

# Music Playlist Title Generation: A Machine-Translation Approach

SeungHeon Doh<sup>1</sup>

Junwon Lee<sup>2</sup>

Juhan Nam<sup>1</sup>

Graduate School of Culture Technology, KAIST, South Korea<sup>1</sup>

Department of Electrical Engineering, KAIST, South Korea<sup>2</sup>

{seungheondoh, james39, juhan.nam}@kaist.ac.kr

## Abstract

We propose a machine-translation approach to automatically generate a playlist title from a set of music tracks. We take a sequence of track IDs as input and a sequence of words in a playlist title as output, adapting the sequence-to-sequence framework based on Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) and Transformer to the music data. Considering the orderless nature of music tracks in a playlist, we propose two techniques that remove the order of the input sequence. One is data augmentation by shuffling and the other is deleting the positional encoding. We also reorganize the existing music playlist datasets to generate phrase-level playlist titles. The result shows that the Transformer models generally outperform the RNN model. Also, removing the order of input sequence improves the performance further.

## 1 Introduction

Music playlists have gained progressively more importance in music streaming services. A playlist represents a group of music tracks that shares similar genre, mood or musical context. When a new playlist is created by curators or users, or generated by recommender systems, they deliver messages about musical needs by providing playlist titles in a phrase (Pichl et al., 2015; Dias et al., 2017). However, it is not trivial to blend semantics of the music tracks and express them with a phrase. As a result, we often find noisy playlist titles which do not accord with the music tracks.

A fundamental issue in automatic playlist title generation is to extract the common semantic features from the music tracks in a playlist, independent of the number of tracks. This issue has been addressed by representing a playlist with track embedding averaging (Hao and Downie, 2020) or a sequential model (Choi et al., 2020). In (Hao and Downie, 2020), they treated playlists as the equivalent of phrases, and tracks as the equivalent of




Figure 1: Diagram of track ID sequence to word sequence in a title.

words. They then used the word2vec model to learn the track embedding. In (Choi et al., 2020), they represented playlists and tracks as a matrix where the columns correspond to playlist IDs and the rows to track IDs. They then used a matrix factorization technique to learn the track embedding and, furthermore, applied an average or sequence model to predict high-level categorical labels.

Another issue is to generate a natural word sequence (e.g., a phrase or a sentence) as a playlist title from the common semantics of music tracks. This sequence-to-sequence setting is similar to the machine translation task. Therefore it is natural to attempt the methods in machine translation, in particular, the encoder-decoder models (Bahdanau et al., 2014; Vaswani et al., 2017). This approach was previously attempted for playlist title generation (Samaniego, 2018). However, the model output was mostly tag-level titles (e.g., a single word or short phrase) rather than phrase-level titles, presumably because they used an unfiltered noisy dataset and a simple RNN model. Also, they

used the track name as an input sequence. This input setting can confine tracks with similar names to have similar semantics, and also can learn the order of input sequence, which may be discarded in music playlists (Hao and Downie, 2020).

In this paper, we present another machine translation approach based on the encoder-decoder framework for automatic playlist title generation as illustrated in Figure 1. Our contribution is as follows: (i) we compare two encoder-decoder models based on RNN and Transformer, (ii) we propose two simple techniques to make track ID sequence orderless and show that they improve the performance, and (iii) we propose a new data split by filtering existing playlist datasets and extracting phrase-level playlist title.

## 2 Dataset and Preprocessing

We apply our proposed approach to two different datasets respectively: Melon Playlist Dataset (Melon) (Ferraro et al., 2021) and Spotify Million Playlist Dataset (MPD) (Chen et al., 2018). As our task is generating a playlist title in phrase for a given track ID sequence, we need a dataset of playlists that contains a pair of track ID sequence and title. Both Melon and MPD satisfy this requirement and support different languages (Korean and English). In Melon, playlist titles are written in both Korean and English (some of titles are mixed with both languages). In case of English words, normalization was done by substituting all characters with lowercase. Both of the languages were simply tokenized by white spaces.

In our task, an ideal playlist title is a phrase that incorporates common features among the songs in a playlist. However, Melon and MPD were originally constructed for automatic playlist continuation (APC) task and so they have several problems to directly use them. First, there are many playlist titles that cannot be considered as a phrase. Melon includes 27,420 playlists with empty titles which is 18.4% of the total playlists. In the case of MPD, 646,868 playlists have titles with a single word which amount to 64.7% of the total. In addition, there are playlist titles that have multiple tokens but not a phrase, for example, “G e o r g e W i n s t o n e” and “beyonce - 4”. Finally, some playlists have zero or few songs which are typically not considered as a playlist. The statistic of the two datasets is summarized in the *Original* column of Table 1.

Dataset	Statistic	Original	Filtered
Melon Playlist	Playlist Number	148,826	51,723
	Unique Track Number	649,092	430,746
	Unique Title Number	115,318	50,296
	Unique Word Number	88,524	56,296
	Average Char Length	2.8	3.6
	Average Title Length	3.6	4.7
	Average Track Length	39.7	46.2
Spotify Million Playlist	Playlist Number	1,000,000	50083
	Unique Track Number	2,262,292	402,523
	Unique Title Number	17,381	1,859
	Unique Word Number	11,146	1,886
	Average Char Length	5.2	4.2
	Average Title Length	1.4	3.4
	Average Track Length	66.3	66.3

Table 1: Compare statistic of datasets. After filtering, as the average title length increases, it can be seen that the noise of each phrase has been removed.

We reorganized the two datasets with the same criteria to improve the quality of data samples for playlist title generation. First, we gather all playlists provided by each dataset. In the case of Melon, we merged the provided train, validation, and test set into one, and then filtered out some playlists with three criteria. First, the number of title tokens should be more than 3. Second, the number of tracks should be more than 10. Third, the average character length of title tokens should be more than 3.

Finally, the filtered dataset is split by the number of title tokens. Playlists with the same number of title tokens are randomly split with a ratio of 8:1:1 and merged among different numbers of tokens subsequently to form train, validation, and test set. As a result, the statistics of data was changed as shown in *Filtered* column of Table 1. The longer average character length and title length indicate the portion of playlist titles in phrases within the dataset has increased.

## 3 Playlist Title Generation

### 3.1 Encoder-Decoder Model

The model for playlist title generation is composed of an encoder and a decoder. The goal of the model is to find a title word sequence  $y$  that maximizes the conditional probability of  $y$  given a source track ID sequence  $x$ . The encoder reads a track ID sequence  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , represents track ID as an embedding vector using random initialized embedding matrix  $E \in \mathbb{R}^{|V| \times d}$ , and transforms it to hidden states  $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ . The decoder takes these hidden states as a context input and outputs a




Figure 2: Compare distribution of datasets(original, filtered), title length 0 means missing data, and title length 1 means tag-level title.

summary  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$ . At each step the model is auto-regressive, consuming the previously generated symbols as an additional input when generating the next. During training, we used the softmax cross-entropy loss. The encoders and decoders can be RNN (Bahdanau et al., 2014), Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) (Gehring et al., 2017) or self-attention layer (Vaswani et al., 2017). In this paper, we compare the RNN model and the Transformer model composed of self-attention layers.

**RNN Model:** Our baseline model corresponds to the neural machine translation model used in (Bahdanau et al., 2014). The encoder consists of bidirectional Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) (Chung et al., 2014), while the decoder consists of a unidirectional GRU with the same hidden-state size as that of the encoder, and an attention mechanism over the source-hidden states and a soft-max layer over the target vocabulary to generate words.

**Transformer:** The encoder and decoder are composed of multi-head self-attention layers and position-wise fully connected feed-forward network with a residual connection and a layer normalization. (Vaswani et al., 2017). The transformer views the encoded representation of the input as a set of key-value pairs and both the keys and values are the encoder hidden states. In the decoder, the previous output is compressed into a query and the next output is produced by mapping this query and the set of keys and values. The output of self-attention layer is a weighted sum of the values, where the weight is calculate by the dot-product the query with all the keys.

### 3.2 Ignoring the Order in Track Sequences

One of the characteristics of playlists is that the order of tracks in a playlist is generally not important. This feature can be exploited for data augmentation. In this paper, we propose two different

Model	Melon		MPD	
	Val NLL	Test NLL	Val NLL	Test NLL
RNN Model	7.482	7.384	2.453	2.357
Transformer	7.150	7.124	1.821	1.805
+ shuffle aug	<b>6.952</b>	<b>7.019</b>	<b>1.543</b>	<b>1.502</b>
+ delete pos	7.036	7.099	1.552	1.538

Table 2: Validation and test NLL for melon and spotify million playlist dataset. The **shuffle aug** means data augmentation through shuffling the input track sequence, and **delete pos** means that delete encoder’s positional encoding in vanilla transformer.

techniques. The first is sequence shuffling which randomly changes the order of tracks in the same playlist. The second is to remove the positional encoding of the encoder. According to the loss of position information, the model can recognize the track sequence except for the sequence information of the data. On the other hand, the decoder applies the positional encoding to the word sequence for title generation. We applied the two techniques independently, because, when the positional encoding is removed, the transformer model does not recognize the input sequence differently regardless of shuffling.

### 3.3 Training Details

We fixed the number of layers of encoder and decoder to two and 128 embedding dimensions and 256 hidden dimensions for fair comparison in the two types of encoder-decoder models. We trained the model using a single GPU. We optimized the model using the Adam optimizer (Kingma and Ba, 2014) with a 0.005 learning rate, and 0.0001 learning rate decay for all models and datasets. We used a batch size of 64 and randomly shuffled the training data at every epoch. We used early stopping on the validation set, monitoring with the validation loss, and used the best model on the validation set to report all performance numbers.

Playlist ID	49169	22501
Input Tracks	Swear by Inc., Millionairess by Inc., Her Favorite Song (w/Crossfade) by Mayer Hawthorne, Dontcha by The Internet, All I Do by Majid Jordan, Her by Majid Jordan, Us by MOVEMENT, The Place by Inc., Coffee (Feat. Wale) by Miguel, Under Control by The Internet, Something's Missing by The Internet, Ocean Drive by Duke Dumont, Drive by Dornik, Make It Work by Majid Jordan, Jump Hi (Feat. Childish Gambino) by Lion Babe, Treat Me Like Fire by Lion Babe, sHe by ZAYN, Hallucinations by dvsn, Dapper (Feat. Anderson .Paak) by Domo Genesis, Bone + Tissue by Gallant, Miyazaki by Gallant, ...	Take Five by Michel Camilo, Angelina by Tommy Emmanuel, Monk's Dream (Live) by Martin Reiter, Stairway To Love by George Benson, Birdsong by Tommy Flanagan, Come Fly With Me by Frank Sinatra, Gemini by Chick Corea, Cheesecake by Dexter Gordon, Kathy by Horace Silver, Love Me by The Little Willies, Perdido by Earl Hines, 'Round Midnight by Hank Jones, I Just Called To Say I Love You by Harry Allen, Killing Me Softly With His Song by Harry Allen, Let's Fall In Love by Diana Krall, Flight To Jordan by Duke Jordan, Quizas Quizas Quizas by Lisa Ono, ...
Ground Truth	late night drive	가을밤 로맨틱 재즈곡들 romantic jazz songs for an autumn night (translated)
RNN Model	몽환적인 r&b r&b dreamy r&b r&b (translated)	jazz jazz jazz jazz
Transformer	생생한 고음질로 만나는 hi-fi 위클리 12월 16일 vol 1 lively and high-quality sound in hi-fi weekly December 16th vol 1 (translated)	카페에서 듣는 음악들 music in a cafe (translated)
Transformer + shuffle aug	들을수록 좋은 세련되고 감각적인 pop stylish and sensual pop that you feel better as you listen more (translated)	카페에서 듣는 감각적인 재즈 sensational jazz in a cafe (translated)
Transformer + delete pos	내가 좋아하는 노래 my favorite song (translated)	카페에서 듣는 잔잔한 음악 calm music in a cafe (translated)

Table 3: Inference example from the melon playlist test dataset. Reference refers to the ground truth of the dataset. Each first line is a generation result, and the second line is a phrase translated from Korean to English. Source means input track sequence, and track index over 15 are excluded.

## 4 Results and Discussion

### 4.1 Quantitative Results

We used negative log-likelihood (NLL) as an evaluation metric for the models. Table 2 lists the NLL values for the RNN and Transformer models on the two datasets. The result shows that the Transformer models generally outperform the baseline RNN model on both datasets. In addition, the Transformer models that ignore the order of track sequence improve the performance further. Between the two techniques, shuffling augmentation has a slightly lower NLL value than deleting the positional encoding on both datasets. This indicates the data augmentation approach that involves ignoring the order is more effective than simply removing the order information.

### 4.2 Qualitative Results

Table 3 shows two examples of title generation given an input track sequence. We can first see that the RNN models generate a short title. They even have repetitions of the genre words (e.g., r&b, jazz). On the other hands, the Transformer models generate a natural phrase composed of more than 3 different words. An interesting result in the

example on the left side is that the basic Transformer model has a very specific title which seems to be copied from data with strong context (“hi-fi weekly December 16th, vol. 1”). This problem is alleviated in the Transformer models with shuffle augmentation or deleting the position encoding.

## 5 Conclusions

In this work, we propose music playlist title generation with a machine translation approach. There are several future directions to extend this work. First, we can try various track embedding vectors for the input sequence. For example, we can use tag prediction vectors or audio embedding vectors from music auto-tagging models or track embedding vector from matrix factorization of user listening data. Second, we should investigate more quantitative metrics to evaluate the models. The BLEU score used in machine translation may be a possibility in terms of accuracy but we should also consider the diversity of the generated playlist titles to provide rich expressions for music listeners. Finally, we need to have a user study designed systematically that compare different models of playlist title generation.

## References

- Dzmitry Bahdanau, Kyunghyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. Neural machine translation by jointly learning to align and translate. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Ching-Wei Chen, Paul Lamere, Markus Schedl, and Hamed Zamani. 2018. Recsys challenge 2018: Automatic music playlist continuation. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems (RecSys)*.
- Jeong Choi, Anis Khelif, and Elena Epure. 2020. Prediction of user listening contexts for music playlists. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on NLP for Music and Audio (NLP4MusA)*.
- Junyoung Chung, Caglar Gulcehre, KyungHyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. Empirical evaluation of gated recurrent neural networks on sequence modeling. In *Proceedings of the Advances in neural information processing systems, Workshop on Deep Learning (NeurIPS)*.
- Ricardo Dias, Daniel Gonçalves, and Manuel J Fonseca. 2017. From manual to assisted playlist creation: a survey. *Multimedia Tools and Applications*.
- Andres Ferraro, Yuntae Kim, Soohyeon Lee, Biho Kim, Namjun Jo, Semi Lim, Suyon Lim, Jungtaek Jang, Sehwan Kim, Xavier Serra, et al. 2021. Melon playlist dataset: A public dataset for audio-based playlist generation and music tagging. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*.
- Jonas Gehring, Michael Auli, David Grangier, Denis Yarats, and Yann N Dauphin. 2017. Convolutional sequence to sequence learning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*.
- Yun Hao and J Stephen Downie. 2020. Using latent semantics of playlist titles and descriptions to enhance music recommendations. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on NLP for Music and Audio (NLP4MusA)*.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR*.
- Martin Pichl, Eva Zangerle, and Günther Specht. 2015. Towards a context-aware music recommendation approach: What is hidden in the playlist name? In *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshop (ICDMW)*.
- Sofia Samaniego. 2018. Playlist title generation using sequence to sequence. *Stanford University, cs224n project report*.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Proceedings of the Advances in neural information processing systems (NeurIPS)*.