

TAILED U-NET: MULTI-SCALE MUSIC REPRESENTATION LEARNING

Marcel A. Vélez Vásquez

Music Cognition Group · Institute for Logic, Language, and Computation · University of Amsterdam
marcel.velezv@gmail.com

John Ashley Burgoyne

j.a.burgoyne@uva.nl

ABSTRACT

Self-supervised learning has steadily been gaining traction in recent years. In music information retrieval (MIR), one promising recent application of self-supervised learning is the CLMR framework (contrastive learning of musical representations). CLMR has shown good performance, achieving results on par with state-of-the-art end-to-end classification models, but it is strictly an encoding framework. It suffers the characteristic limitation of any encoder that it cannot explicitly combine multi-timescale information, whereas a characteristic feature of human audio perception is that we tend to perceive all frequencies simultaneously. To this end, we propose a generalization of CLMR that learns to extract and explicitly combine representations across different frequency resolutions, which we coin the tailed U-Net (TUNe). TUNe architectures combine multi-timescale information during a decoding phase, similar to U-Net architectures used in computer vision and source separation, but have a tail added to reduce sample-level information to a smaller pre-defined number of representation dimensions. The size of the decoding phase is a hyperparameter, and in the case of a zero-layer decoding phase, TUNe reduces to CLMR. The best TUNe architectures, however, require less training time to match CLMR performance, have superior transfer learning performance, and are competitive with state-of-the-art models even at dramatically reduced dimensionalities.

1. INTRODUCTION

Representation learning is a fast-moving sub-field of machine learning that seeks to distill information encoded in different types of input signals into less noisy abstract representations that are suitable for various downstream tasks. Such representations, which are learned without explicit supervision, have been successfully applied to a broad variety of musical and non-musical task domains [1], including audio tagging [2, 3] and speech recognition [4]. After self-supervised training, the learned representations are then evaluated by *probing*, a term originating from natural language processing [5–7]. In MIR, probing is also known as shallow network training or transfer learning [2, 8–13].

When probed, these self-supervised learning methods perform comparably to end-to-end trained models [3, 14, 15].

One of the more common learning architectures used for MIR tasks is the convolutional neural network (CNN) [16–19]. CNNs typically consist of either only an encoder path or an encoder and decoder path. One distinctive CNN with both an encoder *and* a decoder path model is the U-Net, consisting of variants of the encoder and decoder paths called contractive and expansive paths. Our work focuses specifically on adapting the U-Net architecture [20] to representation learning. To the best of our knowledge, there is little to no published research in computer vision, MIR, or signal processing that has considered the potential of U-Nets for representation learning.

U-Nets originated from the field of biomedical image segmentation, where they were introduced with the goal of being more data-efficient and less time-consuming to train for segmentation tasks, while also being able to perform well with relatively few data points and in the presence of class imbalance [20, 21]. U-Net architectures have shown top performance in segmentation, winning the ISBI cell tracking contest by a large margin in 2015 [20]. One of the arguments for how well U-Net architectures perform is the way the contractive and expansive paths allow the network to incorporate features across multiple resolutions.

U-Nets have also been shown to perform well within the audio domain. Their application to source separation in the time-frequency domain yielded state-of-the-art results [22], after which the U-Net established itself for source separation in the raw audio domain as well [23]. In raw audio and speech generation, U-Nets perform on par with Wavenet [24], with fewer parameters and faster inference [25]. We are also motivated to explore U-Net-like architectures for representation learning because of their intuitive relation to the *slow feature hypothesis* [26], which states that much of the meaningful information contained in signals changes gradually, over larger timescales. Without requiring a formal transformation to the frequency domain, U-Net architectures can extract these slow features alongside fine-grained high-frequency information by encoding and combining features across multiple timescales [25].

Given the scarcity of publicly available labelled data in MIR, we focus further on U-Nets for *self-supervised* learning. Specifically, we adapt the contrastive semi-supervised learning method from CLMR [3], since this has shown great promise on label training efficiency and generalisability of learned representations to out-of-domain MIR datasets. Specifically, we generalise the SampleCNN [27] en-






Figure 1: The TUNe architecture extracts features containing information obtained at multiple timescales. To this end, it consists of three main components: (1) the *contractive path* iteratively extracts features at a given timescales and reduces the signal resolution; (2) the *expansive path* upsamples the extracted features at lower resolutions and concatenates them into higher-resolution features than those obtained from the contractive path; and finally, (3) the *tail* combines the features extracted at multiple timescales and reduces their spatial resolution, ultimately yielding a single, low-dimensional, multi-timescale representation for an input signal.

coder architecture used in CLMR with a new architecture we dub the *tailed U-Net* (TUNe). TUNe architectures are like U-Net architectures, but with an additional contractive path – the tail – extending the original architecture by a mapping from a representation at the input resolution to a reduced latent representation size (see Figure 1). Intuitively, the ‘U’ shape of the network extracts a representation at the original temporal resolution, encoding a combination of slow feature patterns with higher-frequency components from the input signal, whereas the tail learns temporally reduced patterns from this enriched signal.

Our main contribution is this novel angle for the use of U-Nets for representation learning on signal data. Furthermore, we investigate a number of architectural setups with different model sizes to assess the performance and parameter efficiency of TUNe networks. In order to evaluate the learned representations, we transfer them to a range of benchmark MIR tasks, showing competitive performance with a drastically shortened training regime, parameter count, and representation dimensionality.

2. RELATED WORK

State-of-the art algorithms for audio-based MIR tasks (e.g., chord recognition, key detection, and music audio tagging) are generally built on one of three input forms: (1) time-frequency representations of the audio signal, (2) raw time-domain audio, or (3) a combination of raw audio and time-frequency representations [28]. Among the top-performing raw audio input architectures are musicCNN [2], JukeBox [29], and SampleCNN [27]. SampleCNN was introduced for raw audio classification and later adapted for CLMR’s contrastive learning setting. We use CLMR’s version of SampleCNN as a reference point for both performance and number of parameters. Moreover,

the TUNe convolution blocks introduced in Section 3 are based on the filter–stride–max pooling operation used in SampleCNN, which downshifts the effective frequency range modelled by the convolution kernels applied in subsequent layers. Note that because of this use of pooling operations, much high-frequency information is discarded in the extraction of the encoding from the input. Instead, our proposed approach explicitly combines these subsampled lower-frequency features with high-frequency features obtained at the original temporal resolution.

For a range of benchmark MIR datasets, CLMR is currently the best-performing self-supervised model that does not require industry-scale hardware to train [14]. It is a self-supervised learning framework, and as such, it requires no labelled data for training. Specifically, it is a contrastive learning framework: given two similar inputs to the network (e.g., two segments from the same song), the loss function is designed to ensure that the learned representations of these samples should lie closer to each other than the representations of samples from two different songs. CLMR also includes music-specific data augmentations to ensure a robust representation learning framework for MIR, for example, transposing the pitch of a segments up or down and still instructing the network to predict a closer distance to the original fragment than to the other audio segments in the batch. Because mapping the representations with a projector head instead of directly using the network representation results in a better representations [30], the output layer is replaced with an identity function and a projector head is added to the models trained with CLMR.

3. TAILED U-NET ARCHITECTURES

The architecture for representation learning we explore in this work is based on the traditional U-Net [20]. The U-

Net’s success on segmentation tasks has been argued to come from its explicit extraction of features at multiple resolutions, which allows it to respond to fine-grained features as well as long-range dependencies in the input. In representation learning for audio, we are interested in constructing encodings which similarly carry both high- and low-frequency information. Because U-Nets were originally designed for image segmentation, however, variants of the architecture traditionally produce an output at the spatial resolution of the input: $\mathbb{R}^{I \times C}$ where I is the input length and C the number of classes given by the task. Representation learning models, on the other hand, aim to decouple the dimensionality of the representation from the temporal resolution of the original input signal, to accommodate usage in a wide variety of downstream tasks. They typically output a single representation: \mathbb{R}^R with R the size of the representation. To address this mismatch, we propose adding a tail module to the U-Net. The tail module serves (1) to combine enriched sequence length representation obtained at multiple resolutions in the contractive and expansive path, and (2) to reduce the resolution of these features to a single compact multi-timescale representation. See Figure 1 for an overview of our architecture.

In addition to the tail module, we introduce another improvement on the TUNe architectures: TUNe+. TUNe+ networks have additional connections between the expansive and tail path (the pink arrows and blocks in Figure 1). This explicit transfer of information at lower resolutions should allow for better multi-timescale feature information flow, further improving the obtained representations.

3.1 Contractive Path

The contractive path of the network is built from a block consisting of a convolution, a batch normalisation layer, and a ReLU activation function, following CLMR’s encoding architecture [3]. This block is repeated N_{con} times (default 4). In Figure 1, this block is indicated with purple arrows. The output of this block is saved to combine with the corresponding expansive block later. After each block, max pooling is applied to extract the most prominent patterns at a given resolution, represented by the red arrows in Figure 1. The output of the max pooling is then passed on either to the next layer in the contractive path or, after the N_{con} -th block, to the beginning of the expansive path. Every layer in the encoder path doubles the amount of channels. The convolution operation is performed with a kernel size of 3 and a stride of 1, and the max pooling operation with a kernel size of 3 and stride of 3. Furthermore, the convolution operation is applied on a padded input, such that input and output to the convolution are of equal sequence length.

3.2 Expansive Path

Whereas each layer of the contractive path reduces the signal resolution, the expansive path of the network is made up of blocks that are paired with blocks from the contractive path, each one gradually *increasing* the signal resolution again. The expansive path block, which is repeated

N_{exp} times (default 4), consists of a strided transposed convolution, represented by the green arrows in Figure 1, with a kernel size of 3, stride of 3, and 0 padding, to keep the dimensionality the same as the output of the contractive block at the same depth. The output of each strided transposed convolution is concatenated with the output of its pair from the contractive path (see the blue arrows leading into the blue-and-white blocks in Figure 1). Next, a convolution followed by batch normalisation and ReLU activation is used to combine the multi-scale features in the concatenated outputs. The upsampling by strided transposed convolution enables the network to combine lower frequency features with the higher frequency information obtained at higher resolutions in the contractive path. The input–output channel ratio for the strided transposed convolution is 2:1, and for the convolution block is also 2:1, because of the concatenation of the encoder block and strided transposed convolution output.

3.3 Tail

The blocks in the tail of a TUNe model are identical to the blocks of the contractive path, each of the N_{tai} blocks (default 4) doubling the number of channels until the representation size is reached. In a TUNe+ model, the tail blocks differ from the contractive path blocks because TUNe+ tail blocks are paired with blocks from the expansive path. As illustrated by the pink arrows in Figure 1, each TUNe+ tail block combines the output of the previous tail block with the output of the expansive block at the same resolution. The input–output channel ratio in this case is 3:2, because the input gets $\frac{2}{3}$ of the input channels from the expansive path and $\frac{1}{3}$ from the previous tail block. Depending on the number of downsampling steps in the tail module, any remaining temporal dimensions O are projected to a single representation using average pooling, mapping from $\mathbb{R}^{O \times R}$ to \mathbb{R}^R with R the representation size. This operation is indicated by the yellow arrow in Figure 1.

The TUNe network architecture allows for flexible network adjustments. When removing all tail layers the resulting TUNe is equivalent to the original U-Net. If all expansive layers are removed there is no way to distinguish contractive and tail layers, and adding six contractive or tail layers is equivalent to CLMR. Since the output does not have to end with the same dimensionality as the input, one can add and remove contractive, expansive, or tail layers without needing to add or remove layers along the other paths. We leverage this compositionality to conduct experiments with the TUNe architecture that explore representations built up over a differing number of timescales, in order to explore the impact of the structure of each respective module on the capacity of the resulting representation to perform in downstream tasks.

4. EXPERIMENTS

To explore the validity and performance of our proposed setup, we trained multiple TUNe architectures with varying path lengths for 1000 epochs on the MagnaTagATune

Variant	N_{con}	N_{exp}	N_{tai}	Filters	Parameters (M)	MTT_{AUC}	MTT_{AP}
Vanilla TUNe	4	4	4	34	2.4	87.7	33.0
TUNe Contractive+1	5	5	4	18	2.3	88.3	33.9
TUNe Contractive+2	6	6	4	9	2.1	88.6	34.6
TUNe Contractive+3	7	7	4	4	1.7	88.0	33.5
TUNe Expansive-1	4	3	3	34	2.3	87.6	33.0
TUNe Expansive-2	4	2	2	35	2.4	87.7	33.1
TUNe Expansive-3	4	1	1	38	2.3	87.6	33.0
TUNe Tail+1	4	4	5	28	2.3	88.2	34.4
TUNe Tail+2	4	4	6	19	2.3	88.7	35.2
TUNe Tail+3	4	4	7	15	2.3	89.1	36.5
TUNe Tail+4	4	4	8	13	2.3	89.2	36.6
TUNe Tail+5	4	4	9	11	2.1	89.2	36.5
TUNe CLMR-tail	4	4	10*	10*	2.5	89.4	36.7
TUNe+	4	4	9	11	2.2	89.2	36.6
Vanilla TUNe Small	4	4	4	11	0.4	86.8	31.9
TUNe+ Large	4	4	9	34	7.4	89.4	37.1
TUNe+ Smaller Rep	4	4	9	11	1.4	89.2	36.1
musicnn 10 000 [2]	-	-	-	-	11.8**	90.7	38.4
TUNe Tail+5 10 000	4	4	9	11	2.1	89.5 (89.6)	37.0 (36.7)
TUNe+ 10 000	4	4	9	11	2.2	89.3 (89.8)	37.1 (37.1)
CLMR 10 000 [3]	10	0	0	-	2.4	88.7 (89.3)	35.6 (36.0)

Table 1: TUNe variant performance on the MagnaTagATune (MTT) tag prediction task with number of parameters and number of initial filters. The performance is measured after 1000 epochs (except where noted otherwise) with the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve MTT_{AUC} , and the average precision, MTT_{AP} . The table is divided into six sections: the Vanilla TUNe model with no layers added; the results of adding contractive layers; the results of removing expansive layers; the results of adding tail layers; the results parameter-efficiency experiments; and the results of the best TUNe models and the CLMR baseline after training for 10 000 epochs. In addition to the shallow probe, we trained a probe with an extra linear layer for the longer trained models and report this score in parentheses. TUNe Tail+5 and TUNe+ at 10 000 epochs are the best-performing models overall, exceeding CLMR’s performance at 10 000 epochs and performing only slightly worse than state-of-the-art end-to-end-trained musicnn. Multiple other variants match CLMR performance even though only trained for 1 000 epochs.

* For the CLMR-tail experiment, the number of filters corresponds to the initial number of filters used for the contractive and expansive path. For the tail, we used the same architecture as CLMR’s SampleCNN and report the number of blocks.

** Number of parameters is taken from the last reported number of parameters, musicnn [31].

audio dataset. As baseline, we compare to CLMR [3]. We ensure a fair comparison by varying the number of channels in each TUNe architecture to obtain a total parameter count comparable to the CLMR baseline. Next, we trained five variants: (1) a version where the tail was fixed to the published pre-trained CLMR model, in order to test whether the contractive and expansive paths (the ‘U’) add information; (2) a TUNe+ network, still restricted to have no more parameters than CLMR, to test whether the extra connections between the expansive path and the tail allow for better feature information flow; (3) a filter-restricted model, to test whether the number of filters can be a bottleneck for the deeper models; (4) a large TUNe+ network with an unrestricted number of parameters; and (5) a model with a smaller representation dimension. Finally, we evaluated the out-of-domain dataset generalisability of our two best models on three different datasets for the same probing task.¹

¹ Pretrained models and source code for all experiments are available to download at <https://github.com/Marcel-Velez/TUNe>

4.1 Hyperparameters and Preprocessing

The hyperparameters we used for pre-training were the same as [3], following their setup with data augmentations. We used an Adam optimiser [32], and He initialisation [33] for all convolutional layers. As input, we sampled audio files at 22 050 Hz for 59 049 samples. We also used the same architecture for the projector head as [3]. This output is then used for the contrastive learning objective. For every experiment, we used a batch size of 96. In order to be able to train with such a batch size, we trained every model data-parallel (DP) on two Titan RTXs, except for Vanilla TUNe and TUNe+ Large. To train these variants with a batch size of 96, we used three Titan RTXs.

4.2 Exploring the TUNe Architecture

Because the number of permutations of how many contractive layers are added, expansive layers are subtracted, tail layers are added grows exponentially, we chose to investigate the influence of each of these paths separately. Every model was trained on the audio of the MagnaTagA-

Tune (MTT) dataset [34]. This dataset consists of 25 863 music clips of 29 seconds of audio from 5223 songs. Each of these clips has one or more tags, making it a multi-class classification task dataset. We use the same train-validation-test split as is common within MIR [35–37]. After training, each model was probed on the MTT tagging task using a single linear-layer probe and evaluated using two metrics. The first metric is the receiver operating characteristic curve (MTT_{AUC}), which is popular but can be positively biased for imbalanced datasets [38], and the average precision (MTT_{AP}). We report results for each model in Table 1.

The only constraint for these variations was to have fewer parameters than CLMR, so as to exclude the model being bigger being a possible reason for performing better. The TUNe architecture follows a fixed input channel–output channel ratio per layer, and thus in order to keep the number of parameters smaller than CLMR, we only had to change the number of output channels of the first block. The remainder of the network changes in proportion. A complete overview of the number of parameters and initial output filters can be found in Table 1.

4.2.1 Contractive Path Depth

When varying the contractive path depth, we also added an equal number of expansive layers, in order to keep the upper resolution of the U and the tail the same; the tail remained unchanged so that the final representation size remained unchanged. Starting from the vanilla default of 4 contractive layers, adding layers increased performance up until $N_{con} = 6$, suggesting that the extra contractive and expansive layers – a deeper U – do allow for better integration of feature information for the representation dimensionality. Contractive+3 ($N_{con} = 7$) drops slightly in performance, which initially seems contradictory to the Contractive+1 and +2 results. We believe this can be attributed to the potentially exponential parameter growth of adding layers to the contractive and thus also expansive paths: to prevent the exponential growth and remain within our constraint on the maximum number of parameters, adding layers entails reducing the number of filters. TUNe Contractive+3, for example, has only 4 initial filters, as compared to 34 in Vanilla TUNe, and this may no longer be enough to achieve good performance.

To test this hypothesis, we ran Vanilla TUNe with the number of filters from TUNe+ (labelled Vanilla TUNe Small in Table 1), and conversely ran TUNe+ with the number of filters from Vanilla TUNe (labelled TUNe+ Large in Table 1). Vanilla TUNe performance dropped and TUNe+ Large performance increased under these conditions, suggesting that the number filters could indeed be the bottleneck for Contractive+3.

4.2.2 Expansive Path Height

In order to analyze the effect of expansive path height, we applied a similar procedure. For every expansive layer we removed, we also removed a tail layer to keep the final representation dimensionality unchanged. Because this modi-

fication reduced dimensionality, we were able to *add* initial filters in order to come closer to the dimensionality of CLMR. Nonetheless, removing expansive layers seems to have little influence: removing up to three layers of the expansive path and tail leaves performance essentially unchanged. Put differently, the extra initial filters seem to be able to compensate for reduced integration of the higher frequency timescale features due to a shallower U.

To see whether the U shape in fact adds information and increases performance, we trained a TUNe model with a tail path identical to pretrained CLMR. If the U shape does not add information, such a model should perform equally well or worse than baseline CLMR; if it performs better, then there is evidence that the contractive and expansive paths are contributing signal enrichment important for representation learning. Indeed, TUNe with a CLMR tail performs better with a single layer probe than baseline CLMR can even after 10 times as many training epochs and a multi-layer probe. It seems that the contractive–expansive path pair is a powerful performance enhancer for time-domain music representation learning.

4.2.3 Tail Length

The model performance after adding 1 to 5 layers to the tail path shows a steady increase per layer added until Tail+4, after which performance seems to plateau. In general, we should expect longer tails to improve performance, because the model average pools the remaining sequence length at the end of the tail path. With fewer tail layers, we average over a longer sequence, and when averaging, detailed information is replaced with an aggregation, thereby losing possible important information. The parameter constraint could again be responsible for the eventual plateau, as we see that the TUNe+ Large model from before also performs better than either Tail+4 or Tail+5. But it is a plateau, not a decrease: Tail+5 performs equivalently to Tail+4, and it does so with fewer parameters and potentially less loss of precision from averaging than Tail+4. We choose Tail+5 as our best model from this block.

4.2.4 Extra Connections

The model with extra connections, TUNe+, performs comparably to the Tail+5 model, with only .1 higher MTT_{AP} . It still shows similar MTT_{AUC} scores as CLMR 10 000 epochs trained and outperforms CLMR MTT_{AP} -wise. To further explore the influence of the added connections we chose TUNe+ to be one of the two variants used for the probing experiments (Section 4.3).

4.2.5 Smaller Representations

All of these variants showed reasonable performance for the same representation size, with only slightly varying numbers of parameters. To test the parameter efficiency of TUNe architectures, we trained another variant of the TUNe+ with the same number of initial filters, but reducing the representation size from 512 to 256. The results were impressive. Even with 44% fewer parameters and a representation size half that of the other TUNe architectures we tested, TUNe+ Smaller Rep still performs equally

well as CLMR after 10 000 epochs. Compared to the best TUNe architectures, it achieves comparable MTT_{AUC} and only marginally worse MTT_{AP} .

4.2.6 Longer Training

In order to be conservative with computing resources, we first trained all of the aforementioned models for 1000 epochs only and probed with only a single linear layer. As a final comparison, we trained the two best models, TUNe Tail+5 and TUNe+, an additional 9 000 epochs. Because of the random data augmentations and the size of MTT, training for more epochs results in the models ‘hearing’ an increasing amount of natural variation in the audio, which in turn improves performance. We evaluated these models using the same probing tasks, once with a single linear layer and once with a two-layer probe to see how much introducing nonlinearity could increase performance. In Table 1, we report these additional multi-layer performance figures in brackets. The MTT_{AUC} score does increase with the multilayer probe, but the MTT_{AP} , on the contrary, decreases. Overall, however, these two 10 000-epoch models are the best performing models from our entire series of experiments, achieving slightly lower performance than the musically motivated end-to-end trained musicnn [2] and outperforming CLMR 10 000 epoch results.

4.3 Probing Tasks

In order to compare the TUNe performance to state-of-the-art models, we evaluate TUNe with probing: training a shallow model on downstream tasks [10]. We use the same datasets as [3] for the CLMR training.

When probing a model, we evaluate the pre-trained model representations on a different dataset than the model is pre-trained on. This evaluation on a different dataset is done by training a probe, often a single linear layer or a multi-layer perceptron with one hidden layer. This probe takes the output representation of the main model as input and outputs the desired classes or values for the task in question. Probing is often used to test certain representation characteristics, in our case, to see how well the learned representations from other types of datasets generalise to music tagging.

We ran the probing experiment to see how well our network could generalise representations when trained on three different datasets: the medium Free Music Archive dataset [39], the fault-filtered GTZAN dataset [40,41] containing 930 songs, and the McGill Billboard dataset [42] containing 712 songs. Next, we probed the trained models on the MTT dataset, of which the results are displayed in Table 2. For this probing experiment, we used a learning rate of $3e^{-4}$, weight decay of 10^{-6} , and an early stopping mechanism. Early stopping occurred if the probe’s validation score did not improve for five epochs.

TUNe architectures allow for excellent out-of-dataset representation generalisability. Even when both TUNe Tail+5 and TUNe+ were trained on the McGill Billboard dataset, which is more than 33 times smaller than MTT, the models still only perform 4% worse on AUC than the

Probing Variant	Training Data	MTT_{AUC}	MTT_{AP}
TUNe+	FMA	89.1 (89.4)	36.2 (36.1)
TUNe Tail +5	FMA	88.9 (89.2)	35.3 (35.9)
CLMR	FMA	86.2 (86.6)	30.6 (31.2)
TUNe+	GTZAN	87.2 (87.9)	32.6 (33.9)
TUNe Tail +5	GTZAN	86.9 (87.5)	32.6 (33.0)
CLMR	GTZAN	81.9 (85.4)	26.2 (29.5)
TUNe Tail +5	Billboard	84.7 (85.8)	28.6 (29.9)
TUNe+	Billboard	84.5 (85.9)	28.7 (30.5)
CLMR	Billboard	82.7 (84.2)	26.9 (27.8)

Table 2: TUNe Tail +5, TUNe+ and CLMR out-of-domain probing experiments. The table shows the probing performance on MagnaTagATune of each of the three models, trained on the Free Music Archive medium (FMA), fault-filtered GTZAN, and the McGill Billboard dataset. In addition to the shallow probe, we trained a probe with an extra linear layer and report this score in parentheses. CLMR results are taken from [3].

models pre-trained on MTT. When they are trained on the GTZAN dataset, which is about the same size as McGill Billboard, both variants outperform CLMR regardless of (non-MTT) training set. With pre-training on the MTT-sized FMA dataset, the TUNe models perform almost as well as they did in the original MTT-only experiments.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduced TUNe network architectures, a generalisation of a recent representation learning framework called CLMR. TUNe brings the strengths of U-Nets to representation learning. TUNe networks comprise three sections, called the contractive, expansive, and tail paths, which can be flexibly lengthened or shortened. We performed several experiments exploring the contribution of each of these paths and compared them against CLMR. We evaluated TUNe’s performance in three ways. First, we trained and evaluated variants of our model with CLMR on MagnaTagATune (MTT), outperforming CLMR marginally after training for a fraction of CLMR’s time. Second, we evaluated the best two models with out-of-domain probing tasks. Both TUNe architectures improved upon the already competitive CLMR performance and showed that TUNe architectures allow for an even better generalisation of music representations. In the supplemental material, we include the results of further experiments showing how TUNe architectures can also achieve competitive performance on other downstream tasks, even at small model sizes. TUNe sets a new standard for parameter efficiency and the ability of modern self-supervised networks to extract salient features, and we hope that it will encourage MIR researchers to use self-supervised music representations more widely.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Bengio, A. Courville, and P. Vincent, “Representation learning: A review and new perspectives,” *IEEE*

- transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 1798–1828, 2013.
- [2] J. Pons and X. Serra, “musicnn: Pre-trained convolutional neural networks for music audio tagging,” 2019.
- [3] J. Spijkervet and J. A. Burgoyne, “Contrastive learning of musical representations,” in *Proceedings of the 22nd International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2021.
- [4] A. Baevski, Y. Zhou, A. Mohamed, and M. Auli, “wav2vec 2.0: A framework for self-supervised learning of speech representations,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 12 449–12 460, 2020.
- [5] D. Hupkes, S. Veldhoen, and W. Zuidema, “Visualisation and ‘diagnostic classifiers’ reveal how recurrent and recursive neural networks process hierarchical structure,” *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, vol. 61, pp. 907–926, 2018.
- [6] A. Conneau, G. Kruszewski, G. Lample, L. Barrault, and M. Baroni, “What you can cram into a single vector: Probing sentence embeddings for linguistic properties,” in *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, vol. 1, 2018, pp. 2126–2136. [Online]. Available: <https://aclanthology.org/P18-1198>
- [7] J. Hewitt and C. D. Manning, “A structural probe for finding syntax in word representations,” in *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, vol. 1, 2019, pp. 4129–4138.
- [8] A. Van Den Oord, S. Dieleman, and B. Schrauwen, “Transfer learning by supervised pre-training for audio-based music classification,” in *Proceedings of the 15th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2014.
- [9] P. Hamel, M. E. Davies, K. Yoshii, and M. Goto, “Transfer learning in MIR: Sharing learned latent representations for music audio classification and similarity,” in *Proceedings of the 14th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2013.
- [10] K. Choi, G. Fazekas, M. B. Sandler, and K. Cho, “Transfer learning for music classification and regression tasks,” in *Proceedings of the 18th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2017.
- [11] J. Lee, J. Park, and J. Nam, “Representation learning of music using artist, album, and track information,” Paper presented at the Machine Learning for Music Discovery Workshop, International Conference on Machine Learning, 2019.
- [12] Q. Huang, A. Jansen, L. Zhang, D. P. Ellis, R. A. Saurous, and J. Anderson, “Large-scale weakly-supervised content embeddings for music recommendation and tagging,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2020, pp. 8364–8368.
- [13] J. Kim, J. Urbano, C. Liem, and A. Hanjalic, “One deep music representation to rule them all? A comparative analysis of different representation learning strategies,” *Neural Computing and Applications*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 1067–1093, 2020.
- [14] R. Castellon, C. Donahue, and P. Liang, “Codified audio language modeling learns useful representations for music information retrieval,” in *Proceedings of the 22nd International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2021.
- [15] K. He, X. Chen, S. Xie, Y. Li, P. Dollár, and R. Girshick, “Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners,” arXiv:2111.06377, 2021.
- [16] B. Zhang, J. Leitner, and S. Thornton, “Audio recognition using mel spectrograms and convolution neural networks,” Online report, Noiselab, University of California, 2019.
- [17] J. S. Gómez, J. Abeßer, and E. Cano, “Jazz solo instrument classification with convolutional neural networks, source separation, and transfer learning,” in *Proceedings of the 19th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2018, pp. 577–584.
- [18] M. A. Rohit, A. Bhattacharjee, and P. Rao, “Four-way classification of tabla strokes with models adapted from automatic drum transcription,” in *Proceedings of the 22nd International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2021.
- [19] H.-W. Dong, W.-Y. Hsiao, L.-C. Yang, and Y.-H. Yang, “MuseGAN: Multi-track sequential generative adversarial networks for symbolic music generation and accompaniment,” in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2018.
- [20] O. Ronneberger, P. Fischer, and T. Brox, “U-Net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation,” in *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*. Springer, 2015, pp. 234–241.
- [21] S. Minaee, Y. Y. Boykov, F. Porikli, A. J. Plaza, N. Kehtarnavaz, and D. Terzopoulos, “Image segmentation using deep learning: A survey,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2021.
- [22] A. Jansson, E. Humphrey, N. Montecchio, R. Bittner, A. Kumar, and T. Weyde, “Singing voice separation with deep U-Net convolutional networks,” in *Proceedings of the 18th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2017, pp. 23–27.

- [23] D. Stoller, S. Ewert, and S. Dixon, “Wave-U-Net: A multi-scale neural network for end-to-end audio source separation,” in *Proceedings of the 19th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2018.
- [24] A. Van Den Oord, S. Dieleman, H. Zen, K. Simonyan, O. Vinyals, A. Graves, N. Kalchbrenner, A. W. Senior, and K. Kavukcuoglu, “WaveNet: A generative model for raw audio,” Paper presented at the Speech Synthesis Workshop, International Speech Communication Association, 2016.
- [25] D. Stoller, M. Tian, S. Ewert, and S. Dixon, “Seq-U-Net: A one-dimensional causal U-Net for efficient sequence modelling,” in *Proceedings of the 29th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020, pp. 2893–2900.
- [26] L. Wiskott and T. J. Sejnowski, “Slow feature analysis: Unsupervised learning of invariances,” *Neural Computation*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 715–770, 2002.
- [27] J. Lee, J. Park, K. L. Kim, and J. Nam, “SampleCNN: End-to-end deep convolutional neural networks using very small filters for music classification,” *Applied Sciences*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 150, 2018.
- [28] M. Lederle and B. Wilhelm, “Combining high-level features of raw audio waves and mel-spectrograms for audio tagging,” Submission to the Detection and Classification of Acoustic Scenes and Events challenge, 2018.
- [29] P. Dhariwal, H. Jun, C. Payne, J. W. Kim, A. Radford, and I. Sutskever, “Jukebox: A generative model for music,” arXiv:2005.00341, 2020.
- [30] T. Chen, S. Kornblith, M. Norouzi, and G. Hinton, “A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations,” in *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020, pp. 1597–1607.
- [31] J. Pons, O. Nieto, M. Prockup, E. M. Schmidt, A. F. Ehmann, and X. Serra, “End-to-end learning for music audio tagging at scale,” in *Proceedings of the 19th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2018.
- [32] D. Kingma and J. Ba, “Adam: A method for stochastic optimization,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2014.
- [33] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, “Delving deep into rectifiers: Surpassing human-level performance on ImageNet classification,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 2015, pp. 1026–1034.
- [34] E. Law, K. West, M. I. Mandel, M. Bay, and J. S. Downie, “Evaluation of algorithms using games: The case of music tagging,” in *Proceedings of the 10th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2009, pp. 387–392.
- [35] J. Pons, O. Nieto, M. Prockup, E. M. Schmidt, A. F. Ehmann, and X. Serra, “End-to-end learning for music audio tagging at scale,” in *Proceedings of the 19th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2018.
- [36] S. Dieleman and B. Schrauwen, “Multiscale approaches to music audio feature learning,” in *Proceedings of the 14th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2013, pp. 116–121.
- [37] M. Tagliasacchi, B. Gfeller, F. de Chaumont Quiry, and D. Roblek, “Pre-training audio representations with self-supervision,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, vol. 27, pp. 600–604, 2020.
- [38] J. Davis and M. Goadrich, “The relationship between precision–recall and ROC curves,” in *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on Machine learning*, 2006, pp. 233–240.
- [39] M. Defferrard, K. Benzi, P. Vandergheynst, and X. Bresson, “FMA: A dataset for music analysis,” in *Proceedings of the 18th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2017.
- [40] B. L. Sturm, “The GTZAN dataset: Its contents, its faults, their effects on evaluation, and its future use,” arXiv:1306.1461, 2013.
- [41] C. Kereliuk, B. L. Sturm, and J. Larsen, “Deep learning and music adversaries,” *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, vol. 17, no. 11, pp. 2059–2071, 2015.
- [42] J. A. Burgoyne, J. Wild, and I. Fujinaga, “An expert ground truth set for audio chord recognition and music analysis,” in *Proceedings of the 12th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2011, pp. 633–638.
- [43] J. Spijkervet, “Contrastive Learning of Musical Representations,” Master’s thesis, University of Amsterdam, 2021.
- [44] F. Weninger, F. Eyben, and B. Schuller, “On-line continuous-time music mood regression with deep recurrent neural networks,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2014, pp. 5412–5416.
- [45] E. Koh and S. Dubnov, “Comparison and analysis of deep audio embeddings for music emotion recognition,” arXiv:2104.06517, 2021.
- [46] Pioneer, “Rekordbox v3.2.2,” 2015, available online at <http://www.cp.jku.at/datasets/giantsteps/>.
- [47] J. Jiang, G. G. Xia, and D. B. Carlton, “Crowd annotation for audio key estimation,” 2019.

- [48] F. Medhat, D. Chesmore, and J. Robinson, “Masked conditional neural networks for audio classification,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*, 2017, pp. 349–358.
- [49] F. Korzeniowski and G. Widmer, “End-to-end musical key estimation using a convolutional neural network,” in *Proceedings of the 25th European Signal Processing Conference*, 2017, pp. 966–970.
- [50] G. Tzanetakis and P. Cook, “Musical genre classification of audio signals,” *IEEE Transactions on Speech and Audio Processing*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 293–302, 2002.
- [51] P. Knees, Á. Faraldo Pérez, H. Boyer, R. Vogl, S. Böck, F. Hörschläger, and M. Le Goff, “Two data sets for tempo estimation and key detection in electronic dance music annotated from user corrections,” in *Proceedings of the 16th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*, 2015.
- [52] M. Soleymani, M. N. Caro, E. M. Schmidt, C.-Y. Sha, and Y.-H. Yang, “1000 songs for emotional analysis of music,” in *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM International Workshop on Crowdsourcing for Multimedia*, 2013, pp. 1–6.