# HW3 Transformer-based music generation

Name: 汪宣甫

Student id: R11944074

# Outline

- Method
- Experiments
- Conclusion
- Appendix
- Reference

# Method

- I trained two types of transformer-based language model, GPT2 [1] and llama [2].
- For each model, I fix the loss scale i.e. all models are with the same losses on training data, and tried three decoding strategies: greedy, beam search (number of beams=3) and top-p sampling (p = 0.95, temperature=0.95).

 $\Delta$ : absolute difference with the training dataset's score.

# Experiments

| Method                            | H1                   | H4                   | GS                   |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Compute directly from the dataset |                      |                      |                      |
| Train dataset                     | 1.94                 | 2.53                 | 0.78                 |
| Generated from GPT2               |                      |                      |                      |
| Greedy                            | 1.84 (Δ=0.1)         | 2.42 (Δ=0.1)         | 0.85 (Δ=0.07)        |
| Top-p w/ temperature=0.95         | 1.79 (Δ=0.15)        | 2.40 (Δ=0.13)        | 0.86 (Δ=0.08)        |
| Beam search (num_beams=3)         | 1.90 (Δ=0.03)        | 2.40 (Δ=0.12)        | 0.84 (Δ=0.06)        |
| Generated from LLama              |                      |                      |                      |
| Greedy                            | <b>1.93</b> (∆=0.00) | <b>2.50</b> (∆=0.03) | <b>0.78</b> (∆=0.00) |
| Top-p w/ temperature=0.95         | 0.03 (Δ=0.03)        | 0.03 (Δ=0.03)        | 0.03 (Δ=0.03)        |
| Beam search (num_beams=3)         | 1.96 (Δ=0.02)        | 2.45 (Δ=0.08)        | 0.87 (Δ=0.09)        |

# Conclusion

- Since the ranking depends on the "closeness" to the training dataset, so I list the delta value (the absolute diff.) in page 4.
- From page 4. we can see that generally greedy and beam search are better strategies than top-p sampling if we consider the delta value.
  - The result is quite intuitive since those strategies will choose the overall high probabilities combinations.
- From page 4. we can also see that llama generally outperforms gpt2.
- Also, I have tried qualitative analysis by myself, and I found that sometimes model will output exactly same song as the human player.
- I choose the best setting: llama + greedy decoding as the submission.

# Appendix: generated examples

You can check the examples here:

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1\_nmZeyKukczWPWZqMIaPwck6ID\_-RwnY?usp=drive\_link

### Reference

[1] Radford, Alec, et al. "Language models are unsupervised multitask learners." OpenAl blog 1.8 (2019): 9.

[2] Touvron, Hugo, et al. "Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models." arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971 (2023).