ABSTRACT

In music production, descriptive terminology is used to define perceived sound transformations. By understanding the underlying statistical features associated with these transformations, we can aid the retrieval of contextually relevant processing parameters using natural language, and create intelligent systems capable of assisting in audio engineering. In this study, we present an analysis of a dataset containing descriptive terms gathered using a series of processing modules, embedded within a Digital Audio Workstation. By applying hierarchical clustering to the audio feature space, we show that similarity in term representations exists within and between transformation classes. Furthermore, the organisation of terms in low-dimensional timbre space can be explained using perceptual concepts such as size and dissonance. We conclude by performing Latent Semantic Indexing to show that similar groupings exist based on term frequency.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Musical timbre refers to the properties of a sound, other than loudness and pitch, which allow it to be distinguished from other sounds [8]. Loudness and pitch can easily be measured in low-dimensional space, allowing sounds to be ordered from quiet to loud or low to high in frequency, whereas timbre is a more complex property of sound, requiring multiple dimensions [11]. To characterise perceptual attributes of musical timbre, listeners often attribute semantic descriptors such as bright, rough or sharp to describe latent dimensions [5]. A widely cited definition of timbre [1] shows it can be determined by a range of low level features of an audio signal, where the spectral content and temporal characteristics both affect the perceived timbre of a sound. Signal analysis techniques can be used to extract information about these elements of a signal. The contribution of these low level features to perceived timbre is often the focus of academic research, whereby dimensionality reduction techniques allow for the organisation of terms in an underlying subspace, with the intention of discovering some perceptually relevant representation of the data [2, 4, 6, 17]. In music production, this is of particular interest as it can allow for the manipulation of audio processing modules, comprising multiple parameters using intuitive, low-dimensional controls [3, 12, 14, 15].

In this paper we report our findings from the Semantic Audio Feature Extraction (SAFE) Project [13], and show that semantic descriptions of musical timbre can be grouped using both parameter and feature space representations, and can exhibit timbral similarities within and across audio processing types. We investigate the use of timbral descriptors to aid the retrieval of contextually relevant processing parameters given natural language descriptions of audio transformations. This allows for the development of intuitive and assistive music production interfaces, based on descriptive cues.

2. SAFE

The Semantic Audio Feature Extraction (SAFE) plug-ins\(^1\) provide music producers with a platform to describe timbral transformations in a Digital Audio Workstation (DAW) using natural language [13]. The plugins (referred to herein as transform classes) consist of a five band parametric equaliser, plugins and datasets available at semanticaudio.co.uk.
Table 1: The highest ranking terms using confidence, popularity and generality measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num Instances</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>Popularity</th>
<th>Generality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N term</td>
<td>n term</td>
<td>c term</td>
<td>p term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 warm</td>
<td>boxed .250</td>
<td>warm .0019</td>
<td>sharp .828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bright</td>
<td>splash .250</td>
<td>bright .0014</td>
<td>deep .819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 punch</td>
<td>wholesome .250</td>
<td>crunch .0006</td>
<td>boom .809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 air</td>
<td>pumping .247</td>
<td>room .0005</td>
<td>thick .806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 crunch</td>
<td>rounded .247</td>
<td>fuzz .0004</td>
<td>piano .696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 room</td>
<td>sparkle .247</td>
<td>crisp .0004</td>
<td>strong .596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 smooth</td>
<td>atmosphere .244</td>
<td>clear .0004</td>
<td>soft .575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 vocal</td>
<td>balanced .244</td>
<td>cut .0004</td>
<td>bass .555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 clear</td>
<td>bass .244</td>
<td>bass .0004</td>
<td>gentle .525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 fuzz</td>
<td>basic .244</td>
<td>low .0004</td>
<td>tin .483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The first ten descriptors per class, ranked by number of entries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compressor</th>
<th>Distortion</th>
<th>EQ</th>
<th>Reverb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 : punch</td>
<td>23 : crunch</td>
<td>440 : warm</td>
<td>30 : room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 : smooth</td>
<td>20 : warm</td>
<td>424 : bright</td>
<td>13 : air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 : sofa</td>
<td>6 : fuzz</td>
<td>16 : air</td>
<td>11 : big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 : vocal</td>
<td>6 : destroyed</td>
<td>16 : clear</td>
<td>10 : subtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 : nice</td>
<td>5 : cream</td>
<td>12 : thin</td>
<td>9 : hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 : controlled</td>
<td>5 : death</td>
<td>11 : clean</td>
<td>9 : small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 : together</td>
<td>5 : bass</td>
<td>11 : crisp</td>
<td>8 : dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 : crushed</td>
<td>5 : clip</td>
<td>10 : bass</td>
<td>7 : damp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 : warm</td>
<td>5 : decimated</td>
<td>9 : boom</td>
<td>7 : drum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 : comp</td>
<td>5 : distorted</td>
<td>9 : cut</td>
<td>6 : close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1 Dataset
The dataset used for the study comprised 2694 transforms, split into four groups according to their transform class. Overall, 454 were applied using a compressor, 303 using distortion, 1679 using an equaliser, and 258 using a reverb. The transforms were described using 618 unique terms taken from 263 unique users (averaging 2.35 terms per user), all of whom were music producers who participated by using the SAFE Plugins within their workflow.

To further identify the popularity of a descriptor, we weight the output of Eq. (1) with a coefficient representing the term as a proportion of the dataset:

\[ p = c \cdot \ln \left( \frac{n(d)}{\sum_{d=0}^{D-1} n(d)} \right) \]  

(2)

where \( n(d) \) is the number of entries for a descriptor \( d \).

Finally, we evaluate the extent to which the descriptor is generalisable across a range of transform classes (generality) by finding the weighted mean of the term’s sorted distribution. This is equivalent to finding the centroid of the density function across transform classes.

\[ g = \frac{2}{K-1} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} k \text{sort}(x(d))_k \]  

(3)

where the distribution of the term \( d \) is calculated as a proportion of the transform class \( k \) to which it belongs:

\[ x(d)_k = \frac{n_d(k)}{N(k)} \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} N(k) \]  

(4)

Here, \( N(k) \) is the number of entries in class \( k \) and \( n_d(k) \) is the number of occurrences of descriptor \( d \) in class \( k \). Using these metrics, the database is sorted and the top 10 descriptors are shown in Table 1. Similarly, Table 2 shows the most commonly used descriptors for each individual transform class. To group terms with shared meanings and variable suffixes, stemming conditions are applied using a Porter Stemmer [10]. This allows for the unification of terms such as warm, warmer and warmth into a parent category (warm).
transform, with terms such as *fuzz* and *harsh* clearly separated from *subtle*, *rasp* and *growl*. Equalisation comprises a wide selection of description-categories, although terms that generally refer to specific regions of spectral energy such as *bass*, *mid* and *full* tend to fall into separate partitions. Reverb terms tend to group based on size and descriptions of acoustic spaces. *Hall* and *room* for example exhibit similar feature spaces, while terms such as *soft*, *damp* and *natural* fall into the same group.

### 3.1 Parameter Space Representation

To illustrate the relevance of the within-class feature groups found using the hierarchical clustering algorithm, we can show that terms within clusters maintain similar characteristics in their parameter spaces. To demonstrate this, Figure 2 shows curves corresponding to two groups of descriptors taken from opposing clusters in the equaliser’s feature-space: cluster 2 (*warm*, *bass*, *boom*, *box* and *vocal*) and cluster 8 (*thin*, *clean*, *cut*, *click* and *tin*). Curves in cluster 2 generally exhibit a boost around 500 Hz with a high-frequency roll-off, whereas terms in cluster 8 exhibit a boost in high-frequency energy centered around 5 kHz.

To further evaluate the organisation of terms based on their position in a parameter space, we use PCA to reduce the dimensionality of each space and overlay the parameter vectors. Figure 3 shows this for the distortion and reverb, where in 3(a) the bias is highly correlated with PC2, which tends to organise descriptors based on dissonance. Similarly in 3(b), the mix and gain parameters of the reverb class correlate with PC2 and tend to retain variance using size-based descriptors. These exhibit 0.68 and 0.81 cross-correlation values respectively.

### 4. INTER-TRANSFORM SIMILARITY

To investigate between-class similarities, we perform hierarchical clustering on the dataset, where transforms are grouped by unique terms and separated by transform class. Here, the organisation of terms into clusters is highly correlated with the organisation of terms into transform classes. Out of the 8 data partitions, the mean rank-order generality is 0.23, with a mean of 2.4 unique class labels per group.

To identify transform-agnostic descriptors, i.e. those with similar between-class transformations, we select the top 10 terms with the highest generality scores (defined in Table 1) and measure the variance across the transformations in reduced-dimensionality space. All terms had entries in all 4 transform classes, and had at least 10 entries overall. Ranked by between-class agreement: 1. *piano* (0.001), 2. *sharp* (0.012), 3. *soft* (0.013), 4. *thick* (0.018), 5. *tin* (0.021), 6. *deep* (0.022), 7. *bass* (0.033), 8. *gentle* (0.039), 9. *strong* (0.050), 10. *boom* (0.058).

### 4.1 Term Frequency Analysis

We measure term similarity independently of timbral or parameter space representations, using a term’s association to a given transform class. Here, we use term frequency to define distributions across classes, resulting in four-dimensional vectors, e.g. \( t = [0.0, 0.5, 0.5, 0.0] \) has equal association with the distortion and equaliser, but no entries in the compressor or reverb classes. We then represent these using a Vector Space Model (VSM), and measure similarity between any two terms \( (t_1, t_2) \) using cosine distance: \[
\text{sim}(t_1, t_2) = \frac{t_1 \cdot t_2}{\|t_1\| \|t_2\|} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} t_{1,i} t_{2,i}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N} t_{1,i}^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N} t_{2,i}^2}}
\] (5)

In order to better capture the true semantic relations of
the terms and the transforms they are associated with, we apply Latent Semantic Indexing (LSI) [7], a process that involves reducing the term-transform space from rank four to three by performing a singular value decomposition of the $N_{\text{terms}} \times 4$ occurrence matrix $M = U\Sigma V^*$, and setting the smallest singular values to zero before reconstructing it using $M' = U\Sigma V^*$.

This process eliminates noise caused by differences in word usage, for instance due to synonymy and polysemy, whereas the ‘latent’ semantic relationships between terms and effects are preserved. Figure 4 shows the resulting pairwise similarities of the high-generality terms used in Section 4.

Here, the most similar terms are bass and strong, deep and sharp and boom and thick (all 0.99). Conversely, we can consider the similarity of transform types based on their descriptive attributes by transposing the occurrence matrix in the VSM. This is illustrated in Figure 4, in which terms used to describe equalisation transforms are similar to those associated with distortion (0.95), while equalisation and compression vocabulary is disjunct (0.641).

5. DISCUSSION/CONCLUSION

We have illustrated within- and between-class groupings of semantic descriptions of sound transformations taken from processing modules in a DAW. We showed that the groups represent meaningful subsets of entries by evaluating correlation in their parameter spaces, and that the parameters of each processing module can be used to organise terms in a similar fashion. To evaluate between-transform similarity, we demonstrated that transforms tend to form the basis of discrete clusters, and that terms such as piano, sharp, soft, thick and tinny have similar representations across a range of processing types. Finally, we measured the similarity of effects and terms based on their vector-space representations. This shows that equalisation and compression share a common vocabulary of terms, whilst reverb and distortion have a dissimilar description schema. The results are encouraging and show that timbre descriptors cluster in meaningful ways in the context of audio transformations. The findings thus provide useful insight into how to create semantic descriptor spaces for audio effects.
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