

Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Sciences



FRIEDRICH-SCHILLER-  
UNIVERSITÄT  
JENA

## Master's Thesis

# Music Similarity Analysis Using the Big Data Framework Spark

presented by:

Johannes Schoder

born:

03. September 1994

ID:

169197

course of studies:

M.Sc. Informatik

supervisors:

Ralf Seidler, Prof. Dr. Martin Bücker

# Contents

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>Abbreviations</b>                                    | <b>iv</b>  |
| <b>List of Figures</b>                                  | <b>v</b>   |
| <b>List of Tables</b>                                   | <b>vii</b> |
| <b>1 Introduction</b>                                   | <b>1</b>   |
| 1.1 Why and how? . . . . .                              | 1          |
| 1.2 Overview . . . . .                                  | 2          |
| 1.3 Conclusions . . . . .                               | 3          |
| <b>2 Music Information Retrieval and Big Data</b>       | <b>4</b>   |
| 2.1 Audio Features . . . . .                            | 4          |
| 2.1.1 Fourier Transformation . . . . .                  | 4          |
| 2.1.2 MFCC . . . . .                                    | 6          |
| 2.1.3 other audio features . . . . .                    | 8          |
| 2.2 MIR Toolkits . . . . .                              | 9          |
| 2.2.1 Music Similarity . . . . .                        | 9          |
| 2.2.2 Low-level audio feature extraction . . . . .      | 10         |
| 2.2.3 Melody/ pitch extraction . . . . .                | 10         |
| 2.3 Similarity Analysis . . . . .                       | 12         |
| 2.3.1 Timbre based . . . . .                            | 12         |
| 2.3.2 Pitch based . . . . .                             | 12         |
| 2.3.3 Rhythm based . . . . .                            | 12         |
| 2.3.4 Metadata based/ Collaborative Filtering . . . . . | 12         |
| 2.3.5 Note based . . . . .                              | 13         |
| 2.3.6 Genre specific features . . . . .                 | 13         |
| 2.3.7 summary . . . . .                                 | 14         |
| 2.4 Data aggregation . . . . .                          | 14         |
| 2.4.1 Datasets . . . . .                                | 14         |
| 2.4.2 Alternatives . . . . .                            | 17         |

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 2.5      | Big Data processing . . . . .                     | 20        |
| 2.5.1    | Hadoop . . . . .                                  | 20        |
| 2.5.2    | Spark . . . . .                                   | 21        |
| 2.5.3    | Data locality and parallelization . . . . .       | 22        |
| 2.5.4    | Combining different measurements . . . . .        | 22        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Similarity Analysis</b>                        | <b>23</b> |
| 3.1      | Timbre Similarity . . . . .                       | 23        |
| 3.1.1    | Euclidean Distance . . . . .                      | 23        |
| 3.1.2    | Single Gaussian Model . . . . .                   | 23        |
| 3.1.3    | Other Similarity Metrics . . . . .                | 25        |
| 3.1.4    | Validation . . . . .                              | 25        |
| 3.1.5    | Different recordings and cover versions . . . . . | 27        |
| 3.2      | Melodic Similarity . . . . .                      | 28        |
| 3.2.1    | Representation . . . . .                          | 28        |
| 3.2.2    | Chroma Features . . . . .                         | 28        |
| 3.2.3    | Similarity of chroma features . . . . .           | 31        |
| 3.2.4    | Validation . . . . .                              | 37        |
| 3.3      | Rhythmic Similarity . . . . .                     | 38        |
| 3.3.1    | Beat histogram . . . . .                          | 38        |
| 3.3.2    | Rhythm patterns . . . . .                         | 39        |
| 3.3.3    | Rhythm Histogram . . . . .                        | 41        |
| 3.3.4    | cross-correlation . . . . .                       | 41        |
| 3.4      | Summary . . . . .                                 | 42        |
| 3.4.1    | Timbre Similarity . . . . .                       | 42        |
| 3.4.2    | Melodic Similarity . . . . .                      | 43        |
| 3.4.3    | Rhythm Similarity . . . . .                       | 43        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Implementation</b>                             | <b>45</b> |
| 4.1      | Feature Extraction Performance . . . . .          | 45        |
| 4.1.1    | Test Datasets . . . . .                           | 45        |
| 4.1.2    | Feature Extraction Performance . . . . .          | 46        |
| 4.2      | Big Data Framework Spark . . . . .                | 52        |
| 4.2.1    | Data preprocessing . . . . .                      | 52        |
| 4.2.2    | Euclidean Distance . . . . .                      | 53        |
| 4.2.3    | Bucketed Random Projection . . . . .              | 53        |
| 4.2.4    | Cross-correlation . . . . .                       | 54        |
| 4.2.5    | Kullback-Leibler Divergence . . . . .             | 55        |
| 4.2.6    | Jensen-Shannon Divergence . . . . .               | 55        |

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 4.2.7    | Levenshtein distance . . . . .              | 56        |
| 4.2.8    | performance . . . . .                       | 56        |
| 4.2.9    | possible performance improvements . . . . . | 58        |
| 4.2.10   | Other alternatives . . . . .                | 58        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Results</b>                              | <b>59</b> |
| 5.1      | Runtime . . . . .                           | 59        |
| 5.2      | feature separation quality . . . . .        | 59        |
| 5.3      | Cover song identification . . . . .         | 66        |
| 5.4      | Genre similarity . . . . .                  | 67        |
| 5.5      | ... and beyond genre boundaries . . . . .   | 67        |
| 5.6      | Improvements and outlook . . . . .          | 68        |
|          | <b>References</b>                           | <b>69</b> |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Appendix</b>                             | <b>75</b> |
| 6.1      | Spotify Crawler . . . . .                   | 75        |

# Abbreviations

|                      |                                      |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>MIR</b>           | music information retrieval          |
| <b>MFCC</b>          | mel frequency cepstral coefficients  |
| <b>FFT</b>           | fast fourier transformation          |
| <b>DCT</b>           | discrete cosine transformation       |
| <b>MSD</b>           | million song dataset                 |
| <b>MIDI</b>          | musical instrument digital interface |
| <b>KL divergence</b> | Kullback-Leibler divergence          |
| <b>MP</b>            | mutual proximity                     |
| <b>DTW</b>           | dynamic time warping                 |
| <b>ESA</b>           | explicit semantic analysis           |
| <b>BPM</b>           | beats per minute                     |
| <b>BRP</b>           | bucketed random projection           |
| <b>HDFS</b>          | hadoop distributed file system       |
| <b>RDD</b>           | resilient distributed dataset        |
| <b>HT</b>            | hyperthreading                       |

# List of Figures

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| 2.1  | Frequency Space . . . . .   | 5  |
| 2.2  | Sweep Sinal . . . . .   | 6  |
| 2.3  | MFCCs . . . . .   | 6  |
| 2.4  | Timbre guitar vs. piano . . . . .                                     | 7  |
| 2.5  | MFCC statistics guitar vs. piano . . . . .                            | 7  |
| 2.6  | MFCC statistics guitar vs. piano . . . . .                            | 8  |
| 2.7  | Features of the song Layla by Eric Clapton . . . . .                  | 8  |
| 2.8  | Features of the song Layla by Eric Clapton . . . . .                  | 9  |
| 2.9  | Original Scores . . . . .   | 10 |
| 2.10 | Aubio . . . . .   | 11 |
| 2.11 | Melodia . . . . .   | 11 |
| 2.12 | Transcription . . . . .   | 12 |
| 2.13 | Number of songs in the free music archive dataset per genre . . . . . | 15 |
| 2.14 | Number of songs in the 1517 artists dataset per genre . . . . .       | 15 |
| 2.15 | Number of songs in the MedleyDB dataset per genre . . . . .           | 16 |
| 2.16 | Number of songs in the private music collection per genre . . . . .   | 16 |
| 2.17 | Spotify API . . . . .   | 18 |
| 2.18 | Number of songs in the million song dataset per genre . . . . .       | 19 |
| 2.19 | MapReduce [55] . . . . .  | 20 |
| 2.20 | Spark Cluster . . . . .   | 22 |
| 3.1  | Construction Noise . . . . .  | 26 |
| 3.2  | Chroma Features . . . . .   | 28 |
| 3.3  | Bandpass - Sia . . . . .  | 29 |
| 3.4  | Thresholded Chroma Features - Sia . . . . .                           | 30 |
| 3.5  | Processed Chroma Features - Sia . . . . .                             | 30 |
| 3.6  | Workflow chroma feature extraction . . . . .                          | 31 |
| 3.7  | Processing Step 3 Chroma Features . . . . .                           | 31 |
| 3.8  | cross-correlation . . . . .   | 34 |
| 3.9  | beat-aligned chromagram . . . . .                                     | 35 |

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| 3.10 | Cross-correlation . . . . .   | 36 |
| 3.11 | Cross-correlation . . . . .   | 36 |
| 3.12 | Cross-correlation filtered . . . . .                                | 37 |
| 3.13 | Beat Histogram . . . . .  | 39 |
| 3.14 | Rhythmic Patterns . . . . .   | 40 |
| 3.15 | Rhythm Pattern extraction [67] . . . . .                            | 40 |
| 3.16 | Rhythm Histogram . . . . .  | 41 |
| 3.17 | Detected Onsets (first 30 seconds) . . . . .                        | 42 |
| 4.1  | Performance of various toolkits on a single node . . . . .          | 50 |
| 4.2  | Chroma on 11500 songs, single node . . . . .                        | 54 |
| 4.3  | Performance of various spark algorithms (MFCC Euc, Notes, RP) . . . | 57 |
| 4.4  | Spark DF implementations, single node, 1517 artists . . . . .       | 58 |
| 5.1  | correlation of features . . . . .                                   | 59 |
| 5.2  | correlation 95 songs, 19 genres (5 each), 1517 artists . . . . .    | 60 |
| 5.3  | correlation 95 songs, 19 genres (5 each), 1517 artists . . . . .    | 61 |
| 5.4  | distances 1 song, New Age, 1517 artists . . . . .                   | 62 |
| 5.5  | distances 1 song, Rock/ Metal, 1517 artists, 3 genres . . . . .     | 63 |
| 5.6  | distances 1 song, New Age, 1517 artists, all genres . . . . .       | 64 |
| 5.7  | distances 1 song (Classical), 4 genres (10 songs each) . . . . .    | 65 |
| 5.8  | genre recall 100 songs . . . . .                                    | 66 |
| 5.9  | genre recall 100 songs . . . . .                                    | 67 |

# List of Tables

|     |                                      |    |
|-----|--------------------------------------|----|
| 2.1 | music datasets . . . . .             | 17 |
| 4.1 | appropriate music datasets . . . . . | 46 |

## **Abstract**

**Estimating music similarity by merging various similarity measurements with the help of the Big Data Framework Spark.**

This thesis is about the comparison of construction noise and modern day music. The field of music information retrieval (MIR) in computer science is mostly a data driven and purely mathematical topic. The goal of this thesis is to merge the fields of computer science with music theoretical knowledge and to find potential weak spots of current music similarity algorithms focusing on single aspects like melody, rhythm and timbre.

# 1. Introduction

The idea originated from Dr. T. Bosse from the chair for advanced computing at the Friedrich-Schiller-University (FSU) in Jena. When proposing the idea for a master thesis with the topic of "Music similarity measurement using genre specific features" using different guitar play styles in modern day metal music, he jokingly said that he would also like to know how metal music compares to construction building noise. The idea is actually not so groundless, considering that most people would agree on the fact that metal music is often described as noise by people not used to listening to genres like death and black metal. This thesis is meant to evaluate how music similarity algorithms compare construction noise to common musical genres and how to possibly improve these algorithms.

## 1.1 Why and how?

### Why is music similarity research even necessary?

First of all, there is no fixed definition of music similarity so far. This is one of the first problems, dealing with music similarity. This topic offers multifaceted approaches. Merging multiple approaches with different weights can offer a more diverse music recommendation system. To do this, a lot of different data is required.

Content (music features) and context (listener behaviour) data can be fed into a big data framework to speed up operations. Collecting this data for large amounts of songs results in big datasets that need to be explored efficiently.

### What to improve?

"[...] Spotify Radio, iTunes Radio, Google Play Access All Areas and Xbox Music. Recommendations are typically made using (undisclosed) content-based retrieval techniques, collaborative filtering data or a combination thereof." [1, p. 9] The goal of this work is, to propose a transparent music similarity retrieval method based on various weighted contextual and content-based data. Applying different weights to different


features allows similarity retrieval methods to search for different kind of similarity. E.g. weighing the tempo and beat of a song more than melodic similarity allows the creation of playlists for workout and sport, whilst melodic/ timbre etc. similarities allows to search for similar songs from musical subgenres. The user would get to decide what kind of playlist he wants to create. Adding contextual data and feeding it to an algorithm could add more or less popular music to the playlist with the goal to discover new upcoming artists or get other popular and most listened music. For this thesis however, the focus lies on content-based data/ audio features.

### How to approach this?

First of all, a lot of data is required. In the first part, different scientific datasets are evaluated. Secondly, the available features are shown and explained. In the third part, different metrics are explained using the previously explored features. Lastly, a big data approach to efficiently use the gathered features is proposed and evaluated. A way to evaluate the results is also proposed.

## 1.2 Overview

*Structure:*



## 1.3 Conclusions

Why using a big data framework would help: music similarity is not well defined. It is a rather subjective value that differs from listener to listener. Two tracks could be considered as "similar" when they are equal in tempo, loudness, melody, instrumentation, key, rhythm mood, lyrics or a combination of more than a few of these features. The usage of a big data framework allows to create a variable/ fuzzy metric definition. Various parameters could easily be taken into consideration when calculating the musical distance of two different pieces. Using a Big Data framework, the problem of the fuzzy definition of music similarity could be avoided, if a metric can be found, that takes multiple of the accounted features of this thesis into consideration. Available information includes metadata, user data, audio features, sheet music and more.

*The idea of using genre specific features could be evaluated any further*

*Another important question is how to measure similarity algorithms. There are a few possibilities like genre, composer/ interpret or cover song identification. Or actual user data. MSD Challenge Dataset usable? [2]*

## 2. Music Information Retrieval and Big Data

The field of music information retrieval (MIR) is a large research area combining studies in computer science like signal processing and machine learning as well as psychology and academic music study. To get started, a brief overview is given in the next section providing the most important information about publicly available datasets, MIR toolkits and approaches to music similarity. Various datasets are presented and an overview over Big Data frameworks is given as well.

### 2.1 Audio Features

This section provides an overview about different music similarity measurements, audio features and metrics.

More in-depth information about the different metrics is given in chapter 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3

#### 2.1.1 Fourier Transformation

As done by: [3, pp. 17ff]

Most of the algorithms start with switching from the time domain to the frequency domain, by performing a Discrete Fourier transform as described in equation 2.1 and then compute the power spectrum (equation 2.2)

$$X_m = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} x_k \cdot e^{-\frac{K}{2\pi i} \cdot k \cdot m} \quad (2.1)$$

$$|X_m| = \sqrt{Re(X_m)^2 + Im(X_m)^2} \quad (2.2)$$

Figure 2.1a shows the spectrogram of the first bars of the song Layla by Eric Clapton. The sound sample was recorded on an electric guitar to avoid copyright infringements. Due to the fact that the human ear perceives sound in a non-linear matter, a logarithmic

or Mel-scale is better to represent different pitches.

For example the note A4 is perceived at a frequency of 440Hz, the A note of next octave (A5) is at 880Hz and the next one is at 1600Hz and so on. The Mel-scale [1, pp. 53f] was introduced to resemble the human perception of frequency (equation 2.3)

$$m = 1127 \cdot \ln\left(1 + \frac{f}{700}\right) \quad (2.3)$$

The following plots were created with the librosa library [4]. The high dimensionality of




Figure 2.1: Frequency Space

the data is a problem for machine learning applications and music similarity tasks, as computation based on a vector with such a high dimensionality of the data would take to long. Given a sample rate of  $f_s = 44,1kHz$  (usual CD sample-rate) and a length of a song of about  $t = 180s$ , the time domain contains 7938000 data points usually with 16-bit resolution.

$$K = f_s \cdot t \quad (2.4)$$

Calculating a FFT with a window size of 1024 samples and a hop size of 512 samples (resulting in the factor 1.5 in equation 2.5)[1], the full resulting spectrogram would contain 11627 frames with 1024 frequency values per frame. (eq: 2.5)

$$N_{fv} = 1.5 \cdot \left(\frac{44100 \text{ samples/s}}{1024 \text{ samples/frame}}\right) \cdot t \quad (2.5)$$

To reduce the dimensionality of the feature vector, a typical approach in MIR would be to calculate the so called Mel Frequency Cepstral Coefficients (MFCCs). They are described in more detail in the next section.

## 2.1.2 MFCC

This section gives a brief overview over the computation of the MFCC as stated in [1, pp. 55ff] because out of all features presented in this chapter the MFCC is the hardest one to grasp because of its abstract nature and hardly visible relatedness to musical features. Figure 2.2 shows the magnitude spectrum of a frequency sweep signal.




Figure 2.2: Sweep Sinal

First of all the magnitude spectrum is transformed to the Mel-scale by assigning each frequency value to a Mel- band. Doing this a dimension reduction can be done, by assigning multiple frequency values to one of typically 12 to 40 Mel-bands. The resulting vectors are then fed into a discrete cosine transformation (DCT) resulting in the MFCCs for each frame.

$$X_k = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} x_n \cos \left[ \frac{\pi}{N} \left( n + \frac{1}{2} \right) k \right] \quad (2.6)$$

Figure 2.3a shows the resulting MFCCs with a high resolution of 1024 Mel bands. This is not what in a usual application would be done, because this is nearly as high dimensional as the original spectrogram. Figure 2.3b shows the MFCC reduced to 13 Mel Bands. To better visualize the MFCC features all values are typically scaled to have a standard deviation of 1 and a mean value of 0 per band in the plots.




Figure 2.3: MFCCs

MFCCs were found to be suited to represent timbral properties of music [1, p. 55 ff]. To describe a tone, three moments can be used according to [6, pp. 15]: tonal intensity perceived as loudness, the tonal quality perceived as the pitch and the timbre or tonal color as the third moment. Looking at an example melody line played on a electric distorted guitar and a piano, distinct differences can be seen. Due to the physical properties of a string every note played consists of the main frequency (the actually played key) and so called harmonic overtones because of the way a string e.g. in a piano vibrates and the wooden body resonates. Typically the overtones of a piano consist of the main key, the same key a few octaves higher and major thirds and fifths of the octave. Depending on the instrument these harmonics decline faster or slower or don't appear at all. The electrically amplified guitar amplifies these overtones as well, which is visible in figure 2.4b.




Figure 2.4: Timbre guitar vs. piano

Looking at the MFCCs these differences are also visible. This time the MFCC plots are pictured without the previously mentioned scaling and the mean value and standard deviance of the MFCCs four to 13 are pictured. This calculation of statistical features is later explained in chapter 3.1. Although both times the exact same melody is played in the same tempo, these features vary due to the different timbral properties of the instruments.




Figure 2.5: MFCC statistics guitar vs. piano




Figure 2.6: MFCC statistics guitar vs. piano

### 2.1.3 other audio features

As another, better comprehensible, higher-level set of features, the chromagram represent the tonal properties of a song. The chroma plot (Figure 2.7b) shows the distribution of the different pitches mapped to the various keys in one octave. The values are normalized to one by the strongest dimension. So if all values are close to one, it is most likely that there is only noise or silence at that frame in the recording, as depicted in the first frames of figure 2.7b. The chromagram has one significant downside, because it is reduced to one octave and thus can not represent the melody of a song to its full extend.

Figure 2.8a figures the pitch curve of the recording. None but the most dominant frequencies are shown. Pitches below a certain threshold are filtered out. In contrast to the chromagram the pitch curve provides information over the whole spectrum and is not limited to one octave. These Pitch curves can be used to estimate and transcribe musical notes from audio data as presented in 2.2.3.

The rhythmic low-level features of a song include the estimation of the overall tempo, beats and onset events. The Plot in figure 2.8b shows the onsets and estimated beats in the first 10 seconds from a recording of the song Layla by Eric Clapton.




Figure 2.7: Features of the song Layla by Eric Clapton




Figure 2.8: Features of the song Layla by Eric Clapton

## 2.2 MIR Toolkits

### 2.2.1 Music Similarity

The easiest way to test state of the art music similarity algorithms is to use the open source toolkit Musly [7]. It is based on statistical models of MFCC features and calculates the distances between songs very fast, supporting OpenMP acceleration. It offers the classical mandel-ellis similarity method [8] and a timbre based improved version of the mandel-ellis algorithm using a jenson-shannon-like divergence [9]. More details and a re-implementation of this toolkit is presented in chapter 3.1

As another option, the MIR Toolkit [10] is a toolbox for Matlab [11]. A port to GNU Octave [12] is also available [13]. The short code snippet below is all it takes to compute a similarity matrix based on MFCC features, but the calculation is rather slow.

```

mydata = cell(1, numfiles);
for k = 1:numfiles
    myfilename = sprintf('%d.wav', k);
    mydata{k} = mirmfcc(myfilename);
    close all force
endfor
simmat = zeros(numfiles, numfiles);
for k = 1:numfiles
    for l = 1:numfiles
        simmat(k, l) = mirgetdata( ...
            mirdist(mydata{k}, ...
            mydata{l}));
    endfor
endfor

```

## 2.2.2 Low-level audio feature extraction

To extract audio features like the ones presented in section 2.1.1 (mfccs, chromagram, beats, onsets), a wide variety of toolkits is publicly available, a few are presented in [14]. The YAAFE toolkit [15] is able to extract a lot of different audio features like energy, mfcc or loudness directly into the hadoop file format h5 making it ideal for big data frameworks to use. It can be used with C++, Python or Matlab.

The Essentia toolkit [16] is pretty similar to YAAFE, extending it by the calculation of the rhythm descriptors, bpm etc. It can also be used in C++ and Python

The Librosa Toolkit provides similar functionality [17] as Essentia. It is user-friendly, well documented and can be called from a Jupyter-Notebook [18], allowing rapid prototyping and testing of different algorithms. Most of the plots from section 2.1.1 were created using librosa. The code for the extraction of low level features with essentia and librosa is given in chapter 4.1 as well as a performance analysis.

## 2.2.3 Melody/ pitch extraction

To test the various pitch extraction toolkits, a piece by Rachmaninoff and by Beethoven was used. The first three bars of Rachmaninoffs Prelude can be found in figure 2.9a Figure 2.9b shows the first five bars of Beethovens Bagatelle in A Minor (Für Elise). The first toolkit tested is Aubio [20]. The result can be seen in figure 2.10a and figure




Figure 2.9: Original Scores

2.10b The upper subplot shows the waveform of the first few seconds of each piece. The second plot figures the estimated pitch with green dots. If the pitch is zero, then no pitch could be estimated, most likely because the associated frame contains silence. The blue dots resemble the estimated pitches, where the confidence (shown as the blue graph in the third subplot) is above a certain threshold (the orange line).




Figure 2.10: Aubio

The other melody extraction tool is Melodia[21], which is available as a VAMP plugin and can be used together with the Sonic Visualizer[22]

The results are shown in figure 2.11a and 2.11b. The purple line is the estimated pitch, however there are large jumps between different octaves of the harmonics.




Figure 2.11: Melodia

Sadly the conversion to MIDI does not work flawlessly.

It is clearly visible in figure 2.12 that the transcription does not work accurately enough even for a classical music piece with only one instrument. Figure 2.12a shows the output of a python script using the Melodia VAMP plugin to calculate a MIDI file containing the main melody line and figure 2.12b shows the transcribed MIDI notes from Aubio. The detected melody lines are jumping between different octaves and finding the right threshold for the separation between silence and detected notes turns out to be problematic as well.



Figure 2.12: Transcription

### 2.3 Similarity Analysis

### 2.3.1 Timbre based

As done by: [3]

The proposed approach by [3] is, to take mfccs as low level features and compute statistical features like mean, standard deviation and covariance of the different mfccs to reduce dimensionality before computing similarities. Various similarity measurements are proposed and evaluated in chapter 3.1. The algorithm used in this thesis is described in [3, pp. 17ff]. The framework used to determine the song similarity for the first tests in chapter 3.1 is the MUSLY toolkit [7].

### 2.3.2 Pitch based

As done by: [23]

The proposed approach by [23] is, to take mid-level features like the chromagram or estimated main pitchline instead of high-level features like sheet music or low-level features like gaussian mixture models of MFCCs. A more detailed analysis of this topic is given in chapter 3.2

### 2.3.3 Rhythm based

As done by: [24]

Rhythm based music similarity algorithms use timing information of various events as a baseline. For example low-level features like the onset and beat data from the plot in Figure 2.8b could be used as a starting point for rhythmic similarity retrieval. More advanced approaches make use of the beat histogram, rhythm histogram and rhythm patterns. An in depth overview is given in chapter 3.3

#### 2.3.4 Metadata based/ Collaborative Filtering

As done by: [25] and [26] using the Million Song Dataset (MSD) [27]

In 2012 the MSD Challenge was brought to the MIB community. The researches were

challenged to give a list of song recommendations based on a large set of user data. So if user X listened a lot to artist A and artist B and user Y listens mostly to artist A and artist C, then maybe user X would like artist C as well. These kind of collective listening behavior based recommendations are called collaborative filtering [1, p. 192f.] and are pretty common in large music streaming services, although not necessarily representing direct musical similarity. These kind of recommendation systems tend to propose commonly well known artists rather than not so well known ones biasing the result. On the other hand these kind of similarity algorithms can work very fast and efficient in a Big Data environment. The usage of annotations and metadata information like genre and artist based recommendations are common as well. The recommendation of songs based on the lyrics and also hybrid recommendation systems that combine lyrics, metadata and collaborative filtering are possible. However all of these recommendation strategies are not directly based on musical features and are not considered for this thesis. They are however a possible addition for a hybrid recommendation engine for future research.

### 2.3.5 Note based

As done by: [28]

For comparing musical pieces by their symbolic representation (notes, tabulations etc.) different text retrieval methods could be used. The MIDI datatype could be used, as it is a form of digital representation of music information. [28] uses a variation of the Levenshtein distance measurement. The problem with notation based algorithms is, that there are not many datasets available containing audio and MIDI information. As shown in 2.2.3 the automatic transcription of notes from raw audio does not work flawlessly. There is ongoing research to automatically annotate musical notes with the help of neural networks.[29] In chapter 3.3 an attempt by Xia (et. al) [30] to extract note information as text features from chromagrams and calculating the similarity by using the levenshtein distance is shown and evaluated.

### 2.3.6 Genre specific features

As done by: [31] for indian art music, by using 560 different combinations of different features. They state that: "We evaluate all possible combinations of the choices made at each step of the melodic similarity computation discussed in Section 2. We consider 5 different sampling rates of the melody representation, 8 different normalization scenarios, 2 possibilities of uniform time-scaling and 7 variants of the distance measures. In total, we evaluate 560 different variants" [31, p. 3]. This evaluation showed, that the choice of features and parameters for music similarity measurement is a critical point.

In Rock, Pop and Metal music, extraction of different guitar playstyles would be imaginable. Guitar Tab Extraction [32] Toolkits could be used to extract information if the guitar in a song is mostly plucked or strummed for instance. Or if there are Hammer-on/ Pull-off/ side bending or tapping techniques used. In classical music, the play style of the string section of an orchestra could be taken into consideration.

### 2.3.7 summary

In this thesis music similarity measurements based on three different types of features are evaluated. The first is based on MFCCs to represent timbral features of the songs and therefore offering a set of features to make recommendations that are similar in tone color and should be able to make recommendations inside the boundaries of different genres. The second is based on chroma features/ note information collapsed to one octave to represent a measurement of melodic similarity. With these features the detection of cover versions should be possible. The third set of features is based on the rhythmic properties of a song. This should enable recommendations of songs with the same tempo and rhythmic structure, possibly also enabling the recommendation of songs within the same genre.

The usage of MIDI-files is not considered further due to the rather poor performance of score extraction tools for songs with multiple instruments and melody lines. Also the melodic component of the songs is already represented by the chroma features, although that limits the representation to one or at most a few octaves. Collaborative filtering is left out due to the fact that it does not necessarily represent the musical features and properties but the personal taste of music. And secondly no dataset with the required information and music files was found (2.4). Genre specific features are also not an option because this field is not yet very well researched and the development of algorithms and the extraction of features would go beyond the scope of this thesis.

## 2.4 Data aggregation

To evaluate the music similarity algorithms and metrics a lot of music data is needed.

### 2.4.1 Datasets

#### Free Music Archive

The largest dataset is the Free Music Archive- dataset (fma) consisting of 106733 different songs totalling an amount of nearly one terabyte of music data from all kinds

of different music genres.[33] There is also a lot of metadata information available for most of the songs.




Figure 2.13: Number of songs in the free music archive dataset per genre

## Musicnet and 1517 artists

Another source of music is the Musicnet dataset.[34] It includes 330 pieces of classical music with musical notes as annotations. Other sources of musical information would be the 1517-Artists dataset containing 3180 songs of multiple genres. [35]




Figure 2.14: Number of songs in the 1517 artists dataset per genre

## MedleyDB

For a melody/ pitch based similarity analysis, multitrack datasets could provide useful data, due to the fact that the pitch estimation can be done instrument by instrument. Datasets available are the MedleyDB[36] and MedleyDB2[37] datasets as well as the Open Multitrack Dataset[38] currently consisting of 593 multi-tracks in which the MedleyDB dataset is already included, leaving 481 other tracks for analysis.




Figure 2.15: Number of songs in the MedleyDB dataset per genre

## covers80

For a cover song detection system, the covers80 dataset is available [39] containing 80 original songs mostly from the musical genres rock and pop and 84 cover versions. These cover versions tend to differ significantly in musical style, rhythm and timbre from the original.

The ability to detect cover songs or different versions/ recording of a musical piece could be a good measurement for the efficiency of music similarity algorithms. In the next section one test case is presented, showing, that a MFCC based music similarity algorithm isn't able to detect different recordings of the same piano piece as most similar to each other.

## Private music collection

The private music collection used in this work consist mainly of metal music. The music was legally purchased, all rights belong to the respective owners. The distribution of different songs per genre for this dataset is visualized in figure 2.16.




Figure 2.16: Number of songs in the private music collection per genre

Additionally a private recording dataset was used, consisting of ambient recordings and self produced music. Most of this music can be downloaded from soundcloud[40]. The private music collection is fully catalogued and the according pdf is the appendices.

## Overview and other sources

The music sources and amounts of songs used for the task at hand is listed in table 2.1.

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| fma                     | 106.733 Songs                           |
| private                 | 8484 Songs                              |
| 1517 artists            | 3180 Songs                              |
| Maestro                 | 1184 Songs (piano) + MIDI               |
| musicnet                | 330 Songs (classical) + note annotation |
| Open Multitrack Testbed | 593(481) Songs/ Multitracks             |
| covers80                | 164 Songs (80 originals + 84 covers)    |
| MedleyDB                | 122 Songs/ Multitracks                  |
| MedleyDB2               | 74 Songs/ Multitracks                   |

Table 2.1: music datasets

### 2.4.2 Alternatives

#### Spotify API/ Echonest

Another way of getting music information, audio analysis and metadata is by using the Spotify API[41] Part of the available audio features comes from the Echo Nest[42]. The Downside using the Spotify API is, that there is no packed and ready to use test dataset containing the relevant features. So for scientific purposes, a test dataset would have to be created first. With a small Python library named Spotipy, the available information can very easily be used and accessed. [43]

For the purpose of this thesis, the option of creating an own dataset using the Spotify API and spotipy was considered. Ten very small test playlists of different genres were created using the Spotify Playlist Miner [44]. Appendix 6.1 lists a small script, that is able to download all audio features and analysis data from all of the songs of a playlist, that contains a preview URL with a 30 second audio snippet. The audio features and analysis data is saved as a JSON file containing information over:

- acousticness
- danceability
- instrumentalness
- liveness
- loudness
- speechiness
- valence

- predicted key
- tempo

as well as pitch and timbre information, beats and bars.

In figure 2.17a the chroma features of the piano piece Für Elise by Beethoven are shown and figure 2.17b shows the beginning of the piece in more detail, including green dots, that resemble estimated bar markings. The blue dots represent the note values of one octave. That means they can resemble a value between zero and eleven with zero representing the key C and 11 is representing a B. The Spotify API actually returns a chroma feature value for every single one of the keys per segment, where one segment is a section of samples that are relatively uniform in timbre and harmony. In the plots only the most dominant key per segment is shown.




Figure 2.17: Spotify API

Together with the 30 second audio sample from which more data like MFCCs could be extracted, this data miner could provide all the information needed to build a large dataset for MIR. However the terms and conditions explicitly prohibits crawling the Spotify service. As stated by the Spotify Terms and Conditions of Use, section 9 (User guidelines):

*"The following is not permitted for any reason whatsoever:*

*[...]*

*12. "crawling" the Spotify Service or otherwise using any automated means (including bots, scrapers, and spiders) to view, access, or collect information from Spotify or the Spotify Service;" [45]*

Therefore a larger user created dataset can not be used without the risk of legal infringements. However one could argue, that there is a difference between data mining and data crawling and for small datasets with the purpose of creating Spotify playlists, these restrictions may not apply.

In the sense of the Spotify Developer Terms of Service [46] there may be no legal infringements by creating a non-commercial playlist creation tool. [47] states, that by creating algorithmically-generated playlists similar to the "Discover Weekly" Playlists

one may run into challenges if using such features commercially. However it does not prohibit the usage for non-commercial cases. Upon request the Spotify API developer team did not respond and therefor in this thesis the Spotify API wont be used to create a test dataset.

## Million Song Dataset

Another outstanding and very large dataset is available with the Million Song Dataset (MSD)[27]. It contains a large set of metadata per track as well as a lot of supplementary datasets, like the Tagtraum genre annotation (figure 2.18)[48], the last.fm dataset[49] and the Echo Nest API dataset[50]. Although the MSD does not contain any music files in the first place, 30 second samples could be gathered through simple scripts from 7digital.com when the dataset was made publicly available. On top of that the Echo Nest API data already contains a lot of audio features like pitch, loudness, energy and danceability to name just a few. Another addition is the secondhand dataset, containing a list of cover songs in the million song dataset[51]




Figure 2.18: Number of songs in the million song dataset per genre

Due to the fact that the Spotify API[41] also works with audio features from the Echo Nest[42], the MSD could be used in a big data environment to simulate the work with Spotify data, without manually mining the actual data. The MSD was actually already used in Big Data frameworks for music similarity retrieval based on metadata and user information[26]

Sadly 7digital does not offer the download of the 30 second sample files any more which makes this dataset unusable for this thesis, because missing audio features like mfccs can not be computed from the audio files itself.

## 2.5 Big Data processing

After accumulating the data and presenting various methods to extract and process different audio features, the following section describes the data analysis and computation of the similarities with the Big Data processing framework Apache Spark [52]. Chapter 4.2 deals with the implementation of the various similarity measurements while chapter 5 deals with the handling of larger amounts of data, runtime analysis and the combination of multiple similarity measurements.

***"WRONG" - Donald Trump***

### 2.5.1 Hadoop

With the ever growing availability of huge amounts of high dimensional data the need for toolkits and efficient algorithms to handle these grew as well over the past years. Search engine providers like Google and Yahoo firstly ran into the problem in the early 2000s [53, p. 6].

#### MapReduce

MapReduce as a programming paradigm was introduced by google as an answer to the problem of internet scale data and dates back to 2004 [54]. Figure 2.19 shows the basic scheme of a MapReduce program. The core idea is to split a problem into many independent tasks.




Figure 2.19: MapReduce [55]

replication rate

#### Hadoop

General Purpose Hardware/ commodity hardware

Error Management

Data locality

Other Big Data Toolkits: SMACK; lambda; spark

## **2.5.2 Spark**

SQL vs NoSQL

user defined function

cluster configuration file

streaming

caching

**Spark and RDDs**

**Spark DataFrame**

**lazy evaluation**

**min and max value aggregation**

**Hadoop vs Spark Memory Management**




Figure 2.20: Spark Cluster

### Spark application UI

#### 2.5.3 Data locality and parallelization

*high data locality, full parallelizable, very low replication rate  
insert data locality scheme here*

#### 2.5.4 Combining different measurements

*weighted arithmetic mean of different distance measurements*

$$dist = \frac{\sum_{m=0}^{M-1} w_m \cdot d_m}{\sum_{m=0}^{M-1} w_m} \quad (2.7)$$

*statistic prescaling to have mean = 0.5 and variance 0.5?*

# 3. Similarity Analysis

## 3.1 Timbre Similarity

Mel Frequency Cepstral Coefficients have already been introduced in chapter 2.1.2. This chapter focuses on the different similarity metrics.

To reduce the dimensionality of the data even further, a statistical summarization of the MFCC feature can be calculated [1, pp. 51ff]

### 3.1.1 Euclidean Distance

For each of the Mel- Bands (12 in this case) the mean and standard deviation over all frames is calculated, resulting in a vector of 12 mean values, a 12 by 12 co-variance matrix (actually  $\frac{12 \cdot 11}{2}$  values, because of the triangular shape - the upper triangle contains the co-variances and the main diagonal contains the variances) and 12 variances. These vectors are therefore not dependent on the length of the actual song. Using such a model, the distance between two songs can be calculated as in equation 3.1, where  $x$  and  $y$  are the n-dimensional feature vectors of two different musical pieces:

$$d(x, y) = \|x - y\|_p = \left( \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i - y_i|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad (3.1)$$

also known as the  $L_p$  distance. Most of the times, the Euclidean ( $L_2$ ) or the Manhattan ( $L_1$ ) distance would be used in real world scenarios. This very basic approach has been refined and improved over the past years.

### 3.1.2 Single Gaussian Model

#### Kullback-Leibler Divergence

This approach was first proposed by Mandel and Ellis [8] in 2005 and is briefly summarized in [1, pp. 65f].

After computing the mean value of each MFCC ( $\mu_P$  and  $\mu_Q$ ) and the covariance matrix of the different MFCC vectors ( $\Sigma_P$  and  $\Sigma_Q$ ) of two musical pieces  $P$  and  $Q$ , the Kullback-Leibler divergence (KL divergence) can be calculated as follows, with  $tr(\cdot)$  being the trace (i.e. the sum of the diagonal of a matrix),  $d$  being the dimensionality (number of MFCCs) and  $|\Sigma_P|$  being the determinant of  $\Sigma_P$

$$KL_{(P||Q)} = \frac{1}{2} [\log \frac{|\Sigma_P|}{|\Sigma_Q|} + tr(\Sigma_P^{-1} \Sigma_Q) + (\mu_P - \mu_Q)^T \Sigma_P^{-1} (\mu_Q - \mu_P) - d] \quad (3.2)$$

As a second step the result has to be symmetrized.

$$d_{KL}(P, Q) = \frac{1}{2} (KL_{(P||Q)} + KL_{(Q||P)}) \quad (3.3)$$

This approach is one of the two available similarity metrics of the musly [7] toolkit introduced in section 2.2. This can be simplified and written as a closed form according to [3, p. 44]:

$$d_{SKL}(P, Q) = \frac{1}{4} (tr(\Sigma_P \Sigma_Q^{-1}) + tr(\Sigma_Q \Sigma_P^{-1}) + tr((\Sigma_Q^{-1} \Sigma_P^{-1})(\mu_P - \mu_Q)^2) - 2d) \quad (3.4)$$

### Jensen-Shannon Divergence

The second available metric in the musly toolkit by Schnitzer is using the Jensen-Shannon Divergence (in an slightly adapted way). "The Jensen-Shannon (JS) divergence is another symmetric divergence derived from the Kullback-Leibler divergence. To compute it, a mixture  $X_m$  of the two distributions is defined" [3, p. 43]. "To use the Jensen-Shannon divergence [...] to estimate similarities between Gaussians, an approximation of  $X_m$  as a single multivariate Gaussian can be used [...] This approximation of  $X_m$  is exactly the same as the left-type Kullback-Leibler centroid of the two Gaussian distributions [...]" [3, p. 44]

$$\mu_m = \frac{1}{2} \mu_P + \frac{1}{2} \mu_Q \quad (3.5)$$

$$\Sigma_m = \frac{1}{2} (\Sigma_P + \mu_P \mu_P^T) + \frac{1}{2} (\Sigma_Q + \mu_Q \mu_Q^T) - \mu_m \mu_m^T \quad (3.6)$$

$$JS(P, Q) = \frac{1}{2} \log |\Sigma_m| - \frac{1}{4} \log |\Sigma_P| - \frac{1}{4} \log |\Sigma_Q| \quad (3.7)$$

After calculating a similarity matrix for all songs, it normalizes the similarities with mutual proximity (MP). [9] This method wants to reduce the effect of a phenomenon called hubness that appears as a general problem of machine learning in high-dimensional data spaces. "Hubs are data points which keep appearing unwontedly often as nearest neighbors of a large number of other data points." [3, p. 66].

Schedl and Knees state: "To apply MP to a distance matrix, it is assumed that the

distances  $D_{x,i=1..N}$  from an object  $x$  to all other objects in the data set follow a certain probability distribution; thus, any distance  $D_{x,y}$  can be reinterpreted as the probability of  $y$  being the nearest neighbor of  $x$ , given the distance  $D_{x,y}$  and the probability distribution  $P(x)$  [...] MP is then defined as the probability that  $y$  is the nearest neighbor of  $x$  given  $P(x)$  and  $x$  is the nearest neighbor of  $y$  given  $P(y)$ " [1, p. 80]

Resulting in:

$$P(X > D_{x,y}) = 1 - P(X \leq D_{x,y}) = 1 - \mathcal{F}(D_{x,y}) \quad (3.8)$$

$$MP(D_{x,y}) = P(X > D_{x,y} \cap Y > D_{x,y}) \quad (3.9)$$

according to [1, p. 80]

### 3.1.3 Other Similarity Metrics

Another, more compute heavy distance measurement would make use of Gaussian Mixture Models of MFCCs. As Knees and Schedl state "Other work on music audio feature modeling for similarity has shown that aggregating the MFCC vectors of each song via a single Gaussian may work almost as well as using a GMM [...]. Doing so decreases computational complexity by several magnitudes, in comparison to GMM-based similarity computations." [1, p. 65] Therefore the usage of GMMs is not further considered in this thesis.

The last method mentioned in this thesis for timbral similarity is to use block-level features as proposed by Seyerlehner [56] and described in short by Knees and Schedl [1, p. 67]. Instead of using single frames and summarizing them into statistical or probabilistic models, block-level features use larger, e.g. multiple second long, audio frames and features like fluctuation patterns are computed for these frames.

### 3.1.4 Validation

For this thesis the Kullback-Leibler divergence, the Jensen-Shannon divergence and the Euclidean distance are chosen and tested. There is always a trade-off between the complexity and functionality of the distance computing algorithms and a re-implementation of the block-level features remains left open for future research due to its rather compute heavy nature.

Using the musly toolkit, a first evaluation is presented in the next section. The feature extraction and distance calculation can also be done in python using the librosa library and a small reimplementation of the Mandel-Ellis approach was tested in advance.

*A possible measure for the efficiency of a timbre similarity algorithm is the ability to find songs of the same genre.*

## Construction Noise

Comparing a construction noise sound sample with the private music collection containing mostly metal, rock, pop, classical and hip hop music, the following six best results could be achieved in descending order:

- Ziegenmühlen Session - Down On The Corner (Folk Musik)
- While She Sleeps - The Divide (Metalcore)
- Delain - Mother Machine (Live) (Symphonic Metal)
- Within Temptation - Sanctuary (Intro Live) (Symphonic Metal)
- Without A Martyr - Medusa's Gaze (Death Metal)
- 100 Meisterwerke der Klassik - Orpheus In The Underworld (Orphée aux enfers) - Can-Can (Live At Grosser Saal, Musikverein) (Klassik)

Figure 3.1a and 3.1b show the distribution of the genres of 100 most similar songs compared to the construction noise sample.




Figure 3.1: Construction Noise

Using the full dataset consisting of the private music collection, private field recordings, the full fma-dataset and the musicnet data, the following results could be achieved:

- Born Pilot - Birds Fell (FMA, Electronic, Noise)
- mrandmrsBrian - sun is boring (FMA, Avant-Garde, field recordings)
- steps in snow (private field recording)
- Sawako - Paris Children (FMA, field recordings)
- Jeremy Gluck and Michael Dent - Olivier (FMA, Ambient Electronic)

### 3.1.5 Different recordings and cover versions

Another experiment was, to get the most similar songs to the famous 'Rondo alla Turca' by Mozart. The recording used as a starting point is from the CD "100 Meisterwerke der Klassik" and has a length of 3:33 minutes. This piece by Mozart appears overall four times in the dataset and is recorded by different pianists. Every recording has a different length as listed in the following overview of the recordings by CD

- 100 Meisterwerke der Klassik (3:33)
- Piano Perlen (3:30)
- The Piano Collection - Disk 18 (3:28)
- Mozart Premium Edition - Disk 31 (4:29)

The top ten most similar songs to the 3 minutes and 33 seconds version are listed below:

- Mozart - Concert No. 10 for 2 Pianos and Orchestra in E Flat Major, KV 365 - 2. Andante
- Schubert - Sonata in B Flat, D. 960 - III. Scherzo (Allegro vivace con delicatezza)
- Albeniz - Iberia, Book I - Evocación
- Mozart Sonate Nr. 11 in A-Dur, K. 33 - Mozart - Alla Turca Allegretto (3:28)
- Beethoven - Bagatellen Op 119 -Allemande in D major
- Mozart - Rondo No. 1 in D Major, K. 485
- Mozart - Sonata For Piano No. 8 KV 310 A Minor - Allegro Maestoso
- Sonata For Piano No. 16 KV 545 C Major - Rondo: Allegretto
- Mozart Sonate Nr. 11 in A-Dur, K. 33 - III. Tuerkischer Marsch (3:30)
- Mozart - Piano Sonata No. 13 in B flat major, K. 333 (K. 315c): Allegretto grazioso

The interesting conclusion is that only 2 out of the 3 other versions were considered as most similar songs. The slower recording wasn't even in the top 30 list of the most similar songs. The same was observable for other cover versions of songs in the dataset like Serj Tankians song "Lie Lie Lie" from the CD "Harakiri" and an orchestral recording of the same piece. This is probably due to the usage of GMMs of MFCCs representing and valuing the timbre of the music predominantly instead of the pitches and melody movements.

## 3.2 Melodic Similarity

### 3.2.1 Representation

As presented in section 2.2.3 there are tools for pitch curve extraction of the main melody line. However in polyphonic music these kind of algorithms struggle to get reasonable results, even in pop music. In musical genres like Metal it gets even worse. In conclusion the main pitch-line extraction and the following conversion of a song with multiple concurrent audio tracks to MIDI using up-to-date open source toolkits doesn't produce very reasonable results as shown in 2.2.3. Another possible representation for melodic features could be to transform the structural information to graphs and use graph comparing algorithms to estimate the similarity between songs. [57] A better and widely used approach is to use chroma features as described in the next section 3.2.2.

### 3.2.2 Chroma Features

Chroma Features as described in section 2.1.1 are a good and low dimensional way to describe the melodic features of a song. The reduction of dimensionality however comes with a loss of information, especially what octaves the notes are played in. To compute chroma features, most MIR toolkits already offer methods to do so. The plots in this chapter were created using the essentia [16] and librosa [4] toolkits. In addition to the pure computation of the chroma features, some pre- and post-processing steps were implemented and tested and will be presented later in this chapter. First of all figure 3.2 shows the chroma feature plots from 2 recordings of the first thirty seconds of the song "Chandelier". Figure a shows the original version sung by the artist Sia and figure b shows the features of a cover version from the band Pvris. In the last third of each




Figure 3.2: Chroma Features

sample, the chroma features seemingly get noisier. At these timings in both songs the bass and drum set in. To reduce the effect of rhythm elements over the melodic voice and instrument lines, the audio signal was filtered firstly by a high-pass filter with a cut-off frequency of 128Hz (nearly equal to C3 Key) and secondly by a low-pass filter

with a cut-off frequency of 4096Hz (C8 Key). This limits the frequency range to about 5 octaves. In figure 3.3 the filter frequency and the original audio signals are visualized in blue color and the filtered audio signal is green. The FFT plot before and after filtering the audio signal is also shown. In the chromagram of the bandpass filtered




Figure 3.3: Bandpass - Sia

audio signal the last 10 seconds look cleaner and the melody line is more distinct from the rest in comparison to the chromagram of the unfiltered audio 3.2. The next step is to calculate the most dominant note value for each timeframe. Due to the fact that the chromagram normalizes every timeframe to the maximum note value, the most dominant note always gets the value 1. The closer the rest of the notes are to zero the more likely the timeframe contains silence. If only a few values are close to one, then a chord or harmony is played. To filter out silence the sum over all note values of every timeframe is calculated and if this sum is twice as high as the average sum of notes of the whole song, then the frame is considered as silence. Otherwise the most dominant pitch is set to a fixed value while the rest of the notes are set to zero.

To extract the main melody in most cases only the most dominant pitch is needed, but sometimes the main melody is superimposed by other accompanying instruments. To prevent this the second most dominant pitch is also taken into consideration if its value is greater than a specific threshold. The result is shown in figure 3.4 with the threshold 0.8.

After that a beat tracking algorithm is applied to the song and the count of appearances of each note between two beats is calculated. The notes that appear the most are then set 1 while the rest is set to 0 for each section between two beats. This beat-alignment serves to make the similarity measurement invariant to the global tempo of the song. Even if a cover of a song is played with half the tempo of the original




Figure 3.4: Thresholded Chroma Features - Sia

song, then the melody of each bar is still the same as in the faster version. Figure 3.5 show the different beat aligned features of both songs with bandpass filtered audio and unfiltered audio. The red lines are the detected beat events. Another option would be to separate the frames between the beats in more smaller sections. This would result in a better resolution of the melodic movement but at the same time increase the length of the data vectors that have to be compared to each other. The last processing step is




Figure 3.5: Processed Chroma Features - Sia

to key shift the chroma features to make the similarity analysis key invariant. One way to do so would be to estimate the key in which the song is played in and then shift all chroma features to the same base key, e.g. C Major or A Minor. Due to the structure of the chroma features this can easily be done by assigning all estimated notes a new value a few keys higher or lower and thus shifting the whole song by a few semitones. The whole workflow to extract the chroma features for this thesis is shown in figure 3.6. Another consideration is to use the original chromagram without filtering out the least dominant keys and thus leaving the processing step 3 out. This means a possible tradeoff between accuracy and computation time. The result in the example song by




Figure 3.6: Workflow chroma feature extraction

Sia doesn't show a major impact, as can be seen in figure 3.7. In this thesis step 3 will be used in an attempt to get rid of the pitches of the accompaniment from the main melody line.




Figure 3.7: Processing Step 3 Chroma Features

### 3.2.3 Similarity of chroma features

In this section, two completely different approaches to measure the melodic similarity of two songs will be presented. The first one as proposed by [58] or [30] uses text retrieval methods to compare the chroma features of two songs and the second evaluates the usage of cross-correlation as a signal processing approach [59] and [60].

## Text retrieval

One possibility to process the chromagrams and to estimate similarity between the features of different songs is by handling the features like texts. Due to the extraction of only the main melody line in our feature vector there is only one note for every detected beat. The beat- and pitch-alignment done in the previous steps makes the features relatively time- and key invariant. One problem that remains is the different length of the various feature vectors. [30] mentions that this is indeed a problem when using the levenshtein distance to compute similarity. In their paper they use MIDI files instead of chroma features, but both contain information about the melody of songs so an adaption to chroma features is not an issue, because they can also easily be interpreted as simple strings. The levenshtein distance between the first  $i$  characters of a string  $S$  and the first  $j$  characters of  $T$  can be calculated as follows [30, p. 7]

$$lev_{S,T}(i, j) = \begin{cases} \max(i, j), & \text{if } \min(i, j) = 0 \\ \min \begin{cases} lev_{S,T}(i - 1, j) + 1 \\ lev_{S,T}(i, j - 1) + 1 \\ lev_{S,T}(i - 1, j - 1) \\ + cost[S_i \neq T_j] \end{cases} & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (3.10)$$

Xia (et al.) made some adjustments to this to be able to handle musical information.[30, pp. 7ff] For example to get rid of the problem of various lengths between the songs, they only took the first 200 and the last 200 notes of every song because it could be observed that cover songs tend to share more common notes in the beginning and in the end of each song.

Due to the fact that this thesis has no actual note information from MIDI files but rather short lists of estimated main pitches from the beat aligned chroma features, most of the feature vectors are already smaller than 200 notes. Therefor the implemented algorithm does not split the vectors. This tends to favor cover songs that share the same length.

Englmeier (et al.) use more advanced information retrieval techniques called TF-IDF weights and explicit semantic analysis (ESA). "The TF-IDF weight is a measure which expresses the meaning of a term or a document within a collection of documents." [58, p. 186] To do so, they have to create "audio words" from the song database by splitting the audio signal into snippets, creating chroma features and clustering them with the k-means algorithm. The centroids are then added to a database. These audio words can then be evaluated using the TF-IDF weights and ESA. Although their approach looks promising, a re-implementation of their algorithms would exceed the frame of this thesis.

## Cross-correlation

Another possibility to handle the extracted chroma features is by viewing them as ordinary signals and creating opportunities to apply classical signal processing algorithms. Ellis and Poliner use cross-correlation in their 2007 published paper [60]. Serra (et al.) also reference the work of Ellis and Poliner and discuss different weak points and influences of processing steps like beat tracking and key transposition to the overall performance of this similarity measurement. They also discuss and improve an other approach called dynamic time warping (DTW) further in their paper [59]. The focus in this thesis is set on the cross-correlation method. Given two discrete time signals  $x[n]$  and  $y[n]$  the cross-correlation between the both signals  $k[n] = (x \star y)[n]$  can be denoted as follows:

$$k[n] = (x \star y)[n] = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} x[m]y[m-n] \quad (3.11)$$

For two 2-dimensional input matrices  $X$  with the dimensions  $M$  by  $N$  and  $Y$  as an  $P$  by  $Q$  matrix the cross-correlation result is a matrix  $C$  of size  $M + P - 1$  rows and  $N + Q - 1$  columns. Its elements are given by equation 3.12 [61], the bar over  $H$  denotes complex conjugation (in this case  $H$  is a matrix with real values only).

$$C(k, l) = \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} X(m, n) \overline{H}(m - k, n - l) \quad (3.12)$$

with

$$-(P - 1) \leq k \leq M - 1 \quad (3.13)$$

$$-(Q - 1) \leq l \leq N - 1 \quad (3.14)$$

An example for the one dimensional cross-correlation is shown in figure 3.8 and the full two dimensional cross-correlation of two songs is figured in figure 3.9 and 3.10. Ellis and Poliner did not transpose the songs in the pre-processing step to match the keys of both audio files. Instead they calculated the full cross-correlation for all 12 possible transpositions and chose the best one. As input matrices they averaged all notes of the chroma features per beat and scaled them to have unit norm at each time slice/beat frame. In the original paper the cross-correlation is normalized by the length of the shorter song segment to bind the correlation result to an interval between 0 and 1. But in a later published work from Ellis and Cotton this step was left out, as it seemingly resulted in slightly worse detection ratios of cover songs [62]. Additionally they filtered the result of the correlation with a high-pass filter. "We found that genuine matches were indicated not only by cross-correlations of large magnitudes, but that these large values occurred in narrow local maxima in the cross-correlations that fell off rapidly as the relative alignment changed from its best value. To emphasize these




Figure 3.8: cross-correlation

sharp local maxima, we choose the transposition that gives the largest peak correlation then high-pass filter that cross-correlation function with a 3dB point at 0.1 rad/sample” [60, p. 1431]. The later published paper [62] also states, that changes to the filter parameters improved the cover song recognition rate further, however the exact values e.g. for the cutoff frequency weren’t give, so this thesis uses the older parameters for the filter

Serra (et al.) discussed various effects of pre-processing steps that improve the algorithm even more. E.g they note that a higher chroma resolution of 3 octaves gives better results. Also a key detection and transposition before cross-correlation gives slightly worse results in comparison to the method Ellis and Poliner used.

In this thesis a versions where the songs are all key aligned before the cross-correlation was tested, but due to the fact, that the key detection algorithm in the labrosa and essentia frameworks weren’t always correct a second version where additionally the cross-correlation for all key transpositions is calculated, was also implemented. In summary, the implementation in this thesis is similar to the approach by Ellis and Poliner [60] but some of the steps from the newer paper [62] leave some room for further improvements. The chroma features are beat aligned, averaged per beat and normalized to unit length as well. Additionally all chroma features are transposed to a common key (A in this case) in the pre-processing step. The full cross-correlation according to equation including key shifts by letting  $k$  run from  $-(P - 1) \leq k \leq M - 1$  in equation 3.12 is shown in the figures 3.9 and 3.10 but due to the previous pre-processing key shift and the fact that both input matrices share the same amount of rows (12, one per key) these aren’t ultimately necessary and computation time can be safed by altering the equation to equation 3.15 resulting in a vector C with the correlation results without additional

key-shifting but this version is reliant on an accurate key detection of the songs.

$$C(l) = \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} X(m, n) \overline{H}(m, n - l) \quad (3.15)$$

$$-(Q - 1) \leq l \leq N - 1 \quad (3.16)$$

or even faster without calculating the edges of the matrix.

$$0 \leq l \leq N - Q \quad (3.17)$$

The post-processing step from Ellis and Poliner, namely the high-pass filtering of the result was also implemented.

Figure 3.9 shows two beat aligned, key shifted and per beat averaged chroma features of two short guitar snippets and their cross-correlation. The interesting row of the cross-correlation matrix is the middle row marked with the C key. It shows that both already key shifted melodies do not correlate well. In figure 3.10 the cross-correlation of




Figure 3.9: beat-aligned chromagram

the song "Chandelier" by the singer Sia and covered by Pvris are shown in 3.10c and in contrast to this the cross-correlation of "Rock you like a Hurricane" with the song "Chandelier" by Sia are shown. Due to the previous key shifting, plot 3.10a shows the maximum peak right in the center row. Originally the version by Sia is detected to be written in C sharp and the cover version in F sharp, but both songs are shifted to the A key in the pre-processing step.

The unrelated songs result in much smaller correlation values, especially when looking at the middling row of the matrix (marked as the B-key), but also if the songs are

transposed additionally even then they do not correlate well. In contrast to this the cover songs have multiple visible peaks in the center row. The row with the maximum




Figure 3.10: Cross-correlation

correlation value is extracted and the resulting plot shows, that the cover songs do correlate much better than the unrelated songs (3.11a and 3.11b). The center rows of the cross-correlation matrices from figure 3.10 are separately pictured in figure 3.11 and 3.12. After applying the high-pass filter to the extracted row with the maximum correlation value, the peaks in 3.11a when cross-correlating the cover songs is clearly visible compared to the unrelated songs. An interesting detail that can be pointed out is that the song structure is also visible in plot 3.12a with clearly visible recurring peaks when the refrain is repeated.




Figure 3.11: Cross-correlation




Figure 3.12: Cross-correlation filtered

### 3.2.4 Validation

A good measure for the efficiency of a melodic similarity algorithm is the ability to find cover songs, remixes and recordings of the same song from different artists.

## 3.3 Rhythmic Similarity

This chapter provides an overview over some of the possibilities for computing music similarity by focusing on rhythmic features of different songs.

Nearly every MIR Toolkit provides an extraction tool for the beats per minute (BPM) and thus the tempo of each song. The most trivial solution to computing very low level rhythmic similarities is by sorting and comparing songs by their tempo. Of course there are far better and more accurate solutions. By just comparing the tempo of songs a lot of rhythm information is lost e.g. the rhythmic structures of songs like the time signature, up- and downbeats, etc.

This chapter presents some of the most promising approaches to compute rhythm similarities regarding the applicability in a big data framework.

### 3.3.1 Beat histogram

Other similarity measurements are e.g. the usage of beat histograms as proposed by Tsanetakis and Cook [63]. These are relatively similar to the later evaluated Rhythm Histograms. Gruhne (et al.) further improved the beat histograms and suggested an additional post processing step for the beat histogram before calculating the similarity between songs with the euclidean distance, to improve a comparison of two songs with different tempi by transforming the beat histograms into the logarithmic lag domain. They found, that logarithmic re-sampling of the lag axis of the histogram and cross-correlation with an artificial rhythmic grid improves the performance of this similarity measurement further [64, p. 182]. The essentia toolkit offers methods to extract the beat histogram. The different detected potential bpm's are normalized to 1. If a song changes its tempo then multiple peaks can be seen.

Figure 3.13 shows the beat histograms of the song "Rock you like a hurricane" by the Scorpions and covered by Knightsbridge as well as two different versions of the song "Behind Space" from the swedish metal band In Flames, one is sung by Stanne Mikkelson in 1994 and the second version was recorded with Anders Fridén as a singer in 1999. The 1994 version changes its tempo in the outro of the song as can be seen in the figure.




Figure 3.13: Beat Histogram

Another feature that will just be mentioned here (one of the older ones from 2002) uses the beat spectrum as a feature [24].

### 3.3.2 Rhythm patterns

A more state-of-the-art feature is the so called rhythm pattern, also known as fluctuation patterns for instance mentioned by [65]. To extract these features the rp\_extractor library [66] was made publicly available by the TU Vienna [67]. Figure 3.14 shows the extracted rhythmic patterns of the previously mentioned songs "Rock you like a Hurricane" and "Behind Space". The similarities of the different versions from the same songs are quite visible while at the same time substantial differences between the different songs are recognizable.

The x-axis represents the frequency band converted to the bark scale (a scale representing the human auditory system comparable to the mel scale) and the y-axis represents the modulation frequency index representing the modulation frequencies up to 10Hz (600 BPM). The Bark of a frequency  $f$  can be determined using formula 3.18.

$$Bark = 13 \arctan(0.00076f) + 3.5 \arctan((f/7500)^2) \quad (3.18)$$

The algorithm to extract the rhythm patterns as well as the rhythm histogram and statistical spectrum descriptors measuring the variations over the critical frequency bands can be seen in figure 3.15.




Figure 3.14: Rhythmic Patterns




Figure 3.15: Rhythm Pattern extraction [67]

So in conclusion the Rhythm Patterns basically represent the BPM of various frequency bands. To compare two different songs the euclidean distance between the vectorized rhythm pattern matrices can be calculated as Pampalk suggests [68, p. 40] Pohle, Schnitzer et al. refined Fluctuation Patterns into Onset Patterns e.g. by using

semitone bands instead of fewer critical bands to detect onsets. [69]

This thesis however focuses on Fluctuation/ Rhythm patterns extracted with the rp\_extractor library.

### 3.3.3 Rhythm Histogram

A more simplistic and lower dimensional feature coming with the rp\_extract toolkit is the Rhythm histogram. "The Rhythm Histogram features we use are a descriptor for general rhythmicics in an audio document. Contrary to the Rhythm Patterns and the Statistical Spectrum Descriptor, information is not stored per critical band. Rather, the magnitudes of each modulation frequency bin of all 24 critical bands are summed up, to form a histogram of "rhythmic energy" per modulation frequency. The histogram contains 60 bins which reflect modulation frequency between 0 and 10 Hz." [65, p. 3]. The difference in comparison to the beat histogram mentioned earlier in section 3.3.1 appears to be, that the beat histogram focuses on the basic tempo of the whole song while the rhythm histogram takes all frequency bands and therefore the sub-rhythms of single instruments into account.




Figure 3.16: Rhythm Histogram

### 3.3.4 cross-correlation

Estimating the onset strength per beat and creating a discrete-time signal for each song is another option. Similar to the chroma features the cross-correlation of the onset functions could be used as a similarity measurement.

Looking at the extracted onset features of the Song "Behing Space" by In Flames (sung by Anders Frieden 99' and Stanne Mikkels 94') in figure 3.17, one can see that




Figure 3.17: Detected Onsets (first 30 seconds)

the quality of these signals are greatly dependent on the underlying beat extraction and onset detection algorithms. E.g. the librosa toolkit struggles to detect beats in the first 10 seconds of the version of the song from the year 1999. Also this representation seems to contain a lot less valuable and comparable information in contrast to Fluctuation Patterns. In conclusion this approach is discarded and not further considered and tested in this thesis.

## 3.4 Summary

### 3.4.1 Timbre Similarity

Three different similarity metrics are chosen:

- Euclidean Distance
- Symmetric Kullback-Leibler Divergence
- Jensen-Shannon like Divergence

To calculate the distances, for each song the mean vector, variance and covariance matrix has to be computed for each mfcc band. These are stored in two different output text files:

- out.mfcc (containing mean vector (length  $b$ ), variance vector (length  $b$ ) and vectorized upper triangular covariance matrix (length  $b$ ))
- out.mfcckl (containing mean vector (length  $b$ ) and full covariance matrix as a vector (length  $\frac{b \cdot (b-1)}{2}$ ))

The amount of chosen mfcc bands is  $b = 13$ .

The second file is created to get rid of the necessity to rearrange the covariance matrix inside the Big Data Framework and reduce the computation time when a similarity computation request is processed. The text files contain strings like the following:

*music/CHANDELIER2.mp3; [-498.03763, ... ,4.321189]; [8943.487,... ,61.624344]; [8944.3907652, ... ,74.17548092]*

*music/CHANDELIER2.mp3; [-498.03763, ... ,4.321189]; [8943.487,... ,61.624344]; [[6568.27958735, ... ,74.64776425], ... , [74.64776425, ... ,69.1589048]]*

### 3.4.2 Melodic Similarity

Two different similarity metrics are chosen:

- Levenshtein Distance
- cross-correlation on full beat aligned and per beat averaged chroma features, key shifted to A

These are stored in two different output text files. The vector length is dependent on the numbers of detected beats  $n$

- *out.notes* (containing the estimated original key, the scale and a list of most dominant key per beat, key shifted to the A key (length  $n$ ))
- *out.chroma* (full beat aligned chromagram, containing a  $12 \times n$  matrix)

The output files contain strings like follows:

*music/CHANDELIER2.mp3; G; minor; [6, 2, 5, 7, 7, 7, 7, 2, 2, 2, 2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 3, 0, 0, 0]*

*music/CHANDELIER2.mp3; [[0.5209161 ,0.82440507,... ,0.68443549] ... [0.31470749,0.02552716,... ,0.01234249]]* for the *out.notes* files and *out.chroma* files.

### 3.4.3 Rhythm Similarity

Three different similarity metrics are chosen:

- euclidean distance between beat histograms
- euclidean distance between rhythm histograms
- euclidean distance between rhythm patterns

These are stored in three different output text files.

- out.bh (containing the estimated overall bpm and a vector for the beat histogram normalized to one (length 250))
- out.rh (containing a vector for the rhythm histogram extracted with rp\_extract (length 60))
- out.rp (containing a vectorized matrix for the rhythm patterns extracted with rp\_extract (length  $24 \times 60$ ))

The text files contain strings like:

*music/CHANDELIER2.mp3; 86.9380264282; [0. ... 0.01453488 ... 0. 0.]*

*music/CHANDELIER2.mp3,15.2521291416,10.10441871, ... ,2.2519330706*

*music/CHANDELIER2.mp3,0.0237481782333,0.0208784207788, ... ,0.00204177442894*

# 4. Implementation

*Split in two parts -> Feature Extraction and Big Data on extracted features*

## 4.1 Feature Extraction Performance

So far the required audio features have been selected in chapter 2 as well as toolkits to extract those features from the audio data. In chapter 2.4 different sources for audio files have been presented. Chapter 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 presented algorithms to pre-process the low-level features and use these to compute similarities. This chapter focuses on the selection of datasets to extract features from and the performance of the feature extraction and pre-processing software implementation.

### 4.1.1 Test Datasets

Chapter 2.4.1 introduced a range of MIR datasets but not all are fitting to the problems this thesis evaluates. To test the algorithms on the one hand a lot of data is needed, so the Free Music Archive with its over 100000 songs would be a solid option for performance tests. However on the other hand the genre distribution in the FMA dataset is quite one sided. Most of the songs are tagged as experimental, electronic and rock. Also this dataset may not be really representative for actual popular music, a lot of the songs are live recordings with poor audio quality, possibly influencing the results. The 1517 artists dataset offers 19 different genres with songs relatively equally distributed. For an objective evaluation of the proposed algorithms e.g. by genre recall this dataset is ideal. For cover song detection, the covers80 dataset is included as well. The last source used in this thesis is the private music collection. This collection is biased towards metal music but due to the match with personal taste, it offers a subjective evaluation of the results of the similarity analysis. In conclusion that sums up to about 117000 songs for performance tests and about 12000 songs for a detailed evaluation of the algorithms in this thesis. As mentioned in 2.4.1 all albums from the private music collections are cataloged as well and the associated document is in the

appendices. For the first tests an even smaller sample dataset containing 10 songs out of 10 different genres was created from the private music collection and the list with the belonging songs is also in the appendices.

|              |                                      |
|--------------|--------------------------------------|
| fma          | 106.733 Songs                        |
| private      | 8484 Songs                           |
| 1517 artists | 3180 Songs                           |
| covers80     | 164 Songs (80 originals + 84 covers) |

Table 4.1: appropriate music datasets

### 4.1.2 Feature Extraction Performance

After evaluating the different features in the last three chapters, this one discusses the feature extraction process in detail. The post processing of the features like the note estimation from the chroma features and the calculation of statistic features from the mfccs was already explained in the previous chapters and is left out here. The full code is in the appendices.

#### Librosa

For most of the plots in the introduction section 2 the python toolkit librosa was used because of its ease of use and very good documentation. The code example shows the necessary methods to extract the most important features like mfcc, chromagram and beats/ onsets.

```

1 path = ('music/guitar2.mp3')
2 x, fs = librosa.load(path)
3 mfcc = librosa.feature.mfcc(y=x, sr=fs, n_mfcc=12)
4 onset_env = librosa.onset.onset_strength(x, fs, aggregate=np.median)
5 tempo, beats = librosa.beat.beat_track(onset_envelope=onset_env,sr=fs)
6 times = librosa.frames_to_time(np.arange(len(onset_env)), sr=fs, hop_length= 512)
7 chroma = librosa.feature.chroma_stft(x, fs)

```

But when extracting features from batches of audio data the librosa library turned out to be very slow. For a very small dataset of 100 songs, the extraction of just the mean, variance and covariance of the mfccs and the estimated notes from the chromagram took about 48 minutes. For larger datasets like the 1517 artists dataset the feature extraction process would have taken about 22 hours.

## Essentia

[14] compares different Audio feature extraction toolboxes and shows that essentia is a much faster alternative to librosa due to the underlying C++ Code and provides even more features, but it is a bit less well documented and requires more effort in implementation at the same time.

In the end the code to extract the necessary features had to be rewritten for the usage of essentia due to the slow performance of librosa. Essentia offers two different ways to handle audio files. The first one is to use the essentia standard library. It offers similar methods to librosa and uses an imperative programming style. The audio file has to be read, sliced and preprocessed by hand. The second way is to use essentia streaming. Basically a network of connected algorithms is created and they handle and schedule the "how and when" whenever a process is called.

### Essentia Standard

In the final extractor code the mfcc calculation and beat histogram estimation is done with the essentia standard library, because it offers a fast and easy way to implement the basic feature extraction tasks.

```
1 audio = es.MonoLoader(filename=path, sampleRate=fs)()
2 hamming_window = es.Windowing(type='hamming')
3 spectrum = es.Spectrum()
4 mfcc = es.MFCC(numberCoefficients=13)
5 mfccs = numpy.array([mfcc(spectrum(hamming_window(frame)))[1]
6   for frame in es.FrameGenerator(audio, frameSize=2048, hopSize=1024)])
7 rhythm_extractor = es.RhythmExtractor2013(method="multifeature")
8 bpm, beats, beats_confidence, _, beats_intervals = rhythm_extractor(audio)
9 peak1_bpm, peak1_weight, peak1_spread, peak2_bpm, peak2_weight, peak2_spread, histogram =
10   es.BpmHistogramDescriptors()(beats_intervals)
```

### Essentia Streaming

The essentia streaming library is used to calculate the chroma features in the final code. It eases up the filtering with the high- and a lowpass filter. The audio signal is passed through various stages of processing and ultimately resulting in the chroma features of the high-pass filtered audio signal.

```
1 loader = ess.MonoLoader(filename=path, sampleRate=44100)
2 HP = ess.HighPass(cutoffFrequency=128)
3 LP = ess.LowPass(cutoffFrequency=4096)
4 framecutter = ess.FrameCutter(frameSize=frameSize, hopSize=hopSize, silentFrames='noise')
```

```

5 windowing = ess.Windowing(type='blackmanharris62')
6 spectrum = ess.Spectrum()
7 spectralpeaks = ess.SpectralPeaks(orderBy='magnitude', magnitudeThreshold=0.00001,
8     minFrequency=20, maxFrequency=3500, maxPeaks=60)
9 hpcp = ess.HPCP()
10 hpcp_key = ess.HPCP(size=36, referenceFrequency=440, bandPreset=False, minFrequency=20,
11     maxFrequency=3500, weightType='cosine', nonLinear=False, windowSize=1.)
12 key = ess.Key(profileType='edma', numHarmonics=4, pcpSize=36, slope=0.6,
13     usePolyphony=True, useThreeChords=True)
14 pool = essentia.Pool()
15 loader.audio >> HP.signal
16 HP.signal >> LP.signal
17 LP.signal >> framecutter.signal
18 framecutter.frame >> windowing.frame >> spectrum.frame
19 spectrum.spectrum >> spectralpeaks.spectrum
20 spectralpeaks.magnitudes >> hpcp.magnitudes
21 spectralpeaks.frequencies >> hpcp.frequencies
22 spectralpeaks.magnitudes >> hpcp_key.magnitudes
23 spectralpeaks.frequencies >> hpcp_key.frequencies
24 hpcp_key.hpcp >> key.pcp
25 hpcp.hpcp >> (pool, 'tonal.hpcp')
26 essentia.run(loader)
27 chroma = pool['tonal.hpcp'].T

```

## Essentia performance

The calculation with the essentia library for 100 songs took less than half of the time librosa needed. This is a significant improvement, however the essentia library uses only one CPU core so that performance was further improved by using the parallel python library as presented in the next code snippet.

## parallel python

Multiple CPU cores get a part of the filelist of all songs and can compute the features fully parallel.

```

1 job_server = pp.Server()
2 job_server.set_ncpus(ncpus)
3 jobs = []
4 for index in xrange(startjob, parts):
5     starti = start+index*step
6     endi = min(start+(index+1)*step, end)
7     jobs.append(job_server.submit(parallel_python_process, (index, filelist[starti:endi],1,1,1,1,1)))
8 gc.collect()

```

```

9 | times = sum([job() for job in jobs])
10| job_server.print_stats()

```

The computation time takes about 15.4 seconds per song and processor core. Using 4 CPU cores for 100 songs, the overall processing time could be reduced to about 385 seconds.

$$time = \frac{\#songs}{\#CPUs} \cdot 15.4s \quad (4.1)$$

Parallel python also opens up the possibility to use a cluster instead of a single node PC.

For convenience, every processor gets a batch of files instead of single songs. For every batch different output files for the various features are created. The batch size determines the overall size of these feature-files. For example for the 1517 artists dataset a batch size of 400 songs was chosen, so overall 4 CPUs had to process 2 batches, resulting in 8 different output files with the chroma feature files being the largest with about 25MB per file.

### **rp\_extractor**

For the extraction of the rhythm patterns and rhythm histogram features as described in chapter 3.3 the rp\_extractor tool provided by the TU Wien was used. Although running in parallel on all CPU cores on a single node, the extraction of the features from 100 songs takes about 442 seconds.

### **performance**

In summary the estimated time based on the performance measurements can be calculated and is listed below, leading to the conclusion that the extraction of the features for the full dataset including the FMA dataset can only be done with the help of a computing cluster.

#### **Estimated feature extraction times**

- 3h24 - 1517 artists - essentia parallel, single node, 4 CPU cores
- 3h54 - 1517 artists - rp\_extract
- 9h06 - private dataset - essentia parallel, single node, 4 CPU cores
- 10h24 - private dataset - rp\_extract
- (125h - full dataset - essentia parallel, single node, 4 CPU cores)
- (143h - full dataset - rp\_extract)




Figure 4.1: Performance of various toolkits on a single node

### mpi4py

For the extraction of the features from the fma dataset on the "ARA" cluster of the Friedrich-Schiller-University in Jena parallel python had to be replaced with mpi4py. Mpi4py provides Python bindings for the Message Passing Interface standard (MPI) [70]. Every compute process gets a rank number and is aware of the overall count of all processes. With these two values the file list of all audio files is split and each process only processes the according files. The audio files were stored in a parallel cluster file system called beegfs [71]. Equally to the implementation using parallel python every process stores the results in batches in separate output files, each of them containing 25 songs.

All files larger than 25MB were filtered out of the fma dataset to avoid memory overflows, still leaving 102813 songs to evaluate. A total of 36 compute nodes were used. Every node had 192GB of RAM and 36 CPU cores (72 using hyper-threading (HT)). To increase the available Memory per CPU, only 18 CPU cores per node were used. During the computation of the features with essentia one out of the 648 processes ran out of memory, so only 102793 out of the 102813 songs were processed. For performance tests this doesn't make a large difference but for future work, the feature extraction script should be adapted accordingly. The extraction of the features took 1439s (fastest process) to 1950s (slowest). With a better balancing and messaging between the processes, the task could be distributed in a way where idle tasks take parts of the file list from tasks that are still processing.

```

1 comm = MPI.COMM_WORLD # get MPI communicator object
2 size = comm.size # total number of processes
3 rank = comm.rank # rank of this process
4 status = MPI.Status() # get MPI status object
5
6 files_per_part = 25
7 start = 0
8 last = len(filelist)
9
10 parts = (len(filelist) / files_per_part) + 1
11 step = (last - start) / parts + 1
12 for index in xrange(start + rank, last, size):
13     if index < parts:
14         starti = start+index*step
15         endi = min(start+(index+1)*step, last)
16         parallel_python_process(index, filelist[starti:endi])

```

The extraction of the rhythm patterns spawns the same amount of processes, but each of the processes is able to make use of 4 CPU cores. The fastest process finished after 1657s and the slowest one took 1803s.

### Total amount of songs

Due to the above mentioned filtering of larger audio files and due to the fact that the rhythm pattern extraction script is not able to handle some audio file formats like Ogg Vorbis, not all features from all songs could be extracted. So in the end the overall count of songs where features could be extracted is 114310.

## 4.2 Big Data Framework Spark

After the features are extracted, the next step is to load the feature files into the HDFS. The first tests with spark were performed on a single PC with 4 CPU cores, running Spark 2.4.0.

The cluster test were performed on the ARA- Cluster, that offers 16 compute-nodes with 32 CPU-cores per node (72 with HT) and 192GB RAM. The cluster was running an older version of Spark (1.6.0)

### 4.2.1 Data preprocessing

The features are stored in text files as described in chapter 3.4. Due to the fact that the features were extracted in parallel and in batches of only a few songs, each of the feature files only contain the features of a small number of songs. Because many small files are inefficient to process with Spark [53, p. 153] all files containing the same feature type are merged to one large file, before being loaded into the HDFS. By loading larger files into the HDFS, the partitioning into data blocks is performed according to the standard parameters of the HDFS (e.g. 128 MB partitions). Additional repartitioning on the cluster is later performed with Spark by using the *rdd.coalesce(repartition\_count)* command. Finally to work with the features a few transformations have to be performed on the data. For example the extracted note values are stored as lists of numbers, each representing a certain note. To compare these using the Levenshtein distance, these lists are converted into strings.

```
1 chroma = sc.textFile("features/out[0-9]*.notes").coalesce(repartition_count)
2 chroma = chroma.map(lambda x: x.split(';'))
3 chroma = chroma.map(lambda x: (x[0], x[1], x[2], x[3].replace("0",'A').replace("1",'B').replace("2",'C').replace("3",'D').replace("4",'E').replace("5",'F').replace("6",'G').replace("7",'H').replace("8",'I').replace("9",'J').replace("10",'K').replace("11",'L')))
4 chroma = chroma.map(lambda x: (x[0], x[1], x[2], x[3].replace(' ','')).replace(' ',''))))
5 df = spark.createDataFrame(chroma, ["id", "key", "scale", "notes"])
```

All the other features are stored as lists of floats and have to be converted to vectors.

```
1 list_to_vector_udf = udf(lambda l: Vectors.dense(l), VectorUDT())
2 rp = sc.textFile("features[0-9]*/out[0-9]*.rp").coalesce(repartition_count)
3 rp = rp.map(lambda x: x.split(","))
4 kv_rp= rp.map(lambda x: (x[0].replace(";",",").replace(".",",").replace(",",""), list(x[1:])))
5 rp_df = spark.createDataFrame(kv_rp, ["id", "rp"])
```

```
6 rp_df = rp_df.select(rp_df["id"],list_to_vector_udf(rp_df["rp"]).alias("rp"))
```

#### 4.2.2 Euclidean Distance

```
1 from scipy.spatial import distance
2 #...
3 distance_udf = F.udf(lambda x: float(distance.euclidean(x, comparator_value)), FloatType())
4 result = df_vec.withColumn('distances', distance_udf(F.col('features')))
5 result = result.select("id", "distances").orderBy('distances', ascending=True)
6 result = result.rdd.flatMap(list).collect()
```

*Explain usage of user defined function udf*

**Used with BH, RH, BP AND MFCC**

**super versatile AND very fast**

*insert analysis of performance*

#### 4.2.3 Bucketed Random Projection

Due to the fact that the ARA cluster is running with PySpark version 1.6.0, the Bucketed Random Projection (BRP) Algorithm could only be tested on the single node test platform.

```
1 from pyspark.ml.feature import BucketedRandomProjectionLSH
2 #...
3 brp = BucketedRandomProjectionLSH(inputCol="features", outputCol="hashes", seed=12345,
4 bucketLength=25.0)
5 model = brp.fit(df_vec)
6 comparator_value = Vectors.dense(comparator[0])
7 result = model.approxNearestNeighbors(df_vec, comparator_value, df_vec.count()).collect()
8 rf = spark.createDataFrame(result)
9 result = rf.select("id", "distCol").rdd.flatMap(list).collect()
```

*Usable as a substitute for euclidean UDF*

*Is it faster than the UDF tho? - performance test*

#### 4.2.4 Cross-correlation




Figure 4.2: Chroma on 11500 songs, single node

#### *2 Versions explained - with additional key shift and without*

```

1 def cross_correlate(chroma1, chroma2):
2     corr = sp.signal.correlate2d(chroma1, chroma2, mode='full')
3     #transposed_chroma = transposed_chroma / (min(length1, length2))
4     index = np.where(transposed_chroma == np.amax(transposed_chroma))
5     index = int(index[0])
6     mean_line = transposed_chroma[index]
7     sos = sp.signal.butter(1, 0.1, 'high', analog=False, output='sos')
8     mean_line = sp.signal.sosfilt(sos, mean_line)
9     return np.max(mean_line)
10 #...

```

```

11 distance_udf = F.udf(lambda x: float(cross_correlate(x, comparator_value)), DoubleType())
12 result = df_vec.withColumn('distances', distance_udf(F.col('chroma')))
13 result = result.select("id", "distances").orderBy('distances', ascending=False)
14 result = result.rdd.flatMap(list).collect()

```

*Memory intense - had to alter spark-defaults.conf*

*spark.driver.memory 6g*

*spark.executor.memory 2g*

*Insert graphics of calculation time with and without correlation*

*Differences in the results to the original paper can be explained with the different underlying beat tracking, different filter parameters and a few improvements that are left out as mentioned in 3.2.2[62]*

#### 4.2.5 Kullback-Leibler Divergence

```

1 def symmetric_kullback_leibler(vec1, vec2):
2     #preprocessing: splitting vec1 and vec2 into mean1, mean2, cov1 and cov2
3     d = 13
4     div = 0.25 * (np.trace(cov1 * np.linalg.inv(cov2)) + np.trace(cov2 * np.linalg.inv(cov1)) + np.
5         trace( (np.linalg.inv(cov1) + np.linalg.inv(cov2)) * (mean1 - mean2)**2) - 2*d)
6     return div
7 distance_udf = F.udf(lambda x: float(symmetric_kullback_leibler(x, comparator_value)),
8 DoubleType())
9 result = df_vec.withColumn('distances', distance_udf(F.col('features')))
10 result = result.select("id", "distances").orderBy('distances', ascending=True)
11 result = result.rdd.flatMap(list).collect()

```

*Differences in the results to the original musly tool can be explained due to the choice of only 13 MFCC bands in this thesis compared to the 25 bands in musly[7]*

#### 4.2.6 Jensen-Shannon Divergence

```

1 def jensen_shannon(vec1, vec2):
2     #preprocessing: splitting vec1 and vec2 into mean1, mean2, cov1 and cov2
3     mean_m = 0.5 * (mean1 + mean2)
4     cov_m = 0.5 * (cov1 + mean1 * np.transpose(mean1)) + 0.5 * (cov2 + mean2 * np.transpose(
5         mean2)) - (mean_m * np.transpose(mean_m))
6     div = 0.5 * np.log(np.linalg.det(cov_m)) - 0.25 * np.log(np.linalg.det(cov1)) - 0.25 * np.log(
7         np.linalg.det(cov2))

```

```

6 if np.isnan(div):
7     div = np.inf
8 return div
9 distance_udf = F.udf(lambda x: float(jensen_shannon(x, comparator_value)), DoubleType())
10 result = df_vec.withColumn('distances', distance_udf(F.col('features')))
11 result = result.select("id", "distances").orderBy('distances', ascending=True)
12 result = result.rdd.flatMap(list).collect()

```

*Problem mit den "skyrocketing determinanten" -> Lösung: cholesky zerlegung, geht nicht - nicht positiv definit, Lösung 2 nutzen von SKL aber noch rechenintensiver![3, p.45]*

#### 4.2.7 Levenshtein distance

```

1 def get_neighbors_notes(song):
2     filterDF = df.filter(df.id == song)
3     filterDF.first()
4     comparator_value = filterDF.collect()[0][3]
5     print comparator_value
6     df_merged = df.withColumn("compare", lit(comparator_value))
7     df_levenshtein = df_merged.withColumn("word1_word2_levenshtein", levenshtein(col("notes"),
8         col("compare")))
9     df_levenshtein.sort(col("word1_word2_levenshtein").asc()).show()

```

#### 4.2.8 performance

```

1 confCluster = SparkConf().setAppName("MusicSimilarity Cluster")
2 confCluster.set("spark.driver.memory", "64g")
3 confCluster.set("spark.executor.memory", "64g")
4 confCluster.set("spark.driver.memoryOverhead", "32g")
5 confCluster.set("spark.executor.memoryOverhead", "32g")
6 #Be sure that the sum of the driver or executor memory plus the driver or executor memory
overhead is always less than the value of yarn.nodemanager.resource.memory-mb
7 #confCluster.set("yarn.nodemanager.resource.memory-mb", "192000")
8 #spark.driver/executor.memory + spark.driver/executor.memoryOverhead < yarn.nodemanager.
resource.memory-mb
9 confCluster.set("spark.yarn.executor.memoryOverhead", "4096")
10 #set cores of each executor and the driver -> less than avail -> more executors spawn
11 confCluster.set("spark.driver.cores", "32")
12 confCluster.set("spark.executor.cores", "32")
13 confCluster.set("spark.dynamicAllocation.enabled", "True")
14 confCluster.set("spark.dynamicAllocation.minExecutors", "16")

```

```

15 confCluster.set("spark.dynamicAllocation.maxExecutors", "32")
16 confCluster.set("yarn.nodemanager.vmem-check-enabled", "false")
17 repartition_count = 32

```

## Differences between the feature types

### Performance Comparison of RDD vs DataFrames vs single DataFrame

#### *Explain Single DataFrame vs multiple DataFrames*




Figure 4.3: Performance of various spark algorithms (MFCC Euc, Notes, RP)

## min and max value aggregation

*Why? Scaling of distances between 0 to 1 interval to combine different distances*




Figure 4.4: Spark DF implementations, single node, 1517 artists

#### 4.2.9 possible performance improvements

*Pre- merge feature sets, broadcast comparator, descending importance pre-filtering*

*statistic normalization of similarities*

*Filter and refine after statistic normalization, drop all below mean*

*Is there a better way to cross-correlate???*

#### 4.2.10 Other alternatives

Alternating Least Squares

TF-IDF weights

DIMSUM all-pairs similarity

# 5. Results

Very small 100 Song Dataset plus 20 Cover Songs to evaluate and compare similarity metrics. Full similarity matrices. High performance/ throughput tests with full 12000 song testset to evaluate full load performance.

## 5.1 Runtime

## 5.2 feature separation quality

*Which features are useful, which not (looking at you rhythm histogram)*

correlation of features in figure 5.1




Figure 5.1: correlation of features

correlation of features in figure 5.2

|               | <b>rp</b>  | <b>rh</b>    | <b>bh</b>   | <b>js</b>  | <b>skl</b>   | <b>mfcc</b> | <b>chroma</b> | <b>notes</b> | <b>agg</b> |
|---------------|------------|--------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|------------|
| <b>rp</b>     | 1          | 0.911142     | 0.297921    | -0.0855226 | -0.0357198   | 0.089262    | 0.0751971     | 0.0109592    | 0.722755   |
| <b>rh</b>     | 0.911142   | 1            | 0.239553    | -0.0274831 | -0.000769265 | 0.122862    | 0.0740306     | 0.00990675   | 0.741954   |
| <b>bh</b>     | 0.297921   | 0.239553     | 1           | -0.233594  | -0.190448    | -0.0942067  | 0.0383251     | -0.00106577  | 0.323159   |
| <b>js</b>     | -0.0855226 | -0.0274831   | -0.233594   | 1          | 0.744165     | 0.124648    | 0.0281869     | -0.0604989   | 0.418403   |
| <b>skl</b>    | -0.0357198 | -0.000769265 | -0.190448   | 0.744165   | 1            | 0.0376314   | 0.0225788     | -0.0490918   | 0.434934   |
| <b>mfcc</b>   | 0.089262   | 0.122862     | -0.0942067  | 0.124648   | 0.0376314    | 1           | 0.0199855     | -0.0359137   | 0.361299   |
| <b>chroma</b> | 0.0751971  | 0.0740306    | 0.0383251   | 0.0281869  | 0.0225788    | 0.0199855   | 1             | 0.194065     | 0.197298   |
| <b>notes</b>  | 0.0109592  | 0.00990675   | -0.00106577 | -0.0604989 | -0.0490918   | -0.0359137  | 0.194065      | 1            | 0.2281     |
| <b>agg</b>    | 0.722755   | 0.741954     | 0.323159    | 0.418403   | 0.434934     | 0.361299    | 0.197298      | 0.2281       | 1          |

Figure 5.2: correlation 95 songs, 19 genres (5 each), 1517 artists

Scatter Matrix, 5 songs of each genre from 1517 artists - distances combined, main diagonal = Kernel Density Estimation in figure 5.3




Figure 5.3: correlation 95 songs, 19 genres (5 each), 1517 artists

Scatter Matrix, 1 Song (New Age) from 1517 artists - distances, main diagonal = Histogram, all genres in figure 5.4




Figure 5.4: distances 1 song, New Age, 1517 artists

Scatter Matrix, 1 Song (Rock/ Metal) from 1517 artists - distances, main diagonal = Kernel Density Estimation, picked subset of 3 genres

All features combined recommends Rock primarily

Most interesting Detail: Plot JS - RP: overall similarity JS between Rock and Hip Hop - overall similarity RP between Classical and Metal - only one feature would not be able to separate all 3 genres in figure 5.5




Figure 5.5: distances 1 song, Rock/ Metal, 1517 artists, 3 genres

Scatter Matrix, 1 Song (New Age) from 1517 artists - distances, main diagonal = Kernel Density Estimation, all genres in figure

No combination of features is able to accurately separate New Age from Rock and Pop




Figure 5.6: distances 1 song, New Age, 1517 artists, all genres

Scatter Matrix, 1 Song (Classics) from 100 song sample - distances, main diagonal = Kernel Density Estimation, picked subset of 4 genres in figure 5.7




Figure 5.7: distances 1 song (Classical), 4 genres (10 songs each)

distances from classical song out of 1517 artists dataset in figure 5.8




Figure 5.8: genre recall 100 songs

### 5.3 Cover song identification

*Able to find "Rock you like a Hurricane" cover as top recommendation in over 11500 songs*

*counting the hits in the top 10 results of 80 requested songs on 164 song dataset covers 80:*

- chroma: 16
- notes: 24
- chroma + notes: 24
- notes + rp: 22
- chroma + notes + rp: 28

- mfcc + notes + rp: 20

*interesting sidenote: results of chroma only and notes only different! Nearly ever*

## 5.4 Genre similarity

100 Song Testset, 10 genres:




Figure 5.9: genre recall 100 songs

## 5.5 ... and beyond genre boundaries

*Rachmaninoff Prelude C# minor full dataset Top 5 MFCC Euclidean*

- Songs/Klassik/Rachmaninoff-IdilBiret-Op3\_No2PreludeinC-SharpMinormp3
- Jazz&Klassik/100MeisterwerkederKlassik/Rachmaninov\_PianoConcertoNo2InCMinorOp18-1Moderato(Excerpt)mp3
- Jazz&Klassik/LangLang-Liszt/11\_LangLang\_PianoConcertoNo1inEflatmajorS124(LWH4)1Allegro
- Jazz&Klassik/PianoCollection/CD4-Brahms/03PianoSonataNÂ°2inFsharpminorOp2-IIIScherzoallegrowav
- Metal&Rock/Compilations/RelapseSampler-RelapseSampler2015/SteveMoore-RelapseSampler2015Intro&Creditsmp3
- Jazz&Klassik/LangLang-Liszt/12\_LangLang\_PianoConcertoNo1inEflatmajorS124(LWH4)2Quasiallegrettovivace-Allegroanimatomp3

## **5.6 Improvements and outlook**

more state of the art similarity (blocked)

performance improvements

Genre and metadata, Genre specific features, combinations and variable model, Collaborative Filtering, Lyrics

reduce hubness

# References

- [1] Peter Knees and Markus Schedl. Music Similarity and Retrieval. An introduction to web audio- and web-based strategies. In: Springer, 2016. ISBN: 9783662497203.
- [2] B. McFee et al. The Million Song Dataset Challenge, AdMIRE '12. In:
- [3] Dr. Dominik Schnitzer. Dealing with the Music of the World: Indexing Content-Based Music Similarity Models for Fast Retrieval in Massive Databases, 1st ed. In: 2012. ISBN: 9781477494158.
- [4] Brian McFee et al. LibROSA: Audio and Music Signal Analysis in Python. In: Proceedings of the 14th Python in Science Conference.
- [5] Prélude cis-Moll (Rachmaninow). In: URL: [https://imslp.org/wiki/Morceaux\\_de\\_fantaisie\%2C\Op.3\\\_\(Rachmaninoff\%2C\Sergei\)](https://imslp.org/wiki/Morceaux_de_fantaisie\%2C\Op.3\_(Rachmaninoff\%2C\Sergei)).
- [6] C. Weihs; D. Jannach; I. Vatolkin; G. Rudolph. Music Data Analysis. New York: Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2017. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781315370996>.
- [7] Dr. Dominik Schnitzer. Audio Music Similarity. In: URL: <http://www.musly.org/index.html>.
- [8] M. Mandel and D. Ellis. Song-level features and support vector machines for music classification. In: Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Music Information Retrieval, ISMIR, 2005.
- [9] D. Schnitzer et al. Using mutual proximity to improve content-based audio similarity. In: Proceedings of the 12th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference, ISMIR, 2011.
- [10] Olivier Lartillot and Petri Toivainen. MIR in Matlab (II): A Toolbox for Musical Feature Extraction from Audio. In: Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Music Information Retrieval, ISMIR 2007, Vienna, Austria, September 23-27, 2007.
- [11] MATLAB. in: URL: <https://de.mathworks.com/help/matlab/index.html>.

- [12] John W. Eaton et al. GNU Octave version 4.2.0 manual: a high-level interactive language for numerical computations. In: 2016. URL: <http://www.gnu.org/software/octave/doc/interpreter/>.
- [13] Martin Ariel Hartmann. A port of MIRToolbox for Octave. In: 2016. URL: <https://github.com/martinarielhartmann/mirtooloct>.
- [14] David Moffat, David Ronan, and Joshua Reiss. An Evaluation of Audio Feature Extraction Toolboxes. In: Nov. 2015. DOI: [10.13140/RG.2.1.1471.4640](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.1471.4640).
- [15] B.Mathieu et al. YAAFE, an Easy to Use and Efficient Audio Feature Extraction Software. In: Proceedings of the 11th ISMIR conference, Utrecht, Netherlands, 2010.
- [16] D. Bogdanov et al. ESSENTIA: an Audio Analysis Library for Music Information Retrieval. In: International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference (ISMIR'13). 2013, pp. 493–498.
- [17] Michael I. Mandel and Daniel P. W. Ellis. Labrosa's audio music similarity and classification submissions. In: 2007.
- [18] Jupyter. In: URL: <https://jupyter.org/index.html>.
- [19] Für Elise. In: URL: [https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/a/a9/BH\\_116\\_Vergleich.png](https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/a/a9/BH_116_Vergleich.png).
- [20] Paul Brossier et al. aubio/aubio: 0.4.8 (Version 0.4.8). In: 2018. URL: <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1494152>.
- [21] J. Salamon and E. Gómez. Melody Extraction from Polyphonic Music Signals using Pitch Contour Characteristics. In: IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech and Language Processing, 20(6):1759-1770. 2012.
- [22] C. Cannam, C. Landone, and M. Sandler. Sonic Visualiser: An Open Source Application for Viewing, Analysing, and Annotating Music Audio Files. In: Proceedings of the ACM Multimedia 2010 International Conference. Firenze, Italy, 2010, pp. 1467–1468.
- [23] Matija Marolt. A Mid-level Melody-based Representation for Calculating Audio Similarity. In: ISMIR 2006, 7th International Conference on Music Information Retrieval, Victoria, Canada, 8-12 October 2006. 2006.
- [24] Jonathan Foote, Matthew Cooper, and Unjung Nam. Audio Retrieval by Rhythmic Similarity. In: Jan. 2002.
- [25] Zhao Yufeng and Li Xinwei. Design and Implementation of Music Recommendation System Based on Hadoop. In: 2018. DOI: [10.2991/icsnse-18.2018.36..](https://doi.org/10.2991/icsnse-18.2018.36..)

- [26] B. McFee and G.R.G. Landkriet. Large-scale music similarity search with spatial trees. In: ISMIR '11. URL: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.226.5060>.
- [27] Thierry Bertin-Mahieux et al. The Million Song Dataset. In: Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR 2011). 2011.
- [28] Guangyu Xia et al. MidiFind: Similarity Search and Popularity Mining in Large MIDI Databases, 259-276. In: 2013. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-12976-1\\_17](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12976-1_17).
- [29] Jong Wook Kim et al. CREPE: A Convolutional Representation for Pitch Estimation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2018.
- [30] Guangyu Xia et al. MidiFind: Similarity Search and Popularity Mining in Large MIDI Databases. In: Oct. 2013, pp. 259–276. ISBN: 978-3-319-12975-4. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-319-12976-1\\_17](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12976-1_17).
- [31] Sankalp Gulati, Joan Serra, and Xavier Serra. An evaluation of methodologies for melodic similarity in audio recordings of Indian art music, 678-682. In: 2015. DOI: [10.1109/ICASSP.2015.7178055](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP.2015.7178055).
- [32] Cumhur Erkut et al. Extraction of Physical and Expressive Parameters for Model-based Sound Synthesis of the Classical Guitar. In: 2002.
- [33] Michäel Defferrard et al. FMA: A Dataset for Music Analysis. In: 18th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference, 2017. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.01840>.
- [34] John Thickstun, Zaid Harchaoui, and Sham M. Kakadetitle. Learning Features of Music from Scratch. In: International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR). 2017. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.09827>.
- [35] Klaus Seyerlehner. 1517-Artists Dataset. In: 2010. URL: <http://www.seyerlehner.info/index.php?p=1\3\Download>.
- [36] R. Bittner et al. "MedleyDB: A Multitrack Dataset for Annotation-Intensive MIR Research". In: 15th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference, 2014.
- [37] R. Bittner et al. MedleyDB 2.0: New Data and a System for Sustainable Data Collection. In: New York, NY, USA: International Conference on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR-16). 2016.

- [38] B. De Man et al. The Open Multitrack Testbed. In: 137th Convention of the Audio Engineering Society, 2014.
- [39] D. P. W. Ellis. The "covers80" cover song data set. In: 2007. URL: available: <http://labrosa.ee.columbia.edu/projects/coversongs/covers80/>.
- [40] Soundcloud bqpd. In: URL: [https://soundcloud.com/bq\\_pd](https://soundcloud.com/bq_pd).
- [41] Spotify API. in: URL: <https://developer.spotify.com/documentation/>.
- [42] The Echo Nest. In: URL: <http://the.echonest.com/>.
- [43] Spotipy - a Python client for The Spotify Web API. in: URL: <https://github.com/plamere/spotipy>.
- [44] Spotify Playlist Miner. In: URL: <https://developer.spotify.com/community/showcase/playlist-miner-spotify/>.
- [45] Spotify Terms and Conditions of Use. In: URL: <https://www.spotify.com/lt/legal/end-user-agreement/plain/#s9>.
- [46] Spotify Developer Terms of Service. In: URL: <https://developer.spotify.com/terms/>.
- [47] Spotify Commercial Restrictions. In: URL: <https://developer.spotify.com/legal/commercial-restrictions/>.
- [48] Hendrik Schreiber. Improving Genre Annotations for the Million Song Dataset. In: In Proceedings of the 16th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference (ISMIR), pages 241-247, Málaga, Spain, Oct. 2015.
- [49] Last.fm dataset, the official song tags and song similarity collection for the Million Song Dataset. In: URL: <http://labrosa.ee.columbia.edu/millionsong/lastfm>.
- [50] The Echo Nest Taste profile subset, the official user data collection for the Million Song Dataset. In: URL: <http://labrosa.ee.columbia.edu/millionsong/tasteprofile>.
- [51] SecondHandSongs dataset, the official list of cover songs within the Million Song Dataset. In: URL: <http://labrosa.ee.columbia.edu/millionsong/secondhand>.
- [52] Matei Zaharia et al. Apache Spark: A Unified Engine for Big Data Processing. In: Commun. ACM 59.11 (Oct. 2016), pp. 56–65. ISSN: 0001-0782. DOI: [10.1145/2934664](https://doi.org/10.1145/2934664). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2934664>.
- [53] Jeffrey Aven. Data Analytics with Spark Using Python. 1st. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2018. ISBN: 013484601X, 9780134846019.

- [54] Jeffrey Dean and Sanjay Ghemawat. MapReduce: Simplified Data Processing on Large Clusters. In: vol. 51. Jan. 2004, pp. 137–150. doi: [10.1145/1327452.1327492](https://doi.org/10.1145/1327452.1327492).
- [55] MapReduce. In: URL: <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Mapreduce.png>.
- [56] Klaus Seyerlehner and Markus Schedl. Block-Level Audio Features for Music Genre Classification. In: 2009.
- [57] Nicola Orio and Antonio Rodà. A Measure of Melodic Similarity based on a Graph Representation of the Music Structure. In: ISMIR. 2009.
- [58] David Englmeier et al. Musical similarity analysis based on chroma features and text retrieval methods. In: Datenbanksysteme für Business, Technologie und Web (BTW 2015) - Workshopband. Ed. by Norbert Ritter et al. Bonn: Gesellschaft für Informatik e.V., 2015, pp. 183–192.
- [59] Joan Serra et al. Chroma Binary Similarity and Local Alignment Applied to Cover Song Identification. In: 16 (Sept. 2008), pp. 1138 –1151. doi: [10.1109/TASL.2008.924595](https://doi.org/10.1109/TASL.2008.924595).
- [60] Daniel P.W. Ellis and Graham E. Poliner. Identifying ‘Cover Songs’ with Chroma Features and Dynamic Programming Beat Tracking. In: vol. 4. May 2007, pp. IV–1429. doi: [10.1109/ICASSP.2007.367348](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICASSP.2007.367348).
- [61] Mathworks. xcorr2. In: URL: <https://www.mathworks.com/help/signal/ref/xcorr2.html>.
- [62] Daniel P W Ellis and Courtenay Cotton. The 2007 LabROSA cover song detection system. In: (Jan. 2007).
- [63] George Tzanetakis and Perry Cook. Musical Genre Classification of Audio Signals. In: IEEE Transactions on Speech and Audio Processing 10 (Aug. 2002), pp. 293 –302. doi: [10.1109/TSA.2002.800560](https://doi.org/10.1109/TSA.2002.800560).
- [64] Matthias Gruhne, Christian Dittmar, and Daniel Gärtner. Improving Rhythmic Similarity Computation by Beat Histogram Transformations. In: Jan. 2009, pp. 177–182.
- [65] Thomas Lidy and Andreas Rauber. Evaluation of Feature Extractors and Psycho-Acoustic Transformations for Music Genre Classification. In: Jan. 2005, pp. 34–41.
- [66] Audio Feature Extraction. In: URL: [https://github.com/tuwien-musicir/rp\\_extract](https://github.com/tuwien-musicir/rp_extract).

- [67] Audio Feature Extraction - Rhythm Patterns. In: URL: <http://www.ifs.tuwien.ac.at/mir/audiofeatureextraction.html>.
- [68] Elias Pampalk. Computational Models of Music Similarity and their Application in Music Information Retrieval. In: 2006.
- [69] Tim Pohle et al. On Rhythm and General Music Similarity. In: Jan. 2009, pp. 525–530.
- [70] mpi4py. In: URL: <https://pypi.org/project/mpi4py/>.
- [71] beegfs. In: URL: <http://www.beegfs.io/content/latest-release/>.

# 6. Appendix

## 6.1 Spotipy Crawler

```
from __future__ import print_function
from spotipy.oauth2 import SpotifyClientCredentials
import json, sys, spotipy, time, os.path
import requests, urllib
import matplotlib.pyplot as pl
import h5json, scipy
import numpy as np
from scipy.spatial import distance

reload(sys)
sys.setdefaultencoding('utf8')
client_credentials_manager = SpotifyClientCredentials()
sp = spotipy.Spotify(client_credentials_manager=client_credentials_manager)
if len(sys.argv) > 1:
    uri = sys.argv[1]
else:
    uri = 'spotify:user:bqpd:playlist:5oF8D71X38WwzeRUdyvpmd'
username = uri.split(':')[2]
playlist_id = uri.split(':')[4]
playlist = sp.user_playlist(username, playlist_id)
results = sp.user_playlists(username, limit=50)
playlist_length = playlist['tracks']['total']
path = os.getcwd()
path = path + "/crawled_data"
playlist_name = playlist['name']
directory = path + "/" + playlist_name
if not os.path.exists(directory):
```

```

os.makedirs(directory)
t_start = time.time()
f_feat = open(path + "/" + playlist_name + "/featurevector.txt", "w")
f_feat.write("Features: \n")
f_feat.close()
feat_vec = []
feat_num = []
feat_name = []

for num in range(0, playlist_length, 100):
    results = sp.user_playlist_tracks(username, playlist_id, limit=100, offset=int(num))
    tracks = results
    for i, item in enumerate(tracks['items']):
        track = item['track']
        track_id = str(track['id'])
        path = os.getcwd()
        path = path + "/crawled_data"
        artist = str(track['artists'][0]['name'])
        songtitle = str(track['name'])
        artist = artist.replace("/", "")
        songtitle = songtitle.replace("/", "")
        artist = artist.replace("$", "")
        songtitle = songtitle.replace("$", "")
        number = i + num
        name = str(number) + " - " + artist + " - " + songtitle
        directory = path + "/" + playlist_name + "/" + name
        prev_url = track['preview_url']
        if not prev_url == None:
            if not os.path.exists(directory):
                os.makedirs(directory)
            filename = directory + "/" + artist + " - " + songtitle + ".mp3"
            urllib.urlretrieve(prev_url, filename)

        tid = 'spotify:track:' + track['id']

        analysis = sp.audio_analysis(tid)
        with open(directory + "/" + songtitle + '_analysis.json', 'w') as outfile:
            json.dump(analysis, outfile)

```

```

outfile.close()
segments = analysis["segments"]
bars = analysis["bars"]
beats = analysis["beats"]

tid = str(tid)

features = sp.audio_features(tid)
with open(directory + "/" + songtitle + '_features.json', 'w') as outfile:
    json.dump(features, outfile)
outfile.close()
acousticness = features[0]['acousticness']
danceability = features[0]['danceability']
energy = features[0]['energy']
instrumentalness = features[0]['instrumentalness']
liveness = features[0]['liveness']
loudness = features[0]['loudness']
speechiness = features[0]['speechiness']
valence = features[0]['valence']
feat_vec.append(scipy.array([acousticness, danceability, instrumentalness,
liveness, loudness, speechiness, valence]))

else:
    print("no url - entry: " + artist + " - " + songtitle)
    print(track_id + "\n")

t_delta = time.time() - t_start
print ("features retrieved in %.2f seconds" % (t_delta,))
dist = distance.euclidean(feat_vec[0], feat_vec[1])

```

# Acknowledgement

# **Declaration of Authorship**

I hereby declare that the thesis submitted is my own unaided work. All direct or indirect sources used are acknowledged as references. This thesis was not previously presented to another examination board and has not been published in German, English or any other language.

Hermsdorf, August 16, 2019

Johannes Schoder