ROBUST MELODY TRACK IDENTIFICATION IN SYMBOLIC MUSIC

Xichu Ma   **Xiao Liu**   **Bowen Zhang**   **Ye Wang**

National University of Singapore

`{ma_xichu, liuxiao, zbowen}@u.nus.edu, wangye@comp.nus.edu.sg`

ABSTRACT

Melody tracks are worthy of special attention in symbolic music information retrieval (MIR) because they contribute more towards music perception than many other musical components. However, many existing symbolic MIR systems neglect the preprocessing of melody track identification (MTI). Moreover, existing MTI methods often deal with MIDIs of the same genres and follow specific track configuration. This limits their generalization and robustness to unseen data. To address these challenges, we propose a CNN-Transformer-based MTI model designed to identify a single melody track for arbitrary MIDI files robustly. To accommodate longer inputs, We also employ a sparse Transformer, speeding up attention computation. Our experiments show that our proposed model outperforms state-of-the-art (SOTA) algorithms in accuracy and benefits downstream MIR tasks.

1. INTRODUCTION

Listeners' perception of musical works is greatly shaped by the melodic lines of those works [1]. Human listeners can usually easily distinguish the melody from other musical components such as harmonic lines [2]. It is, however, not as easy for machines. Melody is also a major focus of many music information retrieval (MIR) tasks. These tasks fall into three categories: 1) Melody as a target, where the system seeks to output a suitable melody. Examples of this task include melody segregation [3, 4] and melody generation [5, 6]. 2) Melody as a requirement, where the model takes in an explicitly-identified melodic line as an input. Such tasks include lyrics generation from music [7, 8] and singing synthesis [9, 10]. 3) Melody as a dependency, where the melody is not explicitly provided as input but still heavily influences the results. Examples include genre classification [11] and music similarity measurement [12].

However, for melody-as-a-target tasks, the data of annotated melody labels can be difficult to obtain. Thus, an automatic MTI model can create more data for their training. The melodic line is the decisive factor for these melody-as-a-dependency tasks [13, 14]. However, current studies on melody-as-a-dependency tasks often neglect to

intelligently identify the melodic lines of music. For example, a music embedding learning model, PiRhDy [15], simply regards the track with the highest average pitch as the melody. Existing genre classifiers treat all tracks equally rather than give special emphasis to the melodic line [11]. On the one hand, melody plays fundamental role in music perception [16]; studies have shown the success of attention and self-attention mechanisms in sequence modeling [17, 18]. On this basis, we hypothesize that melody-as-a-dependency tasks' performance would likely improve if the data are available with identified melodic lines. This preprocessing of MTI would also help melody-as-a-requirement applications. For instance, some stylistic music generation systems can only accommodate specifically formatted melody note sequences as input, demanding musicians' manual annotation [19]. Equipped with a MTI module, it could eliminate the dependence on manual processing.

There are two main challenges in developing a robust Melody Track Identification (MTI) model for symbolic music. First, many existing methods either rely on normative composition theories [20]. They assume that the input MIDIs are highly-formatted (i.e., one channel has only one track) and usually in limited genres [21, 22]. This assumption limits their generalization and robustness in dealing with more diverse or "dirtier" samples. Second, while local and global musical features are both significant for MTI, architectures such as CNNs and RNNs are not ideal in capturing short-and-long-term features simultaneously.

To address the above challenges, we propose a CNN-Transformer model to identify one single track as the melody for a given input MIDI file. This architecture effectively captures local musical features at the level of a measure (or a frame) while also making predictions over the whole piece based on global aggregations of those local features. We also utilize sparse attention in the Transformer [23] to speed up computation and reduce memory requirements so longer musical works can be processed.

We conduct the MTI experiment on a manually annotated dataset of 11,625 MIDIs. The results show that the proposed model makes a breakthrough in the accuracy of MTI. We also evaluate our proposed model as a preprocessing plug-in in the three types of melody-sensitive tasks. The results indicate that our proposed model is easy to incorporate and effectively improves their performance. This work includes a dataset with 13,100 widely used MIDIs whose melody tracks have been labeled. This dataset will be an asset to other MIR studies in the future.

2. RELATED WORK

2.1 Melody-Sensitive Tasks

Many studies have been done on MIR tasks which are heavily influenced by melody. Whether any specific such task has melody as a target, melody as a requirement, or melody as a dependency, accurate identification and knowledge of melody can help solve that task.

2.1.1 Melody as a Target

Tasks which set the melody as a target seek to output a melody. These tasks include generating melodies, extracting melodies from existing music, and converting one melody into another. Most existing systems for these tasks require annotated melodic lines as labels. For instance, MSNet is an encoder-decoder network designed for melody extraction from audio [4]. It takes an audio spectrum as input, extracts a salience map via UNet-like networks, and then estimates the audio's melodic line. Another system treating melody as a target developed a LSTM-GAN model conditioned on lyrics to generate symbolic melody sequences [5].

2.1.2 Melody as a Requirement

Tasks which take melody as a requirement, by definition, require an explicitly labeled melodic line as an input. The aforementioned PiRhDy is a model designed for one such task: it needs an explicitly labeled melodic line so that it can predict a MIDI file's melodic notes by the contexts and thus learning the representation of the music [15]. Similarly, Melody2Vec [24] can only utilize MIDIs with labeled track names of "melody" or "vocal" as training data. Another example is AI-Lyrics, a system which automatically generates lyrics to parallel an input musical piece's style and syllable alignment [8]. This generator requires a syllable template which can only be extracted from the melody track of the input MIDI files. Other lyric generators and singing synthesis systems also require vocal melody to be explicitly identified as inputs [7, 9, 10]. Currently, the melodic lines in MIDI files must be manually labeled for those files to work with these systems, which hinders the systems' practical applications.

2.1.3 Melody as a Dependency

Tasks which use melody as a dependency do not require MIDIs with explicitly labeled melodic lines, but they are dependent on melody information nonetheless. For instance, MuSeReNet is a genre classifier for symbolic music which extracts latent features of MIDI files with CNNs and then feeds them into a Multilayer Perceptron (MLP) to identify their genre [11]. Genre is heavily influenced by melody, so better knowledge of melody would no doubt help improve this system's accuracy. Another example is MusicBERT, which is a large-scale pre-trained model for music understanding, resembling the BERT from the field of Natural Language Processing (NLP) [25, 26]. It pretrains the Transformer encoder [18] by solving a pretext task where it learns a music embedding by reconstructing notes' eight music elements such as tempo, pitch, velocity, and many others. Considering these elements are influenced by melody, we believe the knowledge of melody would likely help the learning.

2.2 Melody Identification

Melody extraction and identification problems can also be subdivided based on the different source and target data forms. The aforementioned MSNet is designed to extract melodic lines from acoustic audio, but though it achieves SOTA performance, it is sensitive to pre-defined settings such as input frame length and is not robust to inputs which do not match with those settings. Other models attempt to perform melodic line extraction from symbolic music [2, 3]. Namely, they output a note sequence representing the melodic line of an input MIDI. Hsiao et al., for instance, uses 1D-CNN networks to extract contextual information and further predict the probability of every pair of notes belonging to the same track. However, this model requires a lot of computation and thus have difficulty handling scaled up data size in a short time.

Rather than generating a note sequence as the melodic line, MTI systems aim to simply label the track which contains the melody. The Skyline algorithm, for instance, picks the track with the highest average pitch as the melody track [27]. There also exist Bayesian approaches which estimate a track to be a melody track if that track maximizes an accumulated probability derived from features such as note velocity, pitch values, and so on [28]. There are few deep learning approaches seeking to identify a single track of a MIDI file as the melody track. However, the emergence of self-attention mechanism makes the deep-learning-based models more powerful to cope with short term and long term musical structures simultaneously. And this motivates us to develop our CNN-Transformer model for this problem.

3. METHOD

In this section, we formulate the MTI problem, then present the data representation and the architecture design.

3.1 Problem Formulation

First, we define robustness of a MTI model for symbolic music in four aspects. A robust MTI model should be capable of identifying the melody tracks from MIDI files that 1) do not follow pre-defined track configurations (i.e., the first channel contains the melody track, the melody track is named as "Melody", etc.), 2) have several melodic and non-melodic tracks within one channel, 3) consist of various musical parameters (instruments, tempos, velocities and time signatures), and 4) diverse in genres, styles, and sentiments.

An arbitrary piece of symbolic music in MIDI format is denoted as $\mathcal{S} = \{Tr_N\}$, where N denotes its number of tracks, each track $tr_i \in Tr$ is a sequence of MIDI events, which trigger control demands or music notes. Namely,

Figure 1. Dataflow of our method. (a) MIDI quantization and split. (b) CNN feature extractor. (c) Global information aggregator. (d) Plug in downstream tasks.

$tr_i = [e_0, e_1, ..., e_M]$ where $e_j \in [0, 127]$. Given an N-track MIDI file $\mathcal{S}$, our task is to predict the ID y^i of one single melody track, formally, $Y = \{y^i | \mathcal{S}\}$. Since a MIDI file has at most 16 sound output channels and one channel can contain several tracks, our MTI model can be seen as a supervised 16-way multirun classifier. When the melody track occupies an entire channel, the initial prediction result is the melody track ID; When the melody track shares a channel with tracks of other musical components, the model reruns a second prediction to further distinguish the melody track from the initially identified channel. Therefore, the prediction process is definitively convergent in finite time.

As shown in Figure 1, the data flow of our proposed robust MTI model is divided into several modules. First, an input MIDI file goes through the input module for pre-processing: it is quantized and serialized as a matrix with a resolution of sixteenth note (Figure 1-a1). Then the matrix is split into overlapped frames with step-wise scanning (Figure 1-a2). Second, a frame level CNN extracts the local features of a frame (Figure 1-b) and a sparse Transformer based classification module predicts the melody track ID based on the aggregated global features (Figure 1-c). Taking in a MIDI and outputting its melody track ID, the whole MTI module (Figure 1-I) can serve as a preprocessing plug-in for other melody-sensitive MIR tasks (Figure 1-II).

3.2 Input Module

Our input module converts an input MIDI file $\mathcal{S}$ into a 2D matrix $\boldsymbol{M} = [m_{ct}]_{C \times T}$, where m_{ct} denotes the pitch value in the cth channel at the tth time step, and T denotes the total length of the MIDI. One time step corresponds to a sixteenth-note length so that the encoding is tempo independent. If there are multiple tracks containing different pitch notes in the same channel c at time t, m_{ct} is temporarily set to the highest pitch value. The module also ensures that all input MIDI files have a full sixteen channels by padding any files with channels of zeros. This encoding provides following advantages against the piano roll representation: 1) It has a fixed dimension of channels; 2) It omits the velocity which can confuse the MTI model; 3) The tracks sharing the same channel can be temporarily

fused into one representative pitch sequence and further distinguished in the rerun of the model later.

Inspired by Simonetta et al. [2], we apply step-wise scanning to split the 2D representation of a MIDI file into overlapping frames of fixed window size, w, equivalent to one bar. Each resultant frame is thus a $w \times w$ matrix $\boldsymbol{m}_{t-l:t+w-l}^{(i)}$, where $\boldsymbol{m}_{t-l:t+w-l}^{(i)}$ represents the frame centers around the tth time step in the ith MIDI file, and l represents the preceding l time steps.

3.3 Architecture Design

We propose a CNN + Sparse Transformer structure to learn local context information of each frame while also aggregating global information over the entire sequence. We also propose to overcome the memory bottleneck that a vanilla Transformer imposes. This enables the system to efficiently process longer music by reducing the density of self-attention connections. We adopt a hierarchical training strategy: First, we pretrain the CNN-based feature extractor by predicting the melody track ID at frame level; then, we fine-tune the whole model by predicting a single melody track ID of the input MIDI.

3.3.1 Local Context-Aware Feature Extraction

We use a CNN as our feature extractor to learn the local context information of given frames provided by the input module. The architecture for this portion of the system is shown in Figure 2. The feature extractor ϕ first goes through pretraining. Specifically, we add a temporary MLP layer with weights $\boldsymbol{W}$ and bias b to each frame to predict its fame-level melody track ID. The predicted probability for a certain frame $\boldsymbol{m}_{t-l:t+w-l}^{(i)}$ can be denoted as

$$\hat{y} = \text{softmax}(\boldsymbol{W}\phi(\boldsymbol{m}_{t-l:t+w-l}^{(i)}) + b) \quad (1)$$


Figure 2. The architecture of our feature extractor. Shortcuts represent skipped paths. Dotted shortcut represents dimension increases. The last fully connected layer (grey) is only used in pre-training.

3.3.2 Global Classification Module

With the pre-trained feature extractor ϕ mentioned above, each MIDI file can now be transformed and concatenated into a context-aware embedding

$$\boldsymbol{M}^{(i)} = \underset{t \in [1,T]}{||} \phi(\boldsymbol{m}_{t-l:t+w-l}^{(i)}) \quad (2)$$

where $\boldsymbol{M}^{(i)} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times d}$, $||$ denotes concatenation over time steps, and d denotes the dimension of feature extractor ϕ.

Figure 3. Left: an example of a sparse self-attention mechanism adapted in symbolic music, where frames 1 and 2 attend to three neighboring frames (blue), two random frames (orange) and a global frame (green) respectively. Right: an illustration of each sparse self-attention mechanism proposed by Big Bird, where $g = 2$, $w = 3$, $r = 2$.

We then apply and fine-tune the global feature aggregators (Sparse Transformer) upon the feature extractor by predicting a single melody track ID based on the aggregation of the frame-level features. Taking the sequence of the concatenated CNN features, the Sparse Transformer computes a sequence of embeddings with the same length and then aggregates to one single label, paying attentions to other positions in its computation. The computation of the multi-head self-attention is the same as the typical Transformer:

$$\mathcal{A}(x_i) = x_i + \phi_{attn}(\underset{h}{||} \delta(\frac{\mathcal{Q}_h(x_i)\mathcal{K}_h(x_i)^T}{\sqrt{d}})\mathcal{V}_h(x_i)) \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{Q}_h(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{K}_h(\cdot)$, $\mathcal{V}_h(\cdot)$ respectively denote the query, key and value function of x_i, $\delta(\cdot)$ denotes the scoring function, $\underset{h}{||}\cdot$ denotes concatenation over attention heads, and ϕ_{attn} denotes the projection applied after concatenation. Especially, the sparse self-attention reduces the density of self-attention connections to accommodate longer inputs.

3.3.3 Sparse Self-Attention In Symbolic Music

In a typical Transformer, the full self-attention mechanism requires a quadratic dependency on sequence length. However, the length of MIDI files is generally long; directly applying a full self-attention operation on it can lead to memory overflow. Rather than simply splitting the embedding $M^{(i)}$ into shorter segments [29], which can cause a loss of global information, we leverage Big Bird [23], a transformer with sparse self-attention mechanism. Specifically, the following sparse self-attention mechanisms are proposed: 1) **Random Attention**, all frames attend to r random frames in the sequence, allowing the global information aggregator to have better generalization ability. 2) **Window Attention**, all frames attend to w neighboring frames in the sequence, functioning as an information gateway of a music bar. 3) **Global Attention**, g newly introduced global frames (e.g., a classification token [CLS] preceding the sequence) attend to all frames in the sequence, collecting the global information. By combining these three sparse attention mechanisms, we manage to approximate the effectiveness of a full self-attention meanwhile reducing the time and space complexity from $O(n^2)$ to $O(n)$. Figure 3 gives an example of how frames sparsely attend in symbolic music.

4. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

This section contains the experiment design and the analysis of the results. First, we detail the construction of the datasets. Then we compare our proposed model with several baselines and alternative architectures so as to evaluate if our proposed MTI model can attain SOTA accuracy. Finally, we evaluate our model on three melody-sensitive downstream tasks, including melody segregation, music embedding learning, and genre classification.

4.1 Dataset

We create four different datasets, one per experiment, to train and evaluate our models. Each dataset is split into a training set and a validation set with an 8:2 ratio unless otherwise noted.

4.1.1 For MTI Model

We collect MIDI songs from three widely used MIDI datasets: LMD [30], Reddit MIDI dataset [1], and Free-MIDI [2]. We then eliminate samples with no obvious melody track, such as MIDIs of percussion instruments and chord progression patterns, and we also eliminate MIDI files where the melody changes tracks. Next, we manually annotate the melody track of the remaining songs and shuffle their melody track IDs for label distribution balance. The resultant dataset contains 11,625 samples for model training and validation (**D-MTI**). Additionally, the trained MTI model automatically annotates another 1,475 files in the Free-MIDI dataset, providing an overall dataset of 13,100 MIDI files (**D-Full**) [3] after manual checking. The proposed datasets are desirable for training and evaluating a robust MTI model because the data covers a variety of genres (17 in total), track configurations (track orders and names), as well as MIDIs with multi-track channels.

4.1.2 For Downstream Task Evaluations

To evaluate our MTI model's utility for downstream MIR tasks, we build three more datasets based on Free-MIDI: a dataset of 1,100 randomly selected MIDIs, including audio

---

[1] https://www.reddit.com/r/datasets/

[2] https://github.com/josephding23/Free-Midi-Library

[3] https://github.com/maxichu/MelodyTrackIdentification

renderings of the MIDIs and of their automatically identified melody tracks (denoted as **D-Audio**), a dataset of 5,000 genre-labeled MIDI files of 17 genres (**D-Genre**), and a dataset of 500 MIDI files of pop songs (**D-POP**).

4.2 Melody Track Identification

To evaluate the effectiveness, efficiency and robustness of our proposed MTI model, we select the following three baseline models: the Skyline algorithm, a Bayesian probability model with dynamic programming [28], and a 1D-CNN model with clustering [3]. The CNN-based melody segregation model [2] is not selected for comparison because it seeks to directly extract the melodic line rather than predict the melody track. We also selected three alternative architectures: a BiLSTM architecture, a CNN + MLP architecture and a CRNN architecture. We then compare our proposed CNN + Sparse Transformer (CNN-ST) architecture with all the above models.

Model	Accuracy(%)	Running Time(s)
Skyline	14.7	252.52
Bayesian	40.98	1094.15
1D-CNN	5.51	14818.89
BiLSTM	10.23	12.37
CNN-MLP	83.65	36.12
CRNN	81.60	32.74
CNN-ST	**84.40**	29.71

Table 1. Accuracy and efficiency of MTI models. The running time is the total time of infering 1,000 samples. (The frame-level accuracy of the basic CNN model is 49.72%)

As shown in Table 1, our proposed model achieves SOTA results without incurring extra computational costs. Both Skyline and the 1D-CNN model suffer sharp reductions in accuracy when dealing with samples which are not highly normative or formative. We believe that Skyline's dependency on music composition convention hinders its generalization, while the clustering phase of 1D-CNN model might be the bottleneck of the capability to accommodate complicated data sources. The Bayesian approaches obtains a lower accuracy of 40.98% on the proposed dataset than the reported 89% accuracy on a standard MIDI dataset. Its definitions of scoring algorithms targeting at only classical music could account for the accuracy drop. These issues can cause their respective algorithms to have low accuracy when processing long music with many different arrangements and genres. Worse still, the high time complexity of the 1D-CNN model can make it too costly to be incorporated into other models or applications.

As shown in Table 1, the comparison between BiLSTM and our proposed CNN-ST shows the CNN's effectiveness in capturing local musical features. The accuracy improvement over frame-level CNN indicates the ability of aggregating global information from frames of the proposed self-attention module. In the case study, our model handle the following occasions better than the baselines: 1) There are other components having a higher average pitch than the melody; 2) The music notes are dense and in large

quantity; 3) There are tracks echoing the high-pitch part of the melody. Therefore, our proposed model leads in accuracy, efficiency, and robustness for the MTI task.

4.3 Downstream Tasks

We test our MTI model in three downstream tasks of different types to evaluate its benefits to the MIR community: 1) Improving melody segregation of audio music by providing more easily-obtained training samples; 2) Improving musical embedding learning by allowing more rigorous assumptions on melody; 3) Improving genre classification by emphasizing the impacts of the melody.

4.3.1 Melody Segregation

As a typical melody-as-a-target task, melody segregation requires pairs of {audio music, melody} for training. However, such data is laborious to obtain–labeling large numbers of melodic lines requires a significant amount of time and effort from trained music specialists. Training with small datasets may lead to underfitting issues, such as a recent melody segregation work whose dataset only contained 108 samples [4]. Furthermore, existing paired datasets are often collected from just a few genres, or even one genre, of music. Models trained by those datasets thus often fail to generalize to music from other genres.

This experiment aims to test whether our MTI model can contribute to the melody segregation task by both automatically labeling the melody tracks of MIDI files in order to rapidly expand the amount of audio, including audio from various genres, formats and compositional rules, which can be used to train these systems.

ID	Pretrain Data	Train Data	OA (%)
1	/	MedleyDB	37.7
2	/	D-Audio-1K	39.91
3	/	MedleyDB ∪ D-Audio-1K	**41.1**
4	D-Audio-1K	MedleyDB	**40.23**

Table 2. Accuracy of different training data settings for the melody segregation task. All results are computed on an independent 100-sample validation subset of D-Audio. OA is short for overall accuracy.

We trained four melody segregation models with the same architecture [4] but different datasets. Our control model was trained with the 108 samples of the original MedleyDB [31]. Our three other models were trained with D-Audio-1K (1,000 samples in D-Audio), a combined dataset of MedleyDB and D-Audio-1K, and D-Audio-1K (pretraining) followed by MedleyDB (fine-tuning), respectively. Validation was done with the set of the remaining 100 samples from D-Audio, denoted as D-Audio-100.

As shown in Table 2, not only does an increased amount of training data improve melody segregation accuracy but pretraining with the D-Audio-1K dataset provides superior results to using either of those datasets on their own. The

pretraining, however, does worse than the setting where all the data is used for training. This can be attributed to the bias of data distribution between the two datasets.

4.3.2 Music Embedding Learning

Music embedding learning is a melody-as-a-requirement task. Many music embedding learning models are trained by predicting the melody notes according to other music components. However, these models generally rely on the Skyline algorithm or track names for data preparation, which can result in errors if they do not find the melody correctly [15, 24].

We conduct an experiment with the PiRhDy embedding model [15] to evaluate how well our proposed MTI can improve music embedding learning models. We run all of PiRhDy's three subtasks for performing music embedding (token modeling, next context modeling, and accompaniment context modeling) on both the D-POP and D-Gen datasets. Before executing those subtasks, we run the Skyline and the proposed CNN-ST+ model to identify melodic lines for the tracks being analyzed.

As shown in Table 3, all three subtasks achieve higher accuracy when using melody tracks identified by our proposed model as compared to Skyline. The best improvement occurs in the subtask of token modeling on the D-Gen dataset, which indicates that our system better handles unusual genres than the existing Skyline algorithm too.

/	Skyline+ D-POP(%)	CNN-ST+ D-POP(%)	Skyline+ D-Gen(%)	CNN-ST+ D-Gen(%)
Token Modeling	60.49	**74.61**	74.77	**96.74**
Context Modeling-Next	91.43	**92.05**	91.89	**94.58**
Context Modeling-Acc	67.45	**78.74**	55.37	**56.53**

Table 3. Accuracy of models using different methods for PiRhDy embedding learning.

Figure 4. The three compared architectures for music genre classification with different inputs of the MLP layer. The inputs of the MLP are: (a) only the CNN features; (b) concatenation of CNN features and the melody tokens; (c) CNN features Add-Norm with the melody tokens.

4.3.3 Genre Classification

As a melody-as-a-dependency task, genre classification can be enhanced by explicitly emphasizing the melody over other musical components. This experiment is conducted on D-Gen. As shown in Figure 4, the full-track

MIDIs and the identified melody track are first both tokenized into REMI [32] sequences with MidiTok toolkit [33]. Next, genre prediction is attempted with three different architectures. All of the architectures are CNN + MLP, and their input layers are just CNN features, CNN features appended with tokenized melody note sequences, and the CNN features Add-Norm with the tokenized melody note sequence respectively.

The results in Table 4.3.3 show that the accuracy increases when feeding the MLP layer with extra information about the melody. Therefore, highlighting the melody by either appending or blending it with the CNN features makes the music genre more distinguishable.

Inputs to MLP	Accuracy(%)
CNN features	41.51
CNN features ‖ Melody Tokens	**42.75**
Add&Norm (CNN features, Melody Tokens)	**45.76**

Table 4. Accuracy of models with different inputs to MLP layers for genre classification.

5. FUTURE WORK

We notice that emphasizing the melody track could dilute models for certain tasks where melody is not decisive, or at least is not the only decisive factor. For instance, we trained systems for key recognition [34, 35] with full MIDI files, just the melody tracks of MIDI files, and just the non-melody tracks of MIDI files. Whether using a rule-based algorithm [34] or a deep learning-based model [35], the systems trained with full MIDI files outperformed the others, and the systems trained with non-melody tracks outperformed those trained with just melody tracks. We thus estimate that accompaniments may matter more than melody for this task and are looking into ways to tweak our algorithm to account for this.

Also, the samples in our collected dataset contain only one melody track, and so for simplicity, we neglect scenarios such as multi-track melodies and melodies which switch tracks. In the future, we will develop a stronger model which can account for these scenarios even though they make the global musical structure of the song more challenging, and will also create datasets with more detailed annotations that can account for the position of the melody on a frame-by-frame basis.

6. CONCLUSION

Melody track identification is the first step towards music understanding and benefits melody-sensitive MIR tasks. This paper addresses the challenges of identifying the melody track accurately, efficiently, and robustly for any input MIDI. Our experiments show that our proposed model achieves SOTA performance and increases accuracy for many downstream tasks. We are optimistic that further research in this direction will not just enhance the ability of computers to identify melody tracks but will also improve many other aspects of MIR.

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

8. REFERENCES

[1] E. Selfridge-Field, "Conceptual and representational issues in melodic comparison," *Computing in musicology: a directory of research*, no. 11, pp. 3–64, 1998.

[2] F. Simonetta, C. Cancino Chacón, S. Ntalampiras, and G. Widmer, "A convolutional approach to melody line identification in symbolic scores," pp. 924–931, 2019.

[3] Y.-W. Hsiao and L. Su, "Learning note-to-note affinity for voice segregation and melody line identification of symbolic music data," in *22nd International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2021.

[4] T.-H. Hsieh, L. Su, and Y.-H. Yang, "A streamlined encoder/decoder architecture for melody extraction," in *ICASSP 2019-2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 156–160.

[5] Y. Yu, A. Srivastava, and S. Canales, "Conditional lstm-gan for melody generation from lyrics," *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications, and Applications (TOMM)*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 1–20, 2021.

[6] J. Wu, C. Hu, Y. Wang, X. Hu, and J. Zhu, "A hierarchical recurrent neural network for symbolic melody generation," *IEEE transactions on cybernetics*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 2749–2757, 2019.

[7] Y. Chen and A. Lerch, "Melody-conditioned lyrics generation with seqgans," in *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Multimedia (ISM)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 189–196.

[8] X. Ma, Y. Wang, M.-Y. Kan, and W. S. Lee, "Ailyricist: Generating music and vocabulary constrained lyrics," in *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2021, pp. 1002–1011.

[9] O. Angelini, A. Moinet, K. Yanagisawa, and T. Drugman, "Singing synthesis: With a little help from my attention," in *Interspeech 2020*, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://www.amazon.science/publications/singing-synthesis-with-a-little-help-from-my-attention

[10] P. Lu, J. Wu, J. Luan, X. T. 0003, and L. Zhou, "Xiaoicesing: A high-quality and integrated singing voice synthesis system," in *Interspeech 2020, 21st Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, Virtual Event, Shanghai, China, 25-29 October 2020*, 2020, pp. 1306–1310.

[11] E. Dervakos, N. Kotsani, and G. Stamou, "Genre recognition from symbolic music with cnns," in *International Conference on Computational Intelligence in Music, Sound, Art and Design (Part of EvoStar)*. Springer, 2021, pp. 98–114.

[12] F. Simonetta, F. Carnovalini, N. Orio, and A. Rodà, "Symbolic music similarity through a graph-based representation," in *Proceedings of the Audio Mostly 2018 on Sound in Immersion and Emotion*, 2018, pp. 1–7.

[13] T. Endo, S.-i. Ito, Y. Mitsukura, and M. Fukumi, "The music analysis method based on melody analysis," in *2008 International Conference on Control, Automation and Systems*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 2559–2562.

[14] J. Salamon, B. Rocha, and E. Gómez, "Musical genre classification using melody features extracted from polyphonic music signals," in *2012 ieee international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (icassp)*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 81–84.

[15] H. Liang, W. Lei, P. Y. Chan, Z. Yang, M. Sun, and T.-S. Chua, "Pirhdy: Learning pitch-, rhythm-, and dynamics-aware embeddings for symbolic music," in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2020, pp. 574–582.

[16] M. R. Jones, "Music perception: Current research and future directions," *Music perception*, pp. 1–12, 2010.

[17] D. Bahdanau, K. Cho *et al.*, "Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. arxiv preprint arxiv: 1409.0473," 2014.

[18] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, Ł. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention is all you need," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.

[19] S. Dai, X. Ma, Y. Wang, and R. B. Dannenberg, "Personalized popular music generation using imitation and structure," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.04709*, 2021.

[20] D. Rizo, P. J. P. De Leon, A. Pertusa, C. Pérez-Sancho, and J. M. I. Quereda, "Melody track identification in music symbolic files." in *FLAIRS Conference*, 2006, pp. 254–259.

[21] Z. Wang, K. Chen, J. Jiang, Y. Zhang, M. Xu, S. Dai, X. Gu, and G. Xia, "Pop909: A pop-song dataset for music arrangement generation," in *ISMIR*, 2020.

[22] Q. Xi, R. M. Bittner, J. Pauwels, X. Ye, and J. P. Bello, "Guitarset: A dataset for guitar transcription." in *ISMIR*, 2018, pp. 453–460.

[23] M. Zaheer, G. Guruganesh, K. A. Dubey, J. Ainslie, C. Alberti, S. Ontanon, P. Pham, A. Ravula, Q. Wang, L. Yang *et al.*, "Big bird: Transformers for longer sequences," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 17 283–17 297, 2020.

[24] T. Hirai and S. Sawada, "Melody2vec: Distributed representations of melodic phrases based on melody segmentation," *Journal of Information Processing*, vol. 27, pp. 278–286, 2019.

[25] M. Zeng, X. Tan, R. Wang, Z. Ju, T. Qin, and T.-Y. Liu, "Musicbert: Symbolic music understanding with large-scale pre-training," in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, 2021, pp. 791–800.

[26] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, "Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding," in *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL-HLT 2019, Minneapolis, MN, USA, June 2-7, 2019, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, 2019, pp. 4171–4186.

[27] A. Uitdenbogerd and J. Zobel, "Melodic matching techniques for large music databases," in *Proceedings of the Seventh ACM International Conference on Multimedia (Part 1)*, ser. MULTIMEDIA '99, New York, NY, USA, 1999, p. 57–66. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1145/319463.319470

[28] Z. Jiang and R. B. Dannenberg, "Melody identification in standard midi files," in *16th Sound & Music Computing Conference*, 2019, pp. 65–71.

[29] C. Hawthorne, I. Simon, R. Swavely, E. Manilow, and J. H. Engel, "Sequence-to-sequence piano transcription with transformers," in *Proceedings of the 22nd International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference, ISMIR 2021, Online, November 7-12, 2021*, 2021, pp. 246–253.

[30] C. Raffel, *Learning-based methods for comparing sequences, with applications to audio-to-midi alignment and matching*. Columbia University, 2016.

[31] R. M. Bittner, J. Salamon, M. Tierney, M. Mauch, C. Cannam, and J. P. Bello, "Medleydb: A multitrack dataset for annotation-intensive mir research." in *ISMIR*, vol. 14, 2014, pp. 155–160.

[32] Y.-S. Huang and Y.-H. Yang, "Pop music transformer: Beat-based modeling and generation of expressive pop piano compositions," in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2020, pp. 1180–1188.

[33] N. Fradet, J.-P. Briot, F. Chhel, A. El Fallah-Seghrouchni, and N. Gutowski, "Miditok: A python package for midi file tokenization," in *22nd International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2021.

[34] D. Temperley, "What's key for key? the krumhansl-schmuckler key-finding algorithm reconsidered," *Music Perception*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 65–100, 1999.

[35] F. Foscarin, N. Audebert, and R. Fournier-S'Niehotta, "Pkspell: Data-driven pitch spelling and key signature estimation," in *Proceedings of the 22nd International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference, ISMIR 2021, Online, November 7-12, 2021*, 2021, pp. 197–204.