Title of your thesis

Your Name

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Your Department

Your Advisor, Chair

First Committee

Second Committee

Third Committee

Last Committee

December 4, 2020

Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Some Keywords, Subject matter, etc.

Title of your thesis

Your Name

ABSTRACT

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

Dedicated to Virginia Tech.

Acknowledgments

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

In 1952 L.A. Hiller and L.M Issacson ushered forth a new era of the study of both music
and computer science when they introduced the Illiac Suite – the first composition that was
created solely by a computer [29]. What we'll refer to broadly as Music Information Re-
trieval (MIR)[1] research has continued to see impressive advancements since the introduction
of the Illiac Suite in several different domains, including musical composition[3], instrument
and sound synthesis[9], and musical analysis[32]. Much of the challenge in MIR research
is to bridge the gap between the highly subjective nature of the musical experience paired
with the strong hierarchical and mathematical patterns that are present from a quantitative
perspective. The most well-known application of MIR research is that of musical recom-
mendation platforms such as Spotify which study the different patterns present in a diverse
range of musical ideas to suggest to their listeners music which they may appreciate in the
future given their past listening habits.

Widmer[32] suggests that there are a deeper set of problems that the MIR community should
focus on which are by their nature, more fundamental to understanding the nature of music
itself. One such problem is that of understanding what constitutes *expression* in musical
performance. Current automatic performance generation systems (typically bundled with
musical notation software) render deterministic and uninteresting performances which don't

---

[1]Widmer [32] points out that MIR itself does not encompass the entire scope of computer music research,
but that it is a good proxy to use when referring the field as a whole. We will operate under the same
assumption

contain the "human" element; that is, they do not use the different components of musical performance such as variations in timing, dynamics and articulation, to "express" different ideas or emotions. Each performance of a musical composition inherently carries with it some interpretation of the composition which is communicated through musical expression. Our work is a further continuation of the computational modeling of expressive musical performance (EMP) in the context of automatic performance generation.

Typical EMP generation systems use Machine Learning (ML) to build generation systems which are trained on existing data sets comprised of actual human performance. The most recent models are either probabilistic (usually using Hidden Markov Models) in nature, or based on artificial neural networks (ANN) which is a family of ML models that have led to the rapid increase of Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems in many areas, including computer vision, natural language processing (NLP), and speech and audio processing[13][2]. State of the art models are based on Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN) and their common adaptation as a Long Short Term Memory (LSTM) network which are designed to model sequential data, such as music. A relatively new model in sequential Deep Learning (DL), the Transformer, has led to impressive advances over RNN based models in NLP and other fields. We apply the Transformer in EMP generation, which to our knowledge has never been done, using an existing end to end state of the art EMP generation system.

We evaluated our model quantitatively through the current standard evaluation metric and it performs worse than an existing RNN based system. However, a qualitative evaluation through our personal listening revealed a disconnect between the performance according to the quantitative metric and performance according to actually listening to the performances. We ran further experiments deviating from the standard method to identify why this might be

---

[2]The use of neural networks in ML is commonly referred to as "Deep Learning" because of the many connected layers that usually comprise the networks. The term "deep" is used to describe the long path which information must follow to propogate through the large network. This is in contrast to other ML models which usually do not have that depth

the case, and provide some insights about possible problems with the quantitative evaluation and intuition for how to create better evaluation methods. We also give an error analysis of our own model and notice that the decrease in performance may not be with the underlying Transformer mechanisms but with our network architecture from a higher level.

We also bring to light some of the philosophical conundrums with studying EMP generation at a computational level. Because the "quality" of a musical experience is so subjective, creating the right incentives for a computer model to generate novel performances is not trivial. This is related to our discovery of possible flaws in our model evaluation. In agreement with other authors [32], we advocate for further research in the area to draw just as much from music at the human psychological level as the mathematical and statistical.

Chapter 2

Background: Expressive Performance

There are two major research components upon which this project is based. The first is the problem domain of expressive musical performance, and the second is the ML modeling domain of Transformers. In this chapter, we will introduce and discuss EMP. In chapter 3 we'll do the same for the Transformer.

Expressive musical performance is a small subset of Music Information Retrieval research, which can be broadly categorized into two separate tasks: the first is developing computational methods for musical analysis, and the second is developing computational methods for music generation. We are interested in the latter, although it is worthwhile to note that there is a large overlap between the areas[1]. In order to study how musical performance generation (and more particularly *expressive* musical performance generation) models work, it is necessary to gain a proper understanding of the entire computational musical generation process as a whole. Ji et al. [22] break the process down into 3 different components, with 4 different roles or agents that interact with that process. Figure 2.1 shows each step in the process as well as the agents that participate

Richard: Try to get permission to reproduce the image in the paper

.

---

[1]Creating a performance generation system is useful for performance analysis as long as the generation system is interpretable. The same can be said in reverse. Analysis can provide insight to generation, and generation can provide insight to analysis

Figure 2.1: The first step of musical generation is composition, shown as a score in the figure. The second is performance, which is our area of interest. The third is the production of sound. Each different agent: composer, performer, instrument, and listener, can be thought of as a separate computational model in the generation process

An EMP generation model is analogous to the performer as shown in 2.1, who takes as input a musical composition and produces as output a performance. It is the phenomena of musical expression that makes the performance generation process interesting. Musical expression can be thought of as the performers' interpretation of a composition codified into different performance parameters that are intended to contribute the quality of a musical experience [2]

To provide a more detailed explanation of expression in musical performance, it is necessary to clearly define the first two components of the generation process - namely, scores and performances. We provide descriptions of both components at both a general and mathematical level. At the mathematical level we use the terminology of a **feature**, which is commonly used to describe the numerical values and data structure which are used as the input and output of a ML model. We refer the reader to appendix A.1 which provides some basic musical terminology and concepts that will be useful for understanding our definitions [3]. Due

---

[2] Because the quality of a musical experience is highly subjective, there is no definition of what makes for a "correct" interpretation of a given composition [4]. The subjective nature of EMP generation makes it a difficult problem to understand from a computational perspective and is related to our discussion of evaluation methods given in section 2.3.2.

[3] Most of the appendix material may seem elementary to those who already have a background in music or musical notation. However, we feel that is necessary to include if for no other reason than to provide a clear definition for our descriptions both in general and at detailed mathematical level

Missing
figure

Image that shows a sample score with colorized annotations that show the different hierarchical levels

Figure 2.2: Caption will be dependent on the image.

Richard
add ref-
erence

to the constraint of our data we focus only on western classical piano music.

2.1 Scores

A musical score is a symbolic representation of a musical composition. The symbolic notation used to create musical scores can be thought of as a language used to express musical ideas and information. It presents this information in a hierarchical structure with different levels of musical detail at each level. Figure 2.2 shows a sample score and the different hierarchical levels of information that it contains

The lowest level contains information about the pitch and timing of every single note, as well as optional information about how the note should be played. This can include information specific to instruments such as the bow direction of a violin, but for our purposes (dealing only with piano) we will consider this to be the articulation of each note, usually indicated by **legato** or **staccato**

Richard: Make sure to have some background information on articulation in the appendix

The middle level contains information related to certain substructures within the musical composition, which are usually expressed within a grouping of notes or measures. The most

common score annotations at this level are dynamic markings which indicate whether to play a grouping of notes as *f* (loud), *p* (soft), or as a ***crescendo*** or ***decrescendo*** (gradually increase or decrease the volume). Although dynamic markings are the most common at this level, it is also possible to see score markings for all other musical features, such as local tempo or articulation of a certain substructure. Perhaps the most important score marking at this level is that of a phrase, which is a marking that indicates that a group of notes should be interpreted as belonging to a singular musical idea and that each note should fit within the context of the phrase as a whole. A phrase can be expressed through all of the different aforementioned musical features, including the tempo, timing, dynamics, and articulation of the notes.

The highest level contains meta-information that relates to the entire composition as a whole. This information typically includes the key signature and time signature, as well as the global tempo for the entire piece, most commonly represented as BPM.

2.1.1 Score Features

> Richard: This entire section needs work. Include some detailed information but refer reader to chacon's thesis for a full breakdown. Possibly mention features from virtu-soNet

.

There are some score features which are required for EMP models, which include the musical features at the lowest level of a score as explained in section 2.1. These are pitch and timing, and the duration of the notes. Mid-level features include concepts at the local level and have some music theoretic concepts, such as downbeat information of a given measure according to the time signature, or the tonality of a chord (tonic, dominant, etc). High-level features

represent advanced music theoritic concepts that are more global to the entire piece, including abstract properties of the piece such as the emotion the piece should convey and how different sections of the piece relate to each to tell a complete story [8].

Both the mid-level and high-level features are not necessarily required for every EMP model as the lower-level features are, and are not consistent across all EMP models. It still remains an open question as to which features should be extracted from the data that the model can learn from. The lack of consistency in these features is one of the reasons that evaluation of EMP generation models is so difficult, as explained in section 2.3.2.

2.2   Peformance

An expressive musical performance contains most of the same musical information as does a score, but with one key difference; that is, that an expressive performance will deviate (or interpret) from the exact information that is presented in the score. For example, although a score may indicate a tempo of 120 BPM, it is highly unlikely that a given performer will perfectly adhere to this tempo throughout the entirety of the piece. This is even more apparent if the score indicates a change in tempo somewhere in the composition. If a score indicates that the performance should speed up over a series of notes, there is no telling at what rate the tempo should increase. Some performers may choose to speed up at a fast rate and over a short period of time. Others may choose to increase the tempo at a slow rate and over a longer period of time. A single accelerando (a score indication to pick up the tempo) can result in either of these outcomes.

As mentioned a performance contains most of the same musical information related to a score, which include pitch, tempo, timing and articulation. Each of these expressive parameters will be measurable and absolute, whereas the score markings of these features can be viewed

more as a suggestion than a rule. There a few additional components of performance that are
not ncessarily indicated in scores but are relevant which in understanding performance. The
first we will refer to as deviation which is heavily related to timing. It is typically represented
as a numerical number which represents how far off the timing of a particular note deviates
from it's "correct" position in the score. These micro-timing deviations present in musical
performances are an essential part of expression. Without them, indicating that each note
onset and offset is exactly in line with its marking in the score, performances sound robotic
and mundane

Richard: add a reference, graphic, and sample performance

.

The other important feature of performance that is not always present in a score applies
specifically to the piano, and is the presence of a piano pedal. There are several different
types of piano pedals, but the most common are the sustain pedal, which prolongs the
duration of every note of the piano when activated, and the soft pedal which softens the
sound of the entire piano. Although the effects of these pedals are directly related to the
articulation and dynamics of the performance, their presence (or lack of) can be seen as a
crucial component of piano performance. It is common for the sustain pedal to see active use
in almost all modern piano performance, even when there doesn't exist any score marking
indicating it's use.

2.2.1   Performance Features

Richard: Similarly to score features section, provide more detailed information about
some of the math behind the features. Cite other resources where necessary

For western classical solo piano music, performance features are relatively simple compared to

the score features as well as to other instruments. Most EMP models use the different aspects of a piano performance as explained in section 2.2 for their data features, including the pitch, tempo, timing (or timing deviation), articulation, and pedal. Although at an abstract level the features are the same, there are different numerical methods used to describe each of the different aspects. These are presented in

> Richard: Add reference to relevant work section that goes over the different elements. This information may belong better here and then referenced in the relevant work section

.

2.3   Data

The data required for EMP generation includes some digital form of representation of a score as well as a corresponding performance. Scores are typically given in the form of MusicXML, which is a text-based representation of a score. Performances could be directly be rendered as audio which is the process used by human performers with the use of an acoustic instrument. Instead of audio however, an intermediate data form, MIDI, is used to represent the performance. This better aligns with the generation process outlined in 2.1. In the full generation process, a separate model would be used to take the performance data in MIDI and synthesize that into raw audio which would be presented to the listener. Both data formats contain all of the required information to represent all of the musical components of both a score and a performance, including pitch, tempo, timing, articulation, deviation, and pedal. See appendix A.2 for more information on both MusicXML and MIDI.

To build an EMP generation model, it is necessary to run both the score and performance through a data alignment process in which every note of the performance is mapped to it's

Figure 2.3: Two performances of the same score can vary wildly in their tempo and timing. This makes it necessary to have a score to performance alignment for every performance.

corresponding position in the score. Given the highly dynamic nature of musical performance, it is a non-trivial task to run this alignment process for a set of scores and performances, especially if the task is performed by manual human annotation. There exist methods for both manual and automatic alignment. Due to the time-consuming nature of manual alignment and the need for large data sets to build higher quality models, automatic alignment algorithms are an active area of research.

2.3.1 Existing Data Sets

Richard: Rework this section to fit with new paper outline. Need to forward reference models instead of back reference

One of the problems facing EMP and MIR in general is the lack of high quality and high scale datasets[4]. This is in large part due to the fact that scope of possible data to collect related to music data is large, compared to other domains. As has already been discussed, there are different stages in the musical process, and each of them contain different possibilities for the representation of music. For example, composition can contain largely the same amount of information in at least three forms. The first and most common is the symbollic representation in the form of a data format like MusicXML. A musical performance also con-

tains within it information about the composition itself, and performances can represented in an intermediate format such as MIDI, or in the form of raw audio. The same can be said for other fields such as NLP, which deals mostly with textual data, and Speech Processing, which deals mostly with language in the form of spoken word. However, the two fields are seen as distinct from each other and each come with more standardization in both research methods and data formats. Musical data and information has not seen the same rigour in the literature.

Another inherent problem with getting high-quality musical datasets is that most of the readily available musical data comes in the form of audio, which is much more difficult to process than symbolic (MusicXML) or intermediate (MIDI) forms given that it contains large amounts of noise and does not necessarily compress musical information. In contrast, NLP and Computer Vision directly deal with text and image data respectively, which are both readily available at a large scale due to the internet.

There are normally 3 required components for a EMP dataset.

1. Scores (usually in the form of MusicXML)

2. Performances (usually in the form of MIDI)

3. Metadata about the matching alignment between the score and performance.

Score data is usually gathered by finding readily available MusicXML files from open source software projects which contain music that is in the public domain (which all western classical music is) [4], or by using Optical Music Recognition (OMR) to auotomatically scan paper sheet music into a digital form followed by manual corrections where needed. Because the relevant performance features are difficult to extract from raw audio, performance data usually comes

---

[4]MuseScore is the most common. Also see the International Music Score Library Project

in the form of MIDI. To gather MIDI data of professional performance, it is necessary for the performers to play on a computer-controlled piano which can record performances in MIDI form, as well as automatically play back recorded performances which allow the complete reproducibility of any existing performance. Both the Yamaha Disklavier [5] and the older Bosendorfer CEUS system have this capability.

There is no standardized method for score-to-performance alignment methods and data representations. Each dataset presents in own alignment method as well as the metadata that represents the alignment.

To provide context for the progression of data used in EMP generation, we'll start by touching an older dataset used in older EMP research, the Magaloff Corpus, and then describing a much larger scale dataset, the Piano-e-competition, which has recently been adapted for use in EMP generation. A full overview of datasets for EMP generation can be found in [4]

Magaloff Corpus

Nikita Magaloff was a Russian pianist known for his performance cycles of Chopin's entire works for the solo piano. In one of his final cycles of performances recorder in 1989, he played on a Bosendorfer SE computer-controlled piano. The Magaloff Corpus [10] presented the recorded performances were converted to the standard MIDI format[8], thus making available full performance data of all of Chopins compositions for solo piano. Score data was obtained using OMR with manual corrections where needed. The alignment method presented in [14] was used to produce the note-matching annotations, along with manual correction. The dataset contains over 10 hours of playing, 150 compositions, and over 320,000 performed notes. The corpus however, is not publicly available, and has only been used in research by Flossmann et al. [10] and colleagues [8].

---

[5]https://usa.yamaha.com/products/musical_instruments/pianos/disklavier/index.html

Piano-e-competition

As has been discussed, there is a large push in modern MIR to produce high-quality large datasets. At the heart of this research in MIR is the Piano-e-competition. Started in 2002, it is an international piano competition which attracts some of the promising up and coming musicians at both the senior and junior level [1]. Every performance from the competition is played on a Yamaha Disklavier. Every performance from the competition dating back to 2002 is recorded in both MIDI and audio. Hawthorne et al. [16] introduce the MAESTRO dataset, which presents both MIDI and audio data from the Piano-e-competition in a canonical and easily accessible form. The dataset was first used to build a full musical analysis and generation process framework named wav2midi2wave, which includes a musical transcription process [15] from raw audio to midi (wav2midi), a direct musical composition and performance generation model [17] [6] (can be seen as the midi or midi2midi part of the wav2midi2wav framework), and a synthesis model that takes MIDI and generates raw audio[26] (midi2wav).

The Piano-e-competition also forms the basis for the data used to train virtuosoNet. The Piano-e-competition dataset itself does not provide any data about the scores of the music being performed; this data was collected by Jeong et al. [19] mostly from MuseScore. On top of gathering the score data for all performances in the Piano-e-competition, Jeong et al. [19] also run the automatic score-to-performance alignment algorithm presented in [24] to provide metadata about the alignment between each score and performance. Score-to-performance alignment is error-prone (especially in the case of performance mistakes) and as result, there are some performance notes which are not aligned to those in a score. Jeong et al. [19] also perform additional manual and heuristic corrections to the alignment where needed. The

---

[6]This model directly generates MIDI files without using scores. It simultaneously generates a composition and performance. This task can been seen as a merging of the two separate tasks, composition and performance, as show in figure 2.1

major difference between the Piano-e-competition and the Magaloff corpus is that it contains multiple performances for the same score, whereas the Magaloff Corpus has a 1-1 mapping between a score and performance. The dataset presented in [19] has 226 scores across 16 different composers, roughly 660,000 score notes, and around 3,500,000 performance notes. The number of matched performance notes is ten times larger than the Magaloff Corpus, and all data is made publicly available [7].

The Aligned Scores and Performances (ASAP) dataset [11] is a recent adaptation of both the dataset presented by Jeong et al. [19] and the MAESTRO dataset. It uses the MusicXML files from Jeong et al. [19], audio from the MAESTRO dataset, and MIDI files from both sources which are extracted from the common source of the Piano-e-competition. It provides additional alignment metadata for both MIDI and audio fields, as well as more manual correction in the MusicXML score files. Although the purpose of the ASAP dataset is for Automatic Music Transcription (AMT), which is the task of transcribing a score from a performance (either in audio or MIDI form) [8], it is just as equally useful for EMP generation. To our knowledge it has not been used in any EMP generation task. Although it is largely similar to the dataset used to train virtuosoNet, the implications of it's extensions have yet to be determined in EMP.

2.3.2   Performance Evaluation

Richard: Should probably go in chapter 3

One of the most important components of any computational model performing a task is that of evaluation. Evaluation is used to determine the quality of a model, and serves as

---

[7] The dataset can be found at https://github.com/mac-marg-pianist/chopin_cleaned
[8] AMT can be seen as the "opposite" of EMP, given that transcription does the reverse process of performance by mapping a performance to a score

a benchmark to compare different models used in the same task. Due to the inherently subjective nature of music and musical performance discussed in **??**, evaluation is notiour

sly difficult to understand and perform correctly for EMP generation models [4].

Evaluation for computational models, specifically for EMP models, is typically categorized in two ways, quantitative evaluation and qualitatiative evaluation. Quantitative evaluation methods involve using numerical metrics which are computationally generated and deterministic. Qualitiative evaluation methods usually involve some form of human feedback and judgement presented in some standardized statistical measures. The key difference between quantitative and qualitiative is that qualitative methods are not as consisten and much more difficult to reproduce, given the reliance on the subjective feedback of human listeners. Traditionally, quantitative methods are preferred because of their consistency and reliability, In the case of EMP models however, qualitative evaluation methods may be even more important in gaining an understanding of what makes one model better than another. Finding good methods of evaluation is an active area of research in EMP [4].

Quantitative

This method of evaluation is standard for ML models in general. There are a number of different metrics which are used in the evaluation process, all of which are specific to type of data and problem domain the model fits inside of. We will briefly cover the most common quantiative evaluation method that applies to our data and modeling domain, which is regression .

The two common metrics used for evaluation and regression are Mean-Squared-Error (MSE) and the Pearson Correlation Coefficient, usually denoted as the R^2 score. MSE is used to measure the difference between a prediction and an actual observed target value, and can

Richard

Add reference that discusses the feature en-

be denoted as $MSE = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(Y_i - \hat{Y}_i)^2$, where Y_i is the observed value at time step i, and $\hat{Y}_1$ is the predicted value. R^2 is a probablistic measure of the linear correlation between variables X and Y, and is denoted as $\rho_{X,Y} = \frac{cov(X,Y)}{\sigma_X \sigma_Y}$ where cov indicates the covariance and σ indicates the standard deviation. [9]

One of the problems with using quantiative, or "objective" evaluation methods, is that it usually invovles comparing a generated performance $\hat{Y}$ with a human performance Y. Given that no performance (or interpretation) of a can objectively been seen as better than another, this method of evaluation is also biasing the quality of a model towards some subjective view of the "correct" interpretation. Of course, a "correct" interpretation doesn't exist, which is what makes evalution methods for this particularly problem difficult.

> Richard: Add reference to other works using either MSE or r2

Qualitative

> Richard: Need to conduct more research before I can write this section. Haven't done so because I won't be performing a qualitative evaluation myself in the paper. However it is still worth mentioning

---

[9]See wikipedia for more information on MSE, covariance, standard deviation, and the correlation coefficient

Chapter 3

Background: Sequential Modeling

To understand the motivation for this project, it is necessary to provide some background and context on the current state of the art in the field. We provide this context not only for musical models, but also for all sequential data models in general. Current state of the art models in performance generation use as their foundation a Recurrent Neural Network which is designed to handle sequential data. There have been new recent developments in neural sequence modeling which move completely away from RNNs and towards a new family of ANN architectures, the Transformer. To our knowledge, Transformer models have not been used in EMP generation, which is the driving purpose behind our work.

3.1 Sequential Data

One fundamental aspect in modern machine learning is to learn how to work with data which is sequential; meaning, data whose individual data points have some relationship with each other according to some specific order, or position in time. A simple example of sequential data is observations of weather, which follow predictable patterns according to the time of year. Musical data is fundamentally sequential[32] given that we experience music as individual events across time. Language and speech also exhibit this same property, and much of the work in neural sequential data modeling is based upon natural language processing.

There are different types tasks which are relevant to sequential data. Perhaps the most common task is that of classification, which seeks to assign some sequence of data points to a particular class of data. In this case, the input data is defined as $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, ..., x_n\}$ where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is some m dimensional vector. The output data is a single value $y \in L$ where L is some set of class labels. A sequence classification model $C : \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \to L$ will then map from some input sequence X to a class label y

Richard: Possibly add reference here to more detailed explanation of these features

. Email spam detection and genre classification are common use cases of sequence classification models in NLP and MIR, respectively.

EMP generation is a more complicated process however, and involves the mapping of the input sequence (score) to another output sequence (performance). We call such a task a sequence-to-sequence (*seq2seq*) model. In this case our input data X is the same, but our output data is also defined as a sequence of vectors $Y = \{y_1, y_2, y_3, ..., y_l\}$, where $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^k$ is a k-dimensional vector. A *seq2seq* model $S : \mathbb{R}^{n \times m} \to \mathbb{R}^{l \times k}$ will map from an input sequence X to an output sequence Y. For EMP generation, m is the number of score features, n is number of input score notes, k is the number of performance features, and l the number of output performance notes.

3.2   Neural Machine Translation

The Recurrent Neural Network and it's adaptations have historically been used as the go to model for sequential modeling with NNs. For brevities sake, we do not provide the detailed mathematical defintion for RNNs here and refer to the reader to [13]. However, in recent years the Transformer[30] architecture model has surpassed RNNs in many tasks as is

becoming the de-facto standard for sequential data modeling in modern Machine Learning. To provide context for the origin of Transformer we will outline the historical progress of an NLP task which was the first application of the Transformer. That is neural machine translation (NMT).

Machine translation (MT) is the task of computationally translating one natural language to another[1]. Traditional MT systems relied rule sets and complicated decoding algorithms, and are known as statistical machine translation (SMT). NMT allows for the end-to-end training of a translation system inside of a single ANN and significantly reduces the complexity of building MT models [6]. NMTs are *seq2seq* models and typically operate by translating a single sentence at a time. Until the advent of the Transformer, they were based on RNN models.

One of the complexities in building a NMT model is that the source and target sentences are often not the same length - $n \neq l$ in our definition of *seq2seq* models given in section 3.1. To account for this, NMT translation systems use what is known as an *encoder-decoder* architecture. The job of the encoder is to learn some some representation, or encoding, of the source sentence. In the original formulation of the *encoder-decoder* NMT architecture, Cho et al. [5] present this encoding was in the form of a fixed size vector c. This vector is then given to the decoder which is a language model, which is a generative sequence model that is auto-regressive (uses the output at one time step as the input for the next). The decoder uses c as a condition to *generate* the new sentence in the target language. From a probablistic perspective, we can view the decoder as calculating the probability of the next word in the sentence given all of the previous words as well as the hidden encoding vector.

$$P(y_t|y_{t-1}, y_{t_2}, ..., y_1, c)$$

This RNN based *encoder-decoder* model was able to improve upon the state of the art results for existing SMT based translation system However, there is an inherent limit imposed on the system for long sentences. Cho et al. [5] shows that the performance of a basic *encoder-decoder* model deteriorates rapidly as the length of an input sentence increases. To account for this Bahdanau et al. [2] present what is known as the *attention* mechanism. Instead of using a fixed sized vector encoding, *attention* allows the model to search for a set of positions in the source sentence where the most relevant information is concetrated.

> Richard: Continue discussion about Attention

3.3 Transformers

> Richard: transformer section needs a lot of work given the change of the general document outline

To properly understand the significance of Transformers and their involvement in our work, it is necessary to provide context about the domain in which the Transformer was first introduced and give an overview of the existing work in that domain that the Transformer built on. We'll then provide some detail about the Transformer itself as well as adaptations of the original architectures and their results.

3.3.1 Attention is All You Need

In the seminal paper, Vaswani et al. [30] introduce the Transformer. The Transformer is an encoder-decoder seq-2-seq modeling neural network architecture that relies solely on the use of attention and cuts out any semblance of a recurrent architecture. The Transformer was the first architecture to make use of attention by itself, and by doing so pushed the state of

the art in machine translation even further than it had been with attention-based recurrent models.

The Transformer architecture consists of a stack of N layers, all of which use a combination of a self-attention (attention that applies only within a single input sequence and not between an input and a output sequence)

> Richard: Explore different ways to describe self-attention. May not even be necessary at all to mention

mechanism along with a standard pointwise fully connected feed-forward neural network (FFNN). Both the encoder and decoder comprise of these attention based stacked layers. For a full description of the architecture see [30].

3.3.2 Transformer Adaptations: BERT and GPT

Of particular interest in the new Transformer modeling domain is powerful adaptations of the original architecture which have been applied to many other NLP tasks besides machine translation. On such architecture, BERT (which stands for Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers), uses what can be referred to as an "encoder only" Transformer model.

The original Transformer was built with machine translation in mind, but there are several other NLP tasks that could possibly benefti from using an attention only architecture. Some of these tasks include standard text classification, textual entailment, sentiment analysis, question answering, and many more . BERT was introduced as an encoder only transformer

> Richard Find reference

model that could generalize to all of these tasks. The method which it made use of was pre-training the model on a massive data set, with the intuition that by feeding the model so much data that it would learn a general representation of language that could then be

applied to several different tasks. BERT is effectively a massive encoder for language in general, and can be used in conjuction with other models as simple decoders to perform these tasks. See the original paper[7] for the full architecture and details.

Similarly to BERT, the Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) architecture[28] is an adaptation of the original Transformer. The GPT architecture can be seen as a "decoder only" transformer, and is used as a general Language Model (LM). The task of a LM is simple; to predict the next word in a sequence of given words. Given that GPT is a generative model, it employes the decoder side of the Transformer, which is responsible for actually generating the text as part of the machine translation taks. Similarly to BERT, GPT models are pretrained on massive amounts of data to learn a general representation of language, and used in conjuction with other models to perform various tasks.

Both BERT and GPT have significantly pushed the state of art in NLP and sequence modeling in general. Their success in the domain of language presents questions about their effectiveness in other related domains, such as music.

3.4 Existing Expressive Musical Performance Generation Models

Richard: This section also needs a major update after the general outline change

EMP generation models fit into one of two categories, rule-based and data-based. Rule-based systems are built using a set of hardcoded rules which are derived using pre-existing musical knowledge and empirical studies involving human cognition. Data-driven models rely on probabilistic and machine learning methods to take an existing dataset of both scores and performances and use the performance data as a guide to learn the mapping between score

features and performance features.

3.4.1 Rule Based

The KTH system [12] sits at the center of rule-based EMP models. Development of the KTH started in the 1980s and continued well into the 21st century. The initial idea behind the KTH system was to define a set of rules relating to the structure of a musical composition and how they affect a resulting performance, specifically with singing synthesis. The first set of rules was developed related for use in singing synthesis, and these rules were then later adapted to general musical performance.

Since then there have been two general methods in the continued development of the KTH rule system. The first is that of *analysis-by-synthesis*, which involved using the rules to synthesize musical performances that were presented to human listeners (both professional and non-professional), gathering listening feedback, and then using this feedback to modify the rules where needed. The second was an *analysis-by-measurement* method. This method uses direct computation to analyze the result of a computational generated performance with an existing real performance [2]. Example rules from the KTH system are found in figure 3.1

Richard
May
need
more
explo-
ration in
caption

.

To our knowledge, the KTH rule-based system is the first sophisticated computational model for generating expressive performance, and its methods form the basis for much of the research that has been conducted since then. The explicitly defined rules in the KTH system can be thought of as the rules we might expect a data-based model to learn. Widmer [31] shows that data-driven methods do in fact learn some of the same rules as the KTH system,

---

[2]This falls more in line with the data-driven approaches. However, data-driven models use the performance data to directly build the model, whereas the use of real performance data in the KTH system is for evaluation purposes only. Any further updates to the model still rely on a hardcoded set of rules

Missing figure — show some of the rules from the KTH paper in either a table or a figure

Figure 3.1: The left column shows the name of the rule, and the right column provides a language description of that rule. These are the rules that we might expect a data-based system to learn.

but also can learn rules that are the opposite of KTH rules. As has already been discussed, the difficult nature of model evaluation may describe this phenomenon, as there is no telling which rule is more "correct" than another. Nevertheless, the KTH rule system has been an important milestone in the development of EMP models in general.

3.4.2 Data Based

State of the art EMP generation models rely on existing data of actual human performance to learn the mapping between score and performance. The state of the art models are generally based either on sequential probabilistic or non-linear neural network methods[4], although there has been previous work with linear and non-sequential modeling. A complete overview of all relevant EMP generation models is presented in [4] and we will not iterate them here. Instead we will describe a few models and frameworks which are relevant to our work

Basis Function Models

The first of these is a complete computational and mathematical framework for exploring EMP, and is known as the Basis Model (BM) framework[8]. The BM framework for EMP

describes the full end-to-end process involved both the generation and analysis of musical performance, starting with a set of Basis Function Models which are used to provide score features. The BM framework also defines *expressive parameters*, which are analogous to our definition of performance features as outlined in 2.2. Given score features which are defined by a set of basis functions as well a set of expressive parameters used to numerically define a performance, the BM framework then defines a model which can map between the score features and expressive parameters.

> Richard: This idea needs more cohesion with the rest of the thesis. Try to provide our own mathematical definition of EMP (similarly to the way we did with neural machine translation). We could actually use the BM framework as this definition, although it may be more mathematical than we need

.

Eduardo [8] outlines the full mathematical definition of the BM framework, as well as the evolution of the framework and its application with specific feature and model definitions. BM models first started as simple linear non-sequential models which learned the linear relationship between a set of defined basis functions (or score feature) and a single expressive parameter, such as MIDI velocity. This version of the BM models each expressive parameter independently from all others, and implies that the interpretation one expressive parameter will not have an effect on the other . [3]. Both standard least squares regression and a probabilistic Bayesian approach are used to model the linear relationship.

As the BM framework progressed, both non-linear and sequential models were introduced in the form of deep neural networks. The non-linear model was implemented first in the form of Feed-Forward Neural Network (FFNN) was implemented first and showed an increase in

Richard add more information about score feature

Richard Verify that footnote is correct

---

[3]Although this is not necessarily the case in actual performance, it is a simplifying mathematical trait that makes the development and interpretation of the models simpler. All of the BM models operate under this same assumption

goodness-of-fit as well as predictive accuracy over the standard linear models. After the FFNN came a standard RNN and was used in conjunction with the FFNN with features where time-dependent and the sequential nature of music was relevant. The recurrent non-linear model performed the best relative to all other models.

virtuosoNet

Richard: Change virtuosoNet heading to look better. Also look into creating a macro for virtuosoNet to create a typeset so that the name stands out

. Similarly to the BM framework, the development of virtuosoNet is gradual. The first version of the model presented in [18] uses a recurrent hierarchical attention network (HAN) along with a novel encoder-decoder architecture specific to the EMP domain. No quantitative or qualitative evaluation results are presented at this point. The next iteration of virtuosoNet uses a similar encoder-decoder architecture but introduces an iterative sequential graph-based neural network (ISGN) that relies on the score representation as a graph data structure [20]. The latest version presented in [19] returns to the HAN architecture, but does so with a larger dataset as well as additional more abstract hierarchical models that are hypothesized to create better structure at the metrical level and preserve patterns across mid-level structures of the composition, in addition to learning them at the low-level.

Both the ISGN[20] and HAN[19] version of virtuosoNet are trained on the same dataset (which we will describe in section) and evaluated quantitatively using MSE and qualita- Richard add section tively using listening tests. In terms of quantitative evaluation, both the ISGN and HAN perform better than baseline models which remove some of the architecture complexity related to hierarchical layers. The final version of HAN reports better MSE metrics than ISGN. The qualitative evaluation with listening tests shows that both ISGN and HAN perform better than baseline models as well as better than the "deadpan" performance, which

is a performance model that is statically computed using a simple set of rules and gives a somewhat robotic-sounding performance

Richard: Provide more explanation for the deadpan recording. May be worth it to mention in the qualitative evaluation section

. The final HAN version's qualitative evaluation includes a comparison between the HAN and the publicly available version of the BM framework model [4].

The results in [19] show that the HAN performs better than the BM model. There are many plausible reasons that may explain the difference in results other than the HAN being a superior model to the BM, including differences in the training data for both models, bias of the qualitative method towards the HAN, and the fact that the opinion of the members of the listening test doesn't necessarily imply one model being "superior" to another. However, given the results presented by Jeong et al. [19], we will assume that this version of the HAN represents the current "state of the art" in the field, if such a thing even exists.

Richard: Add section that talks about the features used for virtuosoNet

---

[4]The website for the BM model can be found https://basismixer.cp.jku.at/static/app.html. At the time of this writing, the website is currently unavailable

Chapter 4

Methods and Experiments

Given the relevant background research and knowledge base, we will now describe the experiments we ran and the reason behind our experimental methods. Given the powerful advances in NLP due to the Transformer discussed in **??**, our general goal was to investigate the results of the Transformer in application to EMP generation, which to our knowledge has never been done. Because both language and music are highly sequential and hierarchical in nature, our intuition was that because the Transformer does a good job of learning the general structure of language, that it can do the same of for music. We use the general framework for a complete end to end performance generation system which is proposed by virtuosoNet. In its simplicity, the initial purpose of this project was to determine if a Transformer based model can improve upon virtuosoNet, given the same data, features, and evaluation metrics

Richard: Make sure to add a section about feature engineering with virtuosoNet

. However, due to the highly ambiguous and subjective nature of EMP generation, there was no clear way to know if we confidently answer this question given our results. As such, we modified our research direction to providing additional insight and intuition about the nature of EMP generation itself and how this intuition can guide future work.

4.1   Data and Features

The reasons for the adoption of the virtuosoNet system are twofold: the first being that the

dataset used to develop virtuosoNet was the largest publicly available dataset used in EMP

generation, and the second being that the code and models of virtuosoNet are open-sourced

[1] and contain all of the necessary data processing. This system also somewhat represents

the "state of the art" in EMP generation, so it provides a natural starting place to use for

comparison against any further model development. The virtusoNet system uses handcrafted

features for both scores and performances. Score features contain low-level information

(pitch and timing), high-level information such as the key and metric information, as well as

more detailed information such as the duration of rests, articulation markings (legato and

staccato), and the distance from the closest preceding tempo and dynamics directions, slur,

and beam status. The performance features include all of the standard performance features:

tempo expressed as BPM, note onset deviation, MIDI velocity, articulation, and different

features related to the onset and offset times of the pedal. A full outline of the features is

given in [21].

4.2   Model

In the virtuosoNet system, there is a 1:1 mapping between notes in scores and performances.

The original Transformer as an encoder-decoder model was designed as a seq-2-seq model

where the sequences have different lengths, which adds additional complexities into the model

to account for this difference. To keep our system simple, our model is conceptually similar to

BERT, and acts as an encoder-only Transformer model. It contains a simple fully connected

linear layer on top which will learn the final mapping between the Transformer encoding

---

[1]https://github.com/jdasam/virtuosoNet

and the actual score features. We use the standard absolute positional embedding which is concatenated with the score features as input to the model. The performance output features of the model can be used to construct a MIDI file, allowing for the system to performance full performance generation given a score in MusicXML form.

4.3 Experiments and Model Evaluation

virtuosoNet is built as a regression model and uses MSE as both its loss function and evaluation metric. It uses an 8-1-1 train/valid/test data split, and Jeong et al. [19] present MSE results for each different parameter of the performance features on the test set. We follow the same method for our quantitative evaluation. Most models were trained at 50 epochs, and the best model parameters were selected according to the lowest validation evaluation score. We used the software Neptune AI [25] to manage our experiments and report the metric feedback. Data for all of the experiments we ran including the model hyperparameters and metrics can be found online[2].

We ran experiments using the same data for several different model configurations. Similarly to our Transformer encoder model, we build an LSTM baseline model with 3 recurrent layers which acts as an encoder and a simple fully connected linear on top to perform the final mapping between the LSTM encoding and the output features. The LSTM baseline is 3 layers with a hidden size of 256, and is used for comparison purposes only.

---

[2]http://ui.neptune.ai/richt3211/thesis

4.3.1   Quantitative Evaluation

We use several different model configurations for the Transformer. Our Transformer baseline has 6 layers, 6 attention heads, and a hidden size of 256. We chose this as a base configuration because it closely matches the size of the original Transformer [30], except for the hidden size of the feed-forward layer. We chose a smaller hidden size of 256 for our base layer hidden size due the relatively small dimensionality, 78, of the input data to the model. Our initial goal was to find the optimal model configuration according to a quantitative evaluation, which meant finding the lowest total MSE loss. To keep our modeling honest, we withheld from running the final test evaluation until all models had been trained. As such, we needed a way to compare against existing virtuosoNet models without using the final MSE evaluation metrics reported by Jeong et al. [19]. To do this, we trained from scratch the Iterative Sequential Graph Network (ISGN) and the HAN baseline (HAN-BL) models as reported in [20] and [19] respectively, and used the metrics from the validation data set to guide our own model development before we ran the final evaluation. We ran a fairly exhaustive search of a single dimension of the hyperparameters at a time. The full results of these models are show in table 5.1 .

Richard add table reference

4.3.2   Qualitative Evaluation: Identifying Training Problems

During our model development we conducted our own listening tests to subjectively determine the quality of each model. It was apparent from the start that there was a mismatch between the quantitative results of the model and it's quality in a listening test. For example, the Transformer model with N_{id} 125 (which we will denote as $T_{N_{125}}$, see Table 5.1) had much worse validation MSE metrics than almost every other model Transformer model. However, a listening test revealed that the absolute tempo for smaller models, such as the

Transformer baseline $T_{N_{147}}$, was much faster and sounded worse (to the point where the performances are almost 'unlistenable') than $T_{N_{125}}$, even though it presented better quantitative metrics on the validation test set. The potential disconnect between the 'quality' of the model as determined by quantitative and qualitative evaluation led us to investigate potential problems with the training methods used by Jeong et al. [19]. See section for a more in-depth discussion of this evaluation.

Richard
Add ref

One of the first potential problems we identified was the method used to calculate and interpret the loss and evaluation. The output features of virtuosoNet are represented by a sequence of vectors with a length of 11. The first 4 features are values that correspond to a single expressive parameter, and are tempo, velocity, deviation, and articulation, respectively. The last 7 features are all different numbers that correspond to information about the pedal [21]. Jeong et al. [19] present MSE metrics for five different expressive parameters, which include all of those previously mentioned, as well as the pedal. This means that when we refer to the pedal MSE, it is an aggregation of the 7 different features that contain pedal information. The original MSE which was used to train virtuosoNet assumed that every feature of the output vector contributed equally to the final output and corresponding loss optimization. Given that there is 7 times more information for the pedal parameter than all others, we can think of this loss function as placing much more importance for the pedal than every other expressive feature. To combat this, we came up with a new weighted MSE loss function that allows for the optimization of some features over another.

We define the output vector as an 11 dimensional vector $\mathbf{v} = \{t, v, d, a, p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4, p_5, p_6\}$ where t, v, d, and a represent tempo, velocity, deviation, and articulation respectively, and p_i represents a single component of the pedal. For a predicted output vector $\mathbf{v}$ and the target output vector $\widehat{\mathbf{v}}$, standard MSE loss is $MSE(\mathbf{v}, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\mathbf{v}_i - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_i)^2$. This can also be rewritten as $MSE(\mathbf{v}, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}) = \frac{1}{11}[(\mathbf{v}_t - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_t)^2 + (\mathbf{v}_v - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_v)^2 + (\mathbf{v}_d - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_d)^2 + (\mathbf{v}_a - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_a)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{7} (\mathbf{v}_{p_i} - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_{p_i})^2]$.

We introduce 5 different weight values: $\alpha_t, \alpha_v, \alpha_d, \alpha_a$ and α_p. Our weighted MSE loss is defined as $W_{MSE}(\mathbf{v}, \widehat{\mathbf{v}}) = \frac{1}{\alpha_t + \alpha_v + \alpha_d + \alpha_a + \alpha_p}[\alpha_t(\mathbf{v}_t - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_t)^2 + \alpha_v(\mathbf{v}_v - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_v)^2 + \alpha_d(\mathbf{v}_d - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_d)^2 +$ $\alpha_a(\mathbf{v}_a - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_a)^2 + \alpha_p \sum_{i=1}^{7}(\mathbf{v}_{p_i} - \widehat{\mathbf{v}}_{p_i})^2]$. The original MSE can be seen as the weighted MSE with $\alpha_t, \alpha_v, \alpha_d, \alpha_a = 1$, and $\alpha_p = 7$.

If we conceptualize the loss optimization in this way, we can view the original model optimization as placing much more importance towards accuracy in the pedal than any other feature of expression. The MSE was used not only as the loss function to optimize the model, but also as the actual metric to evaluate the model with. This evaluation means that models with an emphasis in pedal accuracy will be preferred over those without it. This presents the question of determining whether or not this is the right way to conceptualize a 'good' model. Would a different configuration of the expressive feature weights lead to a better outcome? These answers are non-trivial and this further emphasizes the importance of having better ways to both optimize and evaluate EMP generation models. With this mind we ran additional experiments changing the weights for each expressive parameter. The results of these experiments are outlined in section 5.2.

We also changed the way in which the loss was calculated for the articulation feature. As discussed in section 3.4.2, virtuosoNet uses an alignment algorithm which presents metadata about the alignment between the score and performance of every single note. The notes that are not aligned are included in the input data to the model, but are excluded from the loss calculation. A similar method is used with notes relating to the articulation feature and the pedal. Jeong et al. [19] say "Since the articulation is largely affected by the sustain pedal, we reduced the weight for the articulation loss to 0.1 for notes with the sustain pedal pressed at the offset". In the actual data generation code the weights for the articulation loss calculation are slightly more complicated than what is presented in the paper [3], but the

---

[3]See github

intuition behind changing the loss for notes used in combination with a pedal is the same. For some experiments we change this loss calculation for articulation to fall in line with all other performance features which involves using alignment data only to exclude notes from the loss. Again, this type of optimization and evaluation is subjective and it is hard to say if one is more correct than another.

Changing the loss function (as well as the evaluation function) in such ways alters the interpretability of the metric and invalidates the direct comparison to the metrics reported for virtuosoNet. However, we can still compare model outputs qualitatively. Due to time and resource constraints, no sophisticated qualitative evaluation method was used to conduct this comparison. Our qualitative evaluation relied mostly on the author's own listening tests and internal discussions about the quality of the performances and potential places for error. The listening tests were conducted by comparing performances of 6 different compositions for each model both audibly and visually using the Digital Audio Workspace (DAW) software Logic Pro X. The performances are listed in table 4.1 No numerical or statistical observations are reported given the fact that all evaluation was done by the author and represents an inherent bias which and cannot be seen as robust or reliable for further analysis. We do however provide some observations related to our qualitative evaluation along with our own interpretation of them, if for no other reason than to guide the intuition behind more robust methods for future work. This analysis is given in section .

Richard
Add reference

Composer	Composition
Bach	Prelude in E Minor, BWV 855
Bach	Prelude in F-sharp Major, BWV 858
Chopin	Etude Op. 10, No. 12
Chopin	Fantaisie-Imropmptu
Beethoven	Piano Sonata No. 17 First Movement
Mozart	Piano Sonata No. 11 First Movement

Table 4.1: The compositions used for the qualitative evaluation of our models. All scores come in the form of MusicXML from MuseScore. None of the scores were present in the training data

Chapter 5

Results

5.1 Quantitative Evaluation Results

As discussed in section 4.3, the original purpose of this project was to determine if a Transformer based model could outperform the existing LSTM virtuosoNet models. Table 5.1 shows the results of our experiments in comparison with the virtuosoNet models. The MSE metrics used for comparison with the virtuosoNet models are taken from [19]. We also present the same performance metrics for our own LSTM baseline model as an additional comparison. All of the models presented in this table are trained using the standard MSE without weighted expressive parameters and use the articulation MSE calculation according to the pedal status as discussed in 4.3.2. To the best of our effort, all models were trained and evaluated using the same data, features, and evaluation metric.

Richard: Explain the results in the table when all experiments are done running

.

5.2 Qualitative Evaluation: Personal Analysis

In section 4.3.2 we outline the evolution of our research method and identify major setbacks in the evaluation and comparison of our models. In our experience, our own qualitative

37

Model Configuration								Results in MSE					
N_{id}	M	L	d_{hid}	D	LR	C	H	Tot	t	v	d	a	p
123	LSTM	3	256	0.1	0.1	0.5		1.08	0.84	1.35	1.02	1.11	1.08
147	T-BL	6	256	0.1	3e-5	0.5	6	0.86	0.54	0.80	0.88	0.80	0.92
169			128					0.87	0.55	0.79	0.96	0.88	0.92
128			528					0.86	0.50	0.76	0.88	0.82	0.93
133			1024					0.83	0.47	0.76	0.88	0.82	0.88
118		12						0.89	0.65	0.82	0.88	0.82	0.95
181		24						0.93	0.62	0.97	0.89	1.09	0.95
132							13	0.84	0.51	0.77	0.95	0.81	0.88
171				0.2				0.91	0.74	0.82	0.95	0.86	0.94
173					0.01			1.01	0.86	1.05	0.90	1.18	1.01
188							26	0.84	0.62	0.78	0.89	0.79	0.87
134		12	528					0.85	0.54	0.75	0.90	0.86	0.89
190		12					13	0.87	0.49	0.78	0.89	0.87	0.94
135		12	528				13	0.84	0.47	0.81	0.89	0.86	0.89
125		24	528					0.93	0.69	0.99	0.91	1.12	0.94
	HAN-BL	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.77	0.40	0.67	0.77	0.72	0.84
	HAN-S	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.73	0.27	0.61	0.75	0.69	0.82
	HAN-M	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.72	0.22	0.53	0.75	0.75	0.81

Table 5.1: A comparison of 3 different families of EMP generation models: virtuosoNet models, Transformer models, and our LSTM baseline models. The left side of the table presents the configuration for each of the models, exluding the virtuosoNet models which are present in other works [19, 20]. N_{id} is the ID of the Neptune experiment, L is the number of layers, d_{hid} is the dimension of the hidden layers, D is the dropout, LR is the learning rate, C is the gradient clip, and H is the number of attention heads. The right side of the table presents the MSE results for all models along the five different expressive dimensions mentioned in 4.3.2, as well as the total MSE which is an aggregation of all the individual expressive features. The entries for the HAN models come from virtuosoNet and are given in [19]

evaluation through listening tests proved to be the most useful method for guiding our model development and analysis. With the full acknowledgment of the inherent bias that underlines such a method and the need for better quantitative evaluation metrics, we will present some of our observations as the model development progressed.

The first general observation is that the two most important factors for overall performance are the tempo and pedal. Models that don't perform either of these two features within certain bounds correctly make performances almost unlistenable. If a performances global tempo is too fast and every other expressive parameter is learned correctly, the resulting performance will still sound bad enough that it's not worth listening to at all[1] [2]. We noticed a similar phenoema with the pedal. Some models generated performances with the sustain pedal applied at all times with hardly any break. The result is a performance that is completely muddied and unrefined. Although these performances are more bearable than those with extreme tempo, they are still hard to listen to in any meaningful way [3].

We also notice that the tempo and timing of the Transformer models is more dynamic that the LSTM models, whether our own or from virtuosoNet. For some models the variability in timing seemed to be a good thing, while for others it was so bad that it almost sounded like the model was still "learning" how to play. The tempo for all LSTM based models (except for some slight variations in the performances from HAN-M [4]) was extremely consistent and non-changing to the point of sounding robotic and mundane. On one extreme with the Transformer the highly dynamic tempo at times sounds like a real performer making mistakes [5], while on the other with LSTM models the performance is so boring that it doesn't sound

---

[1]Performances generated by models can be view through our Neptune Project. Each experiment has an ID and we've run performance generation code for many of the models. To listen to performances, visit an experiments artifacts tab and download available MIDI files which can be played in DAW software such as Logic Pro X. If performances don't exist for an experiment, contact the autor

[2]See $T_{N_{86}}$ Fantaisie Impromptu and $T_{N_{126}}$ Etude Op. 10 No. 12.

[3]See $T_{N_{125}}$ Piano Sonata 11

[4]Performances for this model can be found at N_{126}

[5]See $T_{N_{86}}$ Piano Sonata 11

Missing figure

Images that show the difference of 3 performances, all of the same composition. One performance should have really bad pedal, another should have mediocre pedal, and the other (a human performance) should have natural pedal. Will be gathered with screenshots from Logic Pro

Figure 5.1: Test Caption

"human" at all [6].

The pedaling in general of all models was mediocre at best. One of the observations of the qualitative analysis presented in [19] is that the performances have too much pedal, which is consistent with our own. There are models whose performance pedaling is much better than others and follows the natural cadence of the music, but still don't quite match the use of pedal in actual human performance. Figure 5.1 shows a visual comparison of the sustain pedal usage in different performances.

The importance of tempo and pedal was part of the intuition that led to our formulation of the weighted MSE by expressive parameter defined in 4.3.2. We started out by running experiments with an even weight distribution and ended up with a model configuration that weights tempo and pedal significantly more than all others. We also ran these additional experiments changing the articulation mask. Because changing the loss function also changed our evaluation, we could not directly compare the quantitative results of the models, and so all evaluation was by our own qualitative listening test. We ran a few additional experiments with the tempo and pedal weighted high, along with some additional changes in the model size. A full description of the models and their parameters is given in table 5.2.

$T_{N_{154}}$, which weights all expressive parameters, generates performances with the global tempo

---

[6]See $LSTM_{N_{123}}$ Piano Sonata 11

Model Configuration					Expressive Weights				
N_{id}	L	d_{hid}	H	AM	α_t	α_v	α_d	α_a	α_p
150	256	6	6	a	1	1	1	1	7
				p	1	1	1	1	7
154					0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
156					0.33	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.33
157					0.4	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.4
				p	0.4	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.4
159	528	12	13		0.4	0.067	0.067	0.067	0.4

Table 5.2: The model configurations of additional experiments we ran after our initial quantitative evaluation effort. We show similar hyperparemters as in table 5.1, with an additional parameter AM which reprsents the articulation mask. A value of 'a' indicates that the articulation value was masked according to the note alignment, and a value of 'p' indicates that the articulation value was masked according to the pedal status. There are additional paramter values that are not present but are used in table 5.1: LR is 0.0003, C is 0.5, and D is 0.1

a little too fast and an extremely muddy pedal. $T_{N_{150}}$ which uses the original MSE loss and weights the pedal high produces better performances with reasonable pedaling, although the tempo is inconsistent enough that the performance loses it's cohesiveness as a whole. For these reasons we increased both the tempo and pedal weights to be much higher than the others in models $T_{N_{156}}$ and $T_{N_{157}}$. We found that the tempo and pedal weights $T_{N_{156}}$ were a bit too low - specifically, the pedal is almost just as muddy as it is in $T_{N_{150}}$ and the tempo is still a bit too fast, albeit more consistent and cohesive. We found that $T_{N_{157}}$ produced the best overall performance in the Transformer based models[7]. It is likely that were we to continue to experiment with a different configuration the weights that we could come up with even better results.

Our last general observation is that the virtuosoNet model HAN-M produces the best overall

---

[7]All of these differences are best demonstrated in the performances of Fantaisie Impromptu. Compare $T_{N_{154}}$, $T_{N_{150}}$, $T_{N_{156}}$, and $T_{N_{157}}$

performances. We feel that in general the tempo for HAN-M is a little too slow, but it still creates the most natural expression. This is most apparent in it's performance of Beethoven's Piano Sonata 17 (also known as the "The Tempest"), whose introduction leaves a large space for interpetation to achieve a desired listening result. If the score is rendered exactly as it is, the resulting performance becomes boring and uninteresting. We found that the only model that made this performance "interesting", was the HAN-M. Although we have previously emphasized the problem with using the existing quantitative metric to evaluate our models, both our quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the HAN-M model indicates that it is the "best" model. The proposed Transformer architecture does not improve upon existing models. We will provide some intuition about why this is and possible model improvements for future work in section .

Richard
Add ref
to dis-
cussion

Chapter 6

Discussion

As we have outlined, this project underwent an unexpected evolution of purpose. Our initial goal was to determine if we could outperform the existing state of the art system in EMP generation with the exact same research methods and only a change of computational model. The initial quantitative experiment results indicated that a Transformer does not outperform hierarchical based recurrent models. However, when we ran our own subjective evaluation of the comparison in performance among the two families of models, we determined that the definitive declaration of one model being better than another was not so straightforward. This led us to question the validity of the original research method, particularly with the evaluation metric, and shift our own toward more nuanced and discovery-based experiments. The experiments themselves were not guided by any strict method, and as such, we cannot provide results that we consider to be robust or reliable. However, we would like to use our experience in running these experiments to provide some suggestions for the direction of future work in the area.

6.1   Directions for Future Work

Our two general suggestions for research are centered on the main contributions of this work; that is, modeling and evalution. Although our Transformer based model was "outperformed" by the existing recurrent model, we feel that the Transformer model family still has the

potential to improve upon recurrent models given the right architecture. As far as evaluation is concerned, we use our experience in our model development to consider the possbilities for what a better evaluation metric might look like.

6.1.1　Modeling: Performance as a Generative Process

In section 4.3 we present our proposed Transformer model and the reasoning behind the model selection. This reasoning was based upon the fact that the job of our model was to learn the one-to-one mapping between a single note in a score and it's corresponding expression in a performance, as well the success of similar Transformer adaptations such as BERT[7]. This is in contract to the original encoder-decoder Transformer architecture, whose purpose in machine translation is to learning the mapping between *variable* length sequences. In the encoder-decoder architecture, the job of the encoder is find some good representation of the input data (the original language) that it presents the decoder, who uses this data representation along with it's own internal representation of the output data (the translation language) to *generate* from scratch the target sequence. Although for our particular formulation of EMP generation (based on the existing feature design of virtu-osoNet) there is a one-to-one mapping between a score note and a performance note, we believe that the encoder-decoder architecture would be more appropriate for performance generation than our proposed encoder only model. The former assumes that *generation on the part of the performer* is as fundamental a component of the performance process as is understanding the score. The latter assumes that performance itself is only a matter of correctly understanding and rendering the information presented in the score, and doesn't learn the fundamental aspects of performance itself. Given that our model implements the latter, we believe that explains both the lack of expression and perceived error in creating novel performances, as well as the lower performance according to the quantitative metric.

virtuosoNet itself is based on an encoder-decoder architecture, along with the option to encode a specific performance style (which we feel is useful, but not necessary for performance in general). It uses a combination of pre-defined musically informed hierarchical boundaries (starting from measure, to beat, and ending in a single note) along with the attention mechanism to build both an LSTM based score encoder and generative performance decoder. We believe that it is the encoder-decoder architecture that explains the different in performance between virtuosoNet and our proposed model, and not necessarily indicative that recurrence mechanisms (LSTM) outperform attention mechanisms (Transformer). We suspect that a full encoder-decoder Transformer architecture would have the capability using attention alone to learn the hierarchical boundaries of music that are handcrafted into virtuosoNet. Because the Transformer is more unsupervised from that perspective, it's possible that it can learn additional hierarchical levels that are important in performance. Such a model (whose results may or may not outperform a recurrence based model) would be more useful from an analytical perspective, not only a generative one.

It would also be useful to experiment with the positional embeddings and relative attention mechanisms that are part of the Music Transformer [17] which is used to generate both composition and performance together (see). The increase in direct performance generation of the Music Transformer using relative position attention as opposed to absolute position based attention would likely apply to EMP generation based on a score.

> Richard
> Add section about Music Transformer

The implementation of a full Transformer and the experimentation with relative attention are the next immediate steps for future work. We did attempt to implement the full Transformer model but ran into practical training problems using the native implementation of the Transformer in PyTorch, which is heavily based upon classification of text data which uses highly dimensionional word embeddings. We plan to continue work in this area using custom adaptations and possible innovations of the original Transformer, using the knowledge

gained from this work to guide our experiment development.

6.1.2 Evaluation: Towards Better Metrics

As has been lengthily discussed, we believe current quantitative methods for EMP genera-
tion are in need of significant improvement. Current methods are based upon comparing a
predicted performance against an actual performance and calculating some overall numeri-
cal distance between the output features, usually as the Mean-Squared-Error. As we have
brought to light, this score is going to be highly dependent on the featurization of perfor-
mance expression. In our case, the performance features carried more information about the
various aspects of the sustain and soft pedals than all other expressive features. Using MSE
with this feature set will bias the evaluation towards models with pedal over other import
features relating to tempo, timing and articulation. A different set of output features fun-
damentally changes the interpretability of the model and makes the comparison of models
with different output features impractical.

A direct comparison of a predicted performance with a single target performance will also
create a strong bias toward the human performers interpretation in that performance. An
evaluatoin on a large scale such dataset such as ours that has multiple performances for
a single score will naturally account for some of this bias by presenting multiple "correct"
interpretations for a single score and rewarding those models which can create performances
that have commonalities between them all. However, the extent to which this bias exists
is difficult to account for in interpreting evaluation results. This is especially dependent on
the performances that exist in the evaluation set. For example, two of the scores in our
test data set are Bach's Prelude and Fugue in F Major (BWV 858) and Chopin's Etude Op
10. No 2. There are 2 performances of Bach's Prelude and Fugue and 11 performances of

Chopin's Etude. Does this mean that evaluation will require more generality for the models performance of Chopin's Etude than it will for Bach's Prelude and Fugue? If generality across composers and performance styles is desired (which for us is the case), how much can trust the model evaluation given this knowledge of the test data?

Qualitative evaluation of models is used to address the potential problems of using numerical methods to measure performance. Although the qualitative evaluation methods are also subject to their own heavy bias and potential lack of consistency across multiple experiments, they do provide the "human" element of evaluation which produces an additional level of confidence in the result of the models. Of course, qualitative evaluation methods present a slew of their own practical concerns in evalution. Not only does the diversity of musical experience and knowledge of the listeners create a large space for interpretability of the results[1], it is also difficult to gather together a group (no matter their background) of people who are willing to particpate in the listening evaluation. In our case we didn't have the time or the resources to put together such an evaluation. This in combination with the lack of confidence we can place in the quantitative metric made conducting research difficult and frustrating.

These issues point to the strong need for more standardization in the feature engineering, data sets, and evaluation methods of EMP generation models. We again draw from our comparison of EMP generation to machine translation to draw some insight on how to develop more standardized methods.

> Richard: Continue discussion of better evaluation methods. Need to do more research on current methods

---

[1]Some evaluations present performance to experienced and profesional musicians [27], while others use student musicians [19]. A case can be made using lay people with no formal musical education as the listeners is also a valid method, considering the lack of musicologolical bias they would hold.

6.2   Looking Forward: Finding the *Essence* of Performance

As we went about conceptualizing and developing this project, one thought that has plagued us is that we don't have a proper understanding of the fundamental components that comprise musical performance. Widmer in his *Con Espressione*[2] Manifesto[32] emphasizes the importance of focusing on the finding the *essence* of music itself and using that deeper understanding to more impactful technology related to MIR. When we first started the project we thought that it would be relatively simple to throw the powerful attention mechanism at a fundamentally sequential based modelling problem and that we would see improved results. It is only after running our experiments and taking a step back to look at the results that we understand what Widmer means when he refers to the *essence* of music.

Our experience in the development of this project further convinces of the fact that the computational study of music is an inherently difficult problem, not because of the limits of computation, but because of our current limited understanding of what music actually is. It is relatively simple to experience music on a personal level and to share in that experience with others. However, it is our (and Widmer's) conjecture that there is a fundamental disconnect between our understanding of the phenomenological aspect of music and the actual statistical patterns of nature that make it so appealing. MIR research attempts to encode these statistical patterns in computation and as such, deriving results that are meaningful in practical application with real human interaction is non-trivial. Widmer's suggestion is that we focus on gaining better understanding of the relationship between music in nature and music as it is perceived, and we echo that sentiment here.

This may be an essential component of deriving better evaluation systems for performance,

---

[2] *Con Espression* is the Italian phrase for "with feeling" and is used as direction in musical notation

which can hopefully drive the future development of performance generation models. To create a proper evaluation system or metric, we first need to understand *what exactly it is that constitutes a "good" or "bad" musical performance to a human listener.* This is a separate question from determining the quality of a musical composition, or even of the synthesis of a performance (whether it is the form of an acoustic instrument or a digitial synthesizer). To us, it is not clear where to draw the exact line between composition, performance, and synthesis from the perspective of the human listener. Although we conceptualize them as independent from each to mathematically define our problem space separate as shown in Figure 2.1, they may in fact be entirely dependent or even the same phenomena expressed differently through nature. For example, a musician performing a Jazz improvisation on a guitar may use the physical process of synthesizing sound, such as the way he strikes the guitar string or bends the string to reach a particular note, as driving factors in the musical piece. It is the actual physical limitation of the guitar instrument as the driver of creating sound that enables him to create musical subtleties in both the spontaneous composition and performance of improvisation. Is there a clear cut line between what constitues composition, performance, and synthesis in such a case?

On the flip side, we can analyze over 1000 symbolic musical compositions by Johann Sebastian Bach and their many musical adaptations over the last several hundred years. One example is the well known adaptation of his Prelude No. 1 in C Major, BWV 846 published in 1722 as the accompaniment to a melody composed by Charles Gounod and set to the lyrics of the well known Latin prayer, *Ave Maria.* The original arragement, published in 1853 was for violin (or cello) with the piano[3], but it has since been arranged and performed countless times for different instrument including guitar, string quartet, piano solo, solo vocal and full choir. It is clear that we can view the original piano Prelude as it's own composition and

---

[3]For an example performance, look here for a recent performance by the well known cellist, Yo-Yo Ma

separate from the many different adaptations in composition, performance, and synthesis that complete the full musical experience.

All of this is to say a good definition for what makes the *essence* of musical performance may be impossible to define without further musical exploration. We would like to adopt Widmer's philosophy to guide our future explorations and draw from the fields of musicology, music pyschology, and music cognition as well as further advancement in computer science and mathematics to come closer to discovering this essence. From this work, we have learned that using the attention mechanism and Transformer models in EMP generation creates much more dynamic performances, both "good" and "bad", than recurrence models. The *essence* of this finding could be that using the long term memory that attention provides allows more creative freedom in the performance process than the shorter term memory of an LSTM which might be more constrained by global score features such as the overall tempo. It also may be that having too much creative freedom without respect for global conditioning breaks the inherent musical boundaries defined by congitive perception, as we found to be the case with our Transformer models which were so fast that they were "unlistenable". Further experiments with modeling, data gathering, feature extraction, and evaluation, as well as an exploration of what determines a quality musical experience from a musicological and human cognitive perspective, will help answer these questions. It is our hope that we can continue to explore these problems (difficult as they may be) using additional perspectives drawing from musical research, to come closer to finding the *essence* of performance, and music as a whole.

Appendices

Appendix A

Appendices I

A.1 Musical Concepts and Terminology

A.1.1 Pitch

The first and most basic component in music is pitch. Pitch is a perceptual property of sounds that relates to the physical frequency of a sound vibration [23]. It is what determines whether or not a sound can be though of as "high" or low". The most commonly known way to conceptualize pitch is the 88 different keys on a piano keyboard, where each key represents a different patch value. Pitch is most commonly labeled using scientific pitch notation, which couples a range of letters (A to G) with a range of numbers (zero to eight) that correspond to different octave ranges [1]. The most well known pitch is C4, or "middle C", and lays in the very center of a standard 88 key piano.

Richard
Create
or find
visual-
ization

A.1.2 Tempo and Timing

Tempo in music describes the rate at which notes are played, and timing describes when a particular note should be played relative to the start of the composition. They are best explained in the context of modern western musical notation introduces the idea of note

---

[1]https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scientific_pitch_notation

durations, time signatures, measures, and beats [2].

> Richard: Find a more intuitive way to explain this. The piano roll explanation and visualization may work better

Each composition is broken down into a sequence of measures, and the time signature defines how many beat exist per measure, as well as the duration of a single beat. For example, a 4/4 time signature indicates that there are 4 beats per measure (the top half of the time signature), and that the duration of each beat is represented by a quarter note. A 3/4 time signature would indicate only 3 beats per measure, with the beat duration represented by a quarter note. The timing of a note would refer to it's measure, beat, and note duration. Tempo is most commonly given in beats per minute (BPM). A composition with a 4/4 signatue and a 120 BPM would mean that after one minute, 30 measures of the composition should have been played so far.

> Richard create or find visualization

A.1.3 Dynamics

Dynamics can simply be thought of as how loud or soft a note should be played (or has been played).

A.2 Data Representation

A.2.1 MusicXML

A.2.2 MIDI

---

[2]See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Musical_notation#Modern_staff_notation for a more detailed explanation

Bibliography

[1] 2002 international piano-e-competition. URL https://www.yamahaden.com/midi-files/item/2002-international-piano-e-competition.

[2] Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.0473*, 2014.

[3] Jean-Pierre Briot, Gaetan Hadjeres, and Francois-David Pachet. Deep learning techniques for music generation–a survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.01620*, 2017.

[4] Carlos E Cancino-Chacón, Maarten Grachten, Werner Goebl, and Gerhard Widmer. Computational models of expressive music performance: A comprehensive and critical review. *Frontiers in Digital Humanities*, 5:25, 2018.

[5] Kyunghyun Cho, Bart Van Merriënboer, Caglar Gulcehre, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Fethi Bougares, Holger Schwenk, and Yoshua Bengio. Learning phrase representations using rnn encoder-decoder for statistical machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.1078*, 2014.

[6] Chenhui Chu and Rui Wang. A survey of domain adaptation for neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.00258*, 2018.

[7] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pretraining of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.

[8] Carlos Eduardo. *Computational modeling of expressive music performance with linear*

and non-linear basis function models. PhD thesis, JOHANNES KEPLER UNIVERSITY LINZ, 2018.

[9] Jesse Engel, Cinjon Resnick, Adam Roberts, Sander Dieleman, Mohammad Norouzi, Douglas Eck, and Karen Simonyan. Neural audio synthesis of musical notes with wavenet autoencoders. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1068–1077. PMLR, 2017.

[10] Sebastian Flossmann, Werner Goebl, and Gerhard Widmer. The magaloff corpus: An empirical error study. *Proceedings of the 11th ICMPC. Seattle, Washington, USA*, 2010.

[11] Francesco Foscarin, Andrew Mcleod, Philippe Rigaux, Florent Jacquemard, and Masahiko Sakai. Asap: a dataset of aligned scores and performances for piano transcription. In *ISMIR 2020-21st International Society for Music Information Retrieval*, 2020.

[12] Anders Friberg, Roberto Bresin, and Johan Sundberg. Overview of the kth rule system for musical performance. *Advances in Cognitive Psychology*, 2(2-3):145–161, 2006.

[13] Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. *Deep learning*, volume 1. MIT press Cambridge, 2016.

[14] Maarten Grachten et al. *Expressivity-aware tempo transformations of music performances using case based reasoning*. Universitat Pompeu Fabra, 2006.

[15] Curtis Hawthorne, Erich Elsen, Jialin Song, Adam Roberts, Ian Simon, Colin Raffel, Jesse Engel, Sageev Oore, and Douglas Eck. Onsets and frames: Dual-objective piano transcription. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.11153*, 2017.

[16] Curtis Hawthorne, Andriy Stasyuk, Adam Roberts, Ian Simon, Cheng-Zhi Anna Huang, Sander Dieleman, Erich Elsen, Jesse Engel, and Douglas Eck. Enabling fac-

torized piano music modeling and generation with the maestro dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.12247*, 2018.

[17] Cheng-Zhi Anna Huang, Ashish Vaswani, Jakob Uszkoreit, Noam Shazeer, Ian Simon, Curtis Hawthorne, Andrew M Dai, Matthew D Hoffman, Monica Dinculescu, and Douglas Eck. Music transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.04281*, 2018.

[18] Dasaem Jeong, Taegyun Kwon, and Juhan Nam. Virtuosonet: A hierarchical attention rnn for generating expressive piano performance from music score. In *NeurIPS 2018 Workshop on Machine Learning for Creativity and Design*, 2018.

[19] Dasaem Jeong, Taegyun Kwon, Yoojin Kim, Kyogu Lee, and Juhan Nam. Virtuosonet: A hierarchical rnn-based system for modeling expressive piano performance. In *ISMIR*, pages 908–915, 2019.

[20] Dasaem Jeong, Taegyun Kwon, Yoojin Kim, and Juhan Nam. Graph neural network for music score data and modeling expressive piano performance. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3060–3070, 2019.

[21] Dasaem Jeong, Taegyun Kwon, Yoojin Kim, and Juhan Nam. Score and performance features for rendering expressive music performances. In *Proc. of Music Encoding Conf*, 2019.

[22] Shulei Ji, Jing Luo, and Xinyu Yang. A comprehensive survey on deep music generation: Multi-level representations, algorithms, evaluations, and future directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.06801*, 2020.

[23] Anssi Klapuri. Introduction to music transcription. In *Signal processing methods for music transcription*, pages 3–20. Springer, 2006.

[24] Eita Nakamura, Kazuyoshi Yoshii, and Haruhiro Katayose. Performance error detection and post-processing for fast and accurate symbolic music alignment. In *ISMIR*, pages 347–353, 2017.

[25] neptune.ai. Neptune: experiment management and collaboration tool, 2020. URL https://neptune.ai.

[26] Aaron van den Oord, Sander Dieleman, Heiga Zen, Karen Simonyan, Oriol Vinyals, Alex Graves, Nal Kalchbrenner, Andrew Senior, and Koray Kavukcuoglu. Wavenet: A generative model for raw audio. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.03499*, 2016.

[27] Sageev Oore, Ian Simon, Sander Dieleman, Douglas Eck, and Karen Simonyan. This time with feeling: Learning expressive musical performance. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 32(4):955–967, 2020.

[28] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.

[29] Orjan Sandred, Mikael Laurson, and Mika Kuuskankare. Revisiting the illiac suite–a rule-based approach to stochastic processes. *Sonic Ideas/Ideas Sonicas*, 2:42–46, 2009.

[30] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30:5998–6008, 2017.

[31] Gerhard Widmer. Machine discoveries: A few simple, robust local expression principles. *Journal of New Music Research*, 31(1):37–50, 2002.

[32] Gerhard Widmer. Getting closer to the essence of music: The con espressione manifesto. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, 8(2):1–13, 2016.