

USING MUSICAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CHORD LABELS IN AUTOMATIC CHORD EXTRACTION TASKS

Tristan Carsault¹ Jérôme Nika² Philippe Esling¹
¹ IRCAM - UMR9912 / STMS, ² L3i - Université de la Rochelle
{carsault, jnika, esling}@ircam.fr

ABSTRACT

Recent researches on Automatic Chord Extraction (ACE) have focused on the improvement of models based on machine learning. However, most models still fail to take into account the prior knowledge underlying the labeling alphabets (chord labels). Furthermore, recent works have shown that ACE performances are converging towards a glass ceiling. Therefore, this prompts the need to focus on other aspects of the task, such as the introduction of musical knowledge in the representation, the improvement of the models towards more complex chord alphabets and the development of more adapted evaluation methods.

In this paper, we propose to exploit specific properties and relationships between chord labels in order to improve the learning of statistical ACE models. Hence, we analyze the interdependence of the representations of chords and their associated distances, the precision of the chord alphabets, and the impact of the reduction of the alphabet before or after training of the model. Furthermore, we propose new training losses based on musical theory. We show that these improve the results of ACE systems based on Convolutional Neural Networks. By performing an in-depth analysis of our results, we uncover a set of related insights on ACE tasks based on statistical models, and also formalize the musical meaning of some classification errors.

1. INTRODUCTION

Automatic Chord Extraction (ACE) is a topic that has been widely studied by the Music Information Retrieval (MIR) community over the past years. However, the trend in recent results obtained in chord classification seem to indicate that ACE have reached a glass ceiling [18]. Recently, a part of the MIR community pointed out the need to rethink the experimental methodologies. Indeed, current evaluation methods do not account for the intrinsic relationships between different chords [9]. Our work is built on these questions and is aimed to give some insights on the impact of introducing musical relationships between chord labels in the development of ACE methods.

Most ACE systems are built on the idea of extracting features from the raw audio signal and then using these features to construct a chord classifier [4]. The two major families of approaches that can be found in previous research are *rule-based* and *statistical* models. On one hand, the rule-based models rely on music-theoretic rules to extract information from the precomputed features. Although this approach is theoretically sound, it usually remains brittle to perturbations in the spectral distributions from which the features were extracted. On the other hand, statistical models rely on the optimization of a loss function over an annotated dataset. However, the generalization capabilities of these models are highly correlated to the size and completeness of their training set. Furthermore, most training methods see musical chords as independent labels and do not take into account the inherent relations between chords.

In this paper, we aim to target this gap by introducing musical information directly in the training process of statistical models. To do so, we propose to use prior knowledge underlying the labeling alphabet and to account for the inherent relationships between chords directly inside the loss function of learning methods. Due to the complexity of the ACE task and the wealth of models available, we choose to rely on a single Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) architecture, that provides the current best results in ACE [17]. First, we study the impact of chord alphabets and their relationships by introducing a specific hierarchy of alphabets. We show that some of the reductions performed by previous research might be inadequate for learning algorithms. We also show that relying on more finely defined and extensive alphabets allow to grasp more interesting insights on the errors made by ACE systems, even though their accuracy is only marginally better or worse. Then, we introduce two novel chords distances based on musical relationships found in the *Tonnetz-space* or directly between chord components through their categorical differences. These distances can directly be used as loss functions for learning algorithms. We show that these new loss functions improves current ACE results even without relying on any pre- or post-filtering. Finally, we perform an extensive analysis of our approaches in order to extract insights on the methodology required for ACE. To do so, we developed a specifically-tailored analyzer that focuses on the functional relations between chords to distinguish “strong” and “weak” errors. This analyzer is intended to be used for future ACE research to develop a better understanding on the reasons behind the success or failure of

arXiv:1911.04973v1 [cs.LG] 12 Nov 2019



ACE systems.

2. RELATED WORKS

Automatic Chord Extraction (ACE) is defined as the task of labeling each segment of an audio signal using an alphabet of musical chords. In this task, the chords are seen as the concomitant or successive combination of different notes played by one or many instruments.

2.1 Considerations on ACE task

Whereas most MIR tasks have benefited continuously from the recent advances in deep learning, the ACE field seems to have reach a glass ceiling. In 2015, Humphrey and Bello [9] highlighted the need to rethink the whole ACE methodology by giving four insights on the task.

First, several songs from the reference annotated chord datasets (Isophonics, RWC-Pop, McGill Billboard) are not always tuned to 440Hz and may vary up to a quarter-tone. This leads to multiple misclassification on the concomitant semi-tones. Moreover, they underline the fact that chord labels are not always well suited to describe every song in these datasets.

Second, the chord labels are related and some subsets have hierarchical organizations. Therefore, the one-to-K assessment where all errors are equivalently weighted appears widely incorrect. For instance, the misclassification of a $C:Maj$ as a $A:min$ or $C\#:Maj$, will be considered equivalently wrong. However, $C:Maj$ and $A:min$ share two pitches in common whereas $C:Maj$ and $C\#:Maj$ have totally different pitch vectors.

Third, the very definition of the ACE task is also not entirely clear. Indeed, there is a frequent confusion between two different tasks: the literal *recognition* of a local audio segment using a chord label and its extensive extensions, and the *transcription of an underlying harmony*, taking into account the functional aspect of the chords and the long-term structure of the song. Therefore, even the notion of context windows used for the classification might be wrong, as it classifies a single chord but still relies on the information of neighboring chords. Finally, the labeling process involves the subjectivity of the annotators. For instance, even for expert annotators, it is hard to agree on possible chord inversions.

Therefore, this prompts the need to focus on other aspects such as the introduction of musical knowledge in the representation, the improvement of the models towards more complex chord alphabets and the development of more adapted evaluation methods.

2.2 Workflow of ACE systems

Due to the complexity of this task, ACE systems are usually divided into four main modules performing *feature extraction*, *pre-filtering*, *pattern matching* and *post-filtering* [4].

First, the *pre-filtering* may apply low pass filters or harmonic-percussive source separation methods on the raw signal [11, 24]. This optional step allows to remove noise

or other percussive information that are irrelevant for the chord extraction task. Then, the audio signal is transformed into a time-frequency representation such as the Short-Time Fourier Transform (STFT) or the Constant-Q Transform (CQT) that provides a logarithmically-scaled frequencies. These representations are sometimes summarized in a pitch bin vector called *chromagram*. Then, successive time frames of the spectral transform are averaged in context windows. This allows to smooth the extracted features and account for the fact that chords are longer-scale events. It has been shown that this could be done efficiently by feeding STFT context windows to a CNN in order to obtain a clean chromagram [12].

Then, these extracted features are classified by relying on either a rule-based chord template system or a statistical model. Rule-based methods give fast results and a decent level of accuracy [19]. With these methods, the extracted features are classify using a fixed dictionary of chord profiles [2] or with a collection of decision trees [11]. However, these method are usually brittle to perturbations of the spectral distribution in the input signal and do not generalize well.

Statistical models aim to extract the relations between pre-calculated features and chord labels based on a training dataset in which each temporal frame is associated to a label. The optimization of the model is then performed by using gradient descent algorithms to find an adequate configuration of its parameters. Several probabilistic models have obtained good performances in ACE, such as multivariate Gaussian Mixture Model [3] and Neural Networks (NN) either convolutional [8, 13] or recurrent [1, 23].

Finally, *post-filtering* is applied to smooth out the classified time frames. This is usually based on a study of the transition probabilities between chords by a Hidden Markov Model (HMM) optimized with the Viterbi algorithm [16] or with Conditional Random Fields [14].

2.3 Convolutional Neural Network

A Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) is a statistical model composed of layers of artificial neurons that transform the input information by repeatedly applying convolution and pooling operations. A convolutional layer is defined by a set of convolution kernels that are applied in parallel to the inputs to produce a set of output *feature maps*. These feature maps are defined by a three-dimensional tensor $h \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times I \times J}$ where M is the number of kernels, I is the height and J the width of each kernel. If we define the input as matrix X , then the output feature maps are defined by $Y = X * h_m$ for every kernels where $*$ is a 2D discrete convolution computed by

$$(A * B)_{i,j} = \sum_{r=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^F A_{r,s} B_{r+i-1,s+j-1} \quad (1)$$

for $A \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times F}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{I \times J}$ with $1 \leq T \leq I - 1$ and $1 \leq F \leq J - 1$.




Figure 1. Hierarchy of the chord alphabets (blue: A_0 , orange: A_1 , green: A_2)

As this convolutional layer significantly increases the dimensionality of the input data, a pooling layer is used to reduce the size of the feature maps. The pooling operation reduces the maps by computing local mean, maximum or average of sliding context windows across the maps. Therefore, the overall structure of a CNN usually consists of an alternated succession of convolution, activation and pooling layers. Finally, in order to perform classification, this architecture is typically followed by one or many fully-connected layers. Thus, the last layer produces a probability vector of the same size as the chord alphabet. As we will rely on the architecture defined by [8], we redirect interested readers to this paper for more information.

3. OUR PROPOSAL

3.1 Definition of alphabets

Chord annotations from reference datasets are very precise and includes extra notes (in parenthesis) and bass (after the slash) [7]. With this notation, we would obtain more than one thousand chord classes with a very sparse distribution. However, we do not use these extra notes and bass in our classification, therefore, we can remove this information

$$F : \text{maj7}(11)/3 \rightarrow F : \text{maj7} \quad (2)$$

Even with this reduction, the number of chord qualities (eg. maj7 , min , dim) is extensive and we usually do not aim for such a degree of precision. Thus, we propose three alphabets named A_0 , A_1 and A_2 with a controlled number of chord qualities. The level of precision of the three alphabets increases gradually (see Figure 1). In order to reduce the number of chord qualities, each one is mapped to a parent class when it exists, otherwise to the *no-chord* class N .

The first alphabet A_0 contains all the major and minor chords, which defines a total of 25 classes:

$$A_0 = \{N\} \cup \{P \times \text{maj}, \text{min}\} \quad (3)$$

where P represents the 12 pitch classes.

We consider the interest to work with larger chord alphabet than A_0 . Therefore, we propose an alphabet that contains all the chords present in the harmonization of the major scale (usual notation of harmony in jazz music).

This corresponds to the orange chord qualities and their parents in Figure 1, the chord qualities without any heritage are included in the no-chord class N , leading to 73 classes:

$$A_1 = \{N\} \cup \{P \times \text{maj}, \text{min}, \text{dim}, \text{maj7}, \text{min7}, 7\} \quad (4)$$

Finally, the alphabet A_2 is inspired from the large vocabulary alphabet proposed by [17]. This most complete chord alphabet contains 14 chord qualities and 169 classes:

$$A_2 = \{N\} \cup \{P \times \text{maj}, \text{min}, \text{dim}, \text{aug}, \text{maj6}, \text{min6}, \text{maj7}, \text{minmaj7}, \text{min7}, 7, \text{dim7}, \text{hdim7}, \text{sus2}, \text{sus4}\} \quad (5)$$

3.2 Definition of chord distances

In previous CNN classification systems, the model does not take into account the distance between the output classes by considering the nature of each class. This distance D_0 which we called categorical distance is binary

$$D_0(\text{chord}_1, \text{chord}_2) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \text{chord}_1 = \text{chord}_2 \\ 1 & \text{if } \text{chord}_1 \neq \text{chord}_2 \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

However, we want here to include in our model some relationships between chords. For instance, a $C:\text{maj7}$ is nearer to a $A:\text{min7}$ than a $C\#:\text{maj7}$. Therefore, we propose more refined distances to be used as loss functions through the representation of chords in an harmonic space or in a pitch space to describe more precisely the chord labels.

3.2.1 Tonnetz distance

The *Tonnetz-space* is a geometric representation of the tonal space based on harmonic relationships between chords [5]. Representing chords in this space have already showed promising results for classification on the A_0 alphabet [10]. We choose to work in the Tonnetz-space generated by three transformations applied to major and minor chords (reduction on alphabet A_0) and changing only one of the three notes of the triad. The *R*, *P*, *L* transformations respectively exchange a chord for its *relative* (relative major / minor), *parallel* (same root but major instead of minor or inversely), *leading-tone exchange* (in a major triad the root moves down by a semitone, in a minor triad the fifth moves up by a semitone).

To calculate the distance between two chords, we iterate over all the possible paths in the Tonnetz-space to find the least expensive transformation path between them, applying the same cost for each transformation. Furthermore, an extra cost is added if the chords have been reduced beforehand in order to fit the alphabet A_0 . We note C^∞ the set of the costs of all the possible paths from chord_1 to chord_2 using a combination of the *R*, *P*, *L*. Then, our distance D_1 is defined by:

$$D_1(\text{chord}_1, \text{chord}_2) = \min(C^\infty) \quad (7)$$

3.2.2 Euclidean distance on pitch class vectors

In some works, pitch class vectors are used as an intermediate representation for ACE tasks [15]. Here, we use these pitch class profiles to calculate the distances between chords according to their harmonic content.

Each chord from the dictionary is associated to a 12-dimensional binary pitch vector with 1 if the pitch is present in the chord and 0 otherwise (for instance $C:maj7$ becomes $(1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1)$). The distance between two chords is defined as the Euclidean distance between the two binary pitch vectors.

$$D_2(chord_1, chord_2) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^{11} (chord_1^i - chord_2^i)^2} \quad (8)$$

Hence, this distance allows to account for the number of pitches that are shared by two chords.

The D_0, D_1 or D_2 distance is used as loss function for training the CNN classification model.

3.3 Introducing the relations between chords

Based on our three alphabets A_0, A_1, A_2 with controlled amount of chord qualities and hierarchical relationships, we reduce the original labels before the training to fit one of these alphabet.

In parallel, one of three distances D_0, D_1, D_2 are introduced during the training through the loss function that will be minimized with gradient descent. These loss functions can take different forms but are always defined by a comparison between ground truth annotations y_{true} and the corresponding output y_{pred} . The ground truth annotation y_{true} is a one-hot vector where each bin corresponds to a chord in a chosen alphabet A_i . The output y_{pred} is a vector of probabilities over all the chords in the same alphabet A_i . For the distance D_0 , the loss function only takes into account the probability of the corresponding bin in y_{true} .

However, for our proposed distance, we introduce a similarity matrix M that associates each couple of chords to a similarity ratio.

$$M_{i,j} = \frac{1}{D_k(chord_i, chord_j) + C} \quad (9)$$

C is an arbitrary constant to avoid division by zero. The matrix M is symmetric and we normalize it with its maximum value to obtain \bar{M} . Afterwards, we define a new y_{true} which is the matrix multiplication of the old y_{true} and the normalized matrix \bar{M} .

$$y_{true} = y_{true} \bar{M} \quad (10)$$

The loss function for D_1 and D_2 is now a weighted multi-label classification between the new y_{true} and y_{pred} .

4. EXPERIMENTS

4.1 Dataset

We perform our experiments on the *Beatles* dataset as it provides the highest confidence regarding the ground truth annotations [6]. This dataset is composed by 180 songs annotated by hand. For each song, we compute the CQT by using a window size of 4096 samples and a hop size of 2048. The transform is mapped to a scale of 3 bins per semi-tone over 6 octaves ranging from C1 to C7. We augment the available data by performing all transpositions from -6 to +6 semi-tones and modifying the labels accordingly. Finally, to evaluate our models, we split the data into a training (60%), validation (20%) and test (20%) sets.

4.2 Models

We use the same CNN model for all test configurations, but change the size of the last layer to fit the size of the selected chord alphabet. We apply a batch normalization and a Gaussian noise addition on the inputs layer. The architecture of the CNN consists of three convolutional layers followed by two fully-connected layers. The architecture is very similar to the first CNN that has been proposed for the ACE task [8]. However, we add dropout between each convolution layer to prevent over-fitting.

For the training, we use the ADAM optimizer with a learning rate of 2.10^{-5} for a total of 1000 epochs. We reduce the learning rate if the validation loss has not improved during 50 iterations. Early stopping is applied if the validation loss has not improved during 200 iterations and keep the model with the best validation accuracy. For each configuration we perform a 5-cross validation, by repeating a random split of the dataset.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The aim of this paper is to study the impact of inherent musical relationships carried by parameters described in the previous section rather than obtaining the best classification scores. Therefore, we do not use pre- or post-filtering methods and analyze our results through two evaluators: the *mireval* library [20], and a Python *ACE Analyzer* that we developed to reveal the musical meaning of classification errors and, therefore, understand their qualities.

5.1 Quantitative analysis: MIREX evaluation

Regarding the MIREX evaluation, the efficiency of ACE models is assessed through classification scores over different alphabets [20]. The MIREX alphabets for evaluation have a gradation of complexity from Major/Minor to Tetrads. In our case, for the evaluation on a specific alphabet, we apply a reduction from our training alphabet A_i to the MIREX evaluation alphabet. Here, we evaluate on three alphabet : Major/Minor, Sevenths, and Tetrads. These alphabets correspond roughly to our three reduction alphabets (Major/Minor $\sim A_0$, Sevenths $\sim A_1$, Tetrads $\sim A_2$).




Figure 2. Results of the 5-folds: evaluation on MIREX Maj/Min (\sim reduction on A_0).




Figure 3. Results of the 5-folds: evaluation on MIREX Sevenths (\sim reduction on A_1).

5.1.1 MIREX Major/minor

Figure 2 depicts the average classification scores over all frames of our test dataset for different distances and alphabets. We can see that the introduction of the D_1 or the D_2 distance improves the classification scores compared to D_0 . With these distances, and even without pre- or post-filtering, we obtain classification scores that are superior to that of similar works (75.9% for CNN with post-filtering in [8] versus 76.3% for $A_2 - D_1$). Second, the impact of working first on large alphabets (A_1 and A_2), and then reducing on A_0 for the test is negligible on MIREX Maj/Min (at least from a quantitative point of view, see 5.2).

5.1.2 MIREX Sevenths

With more complex alphabets, the classification score is lower than for MIREX Maj/Min. This result is not surprising since we observe this behavior on all ACE systems. Moreover, the models give similar results and we can not observe a particular trend between the alphabet reductions or with the different distances. The same result is observed for the evaluation with MIREX tetrads (\sim reduction on A_2). Nonetheless, the MIREX evaluation uses a binary score to compare chords. Because of this approach, the qualities of the classification errors cannot be evaluated.

Model	Tot.	\subset Maj	\subset min
A_0-D_0	34.93	-	-
A_0-D_1	36.12	-	-
A_0-D_2	35.37	-	-
A_1-D_0	52.40	23.82	4.37
A_1-D_1	57.67	28.31	5.37
A_1-D_2	55.17	25.70	4.21
A_2-D_0	55.28	26.51	4.29
A_2-D_1	60.47	31.61	6.16
A_2-D_2	55.45	25.74	4.78

Table 1. Left: total percentage of errors corresponding to inclusions or chords substitutions rules, right: percentage of errors with inclusion in the correct triad (% of the total number of errors).

5.2 Qualitative analysis: understanding the errors

We propose to analyze ACE results from a qualitative point of view with a *functional* approach. In tonal music, the *harmonic functions* qualify the roles and the tonal significances of chords, and the possible equivalences between them within a sequence [21, 22]. We developed an *ACE Analyzer* including two analysis modules to discover musical relationships between the chords predicted by ACE models and the target chords. Both modules are generic and independent of the classification model, and will be available online.¹

5.2.1 Substitution rules

The first module detects the errors corresponding to hierarchical relationships or usual *chord substitutions* rules: using a chord in place of another in a chord progression (usually substituted chords have two pitches in common with the triad that they are replacing).

Table 1 presents: *Tot.*, the total fraction of errors that can be explained by the whole set of substitution rules we implemented, and \subset *Maj* and \subset *min*, the errors with inclusions in the correct triad (e.g. $C:maj$ instead of $C:maj7$, $C:min7$ instead of $C:min$). Table 2 presents the percentages of errors corresponding to widely used substitution rules: *rel. m* and *rel. M*, relative minor and major; *T subs. 2*, tonic substitution different from *rel. m* or *rel. M* (e.g. $E:min7$ instead of $C:maj7$), and the percentages of errors $m \rightarrow M$ and $M \rightarrow m$, same root but major instead of minor (or inversely) after reduction to triad. The tables only show the categories representing more than 1% of the total number of errors, but other substitutions (that will not be discussed here) were analyzed: tritone substitution, substitute dominant, and equivalence of some *dim7* chords modulo inversions.

First, *Tot.* in Table 1 shows that a huge fraction of errors can be explained by usual substitution rules. This percentage can reach 60.47%, which means that numerous classification errors nevertheless give useful indications since they associate chords with equivalent harmonic function. For instance, Table 2 shows that a significant amount of errors (up to 10%) are relative major/minor substitutions.

¹ [link removed for anonymous submission]

Model	rel. M	rel. m	T subs. 2	$m \rightarrow M$	$M \rightarrow m$
A_0-D_0	4.19	5.15	2.37	7.26	12.9
A_0-D_1	4.40	5.20	2.47	7.66	13.4
A_0-D_2	5.13	4.87	2.26	8.89	10.89
A_1-D_0	2.63	3.93	1.53	4.46	8.83
A_1-D_1	3.05	3.36	1.58	5.53	7.52
A_1-D_2	3.02	4.00	1.62	5.84	8.07
A_2-D_0	2.54	4.15	1.51	4.96	8.54
A_2-D_1	2.79	2.97	1.54	5.29	7.46
A_2-D_2	3.11	4.26	1.63	5.34	7.59

Table 2. Left: percentage of errors corresponding to usual chords substitutions rules, right: percentage of errors “major instead of minor” or inversely (% of the total number of errors).

Besides, for the three distances, the percentage in *Tot.* (Table 1) increases with the size of the alphabet: bigger alphabets imply more errors that preserve harmonic function.

Second, for A_0 , A_1 , and A_2 , using D_1 instead of D_0 increases the fraction of errors attributed to categories in Table 2 (and in almost all the configurations when using D_2). This shows a qualitative improvement since all these operations are usually considered as valid chord substitutions. Finally, we can note that a large amount of errors (between 28.19% and 37.77%) corresponds to inclusions in major or minor chords ($\subset Maj$ and $\subset min$, Table 2) for A_1 and A_2 .

5.2.2 Harmonic degrees

The second module of our *ACE Analyzer* focuses on harmonic degrees. First, by using the annotations of key in the dataset in addition to that of chords, this module determines the harmonic degrees of the predicted chord and of the target chord: *e.g.* in C, if the reduction of a chord on A_0 is C it will be considered as “I”, if the reduction of a chord on A_0 is D: *min* it will be considered as “ii”, etc. Then, it counts the substitutions of harmonic degrees when it is possible (*e.g.* in C, if the reduction of a chord on A_0 is C# it does not correspond to any degree). This section shows an analysis of the results using this second module. First, it determines if the target chord is diatonic (*i.e.* belongs to the harmony of the key), as presented in Table 3. If it is the case, the notion of incorrect degree for the predicted chord is relevant and the percentage of errors corresponding to substitutions of degrees is computed (Table 4).

A first interesting fact presented by Table 3 is that 36.99% to 45.87% of the errors occur when the target chord is non-diatonic. It also shows, for the three alphabets, that using D_1 or D_2 instead of D_0 makes the fraction of errors corresponding to non-diatonic predicted chords decrease (Table 3, particularly A_0), which means that the errors are more likely to stay in the right key.

High percentages of errors are associated to errors I~V (up to 14.04%), I~IV (up to 17.41%), or IV~V (up to 4.54%) in Table 4. These errors are not usual substitutions, and IV~V and I~IV have respectively 0 and 1 pitch in common. In most of the cases, these percentages tend to decrease on alphabets A_1 or A_2 and when using more mu-

Model	Non-diat. targ.	Non-diat. pred.
A_0-D_0	37.96	28.41
A_0-D_1	44.39	15.82
A_0-D_2	45.87	17.60
A_1-D_0	38.05	21.26
A_1-D_1	37.94	20.63
A_1-D_2	38.77	20.23
A_2-D_0	37.13	30.01
A_2-D_1	36.99	28.41
A_2-D_2	37.96	28.24

Table 3. Errors occurring when the target is non-diatonic (% of the total number of errors), non-diatonic prediction errors (% of the errors on diatonic targets).

Model	I~IV	I~V	IV~V	I~vi	IV~ii	I~iii
A_0-D_0	17.41	14.04	4.54	4.22	5.41	2.13
A_0-D_1	17.02	13.67	3.33	4.08	6.51	3.49
A_0-D_2	16.16	13.60	3.08	5.65	6.25	3.66
A_1-D_0	17.53	13.72	3.67	5.25	4.65	3.5
A_1-D_1	15.88	13.82	3.48	4.95	6.26	3.46
A_1-D_2	16.73	13.45	3.36	4.70	5.75	2.97
A_2-D_0	16.90	13.51	3.68	4.45	5.06	3.32
A_2-D_1	16.81	13.60	3.85	4.57	5.37	3.59
A_2-D_2	16.78	12.96	3.84	5.19	7.01	3.45

Table 4. Errors (> 2%) corresponding to degrees substitutions (% of the total number of errors on diatonic targets).

sical distances (particularly D_2). Conversely, it increases the amount of errors in the right part of Table 4 containing usual substitutions: once again the more precise the musical representation is, the more the harmonic functions tend to be correct.

6. CONCLUSION

We presented a novel approach taking advantage of musical prior knowledge underlying the labeling alphabets into ACE statistical models. To this end, we applied reductions on different chord alphabets and we used different distances to conduct a quantitative and qualitative analysis of the classification results.

First, we conclude that training the model using distances reflecting the relationships between chords improves the results both quantitatively (classification scores) and qualitatively (in terms of harmonic functions). Second, it appears that working first on large alphabets and reducing the chords during the test phase does not improve the classification scores but provides an improvement in the quality of the errors.

Finally, ACE could be improved by moving away from its binary classification paradigm. Indeed, MIREX evaluations focus on the nature of chords but a large amount of errors can be explained by inclusions or usual substitution rules. Our evaluation method therefore provides an interesting notion of *musical quality* of the errors, and prompts to adopt a functional approach or even to introduce equivalences. It could be adapted to the ACE problem downstream and upstream: in the classification processes as well

as in the methodology for labeling the datasets.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank the master's students who contributed to the implementation: Alexis Font, Grégoire Locqueville, Octave Roulleau-Thery and Téo Sanchez. This work was supported by the MAKIMOno project 17-CE38-0015-01 funded by the French ANR and the Canadian Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (STPG 507004-17), the ACTOR Partnership funded by the Canadian Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (895-2018-1023), and the French National Research Agency project DYCI2 ANR-14-CE2 4-0002-01.

8. REFERENCES

- [1] N. Boulanger-Lewandowski, Y. Bengio, and P. Vincent. Audio chord recognition with recurrent neural networks. In *International Symposium on Music Information Retrieval*, pages 335–340, 2013.
- [2] C. Cannam, E. Benetos, M. Mauch, M. E. P. Davies, S. Dixon, C. Landone, K. Noland, and D. Stowell. Mirex 2015: Vamp plugins from the centre for digital music. In *Proceedings of the Music Information Retrieval Evaluation eXchange (MIREX)*, 2015.
- [3] T. Cho. *Improved techniques for automatic chord recognition from music audio signals*. PhD thesis, New York University, 2014.
- [4] T. Cho, R. J. Weiss, and J. P. Bello. Exploring common variations in state of the art chord recognition systems. In *Proceedings of the Sound and Music Computing Conference (SMC)*, pages 1–8, 2010.
- [5] R. Cohn. Neo-riemannian operations, parsimonious tri-chords, and their” tonnetz” representations. *Journal of Music Theory*, 41(1):1–66, 1997.
- [6] C. Harte. *Towards automatic extraction of harmony information from music signals*. PhD thesis, 2010.
- [7] C. Harte, M. B. Sandler, S. A. Abdallah, and E. Gómez. Symbolic representation of musical chords: A proposed syntax for text annotations. In *International Symposium on Music Information Retrieval*, volume 5, pages 66–71, 2005.
- [8] E. J. Humphrey and J. P. Bello. Rethinking automatic chord recognition with convolutional neural networks. In *Machine Learning and Applications (ICMLA), 2012 11th International Conference on*, volume 2, pages 357–362. IEEE, 2012.
- [9] E. J. Humphrey and J. P. Bello. Four timely insights on automatic chord estimation. In *International Symposium on Music Information Retrieval*, pages 673–679, 2015.
- [10] E. J. Humphrey, T. Cho, and J. P. Bello. Learning a robust tonnetz-space transform for automatic chord recognition. In *Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2012 IEEE International Conference on*, pages 453–456. IEEE, 2012.
- [11] J. Jiang, W. Li, and Y. Wu. Extended abstract for mirex 2017 submission: Chord recognition using random forest model. *MIREX evaluation results*, 2017.
- [12] F. Korzeniowski and G. Widmer. Feature learning for chord recognition: The deep chroma extractor. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.05065*, 2016.
- [13] F. Korzeniowski and G. Widmer. A fully convolutional deep auditory model for musical chord recognition. In *Machine Learning for Signal Processing (MLSP), 2016 IEEE 26th International Workshop on*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2016.
- [14] J. Lafferty, A. McCallum, and F. C. N. Pereira. Conditional random fields: Probabilistic models for segmenting and labeling sequence data. 2001.
- [15] K. Lee. Automatic chord recognition from audio using enhanced pitch class profile. In *International Computer Music Conference*, 2006.
- [16] H-L. Lou. Implementing the viterbi algorithm. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 12(5):42–52, 1995.
- [17] B. McFee and J. P. Bello. Structured training for large-vocabulary chord recognition. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference (ISMIR2017)*. ISMIR, 2017.
- [18] M. McVicar, R. Santos-Rodríguez, Y. Ni, and T. De Bie. Automatic chord estimation from audio: A review of the state of the art. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech and Language Processing (TASLP)*, 22(2):556–575, 2014.
- [19] L. Oudre, Y. Grenier, and C. Févotte. Template-based chord recognition: Influence of the chord types. In *International Symposium on Music Information Retrieval*, pages 153–158, 2009.
- [20] C. Raffel, B. McFee, E. J. Humphrey, J. Salamon, O. Nieto, D. Liang, D. P. W. Ellis, and C. C. Raffel. mir_eval: A transparent implementation of common mir metrics. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference, ISMIR*, 2014.
- [21] A. Rehding. *Hugo Riemann and the birth of modern musical thought*, volume 11. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [22] A. Schoenberg and L. Stein. *Structural functions of harmony*. Number 478. WW Norton & Company, 1969.

- [23] Y. Wu, X. Feng, and W. Li. Mirex 2017 submission: Automatic audio chord recognition with miditrained deep feature and blstm-crf sequence decoding model. *MIREX evaluation results*, 2017.
- [24] X. Zhou and A. Lerch. Chord detection using deep learning. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Symposium on Music Information Retrieval Conference*, volume 53, 2015.