

RESEARCH ARTICLE

LOAF-M2L: Joint Learning of Wording and Formatting for Singable Melody-to-Lyric Generation

Longshen Ou, Xichu Ma, and Ye Wang^a

School of Computing, National University of Singapore, 21 Lower Kent Ridge Road, Singapore

ARTICLE HISTORY

Compiled July 22, 2024

ABSTRACT

Despite previous efforts in melody-to-lyric generation research, there is still a significant singability gap between lyrics written by machines and human lyricists. This paper bridges the singability gap with a novel approach to generating singable lyrics by jointly Learning wOrding And Formatting during Melody-to-Lyric training (LOAF-M2L). After general-domain pretraining, our model acquires length awareness using unsupervised learning from a large text-only lyric corpus. Then, we introduce a new objective informed by musicological research on the relationship between melody and lyrics during melody-to-lyric supervised training, which enables the model to learn the fine-grained format requirements of the melody. Our model achieves 3.75% and 21.44% absolute accuracy gains in the outputs' number-of-line and syllable-per-line requirements compared to naive fine-tuning, without sacrificing text fluency. Furthermore, our model demonstrates a 42.15% and 74.18% relative improvement in overall quality in the subjective evaluation, compared to two leading melody-to-lyric generation models, highlighting the significance of formatting learning in lyric generation.¹

KEYWORDS

Lyric generation; lyric singability; melody-to-lyric generation; melody-lyric compatibility; sequence-to-sequence model; conditional text generation; prompt-based control; automatic composing

1. Introduction

Integrating natural language processing in music has seen expansive applications (Sergio Oramas & Serra, 2018). Recently, automatic lyric generation has garnered increasing attention from academic and industrial sectors. In particular, the melody-to-lyric generation (M2L) task aims to produce lyrics that harmonize with the song, making the outcome performable and streamlining the music creation process. An efficient automated system would considerably decrease music creation and production costs (N. Liu et al., 2022).

Lyrics are crafted to be sung. *The ability to be sung with its melody*, which we term as *singability* in this paper, is an essential property for lyrics. While there is no universal consensus on the definition of singability, we believe the definition adopted here

CONTACT Ye Wang Email: wangye@comp.nus.edu.sg

¹Code available at <https://github.com/Sonata165/BART-M2L>




Figure 1. Caption: Comparative analysis of original lyrics with versions generated by various models, all using the same melody for input.

Figure 1. Alt Text: The top row shows the original lyrics, noted for their optimal singability. Rows 2 to 4 feature lyrics produced by SongMASS, AI-Lyricist, and ChatGPT, respectively, highlighting issues like fragmented sentences, syllable-note mismatches, and inappropriate musical emphasis on less meaningful words, all detrimental to singability. The final row presents lyrics from our system, devoid of the aforementioned problems and demonstrating a high degree of singability.

represents a common intersection and is likely to be broadly accepted. Inspired by (Low, 2003), we believe that creating highly singable lyrics involves efforts from both internal and external aspects: (1) clarity in pronunciation, which means adopting a lyrical language style and avoiding complex consonant clusters and undersized vowels, and (2) compatibility with the melody, ensuring words maintain natural tones when sung and emphasizing crucial words musically. With the help of pre-trained language models, we can handle the first requirement by finetuning them with a small amount of lyric text to adjust them to a lyrical output style. However, ensuring the second requirement—*music-lyric compatibility*—is more challenging. This paper delves into enhancing this compatibility of M2L models without considering other content constraints like keywords or emotions.

Without carefully handling the relationship between the melody and lyrics, lyrics that look good on paper will likely be awkward when sung. For example, Fig. 1 shows the original and generated lyrics for a phrase in the song *Free as a Bird*. Notable disparities exist between the original (1st row) and generated lyrics (rows 2–4) from SongMASS (Sheng et al., 2021), AI-Lyricist (Ma, Wang, Kan, & Lee, 2021), and GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023). SongMASS’s output has evident grammatical flaws. While the AI-Lyricist and the ChatGPT offer more fluent outputs, they still grapple with aligning the lyrics to the melody. For lyrics in the red boxes, the performer has to extend the duration of the words to align them with musical notes, while for lyrics in the purple boxes, musical notes have to be broken into pieces to align with the syllables in the text. In both cases, the rhythm pattern will be changed, deviating from the music composer’s intention. Further, in the orange boxes, unimportant words get undue emphasis due to their alignment with longer musical notes, resulting in a jarring effect when sung. Generally, these systems fall short of producing singable lyrics that align with melodies.

In the musical landscape, the fourth-row lyric stands out from the prior results in various capacities. This lyric is not just more fluent than the output from SongMASS due to its grammatical accuracy and continuity, but it also aligns well with the melody. A direct correlation between the number of syllables and musical notes is evident, and their synchronization produces a natural pairing. A case in point is the word ‘alright’, where the emphasis on the second syllable corresponds with the note of the longest duration in its segment, which creates a perfect coupling and contributes to singability. These properties make it a substantially more performable version of lyrics.

This paper proposes an innovative methodology to generate singable lyrics from melodies, aiming to bridge the quality disparities above. Our contributions are:

- We underscore the unique demands of M2L in contrast to lyric-style text generation. Melodies inherently carry specific constraints regarding text structure, phonology, and syntax that guide lyric creation. Our experiments demonstrate that overlooking these specifications can produce grammatically correct lyrics that might not mesh well with the melody. Additionally, we are the first to use computable metrics to quantize the degree of fine-level compatibility between melody and lyrics.
- We devise a hybrid training strategy for our M2L model, blending both unsupervised and supervised learning stages. We found that the sparsity of paired data limits the model’s length awareness ability, yet this can be effectively compensated through self-supervised training with a focus on length-conditioned text generation. Further, the supervised M2L training afterward helps the model identify and interpret the constraints imposed by a given melody. Combining the two stages enables the model to generate more singable lyrics.
- We introduce a fresh training objective during the supervised phase, crafted to maximize the benefit of limited paired data. This approach leverages music–lyric pairs, decoding the implicit formatting guidelines inherent in melodies. This supplementary supervision allows our model to discern and apply the links between melodies and their corresponding constraints, thereby enhancing condition-aware generation.
- Our model’s effectiveness is validated through both objective metrics and subjective evaluations. It crafts singable lyrics with an elevated level of music–lyric compatibility, surpassing earlier M2L models in text quality and alignment with music. Furthermore, it outperforms its unsupervised-learning-only counterparts regarding fluency, compatibility, and overall quality.

2. Related Work

2.1. Relationship between melody and lyrics

A defining feature that sets the M2L model apart from text-only lyric generation models is the conditions that guide its generation. For M2L, these constraints stem directly from the melody, influencing text structure, phonology, and syntax. While some guidelines can be flexible, human-composed lyrics generally adhere to them. Below are some key considerations.

Central to the constraints presented by a melody is the number of syllables per line. Essentially, lyrics need to be contained within a specific length range (Noske & Benton, 1988). Overloading the lyrics with syllables necessitates subdividing notes for each syllable, whereas fewer syllables demand extending some to match multiple notes. Both situations disrupt rhythm, making them unfavorable. Consequently, many studies have focused on incorporating number-of-syllable requirements into the lyric generation process (Guo et al., 2022a; Lee, Fang, & Ma, 2019; P. Li, Zhang, Liu, & Shi, 2020; N. Liu et al., 2022; Ma et al., 2021).

Stressed syllable placement is also pivotal, especially in stress-timed languages like English (Low, 2003). To optimize singability, lyricists often align stressed syllables in the lyrics with the song’s pronounced notes. Recognizing this, several studies have explored methods to govern the positioning of stressed syllables to achieve rhythmic harmony (Ghazvininejad, Choi, & Knight, 2018; Xue et al., 2021).

Achieving synchronicity between melody and lyrics is not just about syllable count

and stress. As Nichols, Morris, Basu, and Raphael (2009) notes: (1) Syllable stress is tightly linked with metric position, melodic peaks, and note length. (2) Stopwords are strongly associated with metric position and melodic peaks. (3) Vowel duration often correlates with note length. These observations unveil a nuanced, intrinsic connection between melodies and lyrics.

Moreover, other factors come into play. For example, in tonal languages, there is an interaction between character tone and melody pitch (Guo et al., 2022b; X. Zhang & Cross, 2021). In pop music, bright vowels tend to occupy weak beat positions (Amirante & Rovetti, 2021). For this paper, we focus on English and do not delve into specific genres or tonal languages.

The complexities do not end here. An essential observation is that the relationship is not strictly one-to-one; theoretically, an infinite number of melodies could fit a particular lyric, with the actual song melody being just one instance. Such loosely coupled associations between melodies and lyrics lead to data sparsity challenges. Given the limited melody–lyric parallel data, it can be challenging for a sequence-to-sequence model to accurately capture these seemingly loosely coupled properties between melody and lyrics. This issue urges us to consider whether there is a way to incorporate these inductive biases into the training process as guidance.

2.2. *Melody-to-Lyric Generation*

The challenge of melody-to-lyric (M2L) generation has seen various intriguing advancements. Watanabe et al. (2018) constructed a melody-conditioned lyric language model in Japanese using melody–lyric aligned data; Lee et al. (2019) tried to solve both M2L and its counterpart, lyric-to-melody generation (L2M) problem with Long Short-Term Memory models; Chen and Lerch (2020) developed a Seq-GAN-based model with theme and melody as conditions; Ma et al. (2021) added length, music structure, and keyword constraints to a Seq-GAN model; Sheng et al. (2021) employed a unified model to solve M2L and L2M problems concurrently and show the effectiveness of unsupervised masked pretraining; Qian, Shi, Guo, Wu, and Jin (2022) introduced a reconstruction loss in training the dual M2L and L2M model; J. Li et al. (2022) incorporated additional music-related information as input, such as beat and tempo.

The emergence of unsupervised training for M2L models has provided innovative approaches (Qian et al., 2023; Tian et al., 2023). Specifically, Tian et al. (2023) introduced an effective content control method, achieved by first planning keywords from the song’s theme and then expanding keywords to a full line of lyrics. As for format control of the generated lyrics, these works follow the below methodology: they first convert melody in music into some *rhythm pattern*, which describes mainly the number-of-syllable requirement from the melody, and the generation model can be aware of this length requirement during generation. Such methodology again points out the importance of length condition in lyric generation and hints that length awareness can be gained without the help of paired data.

However, several gaps persist. Many models fall short of ensuring singability. As will be discussed in §5.2, leading M2L models often fail to align melody notes with lyric syllables satisfactorily (Ma et al., 2021; Sheng et al., 2021). While supervisory trained models could theoretically grasp the intricate correspondence between melody and lyrics, limited paired data hampers this. Furthermore, while unsupervised techniques can train models to recognize syllable counts, they sometimes oversimplify the melody’s

demands. The interplay between syllable stress and melody, among other intricate compatibility requirements, has often been overlooked.

Additionally, while several innovative training strategies exist, an effective approach to help models discern the melody–lyric relationship in sparse data scenarios remains elusive. Although Qian et al. (2022) proposed a reconstruction loss method, its general applicability and diversity warrant further examination. After all, different melodies might enforce similar lyric constraints but not necessarily share resemblances.

2.3. Generate Lyrics with Other Inputs

Beyond M2L, other lyric generation models operate with diverse inputs and constraints. Some consider pre-defined lengths (P. Li et al., 2020; N. Liu et al., 2022; Wu, Du, Guo, & Fujita, 2019), stress patterns (Barbieri, Pachet, Roy, & Degli Esposti, 2012; Xue et al., 2021), and rhyme schemes (Barbieri et al., 2012; P. Li et al., 2020; Langan, 2021; N. Liu et al., 2022; R. Zhang et al., 2022). Others integrate keywords (Nikolov, Malmi, Northcutt, & Parisi, 2020), melody emotions (Huang & You, 2021), styles (Chang, Hung, & Lin, 2021; Langan, 2021), structural patterns (Lu, Wang, Zhuang, Wang, & Xiao, 2019), textual passages (L. Zhang, Zhang, Mao, & Chang, 2022), and even musical accompaniments (Melistas, Giannakopoulos, & Paraskevopoulos, 2021; Watanabe & Goto, 2021). Advanced outputs, like songs with structural tags (Potash, Romanov, & Rumshisky, 2015) or lyrics with hidden messages (Tong, Liu, Wang, & Xin, 2019), have also been explored.

However, there are unresolved challenges in the current approaches. Firstly, the inclusion of format constraints that contribute to music–lyric compatibility is insufficiently comprehensive. Specifically, fine-grained compatibility requirements, such as word importance and vowel duration, are not considered in previous works. Additionally, the current explicit stress pattern control mechanism is less than ideal. It mandates users to specify a rhythmic pattern, indicating which syllables should be stressed. However, in scenarios where content conditions are coupled with predefined output length, there are only limited sentences to convey the intended meaning, leading to only limited numbers of suitable prompts, unknown to the user, that can lead to the output with desired content and format conditions. As a result, the stress patterns provided by the user are very likely to differ from the actual distribution of syllable stress positions in English,² which may lead to results that miss either naturalness or desired properties. Furthermore, the challenge of deciphering syllable stress requirements from the melody remains. For instance, it is not always necessary for a long note to coincide with a stressed syllable. As evidenced in Section 5.1, only 82.45% of long notes align with stressed syllables from our corpus of human-created lyrics. Making an absolute assumption in this regard can render the outputs feel rigid.

2.4. Sequence-to-Sequence Denoising Pretraining

Given the lack of paired melody–lyric domain-specific data, a foundational model is crucial to retain generation quality. Our examination pinpoints large-scale denoising sequence-to-sequence pretraining (Lewis et al., 2020) as an apt choice. The approach has been validated in text generation domains, such as summarization (Akiyama, Tamura, & Ninomiya, 2021) and translation (Y. Liu et al., 2020; Ou, Ma, Kan, & Wang, 2023; Tang et al., 2020). Furthermore, employing transfer learning from general

²An extreme example: the user requires all syllables in the output to be weak syllables.

to specific domains has consistently enhanced performance in data-limited scenarios (Gu, Ou, Ong, & Wang, 2022; Ou, Gu, & Wang, 2022).

Due to the limited in-domain data, a robust foundational model is essential for maintaining the generation quality. Our investigations identified large-scale denoising sequence-to-sequence pretraining (Lewis et al., 2020) as highly suitable for our problem context. This approach has proven its efficacy in text generation tasks, such as summarization (Akiyama et al., 2021) and translation (Y. Liu et al., 2020; Ou et al., 2023; Tang et al., 2020). Moreover, transfer learning of models trained with general-domain data to a domain-specific task is a widely adopted strategy for performance improvement with limited data, such as (Gu et al., 2022; Ou et al., 2022).

2.5. Prompt-Based Methods

The paradigm of using prompt-based methods is gaining traction in NLP research (P. Liu et al., 2023). For conditional text generation tasks, leveraging prompts during fine-tuning has been shown to effectively dictate output attributes (Grangier & Auli, 2018; Y. Liu, Dou, & Liu, 2021) and ensure the inclusion of specific lexicons (Chousa & Morishita, 2021; Susanto, Chollampatt, & Tan, 2020; Wang, Tan, & Liu, 2022). Additionally, this method offers control over other dimensions like output length (Lakew, Di Gangi, & Federico, 2019) and the initial word of the output (Y. Li, Yin, Li, & Zhang, 2022). Notably, in lyric generation, prompt-based techniques have been validated for controlling elements such as syllable count, stress patterns, and rhyme schemes (P. Li et al., 2020; N. Liu et al., 2022; Ma et al., 2021; Ormazabal, Artetxe, Agirrezabal, Soroa, & Agirre, 2022; Xue et al., 2021). Given these advantages, we posit that prompt-based methods present a viable approach for length control in our specific context.

3. Methodology

We focus on improving the compatibility between lyrics and melody to bridge the singability gap. We initiate this by implementing length control at the paragraph level via a prompt-based approach. Subsequent steps involve aligning syllable stress, word importance, and vowel length by introducing specialized training objectives.

3.1. Length: the Basic Requirement for Compatibility

Achieving harmony between lyrics and melody fundamentally depends on synchronizing their lengths. When generating at the paragraph level, ‘length’ is twofold: the number of lines in a lyric paragraph should match the number of melody phrases, and each lyric line’s syllable count should correspond to the phrase’s musical note count.

In our approach, lyric length is strictly controlled, ensuring that each sentence in the generated lyrics exactly meets the desired syllable count. This design draws from prior format control attempts in NLP and adheres to the common practice. This strict control simplifies alignment between lyrics and musical notes, streamlining the process for more nuanced controls.

3.1.1. Prompt-Based Control

To control length during lyric generation, we employ a prompt-based fine-tuning approach. We devise a list of specialized tokens for each output paragraph, each signifying the requisite number of syllables for a given line. These tokens, in the format `<len_i>`, dictate the syllable count, while the list’s length corresponds to the number of lines. With the help of the CMU pronunciation dictionary (Carnegie Mellon University, 2022), we can get the mapping between words and their syllable counts. In addition, we used an auxiliary special token `` to represent sentence breaks. During training, these length tokens are integrated as supplementary input to enhance the model’s awareness of length constraints.

Our foundational model, chosen for its pre-training on large general domain corpus, undergoes further fine-tuning to heighten its sensitivity to length. Given BART’s (Lewis et al., 2020) proficiency in sequence-to-sequence text generation, it was selected for our task. We expanded the BART model’s original vocabulary to incorporate length prompt tokens into our model. This required enlarging both the tokenizer’s vocabulary and the BART model’s embedding layer dimension. Consequently, our length tokens were transformed into vectors, aligning with the BART model’s hidden dimension. During the M2L supervised training, the list of length prompts is concatenated with the musical note information, hinting at the output length. In this way, we expect the length awareness can be gained together with M2L training.

3.1.2. Length-Aware Unsupervised Training

Our experiment found that the quantity of our paired music-lyric data is insufficient to support the model in learning length awareness. We attempt to leverage large-scale text-only lyric data, which offers a more accessible augmentation to paired datasets. We incorporated an additional training phase before the supervised M2L training, dedicated to fostering length awareness using this text-only data prior to the supervised M2L training with the paired dataset. This approach conferred dual benefits. It not only allows the model to understand the meaning of length tokens better, but also better adapt the output style to the lyric domain.

We integrate a masking approach in this phase by drawing inspiration from BART’s pre-training methodology. As in Figure 2, arbitrarily selected segments of the input sequence are concealed using a special token, posing the challenge for the model to reconstruct the masked portion. Meanwhile, the previously discussed length tokens are placed at the beginning of the masked input. This arrangement instructs the model on the anticipated sentence length throughout the generation process.

3.2. Finer-Level Compatibility

3.2.1. Overall Principle

Beyond the foundational requisites for compatibility, our focus shifts toward the nuanced interplay between lyrics and melody. Drawing inspiration from insights presented by Nichols et al. (2009), our methodological design embraces two guiding principles: (1) We aspire to synchronize important musical notes with important syllables. The prominence of notes arises from their metric position, duration, and melodic peak. Concurrently, syllabic importance stems from stress levels and the overall significance of the encompassing word. (2) We aim to align longer musical notes with longer vowels. These foundational principles have informed both our methodological approach and




Figure 2. Caption: Illustration of the unsupervised training for length-awareness. The \otimes refers to concatenation.

Figure 2. Alt Text: Syllable counts per sentence, derived using the CMU dictionary, and partially masked lyrics, are concatenated into a single input sequence. This sequence is fed into our Transformer-based encoder-decoder model, which is trained to reconstruct the original, uncorrupted lyrics utilizing the provided sentence lengths and corrupted text.

compatibility metrics.

3.2.2. Joint Learning of Output Formatting

While unsupervised learning proves potent for length-awareness, supervised learning is more apt for this segment. Given the intricate and fluid rules governing the link between lyrics and melody, which resist easy linguistic or statistical descriptions, we entrust the model with autonomous learning. For achieving finer compatibility, we opt for an end-to-end melody-to-lyric fine-tuning approach for the general-domain model, after length-aware unsupervised learning.

However, the constraints posed by data limitations and sparsity challenge the model’s ability to discern the lyric-melody relationship via supervised learning. As elaborated in Section 5.1, a supervised training phase confined to a language model training objective and paired data does not markedly amplify the compatibility between lyrics and melody in the outputs, compared with a solely unsupervised learning approach.

To foster finer compatibility, we consider embedding the inductive biases outlined earlier into our model. Recognizing the pivotal roles played by the placement of stressed syllables, vital words, and varied vowel lengths in music-lyric compatibility, our model is devised to predict the lyrical pattern necessitated by the input melody explicitly. During M2L training, it then crafts outputs based on these discerned patterns. Specifically, we incorporate three position-wise linear classifiers to predict the syllable stress s , word significance i , and vowel category v . Each classifier processes the hidden representation h of the note sequence from the BART encoder to project the requisite properties for each note, aligning with the syllable position in the output. Our hypothesis posits that by actively learning these formatting nuances, the model’s encoder will internalize formatting information inside h , facilitating the decoder in crafting text in the desired format.

In practice, each classification task is a 3-class classification. The distinct attributes of each class are detailed in Table 1. Despite the absence of labels in the original

Table 1. Labels for classification tasks.

Classification Task	Label	Meaning
Syllable stress	0	Unstressed syllables
	1	Syllables with primary stress
	2	Syllables with secondary stress
Word importance level	0	Stop words
	1	Non-stop words with lower 50% TF-IDF scores
	2	Non-stop words with higher 50% TF-IDF scores
Vowel type	0	Short vowels
	1	Long vowels
	2	Diphthongs

paired dataset used in our experiment, these attributes can be obtained from the target-side textual data, employing pronunciation dictionaries combined with the TF-IDF algorithm.

These classifiers are simultaneously trained with the M2L task, with cross-entropy loss as the training objective. The resulting overall loss function of the model becomes:

$$L = \text{CE}(\mathbf{y}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}) + \frac{1}{|\mathbf{y}|} \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{y}|} [\text{CE}(s_j, \hat{s}_j) + \text{CE}(i_j, \hat{i}_j) + \text{CE}(v_j, \hat{v}_j)], \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{y} represents lyrics; s_j , i_j , and v_j represent syllable stress, word importance, and vowel length, respectively, of the j -th syllable position; letters with and without hats represent predictions and ground truth, respectively; and CE refers to cross-entropy loss.

3.2.3. Handling Music Input

Despite the valuable information within our M2L training dataset, it lacks essential attributes such as tempo and quantized note durations. Instead, notes are represented as sequences of three attributes: onset, offset, and pitch, with each value measured in seconds. This representation results in a sparse distribution of time-related attributes, potentially compromising the model’s learning efficacy. To address this, quantizing the time-related inputs and normalizing them with the tempo is crucial.

To handle melody inputs, we convert the detailed melody information into a sequence of note embeddings. First, we quantize pitches to their nearest MIDI note number, ranging from 1 to 128. For the time-related attributes of notes, we implement the following quantization procedure. Within each paragraph, we select the duration of the shortest note as the reference unit duration, denoted as dur_u . Subsequently, all time-related variables are divided by dur_u , multiplied by 10, and rounded down. Furthermore, each onset time is adjusted by subtracting the time of the first onset within the paragraph. Beyond note duration, we introduce an additional property, rest_j , to




Figure 3. Caption: Illustration of the supervised M2L training with paired melody–lyric data. The \oplus refers to addition; the \otimes refers to concatenation; h : hidden representation of the input sequence.

Figure 3. Alt Text: Quantized note elements are transformed into vector representations and summed together to create a single sequence containing all note information. This sequence is concatenated with a sequence of encoded length prompts, constituting our model’s input sequence. Our model is designed to produce lyrics that meet these specific input criteria. Meanwhile, three classification heads receive the encoder’s output to syllable stress, word importance, and vowel length for each syllable position.

represent the duration of the pause preceding the j -th note.

$$\text{dur}_u^{(s)} = \min_{1 \leq j \leq |y|} \left\{ \text{off}_j^{(s)} - \text{on}_j^{(s)} \right\} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{on}_j^{(q)} = \min \left(\left\lceil 10 \cdot \frac{\text{on}_j^{(s)} - \text{on}_1^{(s)}}{\text{dur}_u^{(s)}} \right\rceil, \text{vocab}_{\text{on}} \right), \quad \forall j \in [1, |y|], \quad (3)$$

$$\text{dur}_j^{(q)} = \min \left(\left\lceil 10 \cdot \frac{\text{off}_j^{(s)} - \text{on}_j^{(s)}}{\text{dur}_u^{(s)}} \right\rceil, \text{vocab}_{\text{dur}} \right), \quad \forall j \in [1, |y|], \quad (4)$$

$$\text{rest}_j^{(q)} = \begin{cases} \text{inf}, & j = 1 \\ \min \left(\left\lceil 10 \cdot \frac{\text{on}_j^{(s)} - \text{off}_{j-1}^{(s)}}{\text{dur}_u^{(s)}} \right\rceil, \text{vocab}_{\text{rest}} \right), & 2 \leq j \leq |y| \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where on_j , off_j , and dur_j refer to the onset, offset and duration of j -th note in the melody; symbols with a ‘(s)’ superscript are in seconds, while those with a ‘(q)’ superscript represent quantized variables used as model inputs.

We allocate three distinct token sets representing different onsets, durations, and rest intervals. Their sizes are dictated by vocab_{on} , $\text{vocab}_{\text{dur}}$, and $\text{vocab}_{\text{rest}}$, which in our experiments, were determined to be 640, 640, and 240, respectively. Separate embedding layers transform these note element tokens into distinct embedding vectors. These vectors are subsequently summed into a single note embedding sequence. Consistent with the BART model’s hidden dimensions, embeddings of each individual note element and compound note representation possess identical dimensions as BART.

3.3. System Overview

Our model’s architecture is illustrated in Fig. 3. The design is rooted in the Transformer encoder-decoder paradigm. Input originates from two sources: length prompts, which signify the syllable count in each paragraph line, and note details, encompassing attributes such as onset, duration, pitch, and rest intervals preceding notes. Each note attribute is fed to a distinct embedding layer, and the resulting embeddings are then added together to form the note embedding vector. Finally, we concatenate

Table 2. Dataset size of different splits.

		Train	Validation	Test	Total
Text-only	#paragraphs	519,616	1,993	1,996	523,605
	#lines	7,046,894	26,684	27,109	7,100,687
Paired	#paragraphs	47,222	1,989	1,989	51,200
	#lines	279,682	11,667	11,430	302,779

the length prompt and note embedding sequences together to form the final input sequence for our model.

Taken together, these innovations form our final melody-to-lyric generation model, which generates the singable lyrics in the 4th line in Fig. 1. More case studies are featured in §5.3.

4. Experiments

4.1. Dataset

Previous studies frequently relied on the dataset from Yu, Srivastava, and Canales (2021), tailored for the *L2M* task. Upon closer inspection of this dataset, we identified several issues. There were many instances of misaligned lyrics and melodies, as well as word omissions in the lyrics. Given these discrepancies, the suitability of this dataset for producing high-quality, aligned lyrics output becomes sub-optimal.

Opting for higher data quality and alignment, we turned to DALI v2 (Meseguer-Brocal, Cohen-Hadria, & Peeters, 2020). This paired dataset offers higher-quality lyric text and alignment. For the text-only lyric corpus, we sourced a genre classification dataset available on Kaggle.³ It is worth noting that this text-only dataset substantially larger than the paired melody-lyric dataset.

We performed text normalization on the data, including removing non-English pieces, converting all letters to lowercase, and removing special symbols and blank lines. Then, deduplication was conducted, removing repeated paragraphs (e.g., repeated chorus) from both text-only and paired datasets. We split both datasets into training/validation/testing sets, ensuring no paragraph overlap across the splits. The dataset statistics of each split are presented in Table 2. For additional data processing, the CMU Pronunciation Dictionary⁴ and the NLTK (Loper & Bird, 2002) were employed to derive the classification labels, as highlighted in Section 3.2.2.

4.2. Model Details

We chose BART-base⁵ (Lewis et al., 2020) as the foundation model, which has been pre-trained on general-domain texts. Unsupervised length-aware training and supervised M2L training are conducted sequentially.

During our experiments, we set the batch size to the largest possible value that could fit into an NVIDIA A5000 GPU (24G), which was 48 for both text-only and paired data training. We conducted a grid search to determine the ideal learning rate, which yielded $2e-4$ for text-only training and $1e-4$ for paired data training. The learning rate

³<https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/mateibejan/multilingual-lyrics-for-genre-classification>

⁴<http://www.speech.cs.cmu.edu/cgi-bin/cmudict>

⁵<https://huggingface.co/facebook/bart-base>

was scheduled with linear decay in text-only training. AdamW (Loshchilov & Hutter, 2019) was used as the optimizer. Warm-up steps were designated 2500 for text-only training and 200 for paired data training. We trained the model on text-only and paired corpora for 15 and 10 epochs, respectively, and selected the best checkpoint based on validation loss. Dropout and label smoothing were not used during training.

4.3. Evaluation

4.3.1. Comparative Models

We evaluate our model using both objective and subjective evaluation, and the original lyrics serve as the gold standard in both assessments.

For the objective evaluation, we assess the quality of the text and its compatibility with music, covering both coarse and fine levels. Our model is compared against several of its ablated versions, which are:

- (1) **Baseline**: A BART-base model finetuned solely with paired M2L data. No length prompt.
- (2) **Adapted baseline**: The baseline with length-unaware in-domain pretraining.
- (3) **Ours**: The proposed model containing length-aware unsupervised training, supervised training, and additional classification objectives.
- (4) **Single-task**: A model with length-aware unsupervised and supervised training.
- (5) **Unsupervised-only**: A Model trained to generate lyrics from only length prompt.
- (6) **Supervised-only**: The baseline with additional length prompt in M2L training.

These ablated variants are the proposed model absent of one or more components yet trained with the same dataset(s). This approach ensures a fair comparison that aid in understanding how our proposed training procedures and objectives contribute to performance improvement.

For the comparison with leading lyric generation systems—SongMASS (Sheng et al., 2021) and AI-lyricist (Ma et al., 2021)—we believe that a human evaluation would provide a more convincing assessment of comprehensive quality. Moreover, our preliminary observations have indicated sub-optimal performance by SongMASS and AI-lyricist with regards to compatibility scores. Consequently, these systems were excluded from the objective evaluation that focuses on music—lyric compatibility

4.3.2. Objective Metrics

For assessing the text quality of generated lyrics, we calculate the perplexity of each model on the test set. Given that we do not impose content constraints on the generated lyrics, discrepancies between outputs and original lyrics can be expected. Consequently, the BLEU score is not adopted as a metric in our problem setting.

4.3.2.1. Syllable Alignment. An integral aspect of our assessment is determining the syllable alignment between lyrics and melodies. We quantify this alignment by:

- (1) **#Line**: The paragraph-level accuracy of the line count, i.e., the ratio of output paragraphs that meet the desired line count requirement. This metric gauges the adherence to the required number of sentences within paragraphs.
- (2) **Line len**: The average accuracy of the syllable count per line. This metric mea-

sures the effectiveness of sentence length control.

4.3.2.2. Fine-Grained Compatibility. We utilize sentence-level metrics to evaluate music–lyric compatibility at a granular level. Central to these metrics is the concept of ‘coexistence probability’, which we define as follows.

Let A and B be a note property and a syllable property, respectively. We define the coexistence probability of note property A and syllable property B as:

$$\Pr(A-B) = \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{\{(x,y)||x|=|y|\}} \Pr(A-B; x, y), \quad (6)$$

$$\Pr(A-B; x, y) = \frac{\text{JointCount}(A, B; x, y)}{\text{Count}(A; x)}, \quad (7)$$

where:

- (x, y) is a paired input note sequence and output text sequence.
- $\text{Count}(A; x)$ counts occurrences of note x_i with property A .
- $\text{JointCount}(A, B; x, y)$ counts occurrences of aligned pairs of musical note x_i and lyric syllable y_i , where x_i has property A and y_i has property B .
- $|X|$ is the size of the testing set.

We apply the Equation 6 to the following five music–lyric property pairs (A, B) , as our fine-level music–lyric compatibility measures:

- (1) **Dur-str**: Long notes (notes with top 50% duration), stressed syllable (either primary stress or secondary stress)
- (2) **Peak-str**: Melody peak (notes with higher pitches than both preceding and following notes), stressed syllable
- (3) **Dur-imp**: Long note, important words (non-stop words)
- (4) **Peak-imp**: Melody peak, important words
- (5) **Dur-vow**: Long note, long vowels (either long vowels or diphthongs)

Because previous works (Nichols et al., 2009) have shown the close relationship between those property pairs, we assume that higher scores on those metrics indicate higher chances of note-syllable property coexistence and, hence, a higher degree of music–lyric compatibility.

4.3.3. Subjective Evaluation

Objective metrics may not capture the entirety of lyric quality. For instance, enhanced compatibility could occasionally result in a compromise on textual fluidity. However, neither objective metrics nor their collective average can accurately convey the model’s balance between these factors and the subsequent overall quality. This underscores the necessity for human evaluation.

We recruited ten university students proficient in amateur-level music performance or lyric composition. Each participant assigned a 5-point score to each lyric version, and the mean score of the same paragraph from different participants represented the final rating for that lyric paragraph. The assessment encompassed three facets:

- (1) **Fluency**: Evaluating grammatical correctness and semantic coherence.
- (2) **Music–Lyric Compatibility**: Gauging the unity between the lyric and the melody, and the consequent ease of singing.

Table 3. The main result of objective evaluation. The best results are **bolded**.

No.	Model	PPL	#Line	Line len	Dur-str	Peak-str	Dur-imp	Peak-imp	Dur-vow
-	Original lyrics	-	100.00	100.00	82.45	66.45	72.29	52.73	59.99
1	Baseline	10.84	95.40	75.67	64.61	47.96	45.94	30.30	50.10
2	Adapted baseline	10.98	14.28	13.15	10.44	8.88	8.26	5.08	7.20
3	Ours	7.93	99.15	97.11	77.78	61.36	54.33	40.04	55.96
4	Single-task	7.96	99.65	97.42	75.15	59.91	54.44	41.49	53.75
5	Unsupervised-only	7.99	99.35	97.15	75.25	58.99	54.78	41.18	54.06
6	Supervised-only	11.62	95.10	70.67	57.86	42.33	38.97	26.74	43.28

- (3) **Overall Quality:** A holistic assessment factoring in both text quality and its harmony with the music, encapsulating the ultimate aspiration of singable lyric generation.

Evaluations were performed at the paragraph level. From the Yu et al. (2021) dataset, we randomly selected ten paragraphs from six songs for the assessment. This exercise posed an out-of-domain test for our model. Each evaluator was presented with seven versions (one original and six generated) of each paragraph for rating. Variations of the same paragraph, including multiple generated versions and the original lyrics, were displayed concurrently for comparison. Reviewers were not informed of the origins of each version. For a comprehensive evaluation, we provided participants with the music sheet containing melody lyrics with melody, together with the corresponding singing audio. This audio incorporated a singing voice synthesized to match the original melody and the generated lyrics, mixed with the original musical accompaniments. The vocal component was synthesized using ACE Studio,⁶ while the background tracks were extracted via the source separation model, Demucs v3 mdx_extra (Défossez, 2021).

5. Results

5.1. Main Results

Table 3 shows the performance comparison on objective metrics. Upon analysis, several key observations supporting our claims emerge:

Adding constraints does not negatively impact text quality. We first compare the perplexity, which reflects the text fluency of these models. Our model (No. 3) achieves the lowest perplexity among all ablation variants. Contrary to the results from Sheng et al. (2021), adding length constraints to the model improves the perplexity performance. This enhancement is likely attributed to these constraints acting as supplementary guidance during training, enabling the model to learn the lyric language style more effectively.

Length prompt and unsupervised training are crucial for gaining length awareness. Evaluating length control performance, it is evident that the baseline model (No. 1) struggles to manage the length of individual lines. Although note input might offer a reasonable hint regarding the number of lines, it does not sufficiently ensure the desired singability. Incorporating length-aware unsupervised training and maintaining length prompts during supervised training (Models No. 3, 4, 5) notably outperform other variants in governing both the number of sentences and individual sentence lengths. Conversely, neglecting length prompts during in-domain unsuper-

⁶<https://ace-studio.huoyaojing.com/>

Table 4. Subjective evaluation results. The best results are **bolded**.

No.	Model	Fluency	Compatibility	Overall Quality
-	Original lyrics	4.02	4.24	4.16
1	Baseline	2.96	2.23	2.37
2	AI-Lyricist	2.24	2.41	2.23
3	SongMASS	1.70	1.94	1.82
4	Ours	3.43	3.18	3.17
5	Single-task	3.31	3.11	3.07
6	Unsupervised-only	3.42	3.07	3.05

vised training (No. 6) even underperforms the baseline model (No. 1).

Supervised training does not benefit performance, unless the proposed objectives are added. When appending a supervised training phase after unsupervised training, but with only language model objective (No. 4), there is only very marginal performance improvement on perplexity and length control over the model with only unsupervised training (No. 5). For nuanced compatibility metrics, the two models exhibit similar performance. However, the inclusion of our novel training objectives during M2L training manifests a noticeable improvement in several fine-grained compatibility measures: +2.63% on dur-str, +1.45% on peak-str, +2.21% on dur-vow, and a comparable performance (-0.11%) on dur-imp. This signals an augmented potential of our model to ensure music–lyric compatibility in its generated output.

Peak-imp may not be a reliable compatibility metric in our corpus. In the peak-imp metric, our model scores lower than the single-task model (No. 4). However, this metric seems not to be a good indicator of music–lyric compatibility in our corpus. Even the gold standard original lyrics achieve a modest 52.73% score on this metric—nearly half of the important words lie on non-peak notes—suggesting that the relationship between melody peaks and non-stopwords is insignificant in this dataset. Therefore, it is acceptable for our model not to excel in this metric. Overall, while there exists potential for further optimization, our model demonstrates the best performance on those property pairs with tighter relationships among all models.

5.2. Human Evaluation

Table 4 highlights that our model (No. 4) excels in all facets of the subjective evaluation, including fluency, music–lyric compatibility, or overall quality, even when tested outside its domain. In contrast, despite using the same training corpus as that of the test data, SongMASS (Sheng et al., 2021) (No. 3) notably underperforms across all metrics. While AI-Lyricist (Ma et al., 2021) (No. 2) fares better than SongMASS, it does not match the proficiency of our baseline model.

Upon comparing our model with its ablation variants, it is evident that excluding the additional training objectives (No. 5) diminishes fluency and compatibility, thereby reducing overall quality. This illustrates the efficacy of these objectives in maximizing the utility of the limited paired data and enhancing the effectiveness of supervised M2L training. Interestingly, when we remove note information from the input and restrict the model to generating lyrics based solely on syllable and line counts (unsupervised-only model, No. 6), it achieves superior fluency compared to the model with both unsupervised and supervised training (No. 5). There is only a slight reduction in compatibility and overall quality scores, further highlighting the importance of length awareness through unsupervised training in crafting singable lyrics for songs.

Original: Your mind tricked you to feel the pain Of some-one close to you
SongMASS: Si - lly si - lly freak lay - ing level Ea - sy but time stop with-
AI-Lyricist: Got - ta tell you pa - ra - dise yeah And you the world of my
LOAF-M2L: I don't wan - na be your he - ro But you're ma-king me feel

6
 lea-ving the game of life So here it is, a - no-ther chance,
 - in a - bout - - - Girl I know my head a - bout - -
 up - co-ming le - o - tard Then be the man nite of this - -
 like I'm the on - ly one The on - ly one that's on your side

13
 Wide a - wake you face the day. Your dream is o ver Or has it just be gun?
 Keep on jun-gle and glad bus got - ta plays - - Dan-cing in - no-cence - -
 Han - son that I make - - - It is a love of mine/girl
 'Cause you're kee-ving me from see - ing the o - therside The o - ther side of you

Figure 4. Caption: A case of melody with original lyrics, and generated lyrics from different models.
Figure 4. Alt Text: The top row displays the original lyrics, while rows 2 and 3 contain versions by SongMASS and AI-Lyricist, exhibiting issues with length adherence and nuanced compatibility that compromise singability. In contrast, the final row highlights our system’s output, which successfully circumvents these issues, offering lyrics with enhanced singability.

5.3. Case Study

Figure 4 presents the lyrics generated by various models for a melody included in the subjective evaluation.

SongMASS’s output exhibits substantial issues in quality: its generated lyrics are incoherent and nonsensical. AI-Lyricist produces complete sentences but lacks semantic coherence, as each sentence is generated in isolation. In contrast, our LOAF-M2L model outputs lyrics that are both grammatically correct and semantically coherent across sentences.

In terms of music–lyric compatibility, our model perfectly aligns each syllable with a corresponding musical note, thereby establishing a solid foundation for compatibility. In contrast, SongMASS and AI-Lyricist show multiple misalignments between syllables and notes, as indicated by the red boxes in Figure 4.

Our LOAF-M2L model further demonstrates fine-grained compatibility. For example (marked with green boxes), the first syllable of the word ‘hero’, typically stressed in speech, aligns with a melody peak for emphasis. Likewise, the less important word ‘the’ in the third sentence is matched with a short musical note. SongMASS and AI-Lyricist, however, perform unsatisfactorily in these respects (marked with orange boxes). In SongMASS’s generated lyrics, the second syllable of ‘gotta’ aligns with a longer note than its first syllable, resulting in unnatural pronunciation when sung. Similarly, the AI-Lyricist pairs the less emphasized word ‘of’ with a quarter note, leading to awkward vocal delivery.

6. Conclusion

In this study, we introduced an innovative approach to address limited compatibility between machine-generated lyrics and the corresponding melodies. Our method enhanced music–lyric compatibility in the generation outputs by implementing prompt-based length control and designing a unique objective rooted in a quantitative analysis

of melody–lyric relationships. Both objective and subjective assessments validated the increased compatibility and singability of the generated lyrics. This research holds potential for various music-centric applications, including aiding songwriters, advancing music education, and enabling personalized song creation.

However, we recognize that melody-to-lyric generation remains a challenging domain. While our system advances the field, it does not produce flawless results. For instance, as illustrated in the last row of Figure 1, the melody’s emphasis on the second syllable of the word ‘baby’ can make the pronunciation incongruous. Additionally, this paper did not address some challenges, including length control’s inflexibility. While influenced by melody, the human composition of lyrics is not strictly bound by it. Lyrics might deviate slightly in syllable count from the number of notes to achieve optimal fluency or meaning conveyance. While introducing some flexibility into length control via prompt-based measures is feasible, achieving a granular melody–lyric alignment and maintaining this compatibility during generation becomes less straightforward. We leave exploring these challenges and potential solutions for future research.

Acknowledgements

This project was funded by research grant A-0008150-00-00 from the Ministry of Education, Singapore.

References

- Akiyama, K., Tamura, A., & Ninomiya, T. (2021, June). Hie-BART: Document summarization with hierarchical BART. In *Proceedings of the 2021 conference of the north american chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Student research workshop* (pp. 159–165). Online: Association for Computational Linguistics. Retrieved from <https://aclanthology.org/2021.naacl-srw.20>
- Ammirante, P., & Rovetti, J. (2021). Bright vowels are favoured on weak beats in popular music lyrics. *Journal of New Music Research*, 50(3), 259–265. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/09298215.2021.1936076>
- Barbieri, G., Pachet, F., Roy, P., & Degli Esposti, M. (2012). Markov constraints for generating lyrics with style. In *Ecai* (Vol. 242, pp. 115–120).
- Carnegie Mellon University. (2022). *The CMU pronouncing dictionary*. Available online at <http://www.speech.cs.cmu.edu/cgi-bin/cmudict>.
- Chang, J.-W., Hung, J. C., & Lin, K.-C. (2021). Singability-enhanced lyric generator with music style transfer. *Computer Communications*, 168, 33–53.
- Chen, Y., & Lerch, A. (2020). Melody-conditioned lyrics generation with seqGANs. In *2020 IEEE International Symposium on Multimedia (ISM)* (pp. 189–196).
- Chousa, K., & Morishita, M. (2021, August). Input augmentation improves constrained beam search for neural machine translation: NTT at WAT 2021. In *Proceedings of the 8th workshop on asian translation (wat2021)* (pp. 53–61). Online: Association for Computational Linguistics. Retrieved from <https://aclanthology.org/2021.wat-1.3>
- Défossez, A. (2021). Hybrid spectrogram and waveform source separation. In *Proceedings of the ismir 2021 workshop on music source separation*.
- Ghazvininejad, M., Choi, Y., & Knight, K. (2018). Neural poetry translation. In *Proceedings of the 2018 conference of the north american chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Human language technologies, volume 2 (short papers)* (pp. 67–71).
- Grangier, D., & Auli, M. (2018). Quickeddit: Editing text & translations by crossing words out. In *Proceedings of the 2018 conference of the north american chapter of the association*

- for computational linguistics: Human language technologies, volume 1 (long papers) (pp. 272–282).
- Gu, X., Ou, L., Ong, D., & Wang, Y. (2022). Mm-alt: A multimodal automatic lyric transcription system. In *Proceedings of the 30th acm international conference on multimedia* (pp. 3328–3337).
- Guo, F., Zhang, C., Zhang, Z., He, Q., Zhang, K., Xie, J., & Boyd-Graber, J. (2022a). Automatic song translation for tonal languages. In *Findings of the association for computational linguistics: Acl 2022* (pp. 729–743).
- Guo, F., Zhang, C., Zhang, Z., He, Q., Zhang, K., Xie, J., & Boyd-Graber, J. (2022b, May). Automatic song translation for tonal languages. In *Findings of the association for computational linguistics: Acl 2022* (pp. 729–743). Dublin, Ireland: Association for Computational Linguistics. Retrieved from <https://aclanthology.org/2022.findings-acl.60>
- Huang, Y.-F., & You, K.-C. (2021). Automated generation of Chinese lyrics based on melody emotions. *IEEE Access*, 9, 98060–98071.
- Lakew, S. M., Di Gangi, M., & Federico, M. (2019). Controlling the output length of neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.10408*.
- Lee, H.-P., Fang, J.-S., & Ma, W.-Y. (2019). iComposer: An automatic songwriting system for Chinese popular music. In *Proceedings of the 2019 conference of the north american chapter of the association for computational linguistics (demonstrations)* (pp. 84–88).
- Lewis, M., Liu, Y., Goyal, N., Ghazvininejad, M., Mohamed, A., Levy, O., ... Zettlemoyer, L. (2020). BART: Denoising sequence-to-sequence pre-training for natural language generation, translation, and comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics* (pp. 7871–7880).
- Li, J., Wang, P., Li, Z., Liu, X., Utiyama, M., Sumita, E., ... Ai, H. (2022). A fuzzy training framework for controllable sequence-to-sequence generation. *IEEE Access*, 10, 92467–92480.
- Li, P., Zhang, H., Liu, X., & Shi, S. (2020). Rigid formats controlled text generation. In *Proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics* (pp. 742–751).
- Li, Y., Yin, Y., Li, J., & Zhang, Y. (2022). Prompt-driven neural machine translation. In *Findings of the association for computational linguistics: Acl 2022* (pp. 2579–2590).
- Lingan, G. (2021). A model designed for automatic generated rap lyrics in given gender and style. In *Ismir 2021-proceedings of the 23th international society for music information retrieval conference, late breaking demo*.
- Liu, N., Han, W., Liu, G., Peng, D., Zhang, R., Wang, X., & Ruan, H. (2022). ChipSong: A controllable lyric generation system for Chinese popular song. In *Proceedings of the first workshop on intelligent and interactive writing assistants (in2writing 2022)* (pp. 85–95).
- Liu, P., Yuan, W., Fu, J., Jiang, Z., Hayashi, H., & Neubig, G. (2023). Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(9), 1–35.
- Liu, Y., Dou, Z.-Y., & Liu, P. (2021). Refsum: Refactoring neural summarization. In *Proceedings of the 2021 conference of the north american chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Human language technologies* (pp. 1437–1448).
- Liu, Y., Gu, J., Goyal, N., Li, X., Edunov, S., Ghazvininejad, M., ... Zettlemoyer, L. (2020). Multilingual denoising pre-training for neural machine translation. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8, 726–742.
- Loper, E., & Bird, S. (2002). Nltk: The natural language toolkit. *arXiv preprint cs/0205028*.
- Loshchilov, I., & Hutter, F. (2019). Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *7th international conference on learning representations, ICLR 2019, new orleans, la, usa, may 6-9, 2019*. OpenReview.net. Retrieved from <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Bkg6RiCqY7>
- Low, P. (2003). Singable translations of songs. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 11(2), 87–103.
- Lu, X., Wang, J., Zhuang, B., Wang, S., & Xiao, J. (2019). A syllable-structured, contextually-based conditionally generation of Chinese lyrics. In *Pricai 2019: Trends in artificial intel-*

- ligence: 16th pacific rim international conference on artificial intelligence, cuvu, yanuca island, fiji, august 26-30, 2019, proceedings, part iii 16* (pp. 257–265).
- Ma, X., Wang, Y., Kan, M.-Y., & Lee, W. S. (2021). AI-Lyricist: Generating music and vocabulary constrained lyrics. In *Proceedings of the 29th acm international conference on multimedia* (pp. 1002–1011).
- Melistas, T., Giannakopoulos, T., & Paraskevopoulos, G. (2021). Lyrics and vocal melody generation conditioned on accompaniment. In *Proceedings of the 2nd workshop on nlp for music and spoken audio (nlp4musa)* (pp. 11–16).
- Meseguer-Brocal, G., Cohen-Hadria, A., & Peeters, G. (2020). Creating DALI, a large dataset of synchronized audio, lyrics, and notes. *Transactions of the International Society for Music Information Retrieval*, 3(1).
- Nichols, E., Morris, D., Basu, S., & Raphael, C. (2009). Relationships between lyrics and melody in popular music. In *Ismir 2009-proceedings of the 11th international society for music information retrieval conference* (pp. 471–476).
- Nikolov, N. I., Malmi, E., Northcutt, C., & Parisi, L. (2020). Rapformer: Conditional rap lyrics generation with denoising autoencoders. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on natural language generation* (pp. 360–373).
- Noske, F., & Benton, R. (1988). *French song from berlioz to duparc: The origin and development of the m lodie*. Courier Corporation.
- OpenAI. (2023). *Gpt-4 technical report*.
- Ormazabal, A., Artetxe, M., Agirrezabal, M., Soroa, A., & Agirre, E. (2022). Poelm: A meter- and rhyme-controllable language model for unsupervised poetry generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12206*.
- Ou, L., Gu, X., & Wang, Y. (2022). Transfer learning of wav2vec 2.0 for automatic lyric transcription. In P. Rao et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 23rd international society for music information retrieval conference, ISMIR 2022, bengaluru, india, december 4-8, 2022* (pp. 891–899). Retrieved from <https://archives.ismir.net/ismir2022/paper/000107.pdf>
- Ou, L., Ma, X., Kan, M.-Y., & Wang, Y. (2023, July). Songs across borders: Singable and controllable neural lyric translation. In *Proceedings of the 61st annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics (volume 1: Long papers)* (pp. 447–467). Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics. Retrieved from <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.27>
- Potash, P., Romanov, A., & Rumshisky, A. (2015). GhostWriter: Using an LSTM for automatic rap lyric generation. In *Proceedings of the 2015 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing* (pp. 1919–1924).
- Qian, T., Lou, F., Shi, J., Wu, Y., Guo, S., Yin, X., & Jin, Q. (2023, July). UniLG: A unified structure-aware framework for lyrics generation. In *Proceedings of the 61st annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics (volume 1: Long papers)* (pp. 983–1001). Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics. Retrieved from <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.56>
- Qian, T., Shi, J., Guo, S., Wu, P., & Jin, Q. (2022). Training strategies for automatic song writing: A unified framework perspective. In *Icassp 2022-2022 ieee international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (icassp)* (pp. 4738–4742).
- Sergio Oramas, F. G., Luis Espinosa-Anke, & Serra, X. (2018). Natural language processing for music knowledge discovery. *Journal of New Music Research*, 47(4), 365–382. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/09298215.2018.1488878>
- Sheng, Z., Song, K., Tan, X., Ren, Y., Ye, W., Zhang, S., & Qin, T. (2021). SongMASS: Automatic song writing with pre-training and alignment constraint. In *Proceedings of the aaai conference on artificial intelligence* (Vol. 35, pp. 13798–13805).
- Susanto, R. H., Chollampatt, S., & Tan, L. (2020). Lexically constrained neural machine translation with levenshtein transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.12681*.
- Tang, Y., Tran, C., Li, X., Chen, P.-J., Goyal, N., Chaudhary, V., . . . Fan, A. (2020). Multilingual translation with extensible multilingual pretraining and finetuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.00401*.

- Tian, Y., Narayan-Chen, A., Oraby, S., Cervone, A., Sigurdsson, G., Tao, C., ... Peng, N. (2023, July). Unsupervised melody-to-lyrics generation. In *Proceedings of the 61st annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics (volume 1: Long papers)* (pp. 9235–9254). Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics. Retrieved from <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.513>
- Tong, Y., Liu, Y., Wang, J., & Xin, G. (2019). Text steganography on RNN-generated lyrics. *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering*, 16(5), 5451–5463.
- Wang, S., Tan, Z., & Liu, Y. (2022, May). Integrating vectorized lexical constraints for neural machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 60th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics (volume 1: Long papers)* (pp. 7063–7073). Dublin, Ireland: Association for Computational Linguistics. Retrieved from <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.487>
- Watanabe, K., & Goto, M. (2021). Atypical lyrics completion considering musical audio signals. In *Multimedia modeling: 27th international conference, mmm 2021, prague, czech republic, june 22–24, 2021, proceedings, part i 27* (pp. 174–186).
- Watanabe, K., Matsubayashi, Y., Fukayama, S., Goto, M., Inui, K., & Nakano, T. (2018). A melody-conditioned lyrics language model. In *Proceedings of the 2018 conference of the north american chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Human language technologies, volume 1 (long papers)* (pp. 163–172).
- Wu, X., Du, Z., Guo, Y., & Fujita, H. (2019). Hierarchical attention based long short-term memory for Chinese lyric generation. *Applied Intelligence*, 49, 44–52.
- Xue, L., Song, K., Wu, D., Tan, X., Zhang, N. L., Qin, T., ... Liu, T.-Y. (2021). DeepRapper: Neural rap generation with rhyme and rhythm modeling. In *Proceedings of the 59th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics and the 11th international joint conference on natural language processing (volume 1: Long papers)* (pp. 69–81).
- Yu, Y., Srivastava, A., & Canales, S. (2021). Conditional LSTM-GAN for melody generation from lyrics. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications, and Applications (TOMM)*, 17(1), 1–20.
- Zhang, L., Zhang, R., Mao, X., & Chang, Y. (2022). QiuNiu: A Chinese lyrics generation system with passage-level input. In *Proceedings of the 60th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics: System demonstrations* (pp. 76–82).
- Zhang, R., Mao, X., Li, L., Jiang, L., Chen, L., Hu, Z., ... Huang, M. (2022). Youling: an AI-assisted lyrics creation system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.06724*.
- Zhang, X., & Cross, I. (2021). Analysing the relationship between tone and melody in chaozhou songs. *Journal of New Music Research*, 50(4), 299-311. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/09298215.2021.1974490>

Appendix A. Ethics Statement

In our human evaluation, we gathered evaluation scores without personal identifiers to ensure objective and fair comparison. Participants only provided ratings, with no other information being collected. Participation was entirely voluntary, with formal consent obtained from each participant. After participation, evaluators were compensated based on the time they spent completing the questionnaire. We have ensured the questionnaire is free from any offensive content. The process of collecting human annotations has received a review exemption from the Institutional Review Board of the National University of Singapore (NUS-IRB), under Reference Code Number: 2022-813.