++

The proposed method computes the tempogram by element-wise multiplication of the Fourier tempogram and the transformed autocorrelation tempogram. The scales of the autocorrelation tempogram are pooled to match the frequency bins of the Fourier tempogram. The maximum values of the pooled autocorrelation tempogram within each bin are extracted and combined with the Fourier tempogram.

From the result, we can see that the badly performed genre back in question 1 & 2 are improved, and now have the similar or better performance like the result from another type of tempogram. For example, Samba has 0.11 from fourier tempogram and 0.37 from autocorrelation tempogram, now it has 0.36.

Question 4.

+	Precision	+	++   F-scores
ChaCha Jive Quickstep Rumba Samba Tango Viennese waltz	0.8991 0.8302 0.8421 0.7554 0.5492 0.8404 0.8857 0.5308	0.8886 0.5393 0.4319 0.7979 0.6121 0.7836 0.6747	0.8938   0.6538   0.5710   0.7761   0.5790   0.8110   0.7659   0.5944

I think the result is affected by the music style, for example, ChaCha's beats are super easy to follow while Walts usually emphasize on the first beat of a bar which leads to unclear down beat.