

# RenderBox: Expressive Performance Rendering with Text Control

Huan Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Akira Maezawa<sup>2</sup>, Simon Dixon<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Centre for Digital Music, Queen Mary University of London

<sup>2</sup>MINA Lab, R&D Division, Yamaha Corporation

huan.zhang@qmul.ac.uk

## Abstract

Expressive music performance rendering involves interpreting symbolic scores with variations in timing, dynamics, articulation, and instrument-specific techniques, resulting in performances that capture musical can emotional intent. We introduce RenderBox, a unified framework for text-and-score controlled audio performance generation across multiple instruments, applying coarse-level controls through natural language descriptions and granular-level controls using music scores. Based on a diffusion transformer architecture and cross-attention joint conditioning, we propose a curriculum-based paradigm that trains from plain synthesis to expressive performance, gradually incorporating controllable factors such as speed, mistakes, and style diversity. RenderBox achieves high performance compared to baseline models across key metrics such as FAD and CLAP, and also tempo and pitch accuracy under different prompting tasks. Subjective evaluation further demonstrates that RenderBox is able to generate controllable expressive performances that sound natural and musically engaging, aligning well with prompts and intent.

## 1 Introduction

A trained musician can take a piece of music and interpret it in their own way, moulding and varying the emotional expression of the piece by subtly changing performance parameters. Parametric dimensions include timing, dynamics, articulation, and instrument-specific techniques such as bowing for strings, breath control for winds, or pedal usage for pianos [Cancino-Chacón, 2018; Palmer, 1996].

Studying such expression patterns has long been of keen interest to musicians, educators and researchers, and it presents a compelling inquiry into exploring whether such intricate expressions can be accurately encapsulated and replicated by computational systems [Hashida *et al.*, 2008]. Named performance rendering as a task, it has applications in technology-mediated music education and interactive music systems for entertainment and creative assistance.




Figure 1: An overview of the performance space proposed by our paradigm, progressively from strict to variant relative to the input MIDI score.

Just as human speech varies in terms of accent, tone and pace, the space of performances is diverse, ranging from the mistake-prone playing of amateur players to highly personal interpretations of virtuosos. While there have been attempts to condition performance generation with controls on tempo [Borovik and Viro, 2023; Rhyu *et al.*, 2022] and perceptual features [Zhang *et al.*, 2024a], enforcing flexible, multi-dimensional control via natural language has not been addressed in the performance rendering task. Here, we present **RenderBox**, a unified performance rendering framework that bridges symbolic music scores and natural language descriptions to generate expressive and controllable audio performances across multiple instruments. Our contributions\* are as follows:

1. We propose the first text-and-score controlled audio performance generation model that supports multiple instruments, enforcing coarse (text-based expressive direction) and granular (MIDI (Musical Instruments Digital Interface) score) controls into the expressive perfor-

\*Demo page: <https://renderbox-page.vercel.app/>

mance realm.

2. We present a training method that enables the model to generate performance audio signals of varying "performance variability," such as playing styles, speed, ornamentation and inclusion of mistakes. This is achieved by applying curriculum learning with carefully designed stages of performance variability, by feeding data with progressive difficulty during training.
3. Besides demonstrating superior performance in both objective and subjective evaluations, our model learnt interpretable similarity space regarding to the performance and composition styles in classical piano literature.

## 2 Related Work

### 2.1 Controllability in Music Generation

To align better with real-world music-making applications, enhancing the controllability of music generation has been a central topic since the introduction of large generative models. Recent music generation models [Copet et al., 2023; Agostinelli et al., 2023; Melechovsky et al., 2024] are prominently based on text controls, which enables descriptions such as genre, instrumentation and mood. As discussed by Lin et al. [2024], the coarse and high-level text controls are intrinsically limited, and music creators would need them to be combined with lower-level content-based controls such as melody, chord and rhythm. A similar idea is used in AudioBox [team, 2023], in which style descriptions (pace, voice type) and text transcripts jointly condition the audio outputs.

Various conditioning mechanisms are used to control music generation. Large generative models like MusicGen [Copet et al., 2023], MusicLM [Agostinelli et al., 2023] and Riffusion<sup>†</sup> are end-to-end systems that are trained with conditioning signals as input. JASCO [Tal et al., 2024] features multiple conditions of text, chords, melody and drums, each passing through their own representation projections that are aligned in time. Diff-A-Riff [Nistal et al., 2024] is a latent diffusion model based on consistency autoencoder input as well as CLAP [Wu et al., 2023] conditioning that is inserted via FiLM [Perez et al., 2018].

Motivated by transferability and resource considerations, some approaches focus on trainable control modules that augment large, pre-trained models. Coco-Mulla [Lin et al., 2024] employs parameter efficient fine-tuning (PEFT) by inserting adaptor joint embeddings into the self-attention layers of the MusicGen decoder. Similar module-based control is used for music editing [Zhang et al., 2024c], building on a pre-trained music generation model. Music ControlNet [Wu et al., 2024] adopts the ControlNet [Zhang et al., 2023] mechanism, inserting control injection layers into a pre-trained U-Net spectrogram generator.

Extracting their controlled information from chromagrams or piano roll matrices, models like MusicGen-Melody, Coco-Mulla and Music ControlNet are conditioned with monophonic melody and generating variations (or accompaniments) that are time-aligned with the melody. However, our

pursuit of expressive performance (which focuses on Western Classical and Jazz) involves much more complex, polyphonic compositions and requires outputs that are faithful to the score notes but not necessarily time-aligned. Thus, we approach the score conditioning with MIDI tokens directly, retaining the details such as exact note onset and track instrumentation, similar to a synthesis approach [Hawthorne et al., 2022].

### 2.2 Performance Rendering

Traditional performance rendering is the task of generating a piece of natural, human-like performance given an input score, and it has been mostly applied in the symbolic domain [Bresin et al., 2002; Maezawa et al., 2019; Jeong et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2024a], with a few attempts in the audio domain [Dong et al., 2022; Renault et al., 2022]. Audio performance rendering bears much resemblance to the more popular text-to-speech (TTS) task, with the goal of faithfully reproducing a piece of transcript (text or symbolic music events) in the audio realm, while retaining acoustic or style cues such as voice timbre, pace or tempo so that the audio sounds natural. Compared to text, music is much more challenging in terms of time alignment, due to its polyphonic nature, as techniques such as the phoneme duration model [Le et al., 2023] that allows fine-grained alignment control in speech synthesis are harder to transfer into a music setting.

Due to the complexity of the task, the variance in the music performance space has not been explored much. A piece can be played in numerous ways, ranging from masterful interpretations by virtuosi to student performances that reflect varying levels of expertise. Zhang et al. [2025; 2024b] highlight the importance of performance understanding and the scarcity of annotated performance data. Our current work situates the performance rendering task within this diverse interpretative space, demonstrating effective control through text-based inputs.

### 2.3 Curriculum Learning and Continual Learning

In our formulation of the performance variation space, a spectrum of sub-tasks with varying difficulty naturally emerges as shown in Figure 1. It ranges from the "strict / easy" synthesis task that does not involve any alteration of the pitch-time relationship from MIDI conditioning, to the "deviated / hard" performance tasks that are subject to variation in tempo and timing, and even addition and removal of pitches. By bootstrapping the tasks on a gradual difficulty scale, simulating the performance variation space can be posited in the framework of continual learning with a curriculum structure.

Curriculum learning [Wang et al., 2022] enables machine learning model training to progress gradually from easy examples to harder ones, and continual learning (CL) enables models to learn new knowledge and preserve knowledge acquired previously from a data stream with a continuously changing distribution. While CL is frequently applied to classification tasks [Wang et al., 2019; Bhatt et al., 2024; Faber et al., 2024], the application of CL in generative models is less prominent. Suffering from potential challenges such as *catastrophic forgetting*, strategies such as rehearsals, replay and regularization are employed, but often at the cost of

<sup>†</sup><https://www.riffusion.com/>

<i>Datasets by stage</i>	Input MIDI	Target Audio	Duration	Instrumentation	Controls / Prompts	Repertoire / Notes
<i>Stage 0: Synthesis</i>						
(n)ASAP	Score & Performance	Synth. Score & Perf. Audio	46h	Piano	-	Common Practice Period solo piano works
MusicNet	Score & Performance	Synth. Score & Perf. Audio	34h	Orchestral	-	Classical music with a large portion of chamber works
GAPS	Score	Synth. Score	10.5h	Guitar	-	Noted classical guitar works
<i>Stage 1: Speed-controlled synthesis</i>						
(n)ASAP-aug	Score	Synth. Score	68.3h	Piano	Tempo	Time-varied score synthesis
GAPS-aug	Score	Synth. Score	25h	Guitar	Tempo	Time-varied score synthesis
MusicNet-aug	Score	Synth. Score	51h	Orchestral	Tempo	Time-varied score synthesis
<i>Stage 2: Expressive Performance</i>						
(n)ASAP	Score	Perf. Audio	48.1h	Piano	Expressive	Aligned perf. segments
GAPS	Score	Perf. Audio	5.3h	Guitar	Expressive	Aligned perf. segments
In-house-Sax	Score	Perf. Audio	2.13h	Saxophone	Expressive or not	Jazz standards (2 versions)
MusicNet	Score	Perf. Audio	30.4h	Orchestral	Expressive	Aligned perf. segments
BachViolin	Score	Perf. Audio	4.4h	Violin	Expressive	Bach violin sonata
<i>Stage 3: Mistake-corrupted performance</i>						
(n)ASAP-synmis	Score	Synth. Perf.	36h	Piano	Mistakes (no annotation)	Synthesized from perf. MIDI which is corrupted with artificial mistakes
<i>Stage 4: Style-directioned Performance</i>						
ATEPP-subset	Score	Perf. Audio	273h	Piano	Performer labels	Standard piano repertoire played by 40+ pianists
Con Espressione	Score	Perf. Audio	0.5h	Piano	Human-annotated expression labels	45 perf. of 9 excerpts annot. by 179 participants
Vienna 4x22	Score	Perf. Audio	1.2h	Piano	Performer labels	4 short pieces played by 22 pianists each

Table 1: Aligned datasets of scores and performances, organized by curriculum level. The dataset duration is computed with regards to the total length of input MIDI segments, and also subject to the availability and validity of accurate alignment.

training additional discriminators. In our case, we take a data-incremental curriculum, and we are also the first to apply CL in incremental development of control for music generation.

### 3 Methodology

#### 3.1 Base Architecture

We base our conditioning model on the text-to-audio architecture from Stable-audio-open [Evans *et al.*, 2024]: an autoencoder with a latent rate of 21.5Hz to preprocess the raw waveform sampled at 44.1kHz, a T5-based text embedding for text conditioning, and a diffusion transformer (DiT) that operates in the latent space of the autoencoder with latent sequences of length 1024 (47 seconds).

During training, we initialize the autoencoder, text embedding module and diffusion transformer with the pre-trained weights of the original text-to-audio model. The DiT is trained to predict a noise increment from noised ground-truth latents, following the standard formulation of the v-objective. Given a latent  $\mathbf{z}_t$  at time  $t$ , perturbed with noise  $\epsilon_t$  according to a variance schedule, the model predicts the velocity  $\mathbf{v}_t = \alpha_t \epsilon_t - \sigma_t \mathbf{z}_t$ , where  $\alpha_t$  and  $\sigma_t$  are determined by the

variance-preserving diffusion process. During inference, we use the DPM-Solver++ for 100 steps with classifier-free guidance (scale of 7.0).

#### MIDI Conditioning

The text and duration (a float input with positional embedding that is used to control output length) conditioning signals are incorporated into the base architecture via cross-attention. We also need to incorporate MIDI score input to instruct the rendering. The input MIDI data is first converted to a MIDI-Like tokenization sequence via `note-seq`<sup>‡</sup>. We use the same note event vocabulary as MT3 [Hawthorne *et al.*, 2022], which is based on the MIDI protocol. Specifically, there are events for Instrument (128 values), Note (128 values), On/Off (2 values), Time (512 values), End Tie Section (1 value), and EOS (1 value). The MIDI conditioning module consists of an embedding layer that projects token vocabularies into a 768-dimensional space, to which a sinusoidal positional encoding is added. Our input MIDI window is 10 seconds, which could include 300–2000 tokens depending on the note density of the piece.

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




Figure 2: ControlNet conditioning (left) and concatenative cross-attention conditioning (right), with color highlighting the initialization of modules and their optimization in our experiments.

To subsequently insert the MIDI embeddings into the DiT, we experimented with two methods:

- Exp.1: Concatenative cross-attention conditioning. The MIDI embedding is concatenated with the T5 text embedding and the duration embedding along the sequence dimension. Besides the new MIDI embedding module, all other modules and layers are initialized with the stable-audio-open weights and receive full fine-tuning (except for T5 which is frozen).
- Exp.2: ControlNet conditioning based on the implementation of stable-audio-controlnet<sup>§</sup> [Ciranni et al., 2025]. With the main DiT and the text and duration embeddings frozen with pretrained weights, the MIDI embeddings go through the ControlNet branch which is a reduced version of DiT with around 20% of the depth. Only the ControlNet branch and MIDI embedder are optimized. See Fig. 2 for an illustration of the conditioning.

### 3.2 Curriculum Training Scheduler

Curriculum learning sequences the learning process in a curriculum of increasing complexity tasks, which allows learning on large data collections that otherwise would be impossible to learn from scratch. As shown in Table 1, we arrange the datasets and training targets by stages of difficulty, distributing to five stages:

- Stage 0 - Synthesis, which enforces the same text prompt (20k steps) ‘Synthesis’. This stage forces the model to direct its attention away from the text information to the MIDI tokens, focusing entirely on mapping MIDI events precisely to audio events.
- Stage 1 - Synthesis with speed change (10k steps). As human performers naturally vary tempo, this stage is an important bridge to train the model to map a stretched / squeezed time series of MIDI events in response to speed prompts (e.g., *twice as fast*).
- Stage 2 - Expressive performance (15k steps). This stage introduces performance recordings as training target (in contrast to mechanically synthesized audio in previous stages), which involves not only global tempo change (indicated by the text prompt) but also local timing variations (such as rubato).

<sup>§</sup><https://github.com/EmilianPostolache/stable-audio-controlnet>

- Stage 3 - Mistake-corrupted performance (4k steps). The target is performance MIDI corrupted with artificial mistakes, such that the model learn possible pitch or rhythm deviation from the score (compared to the deviation-free performance in the previous stage) under the performance category of less-experienced player.
- Stage 4 - Style-directed performance (10k steps). This stage also trains with performance data, but augments the text prompt with available style directions, including performer names or expressivity annotations (i.e. *calm*, *passionate*).

For ablation, we also trained a version of MIDI concatenative cross-attention conditioning without the curriculum learning by mixing all stages of data (Exp.3).

### 3.3 Experiments

All of our experiments are performed on four 80GB A100 GPUs, using 16-bit precision training. For training Exp.1 and Exp.3, we use the AdamW optimizer, with a base learning rate of 1e-5 and a scheduler including exponential ramp-up and decay. With a batch size of 108, Exp.1 trains for a total of 59k steps as stages scheduled in the previous section, and Exp.3 (no stages) is trained for 60k steps. Other training techniques such as EMA are applied, following Evans et al. [2024]. For training Exp.2 of the ControlNet, we have trained 30k steps with a batch size of 108, and a learning rate of 1e-4.

## 4 Datasets

To train our model, we have aggregated a large number of publicly available performance datasets with aligned score and audio performances, across a range of instruments. That includes (n)ASAP [Peter et al., 2023], MusicNet [Maman and Bermanno, 2022], GAPS [Riley et al., 2024], BachViolin [Dong et al., 2022], ATEPP [Zhang et al., 2022], *Con Espresione* [Cancino-Chacón et al., 2020], and Vienna 4x22<sup>¶</sup>. Their size, repertoire, annotations for prompts, augmentation and scheduling are listed in Table 1. In the expressive performance training of stage 2, we also utilized an in-house recorded saxophone dataset (copyrighted) of funk and swing Jazz standards from *The Real Book*.

### 4.1 Augmentations

**Speed augmentation:** For stage 1 training, we apply speed augmentation to induce the model’s ability to synthesize the MIDI score timing into proportionally faster or slower audio, before learning the more flexibly varied performance timing. As shown in Table 2, each score in the (n)ASAP, MusicNet and GAPS datasets is augmented with 5 tiers of speed ranges, in which the speed ratio is randomly sampled within the tier’s range, and the text prompt is augmented with a corresponding speed keyword of common terminology. The speed-controlled re-synthesized score audio is served as the training target. We choose to not speed-augment the performances, since the artist’s interpretation of timing and phrasing would be influenced by tempo [Repp, 1996; Repp, 1995]. While the speed ranges include significant

<sup>¶</sup><https://github.com/CPJKU/vienna4x22>

tempo shifts, they intend to help the model generalize across different expressive timing variations, rather than imply that all music would be performed at such extreme tempos.

**Mistake augmentation:** For the stage 4 training with mistake instruction, we followed the mistake taxonomy proposed by Morsi *et al.* [2024] and implemented several types of mistakes to augment the ASAP dataset: mistouch, asynchrony (delay or anticipation), substitution, ghost note and re-orientation (time block removal). The procedure of applying the mistakes to each segment is detailed in Algorithm 1. Note that our mistake corruption does not involve adding shifts or silence on the time axis, since that would change the score-audio segment alignments.

---

#### Algorithm 1 Mistake Augmentation on Piece Level

---

```

1: Input: A sequence of notes  $\mathcal{N}$  with total duration  $\mathcal{T}$  seconds, each with properties: pitch  $\pi_n$ , velocity  $v_n$ , start time  $s_n$ , and end time  $e_n$ .
2: Definitions:
3:  $P_{\text{uniform}}(a, b)$ : A random value uniformly sampled from the interval  $[a, b]$ 
4:  $\mathcal{U}(0, 1)$ : A uniform distribution over the interval  $[0, 1]$ 
5: for each note  $n \in \mathcal{N}$  do
6:   Mistouch:
7:   if  $\mathcal{U}(0, 1) < 0.05$  then
8:     Generate a new note  $n'$ :
9:      $\pi_{n'} \leftarrow \pi_n + \text{choice}(\{-1, 1\})$ 
10:     $v_{n'} \leftarrow 0.8 \cdot v_n$ 
11:     $s_{n'} \leftarrow s_n + P_{\text{uniform}}(0.02, 0.1)$ 
12:     $e_{n'} \leftarrow s_{n'} + P_{\text{uniform}}(0.1, 0.3)$ 
13:    Add  $n'$  to  $\mathcal{N}$ 
14:   Asynchrony:
15:   if  $\mathcal{U}(0, 1) < 0.2$  then
16:     Shift  $s_n$  and  $e_n$  by  $P_{\text{uniform}}(-0.7, 0.7)$ 
17:     Ensure  $s_n \geq 0$  and  $e_n \geq s_n$ 
18:   Substitution:
19:   if  $\mathcal{U}(0, 1) < 0.05$  then
20:      $\pi_n \leftarrow \pi_n + \text{choice}(\{-1, 1\})$ 
21:   Ghost Notes:
22:   if  $\mathcal{U}(0, 1) < 0.05$  then
23:     Remove  $n$  from  $\mathcal{N}$ 
24:   Time Block Removal:
25:   for  $k = 0$  to  $\lfloor \frac{\mathcal{T}}{5} \rfloor$  do
26:      $t_{\text{start}} \leftarrow 5k + P_{\text{uniform}}(0, 5)$ 
27:      $t_{\text{end}} \leftarrow t_{\text{start}} + P_{\text{uniform}}(0.2, 0.5)$ 
28:     Remove all  $n \in \mathcal{N}$  where  $t_{\text{start}} \leq s_n < t_{\text{end}}$ 

```

---

## 4.2 Prompt Preparation

Our prompts, aligning with the tasks to provide multiple stages of instructions, may include the following fields of information: **sonification type** - ‘*synthesis*’ or ‘*performance*’ (all stages), **speed keyword** (stage 1 and after), **title**, **composer**, **instrumentation**, **mistake** (stage 3), **performer ID** (stage 4), **expression label** (stage 4), subject to the availability of this information in the metadata as shown in Table 1.

The speed keywords (Table 2) are first utilized in stage 1 with the speed-augmented synthesis as described in sec-

Tier	Dur-Range	Speed keyword for prompt
Very Slow	(1.8, 2.2)	<i>Twice as slow as</i> <i>Significantly slower</i> <i>About half the speed of</i>
Slow	(1.5, 1.8)	<i>Considerably slower</i> <i>Moving slower</i>
Slightly Slow	(1.2, 1.5)	<i>A bit slower than score</i> <i>Just under the score’s pace</i> <i>Slightly behind the intended pace</i>
Neutral	(0.8, 1.2)	<i>At the original speed</i> <i>In line with the score’s tempo</i>
Slightly Fast	(0.6, 0.8)	<i>A bit faster</i> <i>Just above the score’s speed</i> <i>Slightly faster than score</i>
Fast	(0.4, 0.6)	<i>Notably faster</i> <i>Well beyond the original tempo</i>

Table 2: Speed prompt keywords arranged in tiers.

tion 4.1. For the later stages of performance data, we incorporate a tempo prompt by estimating the length ratio of the aligned performance window to the reference score. For example, if the aligned performance window is 17 seconds of a given 10-second MIDI score, we simplify the tempo ratio as 1.7 and supply a prompt keyword of *Considerably slower*. For our fixed-length (10s) input window, the performance ratios in our datasets are roughly between 0.4 and 2.2. For other available metadata such as title, composer and instrumentation, we also choose to optionally include them (with random dropout of 0.5) as these labels would facilitate rendering by giving extra context about the MIDI piece.

The prompt field values are specified in a comma-separated list in any order (e.g. “*a bit slower, expressive performance, Bach, Piano*” in stage 2, or “*expressive performance, style of Vladimir Ashkenazy, Etude Op.25 No.11, Chopin, notably faster*” in stage 4).

## 5 Evaluation

We compare our work with the following three models. **MusicGen-melody** is the melody-conditioned version of MusicGen [Copet *et al.*, 2023]. Given that the melody conditioning is implemented via an audio input, we synthesize the MIDI score<sup>1</sup> for MusicGen-melody as score conditioning. **Coco-Mulla** is a MusicGen-based conditioning model which enforces more external controls such as drum track, chord symbols and reference MIDI. In our usage, we supply null values for the drum track and chord symbols, taking it as a MIDI-and-text conditioned generation. **MIDI-DDSP** is an expressive synthesizer framework dedicated to string and wind instruments that is able to control aspects such as brightness and vibrato. Evaluations are conducted in stage 0, 2, and 4 with respect to each stage’s testing set and their prompting.

<sup>1</sup>soundfont: <https://github.com/mrbumpy409/GeneralUser-GS>

Model	Stage 0 - Synthesis				Stage 2 - Performance				Stage 4 - Directed Performance			
	FAD <sub>openl3</sub> ↓	CLAP <sub>score</sub> ↑	Pitch ↑	Tempo ↓	FAD <sub>openl3</sub> ↓	CLAP <sub>score</sub> ↑	Pitch ↑	Tempo ↓	FAD <sub>openl3</sub> ↓	CLAP <sub>score</sub> ↑	Pitch ↑	Tempo ↓
MusicGen-Melody	1017.5	0.194	0.496	2.036	936.88	0.263	0.522	11.12	931.83	0.216	0.523	23.14
Coco-Mulla	984.3	<b>0.260</b>	0.739	1.745	972.65	0.212	0.704	11.65	994.09	0.231	0.674	23.30
MIDI-DDSP	1436.4	0.148	0.730	<b>0.006</b>	1434.5	0.264	0.681	10.80	-	-	-	-
<b>RenderBox-Stage0</b>	<b>839.3</b>	0.174	<b>0.794</b>	0.038	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>RenderBox-Stage2</b>	934.9	0.179	0.780	0.013	<b>562.58</b>	<b>0.265</b>	0.753	<b>10.39</b>	-	-	-	-
<b>RenderBox-Stage4</b>	1002.1	0.177	0.789	0.016	611.18	0.259	<b>0.762</b>	11.55	<b>340.77</b>	<b>0.234</b>	<b>0.748</b>	<b>19.51</b>
<b>RenderBox-no-CL</b>	1369.4	0.167	0.755	1.054	735.68	0.215	0.697	12.04	504.15	0.202	0.695	26.38
<b>RenderBox-ControlNet-no-CL</b>	1082.7	0.175	0.655	1.650	1127.2	0.124	0.630	14.26	781.58	0.144	0.610	26.06

Table 3: Comparison of models across the three main stages, using FAD, CLAP, Chroma, and Tempo scores as metrics. Each stage features different prompting, MIDI conditioning and ground truth data as shown in Table 1. For MIDI-DDSP, the evaluation is only performed on the MusicNet and BachViolin subsets as the model is restricted to chamber instruments.




Figure 3: MOS score of the subjective evaluation on the four dimensions, separated by participant’s experience.

## 5.1 Objective Evaluation

For the audio metrics, we follow the previously established metrics [Evans *et al.*, 2024] implemented in stable-audio-metrics, including the **Fréchet audio distance** (FAD) on *OpenL3* embeddings [Cramer *et al.*, 2019] between the output and ground truth distributions, and distance in LAION-CLAP space [Wu *et al.*, 2023] between the text prompt and output. Given the goal of performance rendering, it is crucial to enforce that the correct piece is played. To evaluate pitch-wise accuracy, we compute the **chroma similarity**, inspired by the evaluation approach used for MusicGen-Melody [Copet *et al.*, 2023]. As the output and ground truth audio are not necessarily time-aligned, we employ dynamic time warping (DTW) on the chromagrams to estimate frame correspondences for a rough audio-level alignment. Following this alignment, frame-wise **cosine similarity** is calculated between the aligned chroma features. Additionally, the DTW alignment cost is incorporated as a penalty term, scaled by a weighting factor  $\lambda = 10^{-3}$ .

We also measure **tempo deviation** to evaluate whether the output tempo is within the prompted tempo tier as specified in Table 2. Given the expected tempo ratio range (for stage 0 synthesis we expect tempo not to change), the tempo deviation is computed as the percentage difference between the estimated output tempo (using *madmom*) and the score tempo adjusted by the prompt.

## 5.2 Subjective Evaluation

Besides the aforementioned baselines, we compare with two additional symbolic-output performance rendering models: VirtuosoNet [Jeong *et al.*, 2019] and DEXter [Zhang *et al.*, 2024a]. The performances are synthesized from MIDI\*\*, as the focus of the subjective evaluation is on the musical content rather than audio quality. Given the conditioning score and text prompt, test participants were asked to rate examples on a 100-point numeric scale on text alignment, music score alignment, expressivity and skill. We included nine questions, spanning six instruments as well as all the task (prompt) types in Section 3.2. Responses were collected from 23 participants, 10 of whom have more than 5 years’ experience of instrument playing.

The results, illustrated in Fig. 3, reveal that RenderBox achieves the highest overall scores across most dimensions for both experienced and inexperienced participants. RenderBox significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) outperforms the conditioned audio generation models Coco-Mulla and MusicGen-Melody in all four dimensions. While symbolic models (those bypassing note event prediction: DEXter, VirtuosoNet, and MIDI-DDSP), achieve comparably positive feedback in score alignment, they lack the balanced performance across dimensions demonstrated by RenderBox.

In general, experienced listeners exhibit a larger difference across the models, due to their greater sensitivity to musical nuances. However, text correspondence does not seem to significantly influence listeners’ overall perception. Although RenderBox is the only model capable of speed control based on the text prompt, this feature alone does not seem to heavily impact MOS score compared to the output of the symbolic models as long as they sound musically correct.

\*\*soundfont: [https://github.com/SunsetMkt/sgm\\_plus\\_archive](https://github.com/SunsetMkt/sgm_plus_archive)




Figure 4: Input MIDI piano rolls and output spectrograms with respect to different text prompting. All visualizations are 20-second windows.

### 5.3 Results and Ablation

As shown in table 3, RenderBox largely outperforms the compared baselines in most metrics, except the CLAP score and tempo deviations from the synthesis stage. [to add] Comparison with **RenderBox-no-CL** demonstrates the effectiveness of the curriculum learning approach: Despite training with the same data with the same number of iterations, **RenderBox-no-CL** does not perform as well as the CL version from any of the stages. The *forgetting* phenomenon is also observed in the evaluations: For the RenderBox models trained up to stage 2 and stage 4, their performance on the stage 0 synthesis task decreased dramatically, as they have been fitted with increasingly diverse distributions.

The controlnet experiment, trained with full set of data in a non-bootstrapped manner, could not outperform the main RenderBox experiments’ result. The zero-convolution-inserted MIDI tokens does not yield a strong impact on the output audio compared to the text conditioning.

### 5.4 The Performer-Piece Embedding Space

In stage 4, we directed the model to learn highly specific performance styles by fitting the model on ATEPP, a collection of virtuoso piano recordings. Although evaluating a pianist’s unique style is inherently challenging due to the expertise required, the outputs of our model received very positive feedback during informal interviews with students and professors from conservatories.<sup>††</sup>

In figure 5 we surveyed 380 test data pieces, generating with prompt “In the style of pianist X,” where X is one of ten famous pianists. We plot the final step’s denoised latent as a t-SNE reduction (*perplexity*=30). Some pianists’ styles clustered prominently regardless of the piece like *Argerich*, *Cortot* and *Gould*. Composers also form clusters, indicating a greater consistency across interpretations that transcends individual performer styles, such as the *Debussy* cluster, *Bach* cluster and *Mozart* cluster at the bottom. Within the composer clusters, we also witnessed patterns of style proximity such as *Gilels* and *Richter*, who are often close regardless of piece, which can be explained by the fact that they are both Russian Silver Age pianists and Neuhaus’s pupils [Razu-

t-SNE Visualization of Latent Embeddings




Figure 5: t-SNE visualization of generation with testing data subset, colored by performers and shaped by composers.

movskaya, 2018]. Modern pianists such as *Yuja Wang* feature much more spread-out interpretations according to the model.

## 6 Conclusion and Future Work

We introduced RenderBox, the first model capable of generating expressive performances with text-based control. Combining coarse language descriptions with fine-grained MIDI conditioning, RenderBox achieves flexible control for speed, mistakes, and style diversity with multiple instruments.

While RenderBox demonstrates robust performance, limitations persist in its handling of acoustic quality due to the lack of detailed annotations for instrument timbres in the training data. Still, as the model bridges symbolic scores and audio, future creative applications can leverage annotated datasets to support instrument transfer, orchestral arrangements from symbolic scores, refinement of MIDI inputs with mistakes into polished audio outputs, and even generation with specific performance techniques.

<sup>††</sup>We strongly encourage readers to explore our demo page.

## References

- [Agostinelli *et al.*, 2023] Andrea Agostinelli, Timo I. Denk, Zalán Borsos, Jesse Engel, Mauro Verzetti, Antoine Cailion, Qingqing Huang, Aren Jansen, Adam Roberts, Marco Tagliasacchi, Matt Sharifi, Neil Zeghidour, and Christian Frank. MusicLM: Generating Music From Text. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.11325*, 2023.
- [Bhatt *et al.*, 2024] Ruchi Bhatt, Pratibha Kumari, Dwarikanath Mahapatra, Abdulmotaleb El Saddik, and Mukesh Saini. Characterizing Continual Learning Scenarios and Strategies for Audio Analysis. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:2407.00465*, jun 2024.
- [Borovik and Viro, 2023] Ilya Borovik and Vladimir Viro. ScorePerformer : Expressive Piano Performance Rendering with Fine-grained Control. In *Proceeding of the 24th International Society on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR)*, Milan, Italy, 2023.
- [Bresin *et al.*, 2002] Roberto Bresin, Anders Friberg, and Johan Sundberg. Director Musices : The KTH Performance Rules System. *Special Interest Group on Music and Computer (SIGMUS) - 46 Kyoto*, pages 43–48, 2002.
- [Cancino-Chacón *et al.*, 2020] Carlos Cancino-Chacón, Silvan Peter, Shreyan Chowdhury, Anna Aljanaki, and Gerhard Widmer. On the Characterization of Expressive Performance in Classical Music: First Results of the Con Espressione Game. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference (ISMIR)*, 2020.
- [Cancino-Chacón, 2018] Carlos Eduardo Cancino-Chacón. *Computational Modeling of Expressive Music Performance with Linear and Non-linear Basis Function Models*. PhD thesis, Johannes Kepler University Linz, 2018.
- [Ciranni *et al.*, 2025] Ruben Ciranni, Emilian Postolache, Giorgio Mariani, Michele Mancusi, Luca Cosmo, and Emanuele Rodolà. COCOLA: Coherence-Oriented Contrastive Learning of Musical Audio Representations. In *Proceeding of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2025.
- [Copet *et al.*, 2023] Jade Copet, Felix Kreuk, Itai Gat, Tal Remez, David Kant, Gabriel Synnaeve, Yossi Adi, and Alexandre Défossez. Simple and Controllable Music Generation. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023.
- [Cramer *et al.*, 2019] Jason Cramer, Ho Hsiang Wu, Justin Salamon, and Juan Pablo Bello. Look, Listen, and Learn More: Design Choices for Deep Audio Embeddings,. In *In Proceedings of the ICASSP 2019 - 2019 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal (ICASSP)*, 2019.
- [Dong *et al.*, 2022] Hao-Wen Dong, Cong Zhou, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Julian McAuley. Deep Performer: Score-to-audio Music Performance Synthesis. In *Proceeding of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2022.
- [Evans *et al.*, 2024] Zach Evans, Julian D. Parker, CJ Carr, Zack Zukowski, Josiah Taylor, and Jordi Pons. Stable Audio Open. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:2407.14358*, jul 2024.
- [Faber *et al.*, 2024] Kamil Faber, Dominik Zurek, Marcin Pietron, Nathalie Japkowicz, Antonio Vergari, and Roberto Corizzo. From MNIST to ImageNet and back: benchmarking continual curriculum learning. *Machine Learning*, 113(10), mar 2024.
- [Hashida *et al.*, 2008] M Hashida, M Nakra, H Katayose, T Murao, K Hirata, K Suzuki, and T Kitahara. Rencon: Performance Rendering Contest for Automated Music Systems. In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Music Perception and Cognition (ICMPC)*, Sapporo, 2008.
- [Hawthorne *et al.*, 2022] Curtis Hawthorne, Ian Simon, Adam Roberts, Neil Zeghidour, Josh Gardner, Ethan Manilow, and Jesse Engel. Multi-instrument Music Synthesis with Spectrogram Diffusion. In *Proceeding of the International Society on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR)*, Bengaluru, India, 2022.
- [Jeong *et al.*, 2019] Dasaem Jeong, Taegyun Kwon, Yoojin Kim, Kyogu Lee, and Juhan Nam. VirtuosoNet: A Hierarchical RNN-based System for Modeling Expressive Piano Performance. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference (ISMIR)*, Delft, Netherlands, 2019.
- [Le *et al.*, 2023] Matthew Le, Apoorv Vyas, Bowen Shi, Brian Karrer, Leda Sari, Rashel Moritz, Mary Williamson, Vimal Manohar, Yossi Adi, Jay Mahadeokar, and Wei Ning Hsu. Voicebox: Text-Guided Multilingual Universal Speech Generation at Scale. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- [Lin *et al.*, 2024] Liwei Lin, Gus Xia, Junyan Jiang, and Yixiao Zhang. Content-based Controls for Music Large Language Modeling. In *Proceeding of the 25th International Society on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR)*, 2024.
- [Maezawa *et al.*, 2019] Akira Maezawa, Kazuhiko Yamamoto, and Takuya Fujishima. Rendering music performance with interpretation variations using conditional variational RNN. *Proceedings of the 20th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference (ISMIR)*, 2019.
- [Maman and Bermanno, 2022] Ben Maman and Amit H. Bermanno. Unaligned Supervision for Automatic Music Transcription in-the-Wild. In *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, volume 162, 2022.
- [Melechovsky *et al.*, 2024] Jan Melechovsky, Zixun Guo, Deepanway Ghosal, Navonil Majumder, Dorien Herremans, and Soujanya Poria. Mustango: Toward Controllable Text-to-Music Generation. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, NAACL*, volume 1, 2024.
- [Morsi *et al.*, 2024] Alia Morsi, Huan Zhang, Akira Maezawa, Simon Dixon, and Xavier Serra. Simulating



- Piano Performance Mistakes for Music Learning. In *Proceedings of the Sound and Music Computing Conference (SMC)*, 2024.
- [Nistal *et al.*, 2024] Javier Nistal, Marco Pasini, Cyran Aouameur, Maarten Grachten, and Stefan Lattner. Diff-A-Riff: Musical Accompaniment Co-creation via Latent Diffusion Models. *Proceeding of the 25th International Society on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR)*, 2024.
- [Palmer, 1996] Caroline Palmer. Anatomy of a performance: Sources of musical expression. *Music Perception*, 13(3):433–453, 1996.
- [Perez *et al.*, 2018] Ethan Perez, Florian Strub, Harm De Vries, Vincent Dumoulin, and Aaron Courville. FiLM: Visual reasoning with a general conditioning layer. In *32nd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2018*, New Orleans, USA, 2018.
- [Peter *et al.*, 2023] Silvan David Peter, Carlos Eduardo Cancino-chacón, Francesco Foscarin, Florian Henkel, and Gerhard Widmer. Automatic Note-Level Alignments in the ASAP Dataset. *Transactions of the International Society for Music Information Retrieval (TISMIR)*, 2023.
- [Razumovskaya, 2018] Maria Razumovskaya. *Heinrich Neuhaus: A Life beyond Music*. Boydell & Brewer, NED - new edition, 2018.
- [Renault *et al.*, 2022] Lenny Renault, Rémi Mignot, and Axel Roebel. Differentiable Piano Model for MIDI-to-Audio Performance Synthesis. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Digital Audio Effects, DAFX*, volume 3, pages 232–239, 2022.
- [Repp, 1995] Bruno H Repp. Quantitative Effects of Global Tempo on Expressive Timing in Music Performance: Some Perceptual Evidence. *Music Perception*, 13(1):39–57, 1995.
- [Repp, 1996] Bruno H Repp. Pedal Timing and Tempo in Expressive Piano Performance: A Preliminary Investigation. *Psychology of Music*, 24(2):199–221, 1996.
- [Rhyu *et al.*, 2022] Seungyeon Rhyu, Sarah Kim, and Kyogu Lee. Sketching the Expression: Flexible Rendering of Expressive Piano Performance with Self-Supervised Learning. In *Proceeding of the International Society on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR)*, Bengaluru, India, 2022.
- [Riley *et al.*, 2024] Xavier Riley, Zixun Guo, Drew Edwards, and Simon Dixon. GAPS: A Large and Diverse Classical Guitar Dataset and Benchmark Transcription Model. In *Proceeding of the 25th International Society on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR)*, aug 2024.
- [Tal *et al.*, 2024] Or Tal, Alon Ziv, Itai Gat, Felix Kreuk, and Yossi Adi. Joint Audio and Symbolic Conditioning for Temporally Controlled Text-to-Music Generation. In *Proceeding of the 25th International Society on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR)*, jun 2024.
- [team, 2023] AudioBox team. Audiobox: Unified Audio Generation with Natural Language Prompts. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:2312.15821*, 2023.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2019] Zhepei Wang, Cem Subakan, Efthymios Tzinis, Paris Smaragdis, and Laurent Charlin. Continual learning of new sound classes using generative replay. In *IEEE Workshop on Applications of Signal Processing to Audio and Acoustics*, volume 2019-October, jun 2019.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2022] Xin Wang, Yudong Chen, and Wenwu Zhu. A Survey on Curriculum Learning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(9), oct 2022.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2023] Yusong Wu, Ke Chen, Tianyu Zhang, Yuchen Hui, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Shlomo Dubnov. Large-Scale Contrastive Language-Audio Pretraining with Feature Fusion and Keyword-to-Caption Augmentation. In *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, 2023.
- [Wu *et al.*, 2024] Shih Lun Wu, Chris Donahue, Shinji Watanabe, and Nicholas J. Bryan. Music ControlNet: Multiple Time-Varying Controls for Music Generation. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio Speech and Language Processing*, 2024.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2022] Huan Zhang, Jingjing Tang, Syed Rafee, Simon Dixon, and George Fazekas. ATEPP: A Dataset of Automatically Transcribed Expressive Piano Performance. In *Proceedings of the International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference (ISMIR)*, Bengaluru, India, 2022.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2023] Lvmin Zhang, Anyi Rao, and Maneesh Agrawala. Adding Conditional Control to Text-to-Image Diffusion Models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2024a] Huan Zhang, Shreyan Chowdhury, Carlos Eduardo Cancino-Chacón, Jinhua Liang, Simon Dixon, and Gerhard Widmer. DEXter: Learning and Controlling Performance Expression with Diffusion Models. *Applied Sciences*, 14(15), 2024.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2024b] Huan Zhang, Jinhua Liang, and Simon Dixon. From Audio Encoders to Piano Judges: Benchmarking Performance Understanding for Solo Piano. In *Proceeding of the 25th International Society on Music Information Retrieval (ISMIR)*, 2024.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2024c] Yixiao Zhang, Yukara Ikemiya, Woosung Choi, Naoki Murata, Marco A. Martínez-Ramírez, Liwei Lin, Gus Xia, Wei-Hsiang Liao, Yuki Mitsufuji, and Simon Dixon. Instruct-MusicGen: Unlocking Text-to-Music Editing for Music Language Models via Instruction Tuning. In *Proceeding of the International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, 2024.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2025] Huan Zhang, Vincent Cheung, Hayato Nishioka, Simon Dixon, and Shinichi Furuya. LLaQo: Towards a Query-Based Coach in Expressive Music Performance Assessment. In *In Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2025.