

YOURMT3+: MULTI-INSTRUMENT MUSIC TRANSCRIPTION WITH ENHANCED TRANSFORMER ARCHITECTURES AND CROSS-DATASET STEM AUGMENTATION

Sungkyun Chang^{*} Emmanouil Benetos^{*} Holger Kirchhoff[†] Simon Dixon^{*}

^{*} Centre for Digital Music, Queen Mary University of London [†] Huawei

ABSTRACT

Multi-instrument music transcription aims to convert polyphonic music recordings into musical scores assigned to each instrument. This task is challenging for modeling as it requires simultaneously identifying multiple instruments and transcribing their pitch and precise timing, and the lack of fully annotated data adds to the training difficulties. This paper introduces *YourMT3+*, a suite of models for enhanced multi-instrument music transcription based on the recent language token decoding approach of MT3. We strengthen its encoder by adopting a hierarchical attention transformer in the time-frequency domain and integrating a mixture of experts (MoE). To address data limitations, we introduce a new multi-channel decoding method for training with incomplete annotations and propose intra- and cross-stem augmentation for dataset mixing. Our experiments demonstrate direct vocal transcription capabilities, eliminating the need for voice separation pre-processors. Benchmarks across ten public datasets show our models' competitiveness with, or superiority to, existing transcription models. Further testing on pop music recordings highlights the limitations of current models. Fully reproducible code and datasets are available at <https://github.com/mimbres/YourMT3>.

Index Terms— Multi-instrument, automatic music transcription (AMT), music information retrieval (MIR), transformers, data augmentation, mixture of experts (MoE), music tokens

1. INTRODUCTION

Automatic music transcription (AMT) [1] is a fundamental task in music information retrieval where the goal is to transform music audio input into a sequence of musical notes, with each note possessing properties such as onset, offset, pitch, and sometimes velocity. The output is typically presented in the form of MIDI or piano-roll notation. The significance of AMT extends to a wide range of applications, including interactive music systems [2], automatic accompaniment generation [3], and music performance assessment.

The key challenge of this research is multi-instrument AMT: identification and transcription of various instruments with vocals from music recordings. Recently, there has been notable progress in this field: MT3 [4] utilized a MIDI-like decoding transformer, while PerceiverTF [5] employed a spectral attention transformer that generates conventional piano-roll. Unfortunately, the absence of fully reproducible code for these models has been a significant limitation for replication and further research. Our replication of MT3, trainable from scratch, is dubbed as *YourMT3* [6]. Based on this,

we propose *YourMT3+*, a hybrid architecture that incorporates advanced architectures and training methods for further enhancements. *YourMT3+* and its variants differ from prior works [4, 5] in the following key aspects:

- **Encoder:** PerceiverTF [5], which generated piano-rolls, is now trained with the MT3 framework to generate note event tokens. We replaced MT3's encoder with PerceiverTF featuring spectral cross attention (SCA). Additionally, replacing its feedforward network (FFN) with a mixture of experts (MoE) [7], denoted as *YPTF.MoE*, demonstrates promising results.
- **Decoder:** Tokens for singing transcription have been further defined. We introduce a multi-channel decoder that replaces MT3's single-channel decoder [4]. This enables task-query based training and the use of partially annotated data, improving performance.
- **Augmentation:** The proposed online data augmentation framework incorporates intra-stem and cross-stem mixing across datasets and pitch-shifting. In particular, *cross-stem augmentation* allows for transcribing singing with other instruments without the need for a voice separation front-end.
- **Evaluation:** Our models were extensively validated on various multi-instrument and single-instrument datasets. One of the main applications of multi-instrument AMT can be transcribing pop music. We provide refined annotations for the existing pop music dataset [8], presenting the first study to investigate multi-instrument AMT performance on commercial pop music.

2. RELATION TO PRIOR WORK

While substantial research exists in AMT, multi-instrument transcription has recently seen significant developments. The field often faces challenges due to the scarcity of fully annotated datasets for all instruments, making it *low-resourced*. Strategies such as multi-task learning [4, 9], unsupervised learning methods [10] and iterative re-alignment techniques [11] have offered partial remedies, with most models producing piano-roll outputs at the frame level.

Compared to the conventional AMT models based on onsets and frames [12], MT3 [4] is a sequence-to-sequence model that mainly distinguished itself in decoding outputs. It decodes a note-level representation similar to language tokens derived from MIDI, deviating from the traditional frame-level piano-rolls. In Section 3.3, we discuss the advantages of using these output tokens in *YourMT3*.

The transcription of singing within multi-instrument AMT remains largely unexplored, despite potential overlaps with source separation [13] and melody extraction [14]. *PerceiverTF* [5], a model with piano-roll output, has significantly advanced the transcription of multiple instruments and vocals by introducing spectral cross-attention (SCA) and stem dataset mixing. We propose an augmen-

This research utilized Queen Mary's Andrena HPC facility supported by QMUL Research-IT, and the AI Industrial Convergence Cluster supported by the Ministry of Science and ICT of Korea, and Gwangju Metropolitan City.




Fig. 1. Overview of *YourMT3+*. (left) Our encoder $E(\cdot)$ takes as input a log mel spectrogram S derived from audio X . (center) An auto-regressive decoder $D(\cdot)$ with the language model (LM) head is conditioned by $E(S)$, and output event tokens Y^l . (right) Cross-dataset stem augmentation, described in Section 4.

tation method, denoted by a plus (+) sign, that formalizes the earlier stem mixing approach [5] within an online multi-dataset pipeline.

3. MODEL

In the *YourMT3+* model taxonomy, we designate models with the same architecture and training method as MT3 as *YMT3*. Models that replace the encoder with PerceiverTF, trained using MT3’s single-channel decoder and our stem augmentation, are termed *YPTF+Single*. The variant replacing the encoder’s FFN with a mixture of experts (MoE) is called *YPTF.MoE*. These models have demonstrated that the PerceiverTF encoder can efficiently process language-style tokens, such as MIDI, instead of using piano-roll. Additionally, we propose a multi-channel decoder that assigns instrument groups per channel and masks loss for unannotated instruments, allowing training with incomplete labels. The final model, which integrates all these features, is termed *YPTF.MoE+Multi*.

The left panel of Figure 1 provides a detailed overview of our final extended model, *YPTF.MoE+Multi*. The subsequent subsections will detail the components of our model variants, including the audio input, encoder, decoder, and output tokens.

3.1. Input

In Figure 1, X represents a 2.048-second audio segment. In *YMT3*, X is transformed into a *log-magnitude mel-spectrogram* $S \in \mathbb{R}^{t \times f}$ with 256 time steps and 512 mel-frequency bins. In *YPTF*, X is initially transformed into a *log-magnitude spectrogram* with 110 time steps and 1,024 frequency bins. Subsequently, a convolutional feature S_{conv} is produced by 2D ResNet pre-encoder [5], resulting in $S_{conv} \in \mathbb{R}^{t \times c \times f'}$, where both c and f' are set to 128. The multi-resolution input of *YPTF* mirrors *PerceiverTF* [5], including an additional channel dimension C , and differs from *PerceiverTF* only in the input length, using 2.048 seconds instead of 6 seconds.

3.2. Encoder

The encoder $E(\cdot)$ takes S as an input, where the last dimension of S typically matches the encoder’s hidden dimension d . Our baseline encoder of *YMT3* is based on the T5-small v1.1 [15] encoder composed of 8 standard transformer blocks with 6-head self-attention and gated FFNs. The proposed *YPTF* replaces the encoder with PerceiverTF (PTF) [5] blocks as depicted in Figure 1 (left).

PTF block: Each PTF block in our model comprises local and temporal transformer sub-blocks. The local transformer first employs spectral cross attention (SCA), derived from Perceiver [16], using a learnable latent array $L \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times d'}$ and S_{conv} as inputs. Here, k is typically set to twice the number of target instrument groups, where $k < c$ and specifically $k = 26$ for 12 instruments plus singing, with each pair of latents serving as a *query* for the corresponding instrument groups. The latent and temporal transformer sub-blocks, featuring 8-head self-attention, FFNs and residual connections for queries, differ functionally: the former processes spectral information independently of time t , by attending to k and c , whereas the latter handles only temporal information relevant to t and d , independent of k . Overall, the PTF block (♣, Figure 1) performs three iterations. Initially, ★ acts as the *query* in SCA during the first iteration. In the second and third iterations, ☆ serves as the *query*.

MoE: Our models, designated as *YPTF.MoE*, replace the FFNs in latent and temporal transformer blocks with mixture of experts (MoE) layers from [7], routing attention output to two out of eight experts (see Supplemental B.5). In our experiments, MoE increased the model complexity by about 5% while improving performance across various datasets. Unlike PerceiverTF, we use RoPE [17] in every sub-block of the encoder to integrate positional information through rotation matrices, replacing trainable position embedding (PE), and pre-LayerNorm with pre-RMSNorm. However, these modifications only offered minor benefits in memory and computation without significantly impacting performance.

3.3. Output Tokens

The center panel of Figure 1 shows the output sequence Y' with a maximum N time steps, and the tokens representing MIDI-like events are listed in Section F of Supplemental Document. We followed the note sequence structure proposed in MT3 [4], and two modifications were made to the MT3 tokens: (a) unused velocity tokens except 0 and 1 were removed, and (b) programs 100 and 101 were reserved for singing voice (melody) and singing voice (chorus), respectively.

Compared to traditional piano-roll [12, 18, 10, 9, 5], the use of MIDI-like tokens [4] offers several advantages. First, it is more memory-efficient, using tokens for note onset, shift, and offset rather than hundreds of frames for silence as in piano-rolls. This efficiency also simplifies handling of multi-instrument data; piano-rolls require separate matrices for each instrument group, while the token approach needs only a program token for each change. Second, using tokens allows expansion of program vocabulary without a substantial memory growth, unlike piano-rolls. Lastly, tokens explicitly represent note onsets and offsets, avoiding the extra post-processing required for piano-rolls.

3.4. Decoder

We use an auto-regressive decoder $D(\cdot)$, conditioned on the encoder’s last hidden state, to generate note sequences. The baseline decoder, based on T5-small v1.1 and denoted as `Single`, produces a single sequence with events from multiple instruments.

When annotations are available for only one or some instruments in the audio, we need to mask the loss for unannotated instruments. The `Single` decoder’s output blends multiple programs, making it hard to mask specific instruments due to token dependencies. To address this, we propose a `Multi` decoder. It can provide separately maskable supervision for each latent L of the PTF encoder, allocated into channels for each program group.

In our implementation, the PTF encoder’s output hidden states are grouped by allocating two latents per channel. With group-linear projection, $k = 26$ latents result in $k' = 13$ projected channels. The `Multi` decoder then independently decodes each of the k' inputs, producing k' sequences for each program using parallel decoders with shared parameters. We set the maximum sequence length to $N_{\text{single}} = 1024$ (as in MT3 [4]) and $N_{\text{multi}} = 256$. Potential truncation loss is discussed further in Supplemental B.6.

4. DATA AUGMENTATION

This section describes an augmentation method for training with multiple datasets. Our strategy is to maximize the diversity of the training examples by randomly mixing selected stems from across multiple datasets. *Intra-stem augmentation* described in Section 4.1 involves selectively muting stems within a multi-track recording to generate several variations, as demonstrated with MT3 [4] and the Slakh dataset. The concept of *cross-dataset stem augmentation*, as discussed in Section 4.2, draws inspiration from PerceiverTF [5]. It aims to create a new mixture of stems from multiple datasets. Additionally, we employ pitch-shifting as described in Section 4.3.

4.1. Intra-stem Augmentation

This refers to the process of randomly dropping instruments from a segment containing multiple stems. From any dataset we sample X , a 2.048-second segment starting from a random point. Assuming

Algorithm 1 Cross-dataset Stem Augmentation

Require: $X, U, L, J, \Psi, \tau, p \{$

X : A segment $X \in U$, with stems $x \in X$.

U : Cached segment batches from various datasets.

L : Maximum length of sequence. 1,024 by default.

J : Maximum number of iterations w.r.t j . 5 by default.

Ψ : Stem mixing policy.

τ : Exponential decay parameter. 0.3 by default.

p : Probability for intra stem selection. 0.7 by default. $\}$

1: $\hat{X}_{\text{in}} \leftarrow x_i : x_i \in X$, selected with $x_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p)$

2: $\hat{X}_{\text{ex}} \leftarrow \emptyset$

3: $j \leftarrow 0$

4: **while** $r \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1) < e^{-\tau j}$ and $|\hat{X}_{\text{ex}}| < L$ and $j < J$ **do**

5: $X' \leftarrow$ a randomly sampled segment from $U \setminus X$

6: $X' \leftarrow \text{Filter}(X'; \Psi)$ // retain stems meeting criteria

7:

8: **if** $X' \neq \emptyset$ **then**

9: $\hat{X}_{\text{ex}} \leftarrow \hat{X}_{\text{ex}} \cup X'$ // add stems

10: $j \leftarrow j + 1$

11: **end if**

12: **end while**

13: $\hat{X} \leftarrow \hat{X}_{\text{in}} \cup \hat{X}_{\text{ex}}$

14: $\text{Mix}(\hat{X})$ // apply stem mixing

that X is composed of N stems denoted x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N , we define a set \hat{X}_{in} of randomly selected or dropped stems as:

$$\hat{X}_{\text{in}} = \{x_i : x_i \in X, \text{ with } x_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p)\} \quad (1)$$

with $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ where $N > 1$. Here, p represents the probability of each stem being selected, set to 0.7 as default. Each x_i may or may not be chosen with a probability p , resulting in \hat{X}_{in} containing various combinations of stems from the original segment X .

4.2. Cross-dataset Stem Augmentation

Procedure: In Algorithm 1, we designate U as a collection of cached segment batches across diverse datasets, with its size required to be at least equal to the batch size and preferably larger, if permitted by memory constraints. The base segment X is a sampled segment from U , and the elements of X are stems denoted by x . Here, x signifies a stem ID, including related token and audio information.

Intra-stem augmentation is first applied to X as in Equation 1, yielding a processed base segment \hat{X}_{in} . Next, we enter a loop to mix the base stems of \hat{X}_{in} with the stems coming from other segments. $U \setminus X$ represents the set of all segments in U excluding X . Each iteration begins by randomly sampling a segment X' from $U \setminus X$. Stems in X' that do not satisfy policy Ψ (detailed in Supplemental D.2) are then filtered out. Subsequently, \hat{X}_{ex} is updated by merging X' . This loop persists until at least one stopping criterion described in the following subsection is satisfied. Once the aggregation is complete, the $\text{Mix}(\cdot)$ function executes the actual mixing of tokens and audio content in a batch-wise manner.

Stopping criteria In Line 5 of Algorithm 1, three criteria are established to stop the iterative mixing among stems. The first criterion is an exponential decay $S(j)$ that serves as the survival function defined as $S(j) = e^{-\tau j}$, where τ controls the surviving curve with respect to j -th iteration. The second criterion restricts \hat{X}_{ex} to a length L , measured as sequence length post-tokenisation. The last criterion, $j > J$ with $J = 5$ allows mixing up to 5 segments per base segment.

Train	Test
MusicNet-EM , GuitarSet, MIR-ST500 , ENST-Drums , Slakh, EGMD, Maestro, CMedia, URMP , SMT-Bass	MusicNet , MusicNet-EM , GuitarSet, MIR-ST500 , ENST-Drums , Slakh, Maestro, MAPS, URMP , RWC-Pop (refined)

Table 1. Summary of datasets for train/test. Multi-instrument datasets with full annotation and stems are highlighted in light blue, while those with partially annotated instruments are highlighted in pink. (refined) We offer updated annotations for RWC-Pop [8].

4.3. Pitch-shifting

During training, pitch-shifting is applied to a batch, after applying cross-dataset stem augmentation. The phase vocoder-based pitch-shifting on the GPU was adapted from the `TorchAudio`¹ library. We used the default settings with the exception of setting $nFFT = 512$ for time-stretching. All the elements within the batch are randomly assigned to one of five groups, each with an equal chance of selection. Each group is then subjected to a pitch shift by an interval of -2, -1, 0, +1, or +2 semitones.

5. EXPERIMENTS

5.1. Experimental Setup

Data Preparation: Table 1 lists the datasets used for training and evaluating our model. We offer a software package, [an anonymised link], for dataset setup and split information to ensure reproducibility of our results. Audio data was converted into 16 kHz mono WAV format. Stems were stored as arrays, and mix-tracks as WAV files, also treating stemless tracks as mix-tracks. For training our `Single` decoder models on `MIR-ST500` [19] and `CMedia` [20], we produced singing and accompaniment stems using a pre-trained separation model [13]. With the `Multi` decoder, we also incorporated the original mix tracks from these datasets.

Evaluation Metrics: To evaluate transcription accuracy for each instrument, we employ the *Instrument Note Onset F1* metric [5]. This metric, valid for any instruments including drums, requires matching the onset, pitch, and instrument to the reference within a tolerance of ± 50 ms. For multiple non-drum instruments, we additionally utilize the *Instrument-Agnostic Onset F1* and *Offset F1* necessitating exact matches for only onset or both onset and offset. These metrics parallel the standard *Note F1* metrics [21] for single-instrument datasets. Furthermore, we used the *Multi (instrument offset) F1* metric [4] for evaluating multi-instrument AMT systems, where correct predictions require matching onset-offset pairs, pitch, and instrument type, excluding drum offsets. Our *Multi F1* metric is notably more stringent than the *Multi Onset F1* reported for `PerceiverTF` [5].

Vocabulary: Our models were trained using `MT3_FULL_PLUS` and tested on `MT3_MIDI_PLUS`, detailed in Section F of the Supplementary Document. Despite testing exclusively with the `MIDI` vocabulary, results in Table 3, labeled *+full vocab*, show that training with the more fine-grained `FULL` vocabulary enhanced performance compared to training and testing solely with `MIDI`.

Training: Our models were trained with two NVIDIA A100 GPUs using `BFloat16` mixed-precision. In the implemented online data pipeline, four CPU processes per GPU were allocated to efficiently

load and augment data without causing streaming bottlenecks. In our preliminary experiments, we tested three optimizers at a constant learning rate of $1e-03$: `AdaFactor` [30], `AdamW` [31], and `AdamWScale` [32]. `AdamWScale`, a variant of `AdamW` that normalizes gradients using root-mean-square (RMS) energy, provided the most efficient training. Our models were trained using `AdamWScale` and a cosine scheduler for 300K steps, with initial and final learning rates of $[1e-02, 1e-05]$ and a 1,000-step warm-up from $1e-03$. We set the dropout rate at 0.05.




Fig. 2. Instrument Onset F1 on Slakh [29].




Fig. 3. Instrument-Onset/Frame/Multi F1 on RWC-Pop [8].

5.2. Results and Discussion

In Table 2, our models are compared with other state-of-the-art models across datasets. From `MAPS` to `GuitarSet`, evaluations use *Instrument Note Onset F1*, while `URMP` and `Slakh` are assessed using *Instrument-agnostic Note Onset F1* and *Multi F1*. Due to space constraints, only the top-performing baselines (*) are listed on the table’s rightmost column. Details of all models are available in our project repository.

Our models prefixed by `Y-` outperformed `MT3` [4] across all datasets. Notably, our models and the unseen baseline [23], trained without `MAPS` [22], outperformed the baseline [24] trained on `MAPS`. This is likely due to the `Maestro` [33] dataset being about nine times larger, providing significantly more in-domain knowledge. Among our models, `YPTF.MoE+Multi` matched or exceeded the performance of the latest baseline models in most datasets. It showed exceptional performance on both refined and unrefined datasets in `MusicNet` strings, particularly in tests with refined labels (EM [11]). However, a noticeable under-performance was observed in singing transcription compared to the baseline [5]. As evidenced by about 10% higher F1 on the `MIR-ST500` (100ms), many onset timing errors exceeded the acceptable 50ms range and

¹<https://pytorch.org/audio>

Test Set	Instrument	YMT3	YMT3+	YPTF+S	YPTF+M	YPTF.MoE+M	MT3 [4]	AMT
		noPS	noPS PS	noPS PS	noPS PS	noPS PS	(colab)	Baseline *
MAPS [22] (unseen)	Piano	81.44	85.92 87.73	88.37 88.73	87.84 86.88	87.88 86.25	80.62	88.40 [23] ♣
MAPS [22] (seen)		-	-	-	-	-	-	85.14 [24] ♣
Maestro v3		94.78	94.80 94.31	96.28 95.85	95.59 94.54	96.98 96.52	94.86	97.44 [24] ♣
MusicNet ext. (EM) [11]	Strings	81.69	89.04 88.34	88.39 89.39	88.52 87.04	91.32 90.07	-△	80.00 [11] #
	Winds	74.95	82.91 80.53	77.72 79.59	77.18 76.54	83.46 78.50	-△	85.50 [11] #
MusicNet ext. [10, 11]	Strings	58.20	64.67 63.94	64.63 65.40	64.17 64.08	66.14 66.09	-△	63.90 [11] #
	Winds	50.76	55.58 55.05	52.55 54.27	51.82 51.42	55.95 55.33	-△	60.90 [11] #
MIR-ST500 [19] (SVS)	Singing	67.98	70.39 70.69	70.82 70.56	71.07 71.32	71.60 72.05	-◇	70.73 [25]
MIR-ST500 [19]		3.62	64.03 65.69	66.75 67.11	69.67 70.26	70.59 71.07	-◇	78.50 [5]
MIR-ST500 (100ms [20])		3.64	71.15 72.08	73.26 73.89	79.29 80.63	81.14 82.08	-◇	-
ENSTdrums (DTP [26])	Drums	87.77	87.60 87.40	89.72 90.65	88.68 90.61	88.79 89.48	77.82	84.50 [26] ♣
ENSTdrums (DTM [26])		78.64	81.84 83.09	85.65 86.41	85.14 87.18	85.92 87.27	70.31	79.00 [26] ♣
GuitarSet [27] (MT3 [4])	Guitar	88.53	91.39 88.49	91.61 88.32	88.92 86.74	91.65 88.87	89.10	91.10 [5]
URMP [28] Onset F1 [4]	Agnostic	77.10	80.00 81.47	81.11 81.54	74.56 75.72	81.05 81.79	76.65	77.0 [4]
URMP [28] Multi F1 [4]	Ensemble	58.23	62.13 62.03	64.34 65.89	57.25 59.82	67.22 67.98	58.71	59.0 [4]
Slakh [29] Onset F1 [4]	Agnostic	64.83	77.96 75.28	80.70 76.32	79.39 75.68	84.14 84.56	75.20	81.9 [5]
Slakh [29] Multi F1 [4]	All	61.77	65.92 63.61	69.52 65.13	69.37 64.96	73.98 74.84	57.69	62.0 [4] ♥

Table 2. Dataset-wise Note Onset F1. *PS* and *noPS* represent training with and without pitch shifting augmentation, respectively. (EM) denotes evaluation using refined labels [11]. (SVS) refers to experiments using singing separated audio as input, obtained through *Spleeter* [13]. (DTP) represents using drum and percussion as input. (DTM) uses input including drum, percussion, and accompaniment. The Onset F1 score on Slakh is instrument-agnostic F1 for non-drum classes. (△) Unavailable due to training split overlaps. (♣) Single-instrument AMT. (◇) Singing voice class was not defined. (#) Additionally collected synthetic data from 8.5K songs were used for pre-training [11].

Model	Onset F1	Offset F1	Drum F1
YMT3 base	64.8	41.7	77.8
+ <i>Intra-aug.</i>	+4.8	+5.5	+0.6
+ <i>Full-vocab.</i>	+0.6	+2.1	+2.6
+ <i>Data balancing</i>	+4.0	+4.7	+1.3
+ <i>Cross-aug.</i>	+4.0	+7.2	+1.6
+ <i>PTF-encoder</i>	+1.8	+4.2	+1.9
+ <i>FFN → MoE</i>	+1.5	+1.3	+3.7
+ <i>Multi decoder</i>	+1.8	+4.0	+0.6
YPTF.MoE+Multi	84.6	70.7	90.1
MT3 (colab)	75.2	56.8	83.9
MT3 [4]	76	57	-
PerceiverTF [5]	81.9	-	78.3

Table 3. Model component analysis and comparison on the Slakh [29] dataset. (-) Values not reported.

fell within 100ms. Given that our model and the baseline [5] share similar encoder structures, our decoder may be more prone to timing errors than traditional piano-roll models. Additionally, the practicality of a 100ms onset tolerance, used in past MIREX [20] singing transcription protocol, appears justified.

YMT3+ and YPTF+Single differ only in their encoders. This comparison revealed that the PTF encoder architecture performs particularly well in complex multi-instrument datasets such as MIR-ST500, ENSTdrums (DTM), and Slakh. *Cross-stem augmentation*, denoted by the (+) symbol in model names, proved essential for transcribing singing without singing voice separation (SVS). YMT3 recorded an F1 score of 3.6% without separation, while YMT3+ with augmentation reached 64%. The models with Multi decoders were beneficial when training on partially annotated datasets, such as MIR-ST500 and ENSTdrums. *Mixture of Experts (MoE)* showed

consistent performance improvements across all datasets. Notably, while pitch-shifting often led to performance degradation in other models, YPTF.MoE compensated for this loss or even improved performance, as evidenced by the Slakh result.

As compared in the lower section of Table 2, YPTF.MoE+Multi significantly outperformed the baselines (MT3 [4] and PerceiverTF [5]) on multi-instrument datasets such as URMP and Slakh. The baseline Multi F1 score marked with a ♥ is from MT3 authors’ report [4]. For the complete comparison table with MT3 [4] and PerceiverTF [5], see Section H of the Supplemental Document.

Ablation Study: In Table 3, the impact of each model component on performance was investigated. Both intra- and cross-stem augmentations significantly improved performance by over 4 percentage points, while all other proposed components steadily enhanced transcription performance. Additionally, the performance improvement denoted by *Data balancing* suggested that previously adopted temperature-based sampling in MT3 [4] might not be suitable for determining the sampling probability of AMT datasets. This is further discussed in Section F of the Supplemental Document.

Performance on Pop Music: As seen at the bottom of Table 3, our model demonstrated competitive performance on the synthetic dataset [29] compared to other multi-AMT models. In Figure 2, our final model achieved 50 to 90% performance for most instruments, except for a few non-mainstream ones like chromatic percussion (c.perc) and synth pad (s.pad) in the synthetic dataset. However, it significantly underperformed on commercial pop music recordings as shown in Figure 3. Particularly for non-main instruments (excluding piano, bass, vocals, and drums), our models performed below 10%. This indicates that relying solely on synthetic datasets is insufficient for modeling the diverse timbres of pop music. Furthermore, except for the piano, all the pitched instruments showed a significant gap in the chroma-level metric, suggesting substantial octave errors and hinting that more varied pitch-shifting could be beneficial.

6. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This work presented `YourMT3+`, a hybrid model suite that combines `MT3` and `PerceiverTF` features. Our final model, `YPTF.MoE+Multi`, employed spectral cross-attention and a Mixture of Experts in its encoder for enhanced performance, and a multi-channel decoder to handle the instruments where annotation is partially available. Our models trained using the proposed online augmentation strategy demonstrated direct vocal transcription capabilities without the need for a singing separation front-end. The final model significantly outperformed `MT3` and `PerceiverTF` on the multi-AMT benchmark with a parameter increase of less than 2.5% compared to `MT3`. Evaluations across ten public datasets also validated our model’s competitiveness. Despite progress, challenges persist: onset timing in singing voice transcription lags behind our baseline, and low performance in pop music may stem from reliance on synthetic datasets for diverse instruments. Future research will address these issues.

7. REFERENCES

- [1] E. Benetos, S. Dixon, Z. Duan, and S. Ewert, “Automatic music transcription: An overview,” *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 20–30, 2018.
- [2] R. Rowe, *Machine musicianship*, MIT press, 2004.
- [3] G. Percival, S. Fukayama, and M. Goto, “Song2quartet: A system for generating string quartet cover songs from polyphonic audio of popular music,” in *ISMIR*, 2015, pp. 114–120.
- [4] J. P. Gardner, I. Simon, E. Manilow, C. Hawthorne, and J. Engel, “MT3: Multi-task multitrack music transcription,” in *ICLR*, 2021.
- [5] W.-T. Lu, J.-C. Wang, and Y.-N. Hung, “Multitrack music transcription with a time-frequency perceiver,” in *ICASSP*, 2023.
- [6] S. Chang, S. Dixon, and E. Benetos, “YourMT3: a toolkit for training multi-task and multi-track music transcription model for everyone,” in *DMRN+17*, 2022.
- [7] A. Q. Jiang, A. Sablayrolles, A. Roux, A. Mensch, and et al., “Mixtral of experts,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024.
- [8] M. Goto, H. Hashiguchi, T. Nishimura, and R. Oka, “RWC music database: Popular, classical and jazz music databases,” in *ISMIR*, 2002, vol. 2, pp. 287–288.
- [9] Y.-T. Wu, B. Chen, and L. Su, “Multi-instrument automatic music transcription with self-attention-based instance segmentation,” *IEEE/ACM Trans. on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 28, pp. 2796–2809, 2020.
- [10] K. W. Cheuk, D. Herremans, and L. Su, “Reconvat: A semi-supervised automatic music transcription framework for low-resource real-world data,” in *ACM Multimedia*, 2021.
- [11] B. Maman and A. H. Bermano, “Unaligned supervision for automatic music transcription in the wild,” in *ICML*, 2022.
- [12] C. Hawthorne, E. Elsen, J. Song, A. Roberts, I. Simon, C. Raffel, J. Engel, S. Oore, and D. Eck, “Onsets and frames: Dual-objective piano transcription,” in *ISMIR*, 2018, pp. 50–57.
- [13] R. Hennequin, A. Khelif, F. Voituret, and M. Moussallam, “Spleeter: a fast and efficient music source separation tool with pre-trained models,” *JOSS*, vol. 5, no. 50, pp. 2154, 2020.
- [14] T.-H. Hsieh, L. Su, and et al., “A streamlined encoder/decoder architecture for melody extraction,” in *ICASSP*, 2019.
- [15] C. Raffel, N. Shazeer, A. Roberts, and et al., “Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer,” *JMLR*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 5485–5551, 2020.
- [16] A. Jaegle, F. Gimeno, A. Brock, O. Vinyals, A. Zisserman, and J. Carreira, “Perceiver: General perception with iterative attention,” in *ICML*, 2021, pp. 4651–4664.
- [17] J. Su, M. Ahmed, Y. Lu, S. Pan, W. Bo, and Y. Liu, “Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding,” *Neurocomputing*, vol. 568, pp. 127063, 2024.
- [18] J. Thickstun, Z. Harchaoui, and S. Kakade, “Learning features of music from scratch,” in *ICLR*, 2016.
- [19] J.-Y. Wang and J.-S. R. Jang, “On the preparation and validation of a large-scale dataset of singing transcription,” in *ICASSP*, 2021, pp. 276–280.
- [20] “MIREX Singing Transcription from Polyphonic Music,” https://www.music-ir.org/mirex/wiki/2020:Singing_Transcription_from_Polyphonic_Music, 2020, [Accessed 01-Apr-2024].
- [21] C. Raffel, B. McFee, E. J. Humphrey, J. Salamon, O. Nieto, D. Liang, and D. P. Ellis, “Mir_eval: A transparent implementation of common mir metrics,” in *ISMIR*, 2014.
- [22] V. Emiya, R. Badeau, and B. David, “Multipitch estimation of piano sounds using a new probabilistic spectral smoothness principle,” *IEEE Trans. on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 1643–1654, 2009.
- [23] D. Edwards, S. Dixon, E. Benetos, A. Maezawa, and Y. Kusaka, “A data-driven analysis of robust automatic piano transcription,” *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 2024.
- [24] K. Toyama, T. Akama, Y. Ikemiya, Y. Takida, W.-H. Liao, and Y. Mitsufuji, “Automatic piano transcription with hierarchical frequency-time transformer,” in *ISMIR*, 2023.
- [25] X. Gu, W. Zeng, J. Zhang, L. Ou, and Y. Wang, “Deep audio-visual singing voice transcription based on self-supervised learning models,” *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2304.12082, 2023.
- [26] C.-W. Wu, C. Dittmar, C. Southall, R. Vogl, G. Widmer, J. Hockman, M. Müller, and A. Lerch, “A review of automatic drum transcription,” *IEEE/ACM Trans. on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 26, no. 9, pp. 1457–1483, 2018.
- [27] Q. Xi, R. M. Bittner, J. Pauwels, X. Ye, and J. P. Bello, “Guitarset: A dataset for guitar transcription,” in *ISMIR*, 2018.
- [28] B. Li, X. Liu, K. Dinesh, Z. Duan, and G. Sharma, “Creating a multitrack classical music performance dataset for multimodal music analysis: Challenges, insights, and applications,” *IEEE Trans. on Multimedia*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 522–535, 2018.
- [29] E. Manilow, G. Wichern, P. Seetharaman, and J. Le Roux, “Cutting music source separation some Slakh,” in *IEEE WAS-PAA*, 2019.
- [30] N. Shazeer and M. Stern, “Adafactor: Adaptive learning rates with sublinear memory cost,” in *ICML*, 2018, pp. 4596–4604.
- [31] I. Loshchilov and F. Hutter, “Decoupled weight decay regularization,” in *ICLR*, 2019.
- [32] P. Nawrot, “NanoT5: Fast & simple pre-training and fine-tuning of t5 models with limited resources,” in *EMNLP Workshop for NLP-OSS*, 2023.
- [33] C. Hawthorne, A. Stasyuk, A. Roberts, I. Simon, and et al., “Enabling factorized piano music modeling and generation with the maestro dataset,” in *ICLR*, 2018.

SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENT FOR YOURMT3+

A. YOUTUBE TRANSCRIPTION DEMO

For demonstration purposes, we provided a Colab notebook¹ that allowed transcription from a YouTube link. In this demonstration experiment, using the NVIDIA T4 GPU provided for free on Google Colab in float32 operation mode, we were able to transcribe approximately six minutes of piano music within 40 seconds. In float16 operation mode, it took about 10 seconds on the T4 GPU, which is equivalent to 36× real-time. On GPUs from the *Ampere* generation or later, which support 16-bit mixed precision, the process was completed in under 10 seconds.

One known issue was that when transcribing music from sources outside the dataset, models trained with Pitch-shift (PS) often incorrectly transcribed segments a semitone higher or lower. This issue was not observed in the models marked with (noPS), as tested in the example audio source².




Fig. 1. Graphical user interface for YouTube Transcription.

B. MODEL DETAILS

B.1. Model Front-end Specification

Encoder Type	YMT3	YPTF
length of X	2.048 s	2.048 s
codec	<i>mel-spec.</i>	<i>spec.</i>
hop-size	128 (8 ms)	300 (18.5 ms)
sample rate	16,000	16,000
input frames	32,767	32,767
n-FFT	2048	2048
n-Bin	512	1024
pre-encoder	No	Yes
shape of S	256×512 ($t \times f$)	$110 \times 128 \times 128$ ($t \times c \times f'$)

Table 5. Input configuration parameters.

B.2. YMT3

Our base model, YMT3, replicates MT3 [1], which is based on the T5-small v1.1³ architecture. Sinusoidal positional encoding is added to the inputs for the encoder and decoder.

B.3. Pre-encoder Specification

The model specification of pre-encoder for YPTF described in Section 3.1 is displayed in Table 6.

Parameter	Value
Kernel Size	(3, 3)
Average Pooling Kernel Size	(1, 2)
Number of Conv Layers per Block	2
Number of Blocks	3

Table 6. PreEncoder specifications.

¹<https://colab.research.google.com/drive/1AgOVEBFZknDkjmSRA7leoa81a2vrnhBG?usp=sharing>

²<https://youtu.be/9E82wwNc7r8?si=I-WyfwJXCBDY2reh>

³<https://github.com/google-research/text-to-text-transfer-transformer>

B.4. Number of Parameters

<i>Model</i>	<i># layers Enc/Dec</i>	<i># Parameters Total (Enc/Dec)</i>
YMT3, YMT3+	12/12	44.7M (19.4M/25.7M)
YPTF+Single	15/12	29.9M (1.8M/25.7M)
YPTF+Multi	15/12	29.9M (1.8M/25.7M)
YPTF.MoE+Multi	15/12	45.8M (20.3M/25.7M)

Table 7. Number of parameters. The total size is not a direct sum of the encoder and decoder due to additional components such as linear projection layers, LM-head, and pre-encoder layer.

B.5. Mixture of Experts Layer in YPTF.MoE

In Section 3.2, the Feed-Forward Networks (FFNs) within each latent transformer and temporal transformer of the PTF block are described as follows:

$$\text{FFN}_{\text{YPTF}}(h_{\text{att}}) = \text{ReLU}(h_{\text{att}} \cdot W_1^T) \odot W_2, \quad (1)$$

where h_{att} is the normalized output of the attention module, W_1 and W_2 are the weights of linear layers without bias terms, and \odot denotes an element-wise product.

In the YPTF.MoE configuration, the standard FFN is replaced by a mixture of experts (MoE), in which each expert ϵ operates as a Gated Linear Unit (GLU) [2] activated by a Sigmoid Linear Unit (SiLU) [3]:

$$\epsilon(h_{\text{att}}) = (\text{SiLU}(h_{\text{att}} \cdot W_1^T) \odot (h_{\text{att}} \cdot V_{\text{gate}}^T)) \cdot W_2^T, \quad (2)$$

where W_1 , W_2 , and V_{gate} are the weights of the linear layers. The MoE replacing FFN is further defined as:

$$\text{MoE}(h_{\text{att}}) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \text{Softmax}(\text{Top2}(h \cdot W_g))_i \cdot \epsilon_i(h_{\text{att}}),$$

where $n = 8$ represents the number of experts. The $\sum \text{Softmax}(\text{Top2}(h \cdot W_g))$ function selectively routes to 2 out of 8 experts. For the latent transformer, the weight matrix W is defined as $W \in \mathbb{R}^{B \cdot t \cdot k \times n}$, organizing the batch size B , time steps t , and number of latents k sequentially. For the temporal transformer, the weight matrix W_g is defined as $W_g \in \mathbb{R}^{B \cdot k \cdot t \times n}$, altering the positions of time steps and latents.

In Table 7, the YPTF.MoE model has about 2.5% more parameters than YMT3 and about 18.5 M more than YPTF. However, since only 2 out of the 8 experts are activated during inference, the model complexity increases by just about 5%. Initial experiments on the Slakh dataset with models utilizing Top1, Top2, and Top4 experts showed that the Top2 model had the best performance. The Top4 model experienced a performance drop of about 1 percentage point, while the Top1 model performed on par with YPTF.

Limitations In our model, unlike recent reports of performance improvements in decoder-only models [4] and fine-tuning [5] with MoE, we have applied MoE only to the audio encoder while training from scratch. Our intention was to expand the encoder capacity to learn a wider range of audio representations. The main results in Table 2 and the ablation experiments in Table 3 suggest that MoE helps prevent performance degradation, especially when pitch shifting is applied during training. However, we have not yet identified clear

patterns regarding which expert FFN is active on specific datasets or types of tokens, as well as the effect of weight initialization [6]. This remains a topic for future research.

B.6. Comparing Output Length of Single vs Multi

The maximum sequence length for training, denoted as N , varies depending on the type of decoder described in Section 3.4. The Single uses $N_{\text{single}} = 1024$ as per MT3 [1], while the Multi uses a smaller N_{multi} , due to its division into multiple program groups. Multi benefits from shorter sequences but faces memory constraints with its 13 output channels ($k' = 13$). We set N_{multi} to 256 to keep token truncation loss under 0.015%.

B.7. Implementation of Masking Loss

The masking loss for unannotated instruments mentioned in Section 3.4 is implemented by filling the target sequence of the respective channels (representing the unannotated program groups) with PAD tokens. During training loss calculation, the PAD tokens are generally excluded.

C. TOKEN DEFINITION

Output tokens representing note events are summarized in Table 8. The structure of the note sequence follows the proposal in MT3 [1]. It begins with the declaration of tie events using program and pitch tokens for notes continued from previous segments. Subsequently, the main events are organized chronologically, with simultaneous events sorted in the order of {program, velocity, pitch}. The sequence concludes with an EOS token followed by paddings. To avoid repeating tokens, *run-length encoding* [7] is employed.

<i>Token Name</i>	<i>Range</i>	<i>Token Index</i>	<i>Description</i>
PAD	0	0	Special token for padding
EOS	0	1	Special token for end of sequence
UNK	0	2	Special token for unknown type event
shift	0-205	3-208	Absolute time with ‘10 ms’ grid within ‘2.048 sec’ segments.
pitch	0-127	209-336	midi note numbers
velocity	0-1	337-338	0 for note-on, 1 for off.
tie	0	339	A delimiter token declaring the end of annotating pre-activated notes.
program	0-127	340-467	GM_INSTR_FULLL [1]
drum	0-127	468-595	GM_DRUM, [1]

Table 8. Token Definition

D. DATA AUGMENTATION

D.1. Default parameters for augmentation

Default parameters for intra-stem augmentation and cross-dataset stem augmentation are outlined in Table 9.

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Default Value</i>
p	0.7
τ	0.3
L	1,024
J	5

Table 9. Default parameters for intra-stem augmentation and cross-dataset stem augmentation.

D.2. Stem Mixing Policy

Stem mixing policy Ψ with default values is outlined in Table 10.

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Value</i>
Allowing instrument overlap	False
Mixing multiple drum tracks	False
Max number of subunit stems	12
p_{singing} , probability of retaining singing stem	0.7

Table 10. Stem mixing policy, Ψ with default values.

E. DATASET CURATION

- MusicNet ext. [8]: This consists of 330 pieces of various classical music played as solo piano, piano trio, string trio, string quartet, winds quartet, ensemble, and so on. Since the original test split consists of only 3 pieces of music, we use the extended test split which consists of 10 pieces for evaluation. This split also has been widely used in recent works [9, 10].
- MusicNet ext. (EM) [10]: This provides refined labels generated through an iterative re-alignment algorithm. Our models were trained using the refined labels⁴ provided by the authors. The refined labels for the eight pieces were only missing in the training split: 2194, 2211, 2211, 2227, 2230, 2292, 2305, and 2310.
- GuitarSet [11]: This dataset comprises a total of 360 audio recordings performed by six guitarists. Each guitarist improvised three progressions in two versions across five musical styles and two tempi. Since there is no official test split, we created our own test split by randomly selecting four players per track for training, assigning one player for validation, and another player for evaluation. Given our split method exposed the model to all pieces multiple times, leading to slight overfitting as observed in Riley et al. [12], future work should consider a piece-based data split.
- MIR-ST500 [13]: The dataset comprises 500 pop songs in Chinese, English, and Korean, with 400 allocated for training and 100 for testing. All songs are licensed mix-tracks by professional artists. The provided annotations focus solely on singing and do not include annotations for the accompaniment. Additionally, we generated singing voice and accompaniment stems for the entire dataset, dubbed as *MIR-ST500 (SVS)*. We used the 2-stem separation model from Spleeter⁵ at 44.1 kHz sampling rate and then converted them to 16 kHz mono.
- ENST-Drums [14]: For testing, subset of 21 files from "drummer 3," following the guidelines outlined in Tables 5 and 11 of the reference work [15]. We utilise two distinct versions of audio files for testing: Drum Transcription in the presence of Percussion (DTP) and Drum Transcription in the presence of Melodic instruments (DTM). For DTM, the test set was mixed with a drums-to-accompaniment ratio of approximately -1.25 dB, as suggested in the survey [16].
- RWC-Pop (bass) [17]: This dataset was solely used for evaluating the bass transcription. Some MIDI files differed significantly from the actual transcriptions, and we speculate that they were primarily created as guide music before recording. While refining MIDI annotations, we encountered several alignment issues, and manually corrected them. We mainly focused on refining the bass tracks, setting aside other instruments. While correcting octave mistakes and pitch errors, we referenced the fundamental frequency in the spectrogram to maintain consistency. For doubled bass tracks, we separated them if there were distinguishable timbres; otherwise, we merged them. After reviews, we chose 90 out of 100 songs for the test set, excluding those without bass. More detailed information is in the dataset's work note file.
- Slakh [18]: The dataset consists of 2,100 multi-track MIDI pieces accompanied by professionally synthesised audio. We utilise the official train split for training on the full dataset training result. This dataset, although synthetic, is unique in its extensive coverage of audio stems and MIDI forms for instruments commonly found in pop music. This is a unique dataset that includes the bass instrument class along with a very small amount of SMT-Bass. However, we found that most of the 11 types of bass instruments included were transcribed one octave higher. We corrected this based on the F0 of the spectrogram. Meanwhile, the pre-trained MT3 model provided by the authors [1] used in benchmarks transcribes one octave higher, so we evaluated the model using uncorrected data for fair comparison.
- EGMD [19]: This drum dataset has an official split information for train (35,218 files), validation (5,030 files), and test (5,290 files). This dataset includes approximately 433 hours of recorded performances by nine drummers, utilising 56 drum-kits included in the Roland TD-17. Despite its extensive dataset size, it also had the limitation of consisting mostly of repetitive drum performances.
- Maestro [20]: The dataset consists of approximately 200 hours of virtuosic piano performances, meticulously aligned with a fine precision of around 3 ms between note labels and audio wave-forms. We utilise the official split from version 3.0.0.
- MAPS [21]: The dataset comprises recordings of MIDI-aligned piano performances in classical music. We utilise only the test split from the splits used in the reference [9].
- URMP [22]: The dataset contains 44 classical music pieces in different ensemble formats, with multi-stem audio and 10ms interval labels. Videos are available but not used. We follow the MT3 paper's split, with 35 training files and 9 testing files out of 44 total.
- CMedia: The dataset originates from the MIREX 2020 singing transcription task⁶ and consists of 100 songs from YouTube. It provides annotations for intervals and pitch, with a 100ms onset tolerance. We obtained this dataset directly from the author, and successfully corrected offset errors in six songs, which were approved by the dataset's author. We have utilised this dataset only for training.
- SMT-Bass [23]: The dataset contains genuine bass recordings, distinguishing it from synthetic data in the Slakh [18]. This dataset encompasses various bass guitar techniques and involves recordings of the chromatic scale using three different bass guitars, each with three distinct pickup settings. We selectively extracted playing styles from the *plucking style* category and mapped them to MIDI programs 33-37. The original dataset files had a duration of 3-4 seconds, and we extended them to 7-8 seconds by adding 1.8 seconds of silence at both ends. Pitch annotation issues were identified, particularly concerning string and fret annotations. To improve the dataset, we used amp envelope-based on/off detection to select regions and verified pitch accuracy by comparing it with Crepe [24] algorithm predictions. As a result, 1327 out of 2332 files were reliable, split into 1061 for training and 266 for validation using an 8:2 ratio. The SMT-bass

⁴<https://github.com/benadar293/benadar293.github.io>

⁵<https://github.com/deezer/spleeter/wiki/2.-Getting-started#using-2stems-model>

⁶https://www.music-ir.org/mirex/wiki/2020:Singing_Transcription_from_Polyphonic_Music

dataset is valuable for genuine bass recordings, addressing pitch issues, and improving bass performance in the *RWC-Pop (bass)* dataset context.

- *RWC-Pop (full)*: This dataset contains 100 pieces of Japanese or English pop music. However, it does not always align with General MIDI program numbers and may not represent actual transcriptions, making it less reliable than Geerdes. While we have thoroughly revised the bass parts, we lacked the time to do so for other instruments. Instead, we mapped the instruments in Table 12 based on keyword filtering of the given MIDI file track names.

F. VOCABULARY

<i>Instrument Name</i>	<i>ID</i>
Acoustic Piano	0, 1, 3, 6, 7
Electric Piano	2, 4, 5
Chromatic Percussion	8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15
Organ	16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23
Acoustic Guitar	24, 25
Clean Electric Guitar	26, 27, 28
Distorted Electric Guitar	29, 30, 31
Acoustic Bass	32, 35
Electric Bass	33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39
Violin	40
Viola	41
Cello	42
Contrabass	43
Orchestral Harp	46
Timpani	47
String Ensemble	48, 49, 44, 45
Synth Strings	50, 51
Choir and Voice	52, 53, 54
Orchestra Hit	55
Trumpet	56, 59
Trombone	57
Tuba	58
French Horn	60
Brass Section	61, 62, 63
Soprano/Alto Sax	64, 65
Tenor Sax	66
Baritone Sax	67
Oboe	68
English Horn	69
Bassoon	70
Clarinet	71
Pipe	72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79
Synth Lead	80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87
Synth Pad	88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95
Singing Voice (Main melody)	100
Singing Voice (Chorus)	101
Drums*	128
Unannotated*	129

Table 11. MT3_FULL_PLUS vocabulary as extended from the FULL vocabulary from the MT3 [1]. An asterisk (*) represents internal IDs that are not tokenised.

<i>Instrument Name</i>	<i>ID</i>
Piano (acoustic)	0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Chromatic Percussion	8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15
Organ	16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23
Guitar (clean)	24, 25, 26, 27
Guitar (distortion)	28, 29, 30, 31
Bass	32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39
Strings + Ensemble	40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55
Brass	56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63

(continued)

Reed	64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71
Pipe	72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79
Synth Lead	80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87
Synth Pad	88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95
Singing Voice	100, 101

Table 12. MT3_MIDI_EXT_PLUS vocabulary used for generating 16-channel-General MIDI files in our demonstration.

<i>Instrument Name</i>	<i>ID</i>
Piano	0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
Chromatic Percussion	8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15
Organ	16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23
Guitar	24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31
Bass	32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39
Strings + Ensemble	40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55
Brass	56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63
Reed	64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71
Pipe	72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79
Synth Lead	80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87
Synth Pad	88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95
Singing Voice	100, 101

Table 13. MT3_MIDI_PLUS vocabulary as extended from the MIDI vocabulary from the MT3 [1]. This vocabulary has been used for evaluation comparing with previous works [1, 25].

G. RE-BALANCING MULTI-DATASET SAMPLING

In multi-task learning, especially within NLP study [26, 27, 28, 29] for multilingual models, handling data size imbalances across languages has been one of the key issues. The sampling distribution for each language can be defined as $\Theta = \{\theta(l)\}$, where l is the l -th language among a total of L . The widely adopted approach, temperature-based sampling, calculates the sampling probability $\theta(l) = (n(l)/n_{\text{total}})^{1/c}$, where $n(\cdot)$ denotes dataset size and the temperature c is typically set 1.43 ([26, 27]) or 3.33 (in [28, 29], and MT3). As $c \rightarrow \infty$, Θ tends towards uniformity⁷.

We experimented with various c values in temperature-based sampling, but this did not prevent performance degradation of up to 5% across multiple datasets. Several factors might contribute to this phenomenon:

- Data size calculation: NLP used tokenised lengths, while MT3 counted files, possibly oversimplifying complex datasets with varied audio lengths.
- Repetitive data impact: Datasets like EGMD contain lengthy, repetitive loops. Data size becomes an unreliable metric for calculating Θ in such cases.
- Dynamic data addition: Unlike MT3, our setup with data augmentation and continuous dataset integration necessitates constant updates to the optimal temperature setting.

To delve into this matter, we adopted a straightforward iterative method with $\eta = 5$ cycles to refine the dataset sampling weights Θ_η for various datasets. The manual tuning followed this procedure:

1. Initial weights Θ_0 were set using the temperature-based approach suggested by MT3 [1].
2. We identified the dataset most prone to over-fitting, as shown by its validation loss curve.
3. We redistributed 10% of the weight from the over-fitting dataset evenly among the others, and train a new model from scratch.
4. We repeated step 2 and 3, η times.

The method’s primary drawback was extending the total training time by η times and the challenge of clearly pinpointing over-fitting in step 2. We repeated this process about seven times to find a relatively good dataset balance. This value is shown in Table 14.

<i>Dataset</i>	<i>Sample Prob.</i>
Slakh	0.295
MusicNet (em)	0.19
MIR-ST500	0.191
ENSTdrums	0.05
GuitarSet	0.01
EGMD	0.004
URMP	0.1
Maestro	0.1
SMT Bass	0.01
CMedia	0.05

Table 14. Re-balanced Dataset Sampling Probability

⁷In multi-lingual large model training, extremely balanced sampling often resulted in biased models due to the over-repetition of smaller datasets, as revealed in previous study [30].

We believe these experimental results not only highlight the limitations of temperature-based dataset sampling but also offer valuable insights into the importance of dataset re-balancing. Given these lessons, we plan to explore online meta-learning techniques [31] for an episode-based optimizations of Θ in future work.

H. PERFORMANCE BENCHMARK ON SLAKH

In Table 15, we compare our final model, `YPTF.MoE+Multi`, with MT3 [1] and PerceiverTF [25] using various metrics. The table displays three versions of MT3s. The first from the left is the result tested with our implemented metric on the Colab notebook provided by the MT3 author, the second is the result reported by the PerceiverTF author, and the third is the result reported by the MT3 authors.

At the top of the table, our model significantly outperformed other models in the Instrument Note Onset F1 metric for 11 instrument classes, falling slightly behind only the PerceiverTF in the "synth-pad" class.

In the middle section of the table, our model also led in the Instrument agnostic metrics.

The bottom section displays metrics comparing the overall performance of Multi-instrument AMT. For a fair comparison, we do not directly compare our Multi (Onset-Offset) F1 with the PerceiverTF authors' Multi Onset F1 [25] score, which counts a note as correct if its program and onset match the reference. Our Multi F1

metric, following prior work [1], counts a note as correct only if both its program, onset, and offset match the reference, thus indicating a more rigorous and comprehensive performance assessment.

<i>Metric</i>	YPTF.MoE+M (PS)	MT3 ⁸ (our colab)	MT3 (colab [25])	MT3 [1]	PerceiverTF [25]
Bass	93.20	71.03	90.6	-	93.0
Brass	74.96	28.67	43.3	-	73.2
C.Perc	67.70	34.31	34.31	-	57.5
Guitar	82.27	65.90	73.2	-	78.5
Organ	73.48	30.14	36.3	-	69.4
Piano	88.84	70.87	78.0	-	85.4
Pipe	74.72	40.60	28.2	-	66.6
Reed	82.22	19.41	44.0	-	72.5
Strings and Ens.	75.44	47.02	55.1	-	74.4
Synth Lead	84.19	29.51	40.9	-	76.9
Synth Pad	45.57	20.02	23.4	-	47.4
Drums	90.05	83.85	77.3	-	78.5
Onset F1 (non-drum)	84.56	75.20	-	76	81.9
Offset F1 (non-drum)	70.70	56.78	-	57	-
Onset F1 (drums/gm)	90.05	83.85	77.3	-	78.5
Multi (Onset-Offset) F1 [1] ♠	74.84	57.16	-	62	-
Multi Onset F1 [25]	-	-	74.3	-	79.8

Table 15. Performance metrics on Slakh [18] dataset. The highest and second-highest scores are highlighted in boldface. ♠: We use `MT3.MIDI.PLUS` vocabulary, which is equivalent to `MIDI [1]` plus singing. (-) Values not reported.

I. YOURMT3 TOOLKIT




Fig. 2. An overview of how to prepare a single MIR task (pink block), and train (yellow block) a model on the task. The dotted line represents preprocessing that runs only once during the task build, and the solid line represents streaming of data during training.

We developed a toolkit titled `YOURMT3` [34] for training AMT models. The toolkit in Figure 2 comprises two primary components: the task and the trainer. Below are several design considerations aimed at streamlining training for multi-task learning with both audio and symbolic music data.

- **Defining AMT tasks:** A task is simply definable with a set of MIDI tokeniser, vocabulary, and an audio processor. Vocabulary interacts with tokeniser, and together with audio processor it configures the data-stream for mixing sub-tracks.
- **Processing on-the-fly:** The token storage in MT3 [1] is sub-optimal for on-the-fly augmentation due to the absence of links between note onsets and offsets. To efficiently extract and blend short segments from large tracks at random start points, we introduced a self-contained data class *NoteEvent* and summarized in Table 16 with ♡. This approach satisfies the requirements for data processing speed and further adaptability to various data augmentations.
- **Dependency-free:** While MT3 processes notes through `NoteSeq`⁹, an undocumented library rooted in `PrettyMIDI`¹⁰ leading to timing complications with overlapping notes, we constructed the pipeline utilizing the foundational `MIDO`¹¹ library.

Previous works [1, 25] have adopted offline processing for data augmentation. In `YOURMT3`, we implemented a pipeline for efficiently streaming thousands of audio stem files. This was achieved through a caching method and the definition of a custom note event format to rapidly process and tokenize note events. We have further enhanced our toolkit, now called `YOURMT3+`. The advancements are highlighted in Table 16. This toolkit update provides an AMT training environment with minimized bottlenecks in distributed data-parallel (DDP) settings.

⁹<https://github.com/magenta/note-seq>

¹⁰<https://github.com/craffel/pretty-midi>

¹¹<https://github.com/mido/mido>

<i>MT3</i> [1]	<i>YourMT3</i> & <i>YourMT3+</i>
<i>Disk I/O</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TF-Record, serialised data with fixed data shape 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Custom stem file format + FIFO cache for efficient random audio sampling
<i>Note Processing Pipeline</i>	
MIDI ↔ Notes ↔ NoteSeq ↔ Events ↔ Tokens(♡)	MIDI ↔ Notes ↔ Note-Events (♡) ↔ Events ↔ Tokens
<i>Stem Augmentation</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A few versions of offline processed data • Dropping random stems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infinite random processing <i>on-the-fly</i> <p>(<i>YourMT3+</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intra/Cross stem augmentation and pitch-shifting
<i>Optimizer</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AdaFactor [32] with constant learning rate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AdamWScale [33] with cosine scheduler
<i>Datasets for Training</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection of 6 datasets [1]: Slakh, Cerberus, MusicNet, GuitarSet, URMP, Maestro 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collection of 6 datasets: Slakh, EGMD, MusicNet EM, GuitarSet, ENST-Drums, MIR-ST500 + <i>Spleeter</i> <p>(<i>YourMT3+</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional 4 datasets: Maestro, URMP, CMedia + <i>Spleeter</i>, IDMT-SMT Bass

Table 16. Comparison of our implemented data pipeline and augmentation method with previous work [1].

J. REFERENCES

- [1] Joshua P Gardner, Ian Simon, Ethan Manilow, Curtis Hawthorne, and Jesse Engel, “MT3: Multi-task multitrack music transcription,” in *ICLR*, 2021.
- [2] Noam Shazeer, “Glu variants improve transformer,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05202*, 2020.
- [3] Stefan Elfving, Eiji Uchibe, and Kenji Doya, “Sigmoid-weighted linear units for neural network function approximation in reinforcement learning,” *Neural networks*, vol. 107, pp. 3–11, 2018.
- [4] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, and et al., “Mixtral of experts,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024.
- [5] Xun Wu, Shaohan Huang, and Furu Wei, “Mole: Mixture of lora experts,” in *ICLR*, 2023.
- [6] Jiachen Li, Xinyao Wang, Sijie Zhu, Chia-Wen Kuo, Lu Xu, Fan Chen, Jitesh Jain, Humphrey Shi, and Longyin Wen, “Cummo: Scaling multimodal llm with co-upcycled mixture-of-experts,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.05949*, 2024.
- [7] A Harry Robinson and Colin Cherry, “Results of a prototype television bandwidth compression scheme,” *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 356–364, 1967.
- [8] John Thickstun, Zaid Harchaoui, and Sham Kakade, “Learning features of music from scratch,” in *ICLR*, 2016.
- [9] Kin Wai Cheuk, Dorien Herremans, and Li Su, “Reconvat: A semi-supervised automatic music transcription framework for low-resource real-world data,” in *ACM Multimedia*, 2021.
- [10] Ben Maman and Amit H Bermanto, “Unaligned supervision for automatic music transcription in the wild,” in *ICML*, 2022.
- [11] Qingyang Xi, Rachel M Bittner, Johan Pauwels, Xuzhou Ye, and Juan P Bello, “Guitarset: A dataset for guitar transcription,” in *ISMIR*, 2018.
- [12] Xavier Riley, Drew Edwards, and Simon Dixon, “High resolution guitar transcription via domain adaptation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15258*, 2024.
- [13] Jun-You Wang and Jyh-Shing Roger Jang, “On the preparation and validation of a large-scale dataset of singing transcription,” in *ICASSP*, 2021, pp. 276–280.
- [14] Olivier Gillet and Gaël Richard, “Enst-drums: an extensive audio-visual database for drum signals processing,” in *ISMIR*, 2006.
- [15] Chih-Wei Wu, Christian Dittmar, Carl Southall, Richard Vogl, Gerhard Widmer, Jason Hockman, Meinard Müller, and Alexander Lerch, “A review of automatic drum transcription,” *IEEE/ACM Trans. on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 26, no. 9, pp. 1457–1483, 2018.
- [16] Jouni Paulus and Anssi Klapuri, “Drum sound detection in polyphonic music with hidden markov models,” *EURASIP Journal on Audio, Speech, and Music Processing*, vol. 2009, pp. 1–9, 2009.
- [17] Masataka Goto, Hiroki Hashiguchi, Takuichi Nishimura, and Ryuichi Oka, “RWC music database: Popular, classical and jazz music databases,” in *ISMIR*, 2002, vol. 2, pp. 287–288.
- [18] Ethan Manilow, Gordon Wichern, Prem Seetharaman, and Jonathan Le Roux, “Cutting music source separation some Slakh,” in *IEEE WASPAA*, 2019.
- [19] Lee Callender, Curtis Hawthorne, and Jesse Engel, “Improving perceptual quality of drum transcription with the expanded groove midi dataset,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.00188*, 2020.
- [20] Curtis Hawthorne, Andriy Stasyuk, Adam Roberts, Ian Simon, and et al., “Enabling factorized piano music modeling and generation with the maestro dataset,” in *ICLR*, 2018.
- [21] Valentin Emiya, Roland Badeau, and Bertrand David, “Multipitch estimation of piano sounds using a new probabilistic spectral smoothness principle,” *IEEE Trans. on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 1643–1654, 2009.
- [22] Bochen Li, Xinzhaoh Liu, Karthik Dinesh, Zhiyao Duan, and Gaurav Sharma, “Creating a multitrack classical music performance dataset for multimodal music analysis: Challenges, insights, and applications,” *IEEE Trans. on Multimedia*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 522–535, 2018.
- [23] Jakob Abeßer, Hanna Lukashevich, and Gerald Schuller, “Feature-based extraction of plucking and expression styles of the electric bass guitar,” in *ICASSP*, 2010, pp. 2290–2293.
- [24] Jong Wook Kim, Justin Salamon, Peter Li, and Juan Pablo Bello, “Crepe: A convolutional representation for pitch estimation,” in *ICASSP*, 2018, pp. 161–165.
- [25] Wei-Tsung Lu, Ju-Chiang Wang, and Yun-Ning Hung, “Multi-track music transcription with a time-frequency perceiver,” in *ICASSP*, 2023.
- [26] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova, “Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding,” in *NAACL*, 2019.
- [27] Zewen Chi, Shaohan Huang, Li Dong, Shuming Ma, Saksham Singhal, Payal Bajaj, Xia Song, and Furu Wei, “Xlm-e: Cross-lingual language model pre-training via electra,” in *ACL*, 2021.
- [28] Linting Xue, Noah Constant, Adam Roberts, Mihir Kale, Rami Al-Rfou, Aditya Siddhant, Aditya Barua, and Colin Raffel, “mt5: A massively multilingual pre-trained text-to-text transformer,” in *NAACL*, 2020.
- [29] Alexis Conneau, Kartikay Khandelwal, Naman Goyal, Vishrav Chaudhary, Guillaume Wenzek, Francisco Guzmán, Edouard Grave, Myle Ott, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov, “Unsupervised cross-lingual representation learning at scale,” in *ACL*, 2019.
- [30] Hyung Won Chung, Noah Constant, Xavier García, Adam Roberts, Yi Tay, Sharan Narang, and Orhan Firat, “Unimax: Fairer and more effective language sampling for large-scale multilingual pretraining,” *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2304.09151, 2023.
- [31] Xinyi Chen and Elad Hazan, “Online control for meta-optimization,” *NeurIPS*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [32] Noam Shazeer and Mitchell Stern, “Adafactor: Adaptive learning rates with sublinear memory cost,” in *ICML*, 2018, pp. 4596–4604.
- [33] Piotr Nawrot, “NanoT5: Fast & simple pre-training and fine-tuning of t5 models with limited resources,” in *EMNLP Workshop for NLP-OSS*, 2023.
- [34] Sungkyun Chang, Simon Dixon, and Emmanouil Benetos, “YourMT3: a toolkit for training multi-task and multi-track music transcription model for everyone,” in *DMRN+17*, 2022.