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**Introduction**

Melody extraction, a common task in the music information retrieval (MIR) community, consists of identifying the melody in a polyphonic music context from audio or symbolic data. Melody is defined as *the sequence of monophonic pitches that a listener might sing or hum when asked to reproduce a polyphonic piece of music, and encompasses the core identity of the piece* (Salamon, Gomez, Ellis, & Richard, 2014). While rather generic, this definition allows for a “correct interpretation” through the identification of melody by a listener. This is important in MIR research due to its need for a ground truth, or a correct answer against which to evaluate algorithm performance. The melody extraction task consists of two sub-tasks: (1) identifying the appropriate pitch from all possible pitches at any given moment in the music and (2) identifying whether or not a melody is present, or active. This second task is referred to as voicing.

The evaluation datasets for melody extraction vary widely, with datasets being relatively small in MIR terms (i.e. a few dozen short excerpts; Bittner et al., 2014). Datasets containing annotations indicating melody in a Western classical, instrumental context are few and far between due to the extensive time commitment involved in building such a dataset. The majority of melody extraction datasets assume that the melody is contained in one track, or instrument, which may be appropriate and perform well for popular types of music but would perform substantially worse for Western classical music, where in instrumental works it is common for the melody to change instruments or rove, as defined by Selfridge-Field (1998). As far as the author is aware, the only two datasets where the annotated melody is allowed to rove are MedleyDB (Bittner et al., 2014) and OrchSET (Bosch, Marxer, & Gómez, 2016).

MedleyDB (Bittner et al., 2014) contains 122 songs, 108 of which contain melody annotations (the remaining songs were not considered melodic by the authors). It contains a wide variety of genres including rock, pop, classical, jazz, fusion, world, musical theater and singer-songwriter and is annotated for melody according to three definitions:

1. The predominant melodic line from one source, or instrument
2. The predominant melodic line from multiple sources, or instruments
3. All melodic lines from multiple sources, or instruments

The first produces an annotated melody that does not rove, while the second definition produces an annotated melody that can and the third produces an annotated melody that may have multiple voices at one time. These annotations were performed both by automatic melody extraction algorithms and by human annotators with at least a Bachelor of Music, producing four versions of the melody for each piece of music in the dataset.

OrchSET (Bosch et al., 2016) is a collection of 64 audio excerpts accompanied by MIDI files containing the melody, as perceived by four listeners. Only excerpts in which all four listeners agreed on the melody were kept in the dataset. This dataset is entirely instrumental, including orchestral music from 15 composers spanning the late Baroque period to the 20th century.

These two datasets present important additions to the set of available evaluation datasets for melody extraction. Melody Annotated String Quartets (MASQ) is a dataset that aims to continue the expansion of available melody extraction evaluation datasets by providing melody annotations for string quartets, a genre not yet represented in the existing melody-annotated instrumental MIR datasets. The dataset currently consists of seven Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart and fourteen Franz Joseph Haydn string quartet movements. This paper will present the details of MASQ as well as an analysis of the disagreements between annotators, offering insight into individual differences and commonalities in melody perception.

**Method**

**Data collection**

**Table 1**. Summary of string quartet movements included in MASQ, along with annotator distribution.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Composer** | **Work** | **Movement** | **Annotator 1** | **Annotator 2** | **Annotator 3** |
| Mozart | K428 | 1 | EF | SS | TB |
| K428 | 2 |
| K458 | 3 |
| K464 | 2 |
| K499 | 3 |
| K575 | 2 |
| K590 | 1 |
| Haydn | Op.1, No.3 | 4 | JT | SS | SW |
| Op.1, No.4 | 4 |
| Op.1, No.6 | 2 |
| Op.9, No.2 | 2 |
| Op.9, No.3 | 3 | AP |
| Op.33, No.3 | 3 | DB |
| Op.33, No.4 | 1 |
| Op.50, No.4 | 1 |
| Op.64, No.3 | 1 | PH |
| Op.64, No.6 | 1 |
| Op.71, No.2 | 2 | SG |
| Op.76, No.3 | 2 |
| Op.76, No.5 | 4 |
| Op.77, No.1 | 3 |

**Dataset**. All Mozart and Haydn string quartets present on the KernScores website[[1]](#footnote-1) in February 2017 were candidates for this dataset, a total of 372 movements. All movements not beginning with exactly four pitches, one in each instrument, were excluded. Seven Mozart and fourteen Haydn movements were randomly selected from the remaining 97 movements. These are listed in Table 1.

**Annotators.** Each movement was annotated by three listeners, one of them always being the author (Annotator 2 in the PDF files). The other two annotators were musicians with formal study at the university level, mean age 25 (SD = 1.32), where each annotator had no more than 7 movements to annotate (see Table 1). Each annotator’s primary instrument is as follows: SS, TB, SW and AP are pianists; PH is an organist; SG is a baritone singer; EF is a violinist; DB is a trumpet player; and JT is a French horn player.

**Procedure.** Each annotator received scores (downloaded from IMSLP[[2]](#footnote-2), an online database of public domain musical scores and audio recordings) for their respective movements and were asked to mark or highlight the melody on the score either manually on a printed version that was scanned back to the author, or electronically (i.e. directly onto the PDF or similar). One Mozart quartet annotator described their selections in a table detailing the measures, beats, and instruments. Annotators were further instructed to always highlight only one note at any given time, and to leave no mark if they did not feel that there was a melody present. These instructions ensure that the melody is monophonic and that MASQ explicitly includes information about voicing.

**Analysis**

**Data preparation**. Using MuseScore[[3]](#footnote-3) to visualize each MIDI file (downloaded from KernScores), each movement was edited so that only the melody marked by each annotator remained. Therefore, there are three versions of each movement; these MIDI files can be found online[[4]](#footnote-4) for use by the research community as ground truth for melody extraction. Alongside the MIDI files, PDF files of the musical score were annotated. The melody is highlighted in light grey where all three annotators agree, and colour-coded by annotator where the annotators disagree (legend included in each score). Each disagreement is labelled with one or more categories defined by the author, as detailed below.

**Visual data analysis**.Each movement was analysed visually: comparing the three annotations, tabulating disagreements between them and sorting these disagreements into categories, which were determined based on the author’s observation. These categories are:

* Competing saliency:
  + High voice: cases when thematic material is presented in a voice other than the highest voice (i.e. annotators may label the thematic material or the highest voice as melodic)
  + Thematic: cases when thematic material is presented simultaneously (i.e. annotators may differ in the material they label as melodic)
* Call/response
  + Overlapping: cases when a pattern is reprised in another instrument and the two iterations of the pattern overlap (i.e. annotators may differ in which iteration they label as melodic)
  + Non-overlapping: cases when patterns that may or may not differ slightly are passed between instruments without overlap (i.e. annotators may label the call or response as melodic but not both; often co-categorized with voicing, though not always)
* Dovetailing: the end of one phrase overlaps with the beginning of a new phrase (i.e. annotators may differ in which phrase they label as melodic)
* Voicing: cases where annotators disagree on whether a melody is present or not

Disagreements that did not fall into any of these categories are labelled ‘Other’. Figure 1 illustrates examples of each of these categories.

**Statistical data analysis.** In addition to summary statistics, the primary statistical test used was the chi-square test, where a significant result is obtained when categories do not contain equal numbers of measures. Chi-square tests were performed to compare: (1) disagreement categories (all sub-categories and general categories); (2) composer; and (3) movement type (i.e. first, second, third or fourth movement), where raw number of disagreements were used in the first case and mean number of disagreements per movement was used in the second and third cases. One-sided binomial tests confirmed whether each individual category was significantly different than expected for a random distribution of disagreement frequencies between categories.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **A close up of text on a white background  Description generated with very high confidence** | **A screenshot of a cell phone  Description generated with very high confidence** |
| 1A) Mozart K464, Movement 2, mm 364-366 | 1B) Mozart K428, Movement 1, mm 85-86 |
| **A screenshot of a cell phone  Description generated with very high confidence** | **A close up of a map  Description generated with high confidence** |
| 1C) Mozart K428, Movement 2, mm 14-17 | 1D) Mozart K428, Movement 1, mm 94-99 |
| **A screenshot of a cell phone  Description generated with very high confidence** | **A close up of a logo  Description generated with high confidence** |
| 1E) Mozart K428, Movement 1, mm 56 | 1F) Haydn Op. 76, No. 5, Movement 4, mm 64-66 |
| **Figure 1.** Illustrative examples of the seven different types of disagreement categories in visual data analysis: competing saliency high voice (1A) and thematic (1B), call/response overlapping (1C) and non-overlapping (1D), dovetailing (1E) and voicing (1F). | |

**Results**

**Visual analysis**

A summary of disagreements is presented in Table 2, where the two most common types of disagreements are *voicing* and *competing saliency – high voice*, representing 47.7% and 34.5% of disagreements respectively. All other disagreement categories each represent less than 10% of disagreements. Further observations will be presented in the Discussion section below.

**Statistical analysis**

The mean number of measures per movement containing disagreements was 31.1 (SD = 25.6), corresponding to a mean percentage of 25.8% (SD = 11.5) of each piece. Excluding the five movements with the highest percentage of disagreements, discussed below where most of the disagreements in each movement are attributable to a single annotator’s systematic differences, the mean percentage of disagreements falls slightly to 21.2% (SD = 8.4), just under one quarter of each piece.

As described above, chi-square tests were employed to detect whether the distribution of annotation disagreements amongst categories is different than expected if these were randomly distributed. Annotation disagreement distribution by category (by overall category and including sub-categories) was significantly different than a random distribution, χ2 (4) = 522.31, p < .0001 and χ2 (6) = 758.36, p < .0001 respectively. One-sided binomial tests confirm that disagreements in each disagreement category (overall or sub-categories) were significantly different from chance, all p < .0001. There was no significant difference in the number of disagreements between composers, χ2 (1) = 0.02, p = 0.86 but there was between types of movements, χ2 (3) = 13.81, p = .003. One-sided binomial tests on the mean number of disagreements for each type of movement reveal that only *second* movements contain significantly less disagreements than chance, p < .0001, while the number of disagreements for all other movement types are not different from chance, p > .05.

**Table 2**. Summary of annotator discrepancies by disagreement category. Mozart movements are identified by their K catalogue number followed by movement number while Haydn movements are identified by their Opus number, quartet number, and movement number. Note that the *Total* column does not equate to the sum of the row; this is due to some discrepancies belonging to more than one category.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Movement** | **Frequency by disagreement category (number of measures)** | | | | | |  | **Summary** | |
| **Call/response** | | **Competing saliency** | | **Dovetailing** | **Voicing** | **Other** | **Total** | **Percent of work** |
| **Overlapping** | **Non-overlapping** | **High voice** | **Thematic** |
| **K428-1** | 2 | 6 | 18 | 6 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 44 | 26.8 |
| **K428-2** | 10 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 27 | 28.1 |
| **K458-3** | 5 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 24.5 |
| **K464-2** | 0 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 26 | 25.0 |
| **K499-3** | 3 | 6 | 27 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 36 | 34.2 |
| **K575-2** | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 10.9 |
| **K590-1** | 0 | 42 | 11 | 0 | 10 | 53 | 2 | 71 | 35.8 |
| **Op.1, No.3-4** | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 46.1 |
| **Op.1, No.4-4** | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8.6 |
| **Op.1, No.6-2** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 23.2 |
| **Op.9, No.2-2** | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7.1 |
| **Op.9, No.3-3** | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 1 | 36 | 49.3 |
| **Op.33, No.3-3** | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 1 | 33 | 36.2 |
| **Op.33, No.4-1** | 0 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 25 | 28.8 |
| **Op.50, No.4-1** | 2 | 0 | 15 | 14 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 44 | 23.7 |
| **Op.64, No.3-1** | 5 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 24 | 14.0 |
| **Op.64, No.6-1** | 3 | 4 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 26 | 18.0 |
| **Op.71, No.2-2** | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 16 | 3 | 26 | 33.7 |
| **Op.76, No.3-2** | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 18 | 15.3 |
| **Op.76, No.5-4** | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 106 | 1 | 121 | 35.3 |
| **Op.77, No.1-3** | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 21 | 6 | 33 | 18.2 |
| **Total measures** | 30 | 60 | 230 | 59 | 38 | 313 | 21 | *M = 31.1 (SD = 25.6)* | *M = 25.8 (SD = 11.5)* |
| **Percent of discrepancies** | 4.5 | 9.0 | 34.5 | 8.8 | 5.8 | 47.7 | 3.2 |  |  |

**Discussion**

In this section, observations related to patterns of disagreements will be elaborated upon. Firstly, while the *voicing* and *competing saliency – high voice* categories remain important, it is important to acknowledge the influence of two annotators on the especially high prevalence of these two types of disagreements. In the first case, the annotator SG is the source of much of the *voicing* disagreements, particularly in Haydn’s Op. 76, No. 5, Movement 4, where SG often did not label a melody when PH and SS did. Removing those 106 disagreements from the voicing category still leaves the category representing 31.6% of total disagreements. In the case of the *competing saliency – high voice* category, the annotator AP tends to label the lower voices as melodic while other annotators prefer the first violin. This is the case in all movements AP annotates. However, if all these disagreements were ignored, *competing saliency – high voice* would still account for 25.4% of total disagreements.

The style of movement also has an influence on the number and type of disagreements observed. For example, minuets tend to have low disagreement overall, particularly Haydn’s Op. 1, No. 4, Movement 4 and Op. 9, No. 2, Movement 2, where annotators disagree for less than 10% of the movement. One exception to this is Haydn’s Op. 1, No. 3, Movement 4, where the trio portion consists almost entirely of disagreements. It is particularly rare in this dataset that all three annotators label a different instrument as melodic; however, this is the case throughout almost this entire trio. While the first annotator almost always labels the most rhythmically active instrument (the second violin or the cello), the second and third annotators label the sustained notes but at different octaves (Figure 2). The lowest rate of disagreement amongst the Mozart movements is found in K575, Movement 2, a slow movement with a high degree of rhythmic synchrony and sparsity. Disagreements are usually restricted to partial measures, with one case where a disagreement spans two measures (mm16 – 17).

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **Figure 2.** Haydn Op. 1, No. 3, Movement 4, mm 38 – 42. In this trio, all three annotators label different instruments as melodic: the first label the most rhythmically active voice while the second and third label the sustained notes at different octaves. |

One more noteworthy style is the theme & variations of Haydn’s Op. 76, No. 3, Movement 2. With relatively few disagreements, these are mostly restricted to *voicing* disagreements and segments where the theme is doubled (*competing saliency – thematic*). Still, disagreements are somewhat surprising as in this theme & variations, the theme is explicitly repeated in each variation, with the accompanying material providing variation. Thus, one would expect that annotators would continue to perceive the theme as the primary melodic content, particularly since all annotators agreed that the first presentation of the theme, as well as its first repetition, were melodic. Perhaps annotators were still aware of the theme throughout but grew bored of it and were sometimes temporarily drawn to other melodic lines (i.e. Variation III). That being said, the annotators agree that the theme remains melodic throughout the vast majority of the movement.

Let us now turn to look more closely at movements with particularly high rates of disagreement. The three movements with the most disagreements are Haydn’s Op. 9, No. 3, Movement 3, Op. 1, No. 3, Movement 4 and Op. 33, No. 3, Movement 3. The source of the majority of disagreement in these have already been discussed, all being movements annotated by AP, where in those annotations the lower voices were more often labelled as melodic than by other annotators. The movement with the next highest rate of disagreement is Mozart’s K590, Movement 1. Here, the majority of disagreements fall

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **Figure 3**. Mozart’s K590, Movement 1, mm 22 – 25. Call/response pattern between the cello and the first violin, where third annotator TB marks only the call portion of the figure (cello). This disagreement accounts for half the disagreements in this movement. |

under the *voicing* and *call/response – non-overlapping* categories. In these disagreements, annotator TB systematically labels only the ‘call’ portion of the call-response figure illustrated in Figure 3.

The only movement to contain all types of disagreements is Mozart’s K428, Movement 1. With lots of interesting thematic material throughout, areas of sparsity and overlapping phrase beginnings and endings, it offers plenty of opportunity to listen to different lines and hear these as melodic. An area of concentrated disagreement is mm 123 – 132, a part of the recapitulation (the last portion of classic sonata form: *exposition*, where thematic material is presented; *development*, where this material is manipulated and developed; and *recapitulation*, where the theme is reprised). In this excerpt (Figure

|  |
| --- |
| A close up of a map  Description generated with high confidence |
| **Figure 4.** Mozart’s K428, Movement 1, mm 123 – 131. The largest concentration of disagreements in the movement, this excerpt is part of the recapitulation of this piece. |

4), a descending 8th-note pattern is repeated in the viola and the cello, but not all annotators followed this pattern, hearing instead the highest voice as melodic. In mm 127, perhaps it is the opening rhythmic figure of the measure that attracted the attention before continuing with the descending 8th-note pattern and becoming the highest voice in the ensemble until mm 129. Measures 130-132 present a pattern seen elsewhere in the movement, where two annotators label the descending 8th-note pattern as melodic while the other labels the highest voice.

Finally, it is worth noting that some disagreements may have been directly caused by the instructions given to the annotators, notably to only highlight one note at any time. Cases of a canon (overlapping instances of thematic material, e.g. Figure 5C) or thematic material presented in thirds or octaves (e.g. Figure 5A) sometimes leads to annotator disagreements when it is entirely possible that both parts of the canon were perceived simultaneously and that the harmonized voices were perceived as one. This leads to an interesting advantage given by this particular dataset: though it would be more accurate to allow listeners to mark an unrestricted number of simultaneous notes and this approach is worth investigating in the future, the disagreements present in this dataset allows for multiple interpretations and thus a more sophisticated evaluation of melody extraction algorithms. For example, algorithms could potentially extract more than one possible melody, ranked in order of likelihood or preference. The regular presence of disagreements throughout this dataset support this type of melody extraction approach, as it would be uncommon for all listeners to perceive the melody identically in instrumental music such as this.

**High-voice superiority**

On the subject of melody extraction, it is worth mentioning the important role of high-voice superiority in human perception. Indeed, the earliest method of melody extraction involved systematically selecting the highest pitch throughout the piece and labelling that as the melody. This is known as the skyline algorithm (Uitdenbogerd & Zobel, 1998). Though this method works well for popular and folk music, it will reach a ceiling performance for Western classical instrumental music, as the melody does not always correspond to the highest pitch at any given time. The MASQ dataset provides examples of the high-voice superiority effect in action, where thematic material is overlooked in favour of the highest voice; and of where the skyline algorithm would fail. Figure 5 illustrates a few examples of the former and Figure 6 illustrates a few examples of the latter. In the three excerpts seen

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| A A screenshot of a cell phone  Description generated with very high confidence | B A screenshot of a cell phone  Description generated with very high confidence | C A close up of a device  Description generated with high confidence |
| **Figure 5.** Examples of the high-voice superiority effect in Mozart string quartet movements K464, Movement 2, mm 10 – 12 (A); K575, Movement 2, mm 16 – 17 (B); and K499, Movement 3, mm 72 – 74. In each of these excerpts, thematic material can be found in a voice other than the highest (cello in A and C and viola in A and B), but some annotators still label the highest note as melodic (violin I in all three excerpts). Excerpt C also features a canon, where thematic material overlaps in mm 73 – 74, also causing some disagreement between annotators. | | |

in Figure 5, thematic material is located in the lower voices (cello in 5A and 5C and viola in 5A and 5B). While some annotators label this thematic material as melody, some annotators instead label the highest voice as melodic, thus demonstrating the high-voice superiority effect. In Figure 6, examples of instances where the perceived melody does not correspond to the highest pitch are given, where in all of these cases the melody is played by the two lower voices in the ensemble, the viola (6A) and the cello (6B and 6C). Here all three annotators agree, demonstrating that there is a need to refine the skyline algorithm to allow the opportunity to fully reflect melody extraction as it is perceived by human listeners.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| A A close up of a device  Description generated with high confidence | B A close up of a device  Description generated with high confidence | C A close up of a device  Description generated with high confidence |
| **Figure 6.** Examples of where the skyline algorithm would fail from Mozart string quartets K428, Movement 1, mm 51 – 52 (A) and K575, Movement 2, mm 21 – 23 (B) and Haydn’s Op. 50, No. 4, Movement 1, mm 124 – 126 (C). In each case, the melody is perceived as not being the highest pitch and is agreed by all annotators. | | |

**Conclusions**

This paper has presented a new dataset for use as ground truth in the melody extraction task. MASQ contains twenty-one string quartet movements by W.A. Mozart and F.J. Haydn, where each movement has been annotated by three musician listeners. MIDI files containing the melody of each movement as annotated by each listener and accompanying PDF files highlighting disagreements can be found online to be used freely. This dataset adds to the existing body of annotated datasets for Western classical music that allow the melody to rove between voices throughout a piece of music, with the ultimate aim being to provide such annotations for all string quartets found on the KernScores website. Though this is currently a very small dataset, the goal of the MASQ project over the next few years is to provide melody annotations for all string quartet movements currently found on the KernScores website, a total of 372 movements. Despite its small size, MASQ provides ground truth melody annotations for a new and complex style of music, that of string quartets.

This paper additionally shared an analysis of annotator disagreements across movements, finding that average disagreement rate was 25.8%, around a quarter of each piece of music annotated. Disagreements were sorted into seven categories: *competing saliency – high voice*, *competing saliency – thematic*, *call/response – overlapping*, *call/response – non-overlapping*, *dovetailing*, *voicing* and *other*. The two most common categories were *voicing* and *competing saliency – high voice*, accounting for 47.7% and 34.5% of disagreements respectively. Though a single annotator sometimes explained up to half of these disagreements, these two categories remain dominant overall. The prominence of voicing disagreements in these annotations highlight the voicing sub-component of melody extraction as important in identifying the correct, or most commonly perceived, melody in any piece of music. On the other hand, the prominence of the *competing saliency – high voice* category demonstrates the high-voice superiority effect, where perception is drawn to the highest voice, regardless of whether or not it contains thematic material. That being said, the skyline algorithm cannot be relied upon entirely and it is important to consider cases where the melody is not located in the highest voice (Figure 6), especially in orchestral and ensemble Western classical music. Finally, the frequency of disagreements suggests a more fine-grained approach to melody extraction, potentially allowing for multiple versions of the melody, ranked by preference. It is the hope that this dataset can be of great use to the MIR community, particularly as it grows in size.
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