
Chord Recognition

Anonymous Author(s)

Affiliation

Address

email

Abstract

Analysis of harmonic structure often starts with labelling every chord in a musical piece. An automatic system for performing chord recognition is very useful for harmonic analysis and for applications such as music search, music similarity identification and music composition. In this report, we describe the use of a hidden-markov perceptron model for chord recognition. Tonal harmony analysis, however, is a sophisticated task and contextual information is needed for accurate chord recognition.

1 Introduction

Our system takes MIDI input re-encoded as a list of events, each consisting of a set of tones. We aim to assign each event with a chord label. A chord is a set of simultaneously played notes and a chord label posesses as information the root note and the mode. In our dataset, we use boolean vectors in $\{0, 1\}^{12}$ to represent the presence or absence of the twelve distinct pitch classes. The lowest note is encoded using an integer. Relative accent is encoded using an integer of value 1 to 5 where lower number denotes less accented event and higher number denotes more accented event.

We also used chord progression and accents as contextual information. Together, they form the framework for designing and evaluating a set of Boolean basis functions.

We approach the chord recognition problem as a sequential supervised learning (SSL) problem. Sequential learning can be understood as a path-finding problem over a layered-graph. Here, the vertices represent chord labels which are weighted using vertical basis functions, while transitional weights are calculated using horizontal basis functions. With T layers, and K labels, we have a $T \times K$ graph. Finding the optimal path can be solved using Viterbi algorithm, yielding a complexity of $O(TK^2)$. However, our system uses CarpeDiem algorithm, solving the problem in $O(TK \log(k))$.

2 Model Formulation

2.1 A critique of BREVE's Feature Functions

In the following, the implemented set of basis functions are described and distinctions between BREVE and ChordRecognition are rationalized. Notably, we denote the current event with x_t , and the currently predicted label with y_t .

In BREVE, five consecutive entries in the feature vector are used to indicate exactly how many notes of y_t are present in x_t . Unfortunately, some chord structures contain 3 distinct notes, while others, like the dominant seventh chord, contain 4 distinct notes. Of the supported chord types, approximately half of the chord structures are comprised of 4 distinct notes, however, these chords are used less frequently. As a result, the learned weights prioritize having three notes of y_t present in x_t , which diminishes the discriminative power of this feature. Consider an event x_t , which contains the pitch classes C, E, G, and Bb. Here, x_t is a fully stated dominant seventh chord, yet it contains

3 distinct notes of A_{m7} , E_{m6} , C_M , C_{M4} , C_{M6} , C_{M7} , G_d , while containing 4 distinct notes of C_V . In general this feature aims to gauge the similarity between a collection of notes and a chord label, however this approach is not optimal, as it reports C_V to be less likely than a number of other labels.

Alternatively, five consecutive entries in the feature vector are used to indicate the percentage of notes in x_t which are contained in y_t . Notably, the percentage is quantized into partitions each with a width of 20%. Using this approach, the learnt weights reflect the fact that having (80%, 100%] is the most desirable condition for a predicted label. As a result, both training error and testing error decreased using this metric.

Furthermore, the model adopted in BREVE makes the assumption that the presence of each note within a given chord structure is equally significant, when in fact this is not the case. For example, given a C_{M7} chord, or any seventh chord for that matter, the presence or absence of a fifth is a very weak indicator, as it is quite common to voice seventh chords without the fifth. In contrast, the presence or absence of a seventh is extremely important, as this chord type specifically dictates its presence. With this in mind, it is somewhat surprising that Radicioni et al. have two features which indicate if the root and added note of a chord y_t are present in x_t , but neglect to observe the presence of a third or fifth. Additionally, it seems counterintuitive that BREVE only observes if the root of y_t is present in x_{t+1} , neglecting to consider the content of x_{t-1} . In light of this reality, ChordRecognition reports the presence of a third and fifth.

The most prominent difficulty in discerning the correct chord label is in cases where x_t contains a small number of distinct pitches. Without contextual information, it is reasonable to assert that an event containing the pitch classes C and G may represent a C_m , C_M , G_{M4} or Ab_{M7} chord. Quite frequently, a fully voiced chord is not sounded simultaneously, as the remaining chord tones have been stated previously or are to be stated on the following beat. In order to mitigate these uncertain circumstances, contextual analysis is necessary.

2.2 Determining the Relevance of CHORDR

Unfortunately, it is not admissible to take adjacent events into consideration for every input x_t , as the nature of adjacent events is only illuminating in specific circumstances. As a result, one experimented with several differing methods for determining a relevant set of events, before determining that the joint criterion of event similarity and accent trajectory was sufficient.

In order to evaluate the similarity between two events x_A and x_B , the number of common tones, or equivalently the number of elements in $x_A \cap x_B$, are counted. When this value surpasses a threshold, the events are considered to be similar. In most musical genres, chord changes are accented. As a result, a set of unaccented events following an accented event frequently constitutes a single chord structure. Since accents are relative to the surrounding context, a pair of events x_A and x_{A+1} satisfy the accent condition when x_A is less accented than x_{A+1} . With regards to the music of J.S. Bach and his Baroque contemporaries, accented beats are directly derived from the metric structure. Accordingly, chord changes often occur on strong beats. Although this musical convention has decreased in prevalence since the Baroque era, chord changes are consistently accented despite the fact that these accents may be syncopated. Additionally, MIDI files contain velocity information which may be used to extrapolate the required accent information. Consequently, this analysis is not limited to the music of J.S. Bach, as it is dependent on accent trajectory not metric structure.

Let x_R be a set of consecutive events, necessarily including x_t , which collectively satisfy the similarity condition and accent condition. Then, x_R is constructed as follows. To begin, x_t is the only element contained in x_R . Here, $x_t.\text{accent}$ refers to the relative accent of event t , an integer in $[1, 5]$. Given $L \geq t$, and $x_{L+1} \in x_R$, x_L satisfies the accent condition if $x_L.\text{accent} \leq x_{L+1}.\text{accent}$ and the similarity condition if $|x_L \cap x_{L+1}| \geq \zeta$ threshold. Given $L \leq t$, and $x_{L-1} \in x_R$, x_L satisfies the accent condition if $x_L.\text{accent} \geq x_{L-1}.\text{accent}$ and the similarity condition if $|x_L \cap x_{L-1}| \geq \zeta$ threshold. To reiterate, x_L is an eligible addition to x_R if it directly precedes or follows one of the events in x_R and satisfies the similarity condition and the accent condition.

Events	x_{28}	x_{29}	x_{30}	x_{31}	x_{32}	x_{33}	x_{34}
Label	D_{m7}	D_{m7}	D_{m7}	G_M	C_M	F_M	F_M
Metric Accent	5	2	1	3	4	3	2

For added clarity, an excerpt from the J.S. Bach dataset will be analyzed, as shown in Table 1. Without considering similarity, $x_R = x_{28}, x_{29}, x_{30}$ with $28 \leq t \leq 30$, $x_R = \{x_{31}\}$ with $t = 31$, and $x_R = \{x_{32}, x_{33}, x_{34}\}$ with $32 \leq t \leq 34$. Evidenced by the correct chord labels provided above, this segmentation of events is quite reasonable, however, it is evident that the similarity condition is needed to disassociate x_{32} from $\{x_{33}, x_{34}\}$.

2.3 An Overview of Feature Functions in CHORDR

Upon determining x_R , several feature functions make observations on general subsets of x_R . Notably, in some cases these subsets may be completely empty, and in that case such features report 0. Let x_C be the set difference of $x_R - x_t$, such that x_C contains all contextually relevant events with the exclusion of x_t . Let x_S be the set intersection of all events in x_R , such that x_S only contains pitch classes common to all contextually relevant events.

Here, one will briefly rationalize the importance each aforementioned subset of x_R . Clearly, it is important to exclusively consider the contents of x_t as it is the event we are interested in labelling. Similarly, it is essential to consider the nature of x_C , in accordance with the reasons for contextual analysis discussed above. With regards to x_S , quite frequently this set contains very few pitch-classes, however, the presence of even a single pitch class in x_S , is significant. Often this pitch class is the root or the fifth of the correct chord label. As a result, it was not beneficial to report if x_S is completely stated, as this case is extremely rare and would likely only occur with $x_R = x_t = x_S$. However, in that case this attribute is already captured by reporting if x_t is completely stated.

Notably, accuracy was slightly improved when reporting the asserted-degree of y_t on pitch classes shared by x_t and x_{t-1} or x_{t+1} dependent on x_R membership, in contrast to reporting the asserted-degree of y_t with respect to each event in x_R . This is likely due to the fact that outermost events in x_R are more likely to contain notes related to a previous chord structure (i.e suspensions) when x_R contains more than 3 events. Since these features are dependent on the presence or absence of a single pitch class, they are quite sensitive to these unrelated pitches. Consequently, it is still relevant to consider $(x_R \cap y_t) / |x_R|$ as the effects of these suspended pitches are significantly lessened. As an added measure, it was found beneficial to record the likelihood of a particular chord type, reported in features $[43, 43 + K - 1]$, where K is number of label types. In the table below, the vertical feature functions are summarized, where highlighted rows signify feature functions developed independently for CHORDR. Notably, the horizontal features in BREVE were not modified.

ϕ class	ϕ number	ϕ description
Penalize Added Note on Weak Beats	1	if $X.meter(t) < X.meter(t-1)$ and y_t is an added note chord type $F(1) = 0$
Asserted-notes	2	root of y_t in x_t
	3	third of y_t in x_t
	4	fifth of y_t in x_t
	5	added note of y_t in x_t
	6	root of y_t in $x_t \cap x_{t-1}$ given x_{t-1} in x_R
Contextually Relevant Asserted-notes for each Chord Degree { root, third, fifth, added note }
	10	root of y_t in $x_t \cap x_{t-1}$ given x_{t-1} in x_R

	14	root of y_t in x_s

Root in Context Regardless of Relevance	18	root of y_t in x_{t-1}
	19	root of y_t in x_{t-1}
Completely Stated Chords	20	all notes of y_t are in x_t
	21	all notes of y_t are in x_t
	22	all notes of y_t are in x_t
Percentage of Notes in Y_t (For every 20%)	23	$\frac{(x_t \cap y_t)}{ x_t }$

	28	$\frac{(x_R \cap y_t)}{ x_R }$

	33	$\frac{(x_C \cap y_t)}{ x_C }$

	38	$\frac{(x_S \cap y_t)}{ x_S }$
Chord Type Likelihood (K label types)	43	y_t is chord type M
	44	y_t is chord type $M4$

Bass-at-degree	43 + K	root of y_t is bass note of x_t
	44 + K	third of y_t is bass note of x_t
	45 + K	fifth of y_t is bass note of x_t
	46 + K	seventh of y_t is bass note of x_t
	47 + K	root of y_t is bass note of x_{t+1}
	48 + K	fifth of y_t is bass note of x_{t+1}
	49 + K	root of y_t is bass note of x_{t+1}
	50 + K	fifth of y_t is bass note of x_{t+1}

ϕ class		ϕ description	ϕ class		ϕ description
Penalize Added Note on Weak Beats	1	if $X.meter(t) < X.meter(t-1)$ and y_t is an added note chord type $F(1) = 0$	Percentage of Notes in Y_t (For every 20%)	23	$(x_t \cap y_t)/ x_t $
Asserted-notes	2	root of y_t in x_t		28	$(x_R \cap y_t)/ x_R $
	3	third of y_t in x_t		33	$(x_C \cap y_t)/ x_C $
	4	fifth of y_t in x_t		38	$(x_S \cap y_t)/ x_S $
Contextually Relevant Asserted-notes for each Chord Degree { root, third, fifth, added note }	5	added note of y_t in x_t	Chord Type Likelihood (K label types)	43	y_t is chord type M
	6	root of y_t in $x_t \cap x_{t-1}$ given x_{t-1} in x_R		44	y_t is chord type $M4$
	Bass-at-degree
	10	root of y_t in $x_t \cap x_{t+1}$ given x_{t+1} in x_R		43 + K	root of y_t is bass note of x_t

	14	...		44 + K	...