

SUBTRACTIVE TRAINING FOR MUSIC STEM INSERTION USING LATENT DIFFUSION MODELS

Ivan Villa-Renteria^{*1} Mason Long Wang^{*2} Zachary Shah^{*2} Zhe Li²
Soohyun Kim³ Neelesh Ramachandran² Mert Pilanci²
Stanford University

ABSTRACT

We present Subtractive Training⁴, a simple and novel method for synthesizing individual musical instrument stems given other instruments as context. This method pairs a dataset of complete music mixes with 1) a variant of the dataset lacking a specific stem, and 2) LLM-generated instructions describing how the missing stem should be reintroduced. We then fine-tune a pretrained text-to-audio diffusion model to generate the missing instrument stem, guided by both the existing stems and the text instruction. Our results demonstrate Subtractive Training’s efficacy in creating authentic drum stems that seamlessly blend with the existing tracks. We also show that we can use the text instruction to control the generation of the inserted stem in terms of rhythm, dynamics, and genre, allowing us to modify the style of a single instrument in a full song while keeping the remaining instruments the same. Lastly, we extend this technique to MIDI formats, successfully generating compatible bass, drum, and guitar parts for incomplete arrangements.

1. INTRODUCTION

While impressive strides have been made in the field of generating fully-mixed music, the conditions for such generation are often abstract, relying on text or style descriptors [1–5]. These descriptors provide high-level guidance but little temporal or melodic control, limiting the practicality of such tools for musicians, who would like them to synergize with existing ideas or themes instead of forming completely new ones. For instance, a musician who is already proficient at a single instrument may have a musical idea that they would like to expand to other instruments. In this scenario, the ideal tool would not only ‘listen’ to the musician’s existing work but also literally build upon it by adding complementary waveforms to enrich the piece.

Music is often the superposition of multiple ‘stems,’ or audio waveforms representing the individual instruments, tracks, or performers in a piece. When summed synchronously, these audio waveforms complement one another and constitute a coherent piece of music. Thus, stems

are codependent in the sense that any subset of stems imposes temporal and harmonic constraints for the remaining set of stems. By working within these constraints, musicians can produce songs by starting with a single musical idea and adding stems iteratively, ensuring that all stems add together harmoniously.

To aid in this process, our goal is to use existing text-to-audio diffusion models to generate stems that accompany existing music. We frame our task as a spectrogram-editing problem: given an audio spectrogram representing a musical piece and an instruction describing the stem to be added, we would like to generate a new spectrogram that adds the stem specified, while maintaining the musical context and the cohesiveness of the piece.

Inspired by recent work in text-based image editing [6], we propose Subtractive Training for diffusion models. Our idea is to combine a large dataset of complete music mixes with 1) a variant of the dataset where a single stem has been removed, achieved by using pretrained music source separation tools, and 2) a set of edit instructions describing how the missing stem should be reintegrated, generated by combining a music captioning model with a large language model. We then fine-tune a text-to-audio diffusion model using our complete music mixes as targets, and our incomplete music mixes and text prompts as input conditions.

Our contributions are threefold. First, we show that our method can be used to generate compelling drum accompaniments to tracks that otherwise lack them. These additional stems both sound realistic and are sympathetic to the existing audio.

Second, current text-to-audio diffusion models have been trained on an extremely large number of text-audio pairs, and thus can model a broad and diverse distribution of musical textures, styles, genres, and rhythms [4, 7]. Since our method uses these text-to-audio diffusion models as a foundation, we show that we can control the reinsertion of a stem by modifying the text instruction. Thus, our method allows us to take a full song and modify the arrangement, timbre, and style of a specific instrument, while keeping the rest of the instruments the same.

Lastly, we show that the Subtractive Training paradigm works in the space of symbolic music, by training a pitch-roll-based diffusion model from scratch to add guitar, bass, and drum stems.

^{*} Equal contribution ¹Department of Computer Science, ²Department of Electrical Engineering, ³Center for Computer Research in Music and Acoustics

⁴[subtractivetraining.github.io](https://github.com/subtractivetraining)

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Text-Based Image Editing

Our method can be viewed as a musical analogue to InstructPix2Pix [6], an image editing procedure that trains a diffusion model to edit images based on text instructions. The procedure uses GPT-3.5 Turbo [8] and Stable Diffusion [9] to generate a large dataset of image-editing examples on which a conditional diffusion model is trained. Our method generates a similar dataset of text-guided spectrogram edits, focusing on stem insertion edits.

Our task is similar to image inpainting [10–12], where the goal is to infill masked portions of an image. However, instead of training the model to *infill* portions of an image that have been *masked*, we train the model to *add* audio stems that have been *subtracted*. Thus, in contrast to training procedures that are ‘masked,’ our method is ‘subtractive,’ hence the name ‘Subtractive Training.’

2.2 Diffusion Models

Diffusion models have emerged as a powerful class of generative models, particularly in the domain of image generation [9, 13, 14]. These models learn to generate samples from a data distribution by iteratively denoising a Gaussian noise signal, gradually refining it into something that represents a generated sample. Many diffusion models operate in a latent space, using an encoder-decoder framework. In this framework, a Variational Autoencoder (VAE) [15] is employed to extract deep latent vectors that represent the desired data (images or audio). The diffusion model is then trained to iteratively denoise Gaussian noise signals into latent vectors that can be decoded by the VAE’s decoder to generate data samples.

2.3 Controlled Music Generation

Since WaveNet [16], there has been a surge of generative music models. Some are instances of latent diffusion models as described above [4, 7]. Other models use sequence modeling on audio tokens using transformers [2, 3, 17]. In the latter case, the training objective is to predict *masked* tokens, while our method relies on *subtracted* audio stems, as a natural analogue to the conception of music as a sum of individual stems.

Work is progressing on music generation models controlled by lower-level features (e.g., temporal or rhythmic features). MusicControlNet [18] is a music generation model with control of time-varying music attributes, like melody, dynamics, and rhythm, and is based on ControlNet [19], a neural network architecture designed to add conditioning controls to pretrained text-to-image diffusion models. Concurrent work on music stem generation includes StemGen, which uses a non-regressive transformer-based architecture on audio tokens. Compared to existing work on stem generation, our method has the benefit of utilizing the incredible power of large, pretrained text-to-audio diffusion models. This allows us to control the generated stem according to a text instruction. Thus, our

method is a way of distilling knowledge from large text-to-audio diffusion models for downstream applications, adding further to a field of flourishing study [20].

3. METHOD

Inspired by [6], the goal of our method is to provide a pretrained text-to-audio diffusion model with a dataset of text-guided stem insertion examples. As an overview, our method involves generating a dataset of song spectrograms of complete mixes, which are coupled with the same songs missing a single stem (e.g., drums). For each pair of complete and stem-subtracted spectrograms, we also use a music captioning model and a large language model to generate a text instruction describing how the missing stem should be added to complete the spectrogram. Then, we fine-tune a pretrained text-to-audio diffusion model on the task of infilling the missing stem and reconstructing the full-mix spectrogram, given both the text instruction and the stem-subtracted spectrogram.

3.1 Dataset Generation

Our training procedure requires a large dataset of audio-audio-text triplets, each consisting of:

1. A full-mix spectrogram.
2. The same spectrogram, but where a single audio stem has been subtracted or removed.
3. Text instructions describing how each the spectrogram with a subtracted stem should be modified to re-insert the missing stem.

A large dataset of such triplets does not exist. Thus, we contribute a large, novel dataset of text-guided stem-insertion examples by combining three preexisting datasets and by utilizing off-the-shelf source separation and music captioning tools.

First, the data we use comes from three source datasets:

1. **MusicCaps**, a dataset of 5.5k caption-audio pairs from songs downloaded from YouTube. The captions are written by musicians, and each of the songs are 10 seconds long [21].
2. **MUSDB18**, a music source separation dataset of 150 full-length music tracks (about 10 hours) with isolated drums, vocals, bass and accompaniment stems [22].
3. **MagnaTagATune**, a music-tagging dataset containing 25,863 music clips, where each clip consists of 29-seconds-long excerpts belonging to one of the 5223 songs, 445 albums, and 230 artists [23].

We describe how we obtain our training examples in the following subsections.

3.1.1 Full-Mix Spectrograms

MagnaTagATune and MusicCaps already contain full-mix audio data, i.e., audio files where all instruments are playing simultaneously. In order to obtain full-mix spectrogram data from the datasets, we segment the songs into 5.11 s portions and compute magnitude spectrograms. For the MUSDB18 dataset, we combine all provided stems to obtain a full mix, then segment it into 5.11-second chunks, computing magnitude spectrograms for each segment.

3.1.2 Stem-subtracted Spectrograms

Our goal is to pair each full-mix spectrogram with a version of it where a specific instrument stem has been removed (e.g., drums). Our method of achieving this goal depends on the source dataset.

Obtaining stem-subtracted audio from MUSDB18 is trivial, since each track comes pre-stemmed; we simply combine all of the stems of interest except for the subtracted stem. No clean separation of stems is provided in the MagnaTagATune or MusicCaps datasets. Thus, to subtract a particular stem from the full-mix segment, we use Demucs [24], a state-of-the-art music source separation model, to decompose the full mix into the subtracted stem and the remaining mix (e.g., the mix without drums).

We segment the stem-subtracted mixes into 5.11-second chunks corresponding to the same time intervals as the full-mix segments, and compute their magnitude spectrograms. This process results in a dataset of paired full-mix and stem-subtracted spectrograms, where each pair represents the same 5.11 s musical excerpt with and without the specified instrument stem.

3.1.3 Edit Instructions

To guide the text-to-audio diffusion model in generating the missing stem, we create a dataset of edit instructions that describe how the stem should be reintroduced. We first leverage the LP-MusicCaps captioning model to generate captions for all full-mix spectrograms.

Next, we employ GPT-3.5 Turbo, a state-of-the-art language model, to generate edit instructions based on the newly generated captions. The prompt template used to generate the edit instructions takes the name of the desired instrument stem (e.g., drums), an action word (e.g., "add" or "insert"), and the segment's caption as input. The language model is then instructed to output an edit instruction describing how to add the specified stem to the clip portrayed in the caption, assuming the stem was not initially present. The inclusion of action words encourages diversity in the generated edit instructions, enhancing the richness of the resulting dataset. The complete prompt used for generating edit instructions is detailed in the Supplementary Materials.

By applying these processes, we obtain a dataset consisting of 83.5k training examples, each comprising a pair of full-mix and stem-subtracted spectrograms, their corresponding captions, and a generated edit instruction. This dataset forms the foundation for our subsequent experiments and analyses.

The resulting edit instructions, along with the stem-subtracted spectrograms, serve as input conditions for the diffusion model during fine-tuning. This allows the model to learn how to generate the missing stem based on both the existing musical context and the text instructions, enabling a high level of control over the generated stem's characteristics.

3.2 Subtractive Learning

Building upon the idea of generating missing stems based on existing musical context and text instructions, we propose a novel approach called Subtractive Learning, which we define as follows:

Consider the joint distribution $p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, where \mathbf{x} represents a complete data sample and \mathbf{y} represents an associated label or condition. In our context, \mathbf{x} is a full-mix audio spectrogram, and \mathbf{y} is an edit instruction describing how to add a specific instrument stem to the mix.

We decompose \mathbf{x} into two components: $\mathbf{x}_{partial}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{missing}$, such that $\mathbf{x} = f(\mathbf{x}_{partial}, \mathbf{x}_{missing})$, where f is a function that combines the two components to reconstruct the complete data sample. In our case, $\mathbf{x}_{partial}$ represents the stem-subtracted spectrogram (e.g., a song with the drum stem removed), and $\mathbf{x}_{missing}$ represents the missing instrument stem (e.g., the drum stem).

Our goal is to learn the conditional distribution $p(\mathbf{x}_{missing}|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}_{partial})$, which corresponds to the probability of generating the missing instrument stem given the edit instruction \mathbf{y} and the stem-subtracted spectrogram $\mathbf{x}_{partial}$.

Diffusion models are particularly well-suited for this task, as they learn to model the data distribution by iteratively denoising a Gaussian noise signal conditioned on the input data. In our case, the diffusion model learns to generate the missing stem $\mathbf{x}_{missing}$ by conditioning on both the edit instruction \mathbf{y} and the stem-subtracted spectrogram $\mathbf{x}_{partial}$. By training the model to estimate the conditional distribution $p(\mathbf{x}_{missing}|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}_{partial})$, we enable it to generate the missing instrument stem that is coherent with the provided audio context and follows the given edit instruction.

3.3 Fine-tuning the Diffusion Model

Latent diffusion models generate data examples by beginning with a latent vector of noise and iteratively denoising it using a UNet [25] into a latent vector that can be decoded into a data example.

Our method utilizes a pretrained text-to-audio latent diffusion model, which we fine-tune on our newly created dataset of audio-audio-text triplets. We begin the fine-tuning process by loading the weights of a pretrained latent diffusion model, and continuing its training. During the fine-tuning process, we provide the stem-subtracted spectrogram $\mathbf{x}_{partial}$ as an input to the denoising UNet, replacing the noisy latent representation. We also input the text embedding of the edit instruction \mathbf{y} into the diffusion model. The UNet is then trained to reconstruct full-mix spectrogram.

4. EXPERIMENTS

4.1 Experimental Setup




Figure 1: Latent Diffusion Model for Drum-Insertion.

4.1.1 Model Architecture

For our experiments, we utilize Riffusion, a latent diffusion model that generates mel spectrograms conditioned on text prompts. Riffusion was created by fine-tuning the Stable Diffusion v1-5 checkpoint to operate on audio data. The model accepts text prompts and 512x512 images as input, and outputs 512x512 mel spectrogram images. An overview of the model architecture is shown in Figure 1.

As a baseline, we compare against SDEdit [26], a diffusion-based style transfer method that is designed to edit images based on a given instruction, which we apply to Riffusion. The baseline method is similar to using our model without Subtractive Training with some nuances. We provide Riffusion with our stem-subtracted spectrogram, and give it a text-conditioning signal instructing it to re-insert the missing stem. The SDEdit baseline additionally adds a small amount of noise to the latent representation of the stem-subtracted spectrogram before the denoising process begins.

4.1.2 Evaluation Dataset

For evaluation, we create a separate test set using the MUSDB18 dataset [22]. We extract 5.11 second clips from the MUSDB18 test split and perform the same stem subtraction, mel spectrogram computation, and edit instruction generation process as we did for the training data. Using the MUSDB18 test set for evaluation helps minimize the effect of stem leakage on the generated outputs, since residual parts of the drum track cannot be used to guide the drum-insertion. This issue of spectral leakage is discussed further in Section 5.1.

In total, the evaluation dataset contains 2,160 examples, each consisting of a 5.11 second full-mix clip, a corresponding stem-subtracted clip, and both a long-form text edit instruction and a shortened 5-word text caption. The short text captions are generated by prompting GPT-4 to summarize the full edit instructions, and are used as conditioning signals for the SDEdit baseline.

4.1.3 Training Details

We fine-tune the pretrained Riffusion model on our dataset using the training procedure from InstructPix2Pix [6]. The

weights of the VAE encoder and decoder and the text encoder are frozen, and only the UNet is updated. We train the model for 300k steps with a batch size of 4 on a single NVIDIA A10G GPU, which equates to roughly 15 epochs. We use the AdamW optimizer with $\beta_1 = 0.9$, $\beta_2 = 0.999$, weight decay of 0.02, and learning rate of 10^{-4} with a cosine decay schedule and 500 warmup steps. The conditioning dropout probability is set to 0.05 during training.

4.1.4 Evaluation Metrics

We evaluate our model and the SDEdit baseline using several metrics designed to assess the quality and diversity of the generated audio, following a similar procedure from [5]:

- **Fréchet Distance (FD):** Similar to frechet inception distance in image generation, FD measures the similarity between generated and real audio features, extracted using a state-of-the-art audio classifier model called PANNs [27]. Lower FD indicates generated examples are more similar to real examples.
- **Fréchet Audio Distance (FAD):** Similar to FD, but uses features from a VGGish model [28] instead of PANNs. FAD may be less reliable than FD due to the potential limitations of the VGGish model.
- **Kullback-Leibler Divergence (KLD):** Measures the difference between the distributions of generated and real audio based on classifier predictions. Lower KLD suggests that the generated distribution is closer to the real data distribution [29]. We compute KLD for each pair of generated and target examples and report the average.
- **Inception Score (IS):** Estimates the quality and diversity of generated examples based on the entropy of classifier predictions. Higher IS generally indicates better quality and diversity. [29]

For the SDEdit baseline, we compare two variants using either 20 or 50 denoising steps. Our model is evaluated using 20 denoising steps. Results on all metrics are shown in Table 1.

4.2 Extension to MIDI

To further demonstrate the generalizability of Subtractive Training, we extend our approach to the domain of symbolic music generation. We represent MIDI data as 3-channel piano roll images, where each channel corresponds to a specific instrument: drums, bass, or guitar. The piano roll values are binary, indicating the presence or absence of a note at each time step and pitch.

We train three separate diffusion models, one for each instrument. For our architecture and training procedure, we use the binary-noise based diffusion model described in [30]. We use a large dataset of Guitar Pro tabs from DadaGP [31] to train our models, from which we transcribe 19,433 pitch-roll chunks.




Figure 2: Pitch rolls showing stem-generation results using three different diffusion models, each trained to output a given instrument. The notes corresponding to the generated instrument are outlined in black.

The input to each model is a piano roll with two channels filled with the context instruments and the remaining channel initialized with noise. For example, the drum model takes in piano rolls with the bass and guitar parts intact, but with the drum part replaced by noise. The diffusion process then generates the missing drum part conditioned on the bass and guitar parts.


Figure 2 shows generated results from held-out data, where we can observe that notes generated with our model align well with the stems they are conditioned on. Qualitative examples are provided on the project website. Given any subset of the three instrument parts, the appropriate model can generate the missing part(s) based on the provided context. This extension highlights the flexibility of our approach and its potential for generating compatible instrumental parts in a symbolic music setting, enabling assistive composition tools that can suggest complementary parts based on incomplete scores or recordings.

4.3 Results

Model	FD↓	FAD↓	KLD↓	ISc↑
SDEdit [20 Steps]	33.25	4.40	3.79	1.35
SDEdit [50 Steps]	27.64	3.40	3.34	1.38
S.T. (Ours)	5.55	0.62	1.10	1.41

Table 1: Quantitative evaluation of the drums insertion task.

Table 1 presents the evaluation results comparing our



(a) Full-mix (b) Background (c) Generated

Figure 3: Comparison of spectrograms before and after stem addition. The Stem-subtracted spectrogram is an input to our model, while the generated spectrogram is the output from the edit instruction "Add rock-style drums"

method against the SDEdit baselines. Our model outperforms both SDEdit variants across all metrics, indicating that the outputs generated by our model are significantly closer to the target audio than those produced by SDEdit. Specifically, we observe a 22.09 decrease in Fréchet Distance and a 2.78 decrease in FAD compared to the best-performing SDEdit variant. Moreover, our method achieves a substantial 2.24 decrease in KLD and a modest increase in Inception Score from 1.38 to 1.41.


These results demonstrate the effectiveness of our Subtractive Training approach in generating high-quality and diverse drum stems that are well-aligned with the target audio. The superior performance of our model can be attributed to its ability to leverage the rich knowledge captured by the pretrained text-to-audio diffusion model and adapt it to the specific task of stem insertion, guided by natural language instructions.

4.4 Qualitative Analysis

To further assess the quality of the generated drum stems, we provide qualitative examples of generated audio on our website⁵. Figure 3 displays the mel spectrograms of the original full-mix audio, the stem-subtracted input, and the generated output for two representative examples from the test set. We can see that our model inserts the drum stem into the spectrogram by preserving the original content in the background and overlaying drum onsets which span the majority of the frequency bins. Moreover, we see that the onsets aren't exactly the same as the onsets from the target, indicating that for this example, the model does not take advantage of data leakage from stem-bleeding. These examples showcase our model's ability to reconstruct realistic and coherent drum patterns that seamlessly blend with the existing instrumental parts.

In addition to stem reconstruction, our method exhibits intriguing style transfer capabilities. By modifying the text instruction, we can guide the model to generate drum stems that adhere to specific genres, dynamics, or stylistic elements. For instance, we demonstrate the successful insertion of jazzy drums into a reggae song in Figure 4, where we can see high presence of high-frequency content compared to the full mix, which correspond to repeated snare hits, highlighting the model's flexibility in adapting to different musical contexts. We also provide an example of

⁵ subtractivetraining.github.io



(a) Full-mix (b) Background (c) Generated

Figure 4: Comparison of spectrograms before and after stem addition. The original genre of the song is reggae, while the drums were inserted with the edit instruction "add jazzy drums."

style transfer focused on dynamics, where the generated drum stem reflects the desired intensity and expressiveness. These and more examples are shown in our website.

These qualitative results underscore the versatility and creative potential of our Subtractive Training approach. By enabling fine-grained control over the characteristics of the generated stem through natural language instructions, our method opens up new possibilities for assistive music composition and arrangement tools.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Limitations and Future Work

While our Subtractive Training method demonstrates promising results in generating high-quality and stylistically appropriate drum stems, there are certain limitations that warrant further investigation and improvement.

One notable issue is the presence of high-frequency leakage in the source-separated audio used as training data. Due to imperfections in the source separation process, slight remnants of the original drum patterns can be observed in the high-frequency range of the stem-subtracted audio. This leakage introduces a bias during training, causing the model to generate drum patterns that closely mimic the original drums. Future work should explore techniques to mitigate this leakage, such as employing more advanced source separation algorithms or incorporating additional pre-stemmed datasets to reduce the reliance on synthetically generated data.

Another limitation is the model's occasional failure to generate proper drum tracks, particularly in the EDM genre. We hypothesize that this issue may be a derivative of the model's bias towards high-frequency leakage patterns. EDM often features prominent high-frequency synth sounds that the model may misinterpret as leakage, leading to the generation of unusual drum patterns that incessantly hit cymbals in an attempt to match the synth patterns. Addressing the leakage problem and improving the model's ability to distinguish between genuine high-frequency content and artifacts would likely alleviate this issue.

To further enhance the quality and controllability of the generated stems, future work could explore the following directions:

1. **Experiment with the ratio of synthetically source-separated data to pre-stemmed data:** More detailed investigation on the optimal balance between

synthetically generated and pre-stemmed data may help mitigate the impact of data leakage and improve the model's generalization capabilities.

2. **Extend to other stems:** Once the issues with drum stem generation are resolved, the Subtractive Training approach should be extended to generate other instrumental stems, such as bass, guitar, or vocals, to enable more comprehensive music production and arrangement tools.
3. **Explore alternative diffusion architectures:** Investigating and adapting state-of-the-art diffusion architectures specifically designed for audio generation may lead to improved performance and increased flexibility in modeling complex musical structures.
4. **Incorporate larger and more diverse datasets:** Expanding the training data to include a wider range of musical genres, styles, and instrumentation would enhance the model's versatility and ability to handle diverse musical contexts.
5. **Refine edit instruction generation:** Developing more sophisticated methods for generating edit instructions, such as leveraging state-of-the-art Music QA LLMs could improve the quality and specificity of the generated stems.

By addressing these limitations and exploring the suggested future directions, we believe that Subtractive Training can be further refined and extended to become a powerful tool for assistive music composition and production.

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduced Subtractive Training, a novel approach for synthesizing individual musical instrument stems using pretrained text-to-audio diffusion models. Our experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of Subtractive Training in generating high-quality and stylistically appropriate drum stems, outperforming baseline methods across various evaluation metrics. We also extended Subtractive Training to the domain of symbolic music generation, successfully generating compatible bass, drum, and guitar parts for incomplete MIDI arrangements.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation (NSF) under Grants ECCS-2037304 and DMS-2134248; in part by the NSF CAREER Award under Grant CCF-2236829; in part by the U.S. Army Research Office Early Career Award under Grant W911NF-21-1-0242; and in part by the Office of Naval Research under Grant N00014-24-1-2164.

7. REFERENCES

- [1] P. Dhariwal, H. Jun, C. Payne, J. W. Kim, A. Radford, and I. Sutskever, "Jukebox: A generative model for music," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00341*, 2020.
- [2] A. Agostinelli, T. I. Denk, Z. Borsos, J. Engel, M. Verzetti, A. Caillon, Q. Huang, A. Jansen, A. Roberts, M. Tagliasacchi *et al.*, "Musiclm: Generating music from text," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.11325*, 2023.
- [3] J. Copet, F. Kreuk, I. Gat, T. Remez, D. Kant, G. Synnaeve, Y. Adi, and A. Défossez, "Simple and controllable music generation," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [4] Q. Huang, D. S. Park, T. Wang, T. I. Denk, A. Ly, N. Chen, Z. Zhang, Z. Zhang, J. Yu, C. Frank *et al.*, "Noise2music: Text-conditioned music generation with diffusion models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.03917*, 2023.
- [5] H. Liu, Z. Chen, Y. Yuan, X. Mei, X. Liu, D. Mandic, W. Wang, and M. D. Plumbley, "Audioldm: Text-to-audio generation with latent diffusion models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12503*, 2023.
- [6] T. Brooks, A. Holynski, and A. A. Efros, "Instructpix2pix: Learning to follow image editing instructions," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 18 392–18 402.
- [7] S. Forsgren and H. Martiros, "Riffusion - Stable diffusion for real-time music generation," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://riffusion.com/about>
- [8] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell *et al.*, "Language models are few-shot learners," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 1877–1901, 2020.
- [9] R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, D. Lorenz, P. Esser, and B. Ommer, "High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2022, pp. 10 684–10 695.
- [10] M. Bertalmio, G. Sapiro, V. Caselles, and C. Ballester, "Image inpainting," in *Proceedings of the 27th annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques*, 2000, pp. 417–424.
- [11] O. Elharrouss, N. Almaadeed, S. Al-Maadeed, and Y. Akbari, "Image inpainting: A review," *Neural Processing Letters*, vol. 51, pp. 2007–2028, 2020.
- [12] H. Xiang, Q. Zou, M. A. Nawaz, X. Huang, F. Zhang, and H. Yu, "Deep learning for image inpainting: A survey," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 134, p. 109046, 2023.
- [13] J. Ho, A. Jain, and P. Abbeel, "Denoising diffusion probabilistic models," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 6840–6851, 2020.
- [14] J. Song, C. Meng, and S. Ermon, "Denoising diffusion implicit models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.02502*, 2020.
- [15] D. P. Kingma, M. Welling *et al.*, "An introduction to variational autoencoders," *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 307–392, 2019.
- [16] A. v. d. Oord, S. Dieleman, H. Zen, K. Simonyan, O. Vinyals, A. Graves, N. Kalchbrenner, A. Senior, and K. Kavukcuoglu, "Wavenet: A generative model for raw audio," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.03499*, 2016.
- [17] H. F. Garcia, P. Seetharaman, R. Kumar, and B. Pardo, "Vampnet: Music generation via masked acoustic token modeling," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04686*, 2023.
- [18] S.-L. Wu, C. Donahue, S. Watanabe, and N. J. Bryan, "Music controlnet: Multiple time-varying controls for music generation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07069*, 2023.
- [19] L. Zhang, A. Rao, and M. Agrawala, "Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 3836–3847.
- [20] W. Luo, "A comprehensive survey on knowledge distillation of diffusion models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.04262*, 2023.
- [21] S. Doh, K. Choi, J. Lee, and J. Nam, "Lp-musiccaps: Llm-based pseudo music captioning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16372*, 2023.
- [22] Z. Rafii, A. Liutkus, F.-R. Stöter, S. I. Mimilakis, and R. Bittner, "Musdb18-a corpus for music separation," 2017.
- [23] E. Law, K. West, M. I. Mandel, M. Bay, and J. S. Downie, "Evaluation of algorithms using games: The case of music tagging." in *ISMIR*. Citeseer, 2009, pp. 387–392.
- [24] A. Défossez, N. Usunier, L. Bottou, and F. Bach, "Demucs: Deep extractor for music sources with extra unlabeled data remixed," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.01174*, 2019.
- [25] O. Ronneberger, P. Fischer, and T. Brox, "U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation," in *Medical image computing and computer-assisted intervention—MICCAI 2015: 18th international conference, Munich, Germany, October 5-9, 2015, proceedings, part III 18*. Springer, 2015, pp. 234–241.

- [26] C. Meng, Y. He, Y. Song, J. Song, J. Wu, J.-Y. Zhu, and S. Ermon, "Sdedit: Guided image synthesis and editing with stochastic differential equations," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.01073*, 2021.
- [27] Q. Kong, Y. Cao, T. Iqbal, Y. Wang, W. Wang, and M. D. Plumbley, "Panns: Large-scale pretrained audio neural networks for audio pattern recognition," 2020.
- [28] S. Hershey, S. Chaudhuri, D. P. W. Ellis, J. F. Gemmeke, A. Jansen, R. C. Moore, M. Plakal, D. Platt, R. A. Saurous, B. Seybold, M. Slaney, R. J. Weiss, and K. Wilson, "Cnn architectures for large-scale audio classification," 2017.
- [29] A. Vinay and A. Lerch, "Evaluating generative audio systems and their metrics," 2022.
- [30] L. Atassi, "Generating symbolic music using diffusion models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08385*, 2023.
- [31] P. Sarmiento, A. Kumar, C. Carr, Z. Zukowski, M. Barthelet, and Y.-H. Yang, "Dadagp: a dataset of tokenized guitarpro songs for sequence models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.14653*, 2021.

A. APPENDIX

A.1 Text Prompt

The prompt that was used to generate the edit instructions from the music captions is given as follows:

```
"You are a professional music
annotator that has been hired to
write text prompts in a large
scale music dataset to train a
text-to-music generative AI
model. You're one of the best in
the industry for this job and
have stellar reviews from other
music labelling companies that
have hired you in the past. Your
captions should be truthful and
accurate. The input and output of
the text-to-music generative AI
model are as follows.\n
```

```
Input: The audio file of the
background music + a text prompt
describing what kind of
instrument should be added to the
given background music and in
what style.\n
```

```
Output: The audio file of the
music modified with the addition
of the instrument in accordance
with the content of the text
prompt.\n
```

```
The following text explains a
music piece that you are going to
be working with now, so imagine
you are listening this music:
{caption}\n
```

```
Then imagine this music without
{stem}. Write a single sentence
text prompt input for instructing
a text to music generative AI
model to generate this music,
when this music without {stem}
was given as a background music
input. So this is not removing.
You want to add {stem} to the
{stem}-less version, while
persuming the {stem}-less version
is given. You should not say like
\"remove a {stem} track\". Do not
add or make up any extra
information about music in the
edit prompt other than the given
explantion. Use information only
from the explantion of the music.
For the text prompt instructions
you generate, you have to focus
on explaining the style of the
instrument we are adding; You do
not have to explain the style of
```

```
the background music if it is
unnecessary for explaining the
instrument we are adding. Make
sure
the edit instruction doesn't have
more than 7 words. When creating
the
edit instruction, use the action
word '{action_word}'. You don't
need to mention that the music is
drum-less, although it is
optional. If you mention the the
notion that the background track
has no drums, you are able to
mention it without using the
phrase '{stem}-less'. Do not use
the word 'energetic' to describe
the {action_word}. If possible,
try to include the genre of the
song in your description of the
drums."
```

stem corresponds to the stem we want to subtract from our data, which in this case is "drums". caption Corresponds to the LPMusicCaps-generated caption of our song. The action_word comes from the set {'Insert', 'Add', 'Generate', 'Enhance', 'Put', 'Augment'}. The action word was chosen uniformly at random, and was included in order to create linguistic variety in the instructions that would be used as training input for the model.