

Blind signal decompositions for automatic transcription of polyphonic music: NMF and K-SVD on the benchmark

Nancy Bertin, Roland Badeau, Gaël Richard

► **To cite this version:**

Nancy Bertin, Roland Badeau, Gaël Richard. Blind signal decompositions for automatic transcription of polyphonic music: NMF and K-SVD on the benchmark. Proc. of IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2007, Honolulu, Hawaii, United States. 1, pp.65–68, 2007. <hal-00945282>

HAL Id: hal-00945282

<https://hal.inria.fr/hal-00945282>

Submitted on 24 Mar 2014

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

BLIND SIGNAL DECOMPOSITIONS FOR AUTOMATIC TRANSCRIPTION OF POLYPHONIC MUSIC: NMF AND K-SVD ON THE BENCHMARK

Nancy Bertin, Roland Badeau, Gaël Richard

GET-Télécom Paris (ENST) - Signal and Image Processing Department
46 rue Barrault - 75634 PARIS Cedex 13, FRANCE
nbertin@enst.fr

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates on the behavior of two blind signal decomposition algorithms, non negative matrix factorization (NMF) and non negative K-SVD (NKSVD), in a polyphonic music transcription task. State-of-the-art transcription systems are based on a frame-by-frame, low-level approach; blind systems could be an alternative to them. Two raw but effective audio-to-MIDI systems are proposed and evaluated. Performances are similar, but in favor of NMF, which is more robust to initialization, choice of the order and computationally less costly.

Index Terms— Automatic transcription, polyphonic music, non negative matrix factorization, K-SVD.

1. INTRODUCTION

Automatic music transcription consists in deriving a symbolic representation (*e.g.* a MIDI-like file) of the music from an audio file. Transcribing monodic music is henceforth a well understood problem; but the case of polyphonic music remains a largely open question.

To address this issue, most of the proposed approaches rely on prior knowledge (*e.g.* signal models [1] or supervised learning [2, 3]) and/or frame-by-frame low-level analysis. The main weakness of this kind of methods is their low capacity to adapt to signals that do not comply with the model. In order to avoid this drawback, a more recent set of approaches consists in using as few hypotheses as possible about the audio content and trying to separate the notes blindly. Among those techniques we find: sparse coding [4], non-negative matrix factorization (first introduced for image processing in [5]), blind source separation [6] (*e.g.* independent component analysis), and their variants [7]. They rely on few and weak hypotheses, and show promising results in polyphonic music transcription.

The work presented here investigates further on the efficiency of this kind of approach for a full audio-to-MIDI transcription. In particular, two algorithms are studied: non-negative matrix factorization (NMF), proposed in [8], and the non-negative variant of the k-means singular value decompositions algorithm (NKSVD), successfully applied to image processing in [9]. If both provide an exploitable decomposition, they behave differently with respect to design choices like initialization, length of the analyzed piece or order of the model, which will be discussed here as well.

The two studied algorithms are briefly presented in section 2 and their implementation in an effective transcription system is described in section 3. We then present in section 4 carried on experiments, and their results in section 5. Conclusions and directions for future work are proposed in section 6.

2. BLIND SIGNAL DECOMPOSITIONS

The two algorithms studied in this paper are briefly described below since more details can be found in [10] for NMF and in [9] for NKSVD. Although they have their own specificities, both algorithms rely on common hypotheses and principles.

2.1. Common framework

Both algorithms consider the magnitude spectrogram of the data as a linear combination of r elementary spectra, or atoms, at each time step; determining a decomposition consists in finding the basis of elementary atoms, and the decomposition of the data on this basis. The magnitude spectrum is obviously not additive, but this is a relevant approximation in many cases.

Basically, let us consider a time-frequency representation V of a musical excerpt. V is in $\mathbb{R}_+^{m \times n}$ where m is the number of frequency bins and n the number of time frames. We search for two matrices $W \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m \times r}$ and $H \in \mathbb{R}_+^{r \times n}$ such that:

$$V \approx WH \quad (1)$$

The approximation is to be understood as a minimization of a “distance” (which has to be defined) between the original V and its reconstruction WH . The specific property exploited here is the non-negativity of all these matrices: they only have zero or positive coefficients. Columns of W are seen as frequency-domain atoms, and lines of H are the temporal activities of each of these atoms in the observed signal. At each time frame j , the spectrum V_j is thus expressed as a linear combination of several atoms, the coefficients of the combination being given by the j -th column of H . The recovered atoms are interpreted as *notes* and the matrix H as *temporal activities*.

2.2. Non-negative matrix factorization (NMF)

In Non-Negative Matrix Factorization, the non-negativity of the matrices involved is the only constraint used to process the decomposition. The approximation comes from the constraint $r < \min(n, m)$, so that the factorization is also a rank reduction. Considering a long enough music piece, containing a certain number of musical events, the most natural (and, we hope, only) way to represent the signal on a reduced-sized basis should be to have a basis of *notes*.

The factorization is processed by iterative minimization of a cost function (Frobenius distance or I-divergence, see [10]) and leading to a local minimum; non-negativity is guaranteed by multiplicative update rules at each iteration.

2.3. Non-negative K-SVD (NKSVD)

K-SVD and its non-negative variant, implemented here, is a sparse-coding-like algorithm, developed for image coding and denoising purpose. In typical algorithms, sparse coding (determination of the decomposition of a signal in a given basis) and dictionary design (determination of the basis in which signals will be decomposed) are often conducted separately. K-SVD was proposed, as a generalization of the k-means algorithm, in order to simultaneously get (and in an unsupervised way) both basis and decomposition.

Sparsity is the property of having few non-zero entries. In music, the intuitive interpretation is that among all possible notes (the 88 keys of the piano for instance), only a few of them can be played simultaneously by a human musician. It is used in addition to the non-negativity constraint to compute the decomposition. In this model, W is considered as a dictionary, and is generally searched overcomplete, that is $r \gg m$. Two quantities have to be minimized during the calculation: the reconstruction error (taken as the Frobenius norm of $V - WH$) and the l^0 -norm of H , which conveys the notion of sparsity. This is performed iteratively, with two steps at each iteration: pursuit (W being fixed, find the best and sparsest H) and dictionary update (refine W , using singular value decompositions (SVD)).

2.4. Main differences

The main difference between the two algorithms is a matter of “philosophy”, in particular as far as the order of the model is concerned. NMF aims at reducing rank, in order to let emerge a meaningful representation; whereas NKSVD, which is in first intention a coding algorithm, aims only at finding an economical representation (through sparsity), with an overcomplete dictionary. Another difference is related to complexity: NKSVD is much more costly than NMF (about 10 times more CPU time), because of the performed singular value decompositions and because the dictionary is supposed to be overcomplete. Eventually, NKSVD allows to control the degree of sparsity of the decomposition; in NMF, sparsity comes as an uncontrolled side effect.

3. THE AUTOMATIC TRANSCRIPTION SYSTEM

The audio-to-MIDI system consists of three steps: processing of a time-frequency representation, its factorization by one of the previously presented algorithms, post-processing of the factors to get a MIDI representation.

3.1. Pre-processing

The short-time Fourier transform of the signal is computed, using a 64 ms Hanning window¹ (2822 samples at 44.1 kHz) with a 50% overlap, and its module is taken to get the non-negative matrix V . There are 4096 frequency bins, negative frequencies being then discarded, leading to 2048-line matrices.

3.2. Factorization

Non-negative matrix factorization (NMF) and the non-negative variant of the K-SVD (NKSVD) are then performed iteratively on V

¹This is obviously a long window, made necessary by frequency resolution considerations; the choice of the Fourier transform is a well-known limit in this domain, and improvements are bound to find a smarter time-frequency representation, not searched here.

until convergence is reached. Initialization is either random, as proposed in the original papers, or set to the spectrum of isolated real piano notes. We implement the most common version of NMF, described in [10]; in NKSVD, the pursuit stage is performed by Matching Pursuit, with a number of retained coefficients set to 10 (*i.e.* at each frame, at most 10 atoms are active simultaneously).

3.3. Post-processing

The post-processing step consists in interpreting the factors W and H as respectively, pitched atoms and temporal activities. Each column of W is considered as a note spectrum. Its pitch is estimated by the maximum of the sum of the log-spectra (rather than the spectral product, in order to avoid numerical errors). Lines of H associated with atoms of the same pitch are summed. We then determine notes onsets and offsets by thresholding the lines of H : the atom j is turned on at time k when h_{jk} exceeds a threshold and turned off when it is below this threshold. The threshold is fixed empirically as the sum of the mean and standard deviation of the line. Velocity was not treated, and arbitrarily set to a constant value. Finally, components without identified pitch and too short events are discarded. A note event is thus described by a pitch, an onset time and a duration.

This post-processing provides a raw, yet useful transcription, for we can listen to the result (by re-synthesis from the MIDI) and compare it to a reference. As our purpose was to focus on the previous (factorization) step, we chose coarse methods for this last part, being aware of their weakness and the necessity to refine them in the future.

4. EXPERIMENTS

4.1. Database

Six pieces from the classical piano repertoire, described in [11], are used for tests. They were recorded on a Disklavier mechanically playing the MIDI file in input. Thus, we have a MIDI reference for each test piece, allowing quantitative comparison with the processed transcription. Each piece was then re-synthesized from the MIDI in order to compare the system performances on real and synthetic audio. In addition, the system was also tested on *La Campanella* by Liszt from the RWC database [12], to evaluate the system in more realistic conditions.

4.2. Parameters

Each piece, in real and synthesized versions, was then systematically analyzed with different values of the model order r . Initialization was either random or fixed to real piano spectra from the RWC database [12].

4.3. Performance evaluation

Music transcription system performance evaluation is a challenging issue, which has not yet reached a consensus in the community. Possible metrics are overviewed in [13]: frame-level metrics (precision/recall and scores aggregated from them), note-level metrics, note onset detection error rates. In order to avoid penalizing the whole system because of the coarseness of the back-end (especially temporal) and the slight misalignments in the reference (due to technical constraints of MIDI acquisition), we chose to measure the note onset detection error, with a tolerance of one window (64ms) before and after the reference onset time.

True positive (TP) is the number of correctly detected notes, false positive (FP) is the number of wrong notes detected and false negative (FN) the number of missing notes. *Precision rate* is the ratio $TP/(TP+FP)$, *recall rate* is the ratio $TP/(TP+FN)$, and *overall accuracy* is defined according to [13] as the ratio $TP/(TP+FP+FN)$.

5. RESULTS

5.1. Preliminary tests

As [8] suggests that notes have to be played alone at least once in the piece in order to get a proper separation, we analyzed this simple example:



Fig. 1. A simple example.

This excerpt was generated by a MIDI synthesizer (with a piano timbre) and analyzed by NMF, with the number of components set to $r = 4$ (4 different notes are heard). Figure 2 shows the visualization of the result: the 4 columns of W on the left, the corresponding lines of H on the right. This way, each left-right pair of graphs shows the frequency content of one component and its temporal occurrences in the analyzed piece.




Fig. 2. NMF result of the analysis of Figure 1.

This case is rather ideal: the synthetic sounds make two notes of the same pitch strictly identical, and every possible combination of 2 notes among 4 is played. However, we can also notice that no note is being played alone, yet the algorithm succeeds in separating them. This suggests that NMF can efficiently separate a polyphony even if the notes are never isolated, provided enough various combinations are heard.

5.2. Main experiments: general observations

Though the pieces are rather difficult to transcribe, performed transcriptions are good enough to easily recognize the piece when the audio signal is synthesized from the transcribed MIDI file. Most errors are typical of the difficulty of the task: octave-related pitch errors (substitution, insertion or deletion of a note having the same chroma² as the target), note detection errors (notes late or too short,

²Chroma is the modulus-12 pitch.

or spurious notes, depending on the choice of the threshold), bad representation of low-pitched notes, missing notes in chords of 4 notes or more. Performances follow the same trends when analyzing either synthetic or real sounds. This suggests that it would not be unreasonable to test transcription algorithms on databases containing mainly synthetic sounds.

Table 1 shows the mean results of the analysis of the six pieces by NMF and NKSVD, in their synthetic and real versions. r was set to 88.

Table 1. Transcription results ($r=88$).

	Algorithm	NMF		NKSVD	
	Initialization	no	yes	no	yes
Synth. audio	Precision (%)	52.4	51.4	36.7	44.9
	Recall (%)	49.3	54.4	35.9	40.2
	Accuracy (%)	34.5	36.1	22.4	25.6
Real audio	Precision (%)	51.5	45.5	47.0	47.8
	Recall (%)	55.1	56.1	38.1	41.2
	Accuracy (%)	36.4	33.6	27.2	29.2

As a reference, for similar analyzed data and identical metrics, accuracies from 30% to 60% are obtained in [13]. Transcription of the Liszt piece showed similar trends, but with lower accuracy, certainly due to the use of the pedal and the fact that the piece is played by a real musician. On this piece, a significative difference was observed between NKSVD with and without structured initialization, in favour of the former.

Original and transcription audio examples are available at <http://www.enst.fr/~nbertin/icassp2007>.

5.3. Parameters influence

Besides the previous general remarks, we can make some additional observations about the behaviors of the system with respect to different parameters and design choices.

5.3.1. Order of the model

Following the original goal of the algorithms, a natural choice for the order r of the model would be: the theoretical r for NMF (*i.e.* the number of different pitches in the MIDI reference), and a largely overestimated r for NKSVD-based transcription. We chose however the same order values for both to keep them comparable. Results are relatively stable with regard to the chosen r , as shown on figure 3. NMF is slightly more sensitive to it, which was rather unexpected.




Fig. 3. Accuracy w.r.t. the ratio between r and the number of different pitches in the reference MIDI file (denoted by rth).

At any order r , we frequently observe that several atoms have the same pitch, corresponding to the most frequent notes appearing in the piece: it is a better strategy for the algorithms to represent

more accurately notes frequently occurring, and the variability between notes of the same pitch increases the need for several atoms to represent each note. This suggests that overestimation of the order is preferable. This is confirmed by figure 3.

5.3.2. Duration of the transcribed piece

Classical, frame-by-frame approaches are indeed not sensitive to the length of the analyzed piece. On the contrary, we expect different performances of NMF and NKSVD-based transcriptions with respect to this length. Indeed, preliminary tests showed that the variety of chords (notes belonging to different chords) could help a lot to separate notes. We analyzed the first 30 seconds of each test piece separately, and compared the transcription performance with the results we get for the same 30 seconds analyzed within the whole piece. Accuracy is between 5% and 8% higher for the whole piece analysis. It is however difficult to claim without precaution that performance is all the better as the piece is long. The piece must remain somewhat homogeneous along time to benefit from notes redundancy.

5.3.3. Initialization

As both algorithms converge to local minima, the initialization of W and H may influence the results. We compared the results of a random initialization of W vs. a chosen one. Columns of W were then initialized with Fourier magnitude spectra of real piano notes. As we are not supposed to know neither the number of pitches in the piece, nor their values, we fixed $r = 88$ and initialized W with the 88 notes of the piano.

As shown on table 1, NMF and NKSVD did not show a particular sensitivity to initialization (except that convergence was reached in twice less iterations). Random and determined initialization lead to very similar results, except for NKSVD analysis of the Liszt piece (accuracy is 8% higher with non-random initialization). This observations could be explained by the match or mismatch between initialization spectra and the actual signals.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

The goal of this preliminary work was to assess the potential of two promising approaches for music transcription. The first conclusion is that blind signal decomposition methods may be an alternative to frame-by-frame approach to build efficient transcription systems. Clearly, such methods provide an interesting mid-level representation that could lead, with an efficient post-processing of the decomposition, to a very accurate transcription.

The comparison between NMF and NKSVD does not highlight a clear superiority of one of them upon the other. NMF seems preferable for its lower computational cost. NKSVD with initialization was however better on the only real music test piece which suggests further investigation on a larger database.

There are a lot of remaining questions and possible improvements. First, an efficient model order estimation method is needed. Second, the problem of complexity and computational cost remains the main handicap of NKSVD. The choice of the pursuit algorithm and of the desired degree of sparsity are other questions to raise. Both methods still need a better back-end (pitch detection in atoms and onset detection in temporal envelopes). For both, the time-frequency representation remains unsatisfactory (because of the well known resolution trade-off of Fourier transform). Eventually, the limitation of the methods to stable spectral profiles (along one note)

is a strong constraint, unrealistic in music (for instance in notes played *vibrato*). This has to be overtaken, for instance by taking into account the temporal evolution of the note spectrum.

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research leading to this paper was supported by the ACI "Masse de données" *Music Discover*, and by the European Commission under contract FP6-027026, Knowledge Space of semantic inference for automatic annotation and retrieval of multimedia content - K-SPACE. The authors also wish to thank Dr. Juan Bello and Dr. Laurent Daudet for their sharing audio and MIDI data.

8. REFERENCES

- [1] A.P. Klapuri, "Automatic transcription of music," in *Proceedings of the Stockholm Music Acoustics Conference (SMAC)*, Aug. 2003, vol. II, pp. 587–590.
- [2] J. Bello, G. Monti, and M. Sandler, "Techniques for automatic music transcription," in *Proceedings of International Conference on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR'00)*, Oct. 2000.
- [3] M.D. Plumbley, S.A. Abdallah, J.P. Bello, M.E. Davies, G. Monti, and M.B. Sandler, "Automatic music transcription and audio source separation," *Cybernetics and Systems*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 603–627, Sept. 2002.
- [4] S.A. Abdallah and M.D. Plumbley, "Unsupervised analysis of polyphonic music using sparse coding," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, vol. 17, pp. 179–196, Jan. 2006.
- [5] D.D. Lee and H.S. Seung, "Learning the parts of objects by non-negative matrix factorization," *Nature*, vol. 401, pp. 788–791, Oct. 1999.
- [6] J.F. Cardoso, "Blind signal separation : statistical principles," in *Proc. IEEE. Special issue on blind source separation*, 1998, vol. 9, pp. 2009–2025.
- [7] M.D. Plumbley, "Algorithms for nonnegative independent component analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 534–543, 2003.
- [8] P. Smaragdis and J.C. Brown, "Non-negative matrix factorization for polyphonic music transcription," in *IEEE Workshop on Applications of Signal Processing to Audio and Acoustics (WASPAA'03)*, Oct. 2003, pp. 177–180.
- [9] M. Aharon, M. Elad, and A. Bruckstein, "K-SVD and its non-negative variant for dictionary design," in *Proceedings of the SPIE conference wavelets*, July 2005, vol. 5914, p. 591411.
- [10] D.D. Lee and H.S. Seung, "Algorithms for non-negative matrix factorization," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 13, pp. 556–562, 2001.
- [11] J.P. Bello, L. Daudet, and M.B. Sandler, "Automatic piano transcription using frequency and time-domain information," *IEEE Transactions on Speech and Audio Processing*, Accepted for publication, 2006.
- [12] M. Goto, H. Hashiguchi, T. Nishimura, and R. Oka, "RWC music database: Popular, classical, and jazz music databases," in *Proc. of the 3rd International Conference on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR 2002)*, October 2002, pp. 287–288.
- [13] G.E. Poliner and D.P.W. Ellis, "A discriminative model for polyphonic piano transcription," *Eurasip Journal of Applied Signal Processing (special issue on Music Signal Processing)*, 2006, to appear.