

CONTINUAL LEARNING FOR SINGING VOICE SEPARATION WITH HUMAN IN THE LOOP ADAPTATION

Ankur Gupta*

Anshul Rai*

Archit Bansal*

Vipul Arora

Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur, India

ankugupt@iitk.ac.in, anshulra@iitk.ac.in, architb@iitk.ac.in, vipular@iitk.ac.in

*Equal Contribution

ABSTRACT

Deep learning-based works for singing voice separation have performed exceptionally well in the recent past. However, most of these works do not focus on allowing users to interact with the model to improve performance. This can be crucial when deploying the model in real-world scenarios where music tracks can vary from the original training data in both genre and instruments. In this paper, we present a deep learning-based interactive continual learning framework for singing voice separation that allows users to fine-tune the vocal separation model to conform it to new target songs. We use a U-Net-based base model architecture that produces a mask for separating vocals from the spectrogram, followed by a human-in-the-loop task where the user provides feedback by marking a few false positives, i.e., regions in the extracted vocals that should have been silence. We propose two continual learning algorithms. Experiments substantiate the improvement in singing voice separation performance by the proposed algorithms over the base model in intra-dataset and inter-dataset settings.

1. INTRODUCTION

Singing voice or vocal is one the most important feature of music and is fundamental to human expression. Separation of vocals from polyphonic music tracks has been a research problem for quite some time as separated singing voice finds various applications in tasks like: singer identification [1], lyric transcription [2], timer based artist clustering [3], beats and notes tracking [4], lyrics synchronization [5], etc.

The singing voice separation task has been approached using various signal processing methods such as [6–8] in the past. In recent years, researchers have significantly improved the performance of vocal separation models using deep learning techniques [9–14]. Even though these deep learning-based approaches provide state-of-the-art performance, they do not provide the user any way to conform the model to a particular song or genre and suffer greatly when new instruments or genres of music are used. This




Figure 1. Pictorial view of problem statement

limits their scope of application to only songs which are similar to the training data (e.g. if accompaniment of a test track has flute, but no song in the training data has flute, the model performance might suffer). Along with this, in the field of music, the data is continually evolving, and it is not feasible to continually create a new dataset to retrain the model from scratch.

In this work, we have presented a user-friendly human-in-the-loop framework for continual learning to conform a U-Net-based deep learning model to target songs/genres while maintaining the generality of the model and avoiding overfitting as well as catastrophic forgetting. As shown in Fig. 1, the base U-net model is used to predict the vocal and accompaniment stems for the target songs. The model is then adapted using a human-in-the-loop approach, where first the human users mark regions in the predicted vocals where the model had incorrectly predicted vocals. Then this human feedback is used to update the model parameters, thereby increasing the model performance on the target songs. We have proposed two approaches for these fine-tuning steps that take special care towards increasing the model’s generalisability.

To show the robustness of our approach, we have experimented under the intra-dataset condition where the test data belongs to the same dataset as the original train data as well as under inter-dataset condition where the model is initially trained on a different dataset and is adapted to the new dataset by correcting its mistakes by a human user on examples from the new-dataset. We also show that using our methods for singing voice separation increases performance not only for the songs corrected in the human-in-the-loop



task but also for new songs that were previously unseen. The performance has been evaluated on different metrics which are compared on the basis of subjective separation quality.

Our contribution can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a human-in-the-loop framework for user interaction with minimal effort and minimal music knowledge from the user’s end.
- We present two continual learning techniques for model fine-tuning with the aim to minimize overfitting and catastrophic forgetting as well as to increase model generalisability while adapting to a new test song.
- We show that for voice separation, continual learning problems mean of SDR is a better measure than widely used median SDR.

The remaining part of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we have discussed previous work in the fields of source separation, human-in-the-loop & continual learning. In Section 3 we have introduced and explained our proposed methods. This is followed by details of our experimentation and an analysis of the results in Section 4. We have concluded with the closing remarks in Section 5. We have also released the source code along with the paper¹

2. PREVIOUS WORK

Many deep learning-based approaches with great performance for singing voice separation have been explored in the recent past. Approaches like [9, 10] use deep RNN architectures on the magnitude plot of the short-time fourier transform (STFT). [11] introduces U-net based approach to the music domain for singing voice separation. [12] uses deep CNN architecture to estimate the source label for each (T-F) bin in the spectrogram. [13, 14] present an approach for source separation directly in the time domain, thereby making use of time-domain signals rather than frequency spectrogram. In this paper, we present our method using U-net architecture, but our method is independent of the exact architecture used and can be applied to other architectures too.

Most of the deep learning-based approaches for singing voice separation focus only on increasing the model performance on benchmark metrics and don’t focus on conforming the model to particular songs and/or genre in a continual learning setting. Previous work for adapting to particular songs have been through human feedback approaches that require either the human to do spectrogram-based mask editing [15], or provide feedback on the fundamental notes/frequency of the singing voice in the song [16]. These approaches hence assume a minimum level of musical understanding in the user and are highly time-consuming. Moreover, the performance of these methods involves overfitting the model to the particular song making their lifelong learning aspect weak. Approaches like [17] which use time

activation of a particular instrument as annotations from the user don’t use deep learning methods. In this paper, we propose a simple human-in-the-loop task that requires minimal music knowledge and can be applied to a large group of deep learning models.

Learning from an infinite stream of data is studied under the continual learning paradigm. [18] surveyed the different approaches that have been proposed for tackling this task and divided them into three categories: replay-based, regularization-based, and parameter isolation methods. Replay-based methods [19–21] rely on storing exemplars from the original training data or generating data points similar to the training data using generative models to prevent forgetting and overfitting. Regularization-based methods like [22] have proposed freezing important weights of the initial model and regularizing trainable weights during finetuning to deal with catastrophic forgetting. Parameter isolation methods dedicate separate parameters to each task in order to prevent catastrophic forgetting, using techniques such as network pruning [23], introducing new branches to the model [24] and masking [25]. In this paper, we adapt replay-based continual learning algorithms to use for model adaptation on a stream of user annotated data.

3. PROPOSED METHOD

3.1 Problem Setting

The problem of singing voice separation has been formally defined as given a time-domain polyphonic music signal $M(t)$, separate $M(t)$ into its constituent signals $V(t)$ and $A(t)$ such that they have minimal interference. Here $V(t)$ and $A(t)$ denotes the separated vocals and accompaniment of the original music signal.

Given a dataset D , we split it into 3 components D_{train} , D_{HITL} and D_{test} , where D_{train} is used for training the base model, D_{HITL} is used for human in the loop adaptation, while D_{test} is the unseen set used for testing the model as in usual machine learning cases. We first train a vocal separation model B using D_{train} which is our base model. Next, we define the continual learning human-in-the-loop task as follows: Given the model B , for each target song s , ($s \in D_{\text{HITL}}$) modify the parameters of B based on human annotations on s , such that its performance on s and songs similar to s increases. Finally, we evaluate the performance of our model on the D_{test} set to test that our model does not suffer from overfitting or catastrophic forgetting.

3.2 Method Overview

For our base model, we use a U-Net-based model similar to [26]. The U-Net architecture consists of an encoder-decoder network made up of convolutional layers with skip connections between the encoder and decoder layers which allow retention of any information lost during encoding. The base model was trained on the D_{train} split of the MUSDB-18 dataset [27], taking data points (X, Y) from each music signal $M(t) \in D_{\text{train}}$, where X is the corresponding spectrogram sliced from the spectrogram of $M(t)$

¹ link will be updated after the anonymity period




Figure 2. Pipeline for creating synthetic music tracks

and Y is the target mask. We use L1 loss for the vocal masks and optimize with Adam optimizer, using a learning rate of 10^{-4} .

For the human-in-the-loop adaptation, we have formulated a human annotation task where the human has to mark segments t_i with the start and end timestamps, t_i^{start} and t_i^{end} , where the estimated vocal track $\hat{V}(t)$ contains audio while it should have been silent. Here, i is the segment index. The annotation task is kept simple, and it is formulated such that the annotator need not have any specialized music skills. During our experiments, we have used a simple heuristic of keeping only the marked regions that are longer than 6 seconds in length to ensure uniformity. We have also developed a GUI interface to make it easier for users to mark the timestamps.

We use batch gradient-based fine tuning for adapting the model. L1 loss is used on the vocal mask along with Adam optimizer, similar to how we had trained our base model, but with 10 times lower learning rate. We fine-tune the model for a fixed number of epochs.

3.2.1 Adaptation with Zero Vocal Targets

In the regions t_i as there are no vocals to extract, the ideal vocal masks for these regions should identically be equal to zero. Therefore the target to the model \mathbf{B} for these regions are zero masks. For model adaptation in this method, we use only the segments t_i for training as we know their target masks.

We observed that if we perform direct fine-tuning using the human annotations of \mathbf{D}_{HITL} , our model quickly overfits these areas. This makes sense as the learning would be to identically predict zero instead of the correct vocal mask. To ensure that the model does not overfit to the new data and does not forget the knowledge it gained from previous examples, replay based continual learning method, which relies on storing a subset of the previous training data (\mathbf{D}_{train}), is used while fine-tuning the model. As shown in Fig. 3, we update the model on exemplars from the original training data (\mathbf{D}_{train}) in conjunction with the data points extracted from the regions marked by the user during the HITL task on \mathbf{D}_{HITL} .




Figure 3. Replay based continual learning

3.2.2 Adaptation with Synthetic Track

In the above method, the new data points given to the model from the user annotated regions are expected to be silent. These are not informative enough to have a good learning. In order to improve the quality of those new data points, we decided to combine the human-in-the-loop annotations and the original training data (\mathbf{D}_{train}) to form synthetic music tracks which provide more informative data points.

As shown in Fig. 2, we create synthetic tracks by superimposing the oracle vocals of songs from \mathbf{D}_{train} with the user annotated time frames from \mathbf{D}_{HITL} . This is achieved by extracting the annotated time segments t_i from $M(t) \in \mathbf{D}_{HITL}$ and repeating it to form the artificial accompaniment for the synthetic track. A track is randomly chosen from \mathbf{D}_{train} , and its oracle vocals are superimposed on the artificial accompaniment. During the finetuning stage, we extract data points (X, Y) from these synthetic tracks, where X is a slice from the spectrogram of the artificial track and Y is the corresponding slice from the oracle vocals used for creating that track. As before, the model is updated in conjunction with these data points and the stored exemplars from \mathbf{D}_{train} , using L1 loss and Adam optimizer with learning rate 10^{-5} .

4. EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

For the methods proposed in this paper, we have conducted extensive experiments for both inter-dataset and intra-dataset settings. The results obtained have been tabulated and studied in this section.

Dataset: We have experimented with the standard benchmark MUSDB-18 dataset to test the performance of our




Figure 4. Comparison of model performance (Mean & Median SDR) with 10%, 50% and 100% of train data as exemplar

proposed approaches. From the train split, consisting of 100 songs, we have used 90 songs to form D_{train} and the remaining 10 songs to form D_{HITL} . The test split, which consists of 50 songs, is used as D_{test} .

To simulate inter-dataset conditions, where the intention is to adapt the model to a new kind of previously unseen data without the knowledge of true stems, we perform human-in-the-loop adaption using a subset of the CC-Mixer dataset [28] and test the performance on the leftover test set in CC-Mixer dataset. Table 1 contains the number of songs in different sets. The MUSDB-18 dataset consisted of vocals, drums, bass, and the rest of the accompaniment stems, which we combined to create two stems, vocals, and accompaniment. The CC-Mixer contained only vocals and accompaniment stems. For all occurrences in tables, we denote the MUSDB-18 dataset by MUS and the CC-Mixer dataset by CCM.

Dataset	D_{train}	D_{HITL}	D_{test}
MUS	90	10	50
CCM	-	30	20

Table 1. Distribution of the number of songs in different split (train, HITL & test) of the datasets

Pre-processing: $M(t)$ is made monaural and re-sampled to 22050 Hz before its short-time Fourier transform (STFT) is computed² with a window size of 2048 and a stride of 512. The magnitude of these STFT spectrograms is divided into windows of shape (1, 1024, 512) [channel, frequency, time] and used as input for our U-net model, which provides us with a mask for extracting vocals from the mixture spectrogram. Using spectrogram of $M(t)$ and this vocal mask from the model, we can compute our estimated $V(t)$ using inverse short-time Fourier transform (iSTFT).

Evaluation Metric: As proposed by [30], we use the Signal Distortion Ratio (SDR) for evaluation of predicted vocal & accompaniment stem³. We aggregate the SDR using a mean over all 1-second frames to keep one single metric per song. While many previous works report the

median SDR of each song, we use mean SDR as we found it’s a better measure to evaluate the performance (explained in section 4.3). However, to make our work comparable with other standard works, we have also reported the median SDR wherever necessary. Due to similar reasons when dealing with multiple songs, we report the mean of SDR computed across all songs, whereas many papers report the median of the song-wise SDR across the songs.

4.1 Adaptation with Zero Vocal Targets

For our replay-based HITL adaptation with zero vocal targets, we had to identify the number of exemplars needed during finetuning for the best results. We observe that the performance of the finetuned models increased on both the median and mean SDR metrics with the number of exemplars kept during replay as seen from figure 4. As a result, for all the models adapted using the zero vocal targets algorithm, we keep 100% of the training data as exemplars and finetune the model for a single epoch. Table 2 compares the performance of the base vocal separation model (U-Net(MUS)) trained on D_{train} of the MUSDB-18 dataset and the model obtained after HITL adaptation with zero vocal targets (U-Net(MUS) + HITL(MUS)) on the D_{HITL} set of the MUSDB-18 dataset. The results show an improvement in the mean SDR for both the D_{HITL} and D_{test} sets of the MUSDB-18 dataset. This indicates that the model finetuned on just the D_{HITL} set did not suffer from overfitting and was generalizable such that it is able to learn to improve non-vocal regions in new songs as well. However, the results in Table 2 show a slight decrease in the median SDR over both the sets D_{HITL} and D_{test} . This is not a big issue because, as we go on to show in subsequent sections, mean SDR is a better metric for evaluating the overall quality of the separated vocals, provided the median SDR is within a reasonable range of the base model.

To verify the adaptability of our approach, we perform inter-dataset validation using the CC-Mixer as our target dataset. We used the pre-trained base model from the previous experiment and adapted it to this new dataset using the HITL set (D_{HITL}) of the CC-Mixer dataset over a single epoch. We can see from Table 3 that the songs of the CC-mixer dataset show a significant increment in mean SDR for the HITL set from -6.29 to -3.37 and for the Test

² computed using librosa [29] library

³We used the pre-existing library for SDR calculation: <https://sigsep.github.io/sigsep-mus-eval/>

Model	D_{HITL}	D_{test}
Mean		
U-Net(MUS)	1.38	1.13
U-Net(MUS) + HITL(MUS)	2.32	1.53
Median		
U-Net(MUS)	5.02	3.87
U-Net(MUS) + HITL(MUS)	4.81	3.82

Table 2. SDR score on D_{HITL} and D_{test} set of MUS

Model	D_{HITL}	D_{test}
Mean		
U-Net(MUS)	-6.29	-2.35
U-Net(MUS) + HITL(CCM)	-3.37	-1.02
Median		
U-Net(MUS)	-0.37	4.60
U-Net(MUS) + HITL(CCM)	0.27	2.64

Table 3. SDR score on D_{HITL} and D_{test} set of CCM

set (D_{test}) from -2.35 to -1.02. This increment in performance once again exhibits the quick adaptability of the model to the D_{HITL} set by the HITL process as well as a general improvement in the ability of the model to suppress residual noise in songs of both the D_{HITL} and D_{test} sets. The results in Table 3 however, reveal an issue with the zero vocal target adaptation methodology. As the new HITL data points do not have any information about vocals but rather only about the residual noise which the base model failed to remove, the finetuned model, after finetuning over a larger D_{HITL} set of 30 songs, saw a decrement in the performance on vocals as seen with the decrease in median SDR of the D_{test} set. This shows that our hypothesis about the zero vocal targets not containing enough information was true.

4.2 Adaptation with Synthetic Track

Our proposed method of adaptation using synthetic music tracks, as elaborated in section 3 shows an improvement in the both mean and median SDR of the D_{HITL} and D_{test} of MUSDB-18 dataset in comparison to the zero vocal target optimization scheme (Table 4). The model was trained such that for each synthetic music track, there were z batches, with each batch containing x data points from the synthetic music track and y data points randomly chosen from the training data set. After performing hyperparameter tuning using grid search, we were able to set the values of each of the hyperparameters to $x=1$, $z=1$, and $y=15$ for all of our reported results. Furthermore, the model finetuned using this strategy was able to perform better than our previous method using just 20% of the original training data (D_{train}), while in comparison, the zero target vocal adaptation model used 100% of the training data.

Similar to the previous part, we also analyzed the model performance on inter-dataset conditions. Table 5 shows our performance on the HITL (D_{HITL}) and test set (D_{test}) of the CC-Mixer dataset. We see that the model is once again able to improve performance on the mean SDR metric for both the songs on which the user-provided annotations (D_{HITL}) as well as on unseen songs (D_{test}). Furthermore,

Model	D_{HITL}	D_{test}
Mean		
U-Net(MUS)	1.38	1.13
U-Net(MUS) + HITL(MUS)	2.45	1.59
Median		
U-Net(MUS)	5.02	3.87
U-Net(MUS) + HITL(MUS)	4.89	3.93

Table 4. SDR score on D_{HITL} and D_{test} set of MUS

Model	D_{HITL}	D_{test}
Mean		
U-Net(MUS)	-6.29	-2.35
U-Net(MUS) + HITL(CCM)	-4.32	-1.36
Median		
U-Net(MUS)	-0.37	4.60
U-Net(MUS) + HITL(CCM)	0.83	4.46

Table 5. SDR score on D_{HITL} and D_{test} set of CCM

we can see from Table 5 that the issue we faced regarding decrement in the median SDR due to zero vocal targets has been completely eradicated. This once again confirms our hypothesis that the use of synthetic tracks to furnish data points for our model adaptation provides much more information to the model regarding both residual noise and vocal separation. The results in Table 4 and Table 5 show that using artificial tracks, we get the best of both worlds - better performance with minimal data requirement.

4.3 Mean SDR over Median SDR

The SDR for a song is estimated using a statistical measure (mean/median) after determining SDR for each 1-second frame of the song. Though some previous works on music source separation have reported their result using median, they did not involved continual learning. For human-in-the-loop continual learning problems like ours, we saw mean to be a better measure of performance than the median.




Figure 5. Comparison of frame wise SDR of songs before and after HITL

Fig 5 shows the graph for SDR (in y-axis) with time(in x-

axis) for the two songs of the test set (\mathbf{D}_{test}) of MUSDB18 dataset: Secret Mountains - High Horse and BigTroubles-Phantom before (blue) and after (orange) the HITL adaptation. We examine from the graph that SDR increases by a considerable margin in the regions with previously low SDR values. At the same time, in areas with already high SDR, performance is similar after HITL when compared to previous base performance. As we can see in fig 5 majority of data points are inclined towards this higher SDR region where the SDR remains almost unchanged, so the median value is not affected after HITL. However, since the mean considers all the frames equally, we see a considerable rise in the overall mean SDR score of the song after HITL. The main aim of the HITL task is to improve the performance of regions that perform poorly (usually low SDR regions) by giving feedback to the model about its mistakes which indeed is happening after performing HITL with our model. An increase in performance on low SDR regions leads to an overall improvement in sound quality when heard by human ears.

4.4 Continual Learning

In order to show that our continual learning approach is free of overfitting, we iteratively performed the HITL task 3 times, each time with a HITL batch of 10 marked audio samples. We used the U-Net model trained with MUSDB18 as Base and performed HITL with HITL set (\mathbf{D}_{HITL}) of CC-mixer dataset in a way similar to inter-dataset setting in the section 4.2. Figure 6 shows the mean and median SDR values pictorially after each iteration. Note that the SDR values have been evaluated on the complete CC-mixer test set (\mathbf{D}_{test}) after each iteration. We see that the median value remains almost constant, indicating that our model does not overfit when learning its mistakes on low SDR parts, and its performance remains intact in other parts. Moreover, we see that the mean value keeps increasing gradually with a significant gain after the first iteration itself, indicating that the model adapts to the new data quickly and keeps on improving with the addition of more examples, but doesn't overfit to HITL set songs.




Figure 6. Comparison of SDR after each iteration of HITL

For measuring catastrophic forgetting, we computed the SDR score on the test set of MUSDB-18 (\mathbf{D}_{test}) after

performing HITL fine-tuning on the HITL set of CC-mixer (\mathbf{D}_{HITL}). We got a median SDR score of 3.75 and a mean SDR score of 1.76, which is well within the desired range.

5. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we present a framework to incorporate human feedback to improve the performance of vocal separation models on the existing dataset and adapt the current model to other kinds of the real-world dataset without requiring actual vocals stems. We presented two adaptation algorithms - one using zero vocal targets and the other using synthetic tracks - the latter performed better than the former in our experiments and also used lesser exemplars from the $\mathbf{D}_{\text{train}}$ set, thereby reducing storage requirements and decreasing adaptation time. We showed that our final continual learning approach minimizes overfitting and catastrophic forgetting and maximizes generality. We also showed that reporting mean SDR is a better evaluation criterion than median SDR in human-in-the-loop source separation tasks. Also, approaches in this paper are independent of the initial choice of the deep learning model. They hence could be used in conjunction with other network types with a little bit of fine-tuning for hyperparameters for best performance.

Though this paper currently focuses on separating the vocals from the music signal, future works can explore extending this to other stems with adequate modifications to the human-in-the-loop task. Recently there have also been encouraging works in the field of regularization-based continual learning in the field of computer vision, and there are opportunities for future works to incorporate these algorithms in the proposed human-in-the-loop framework.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] A. Mesaros, T. Virtanen, and A. Klapuri, "Singer identification in polyphonic music using vocal separation and pattern recognition methods," in *ISMIR*, 2007.
- [2] A. Mesaros and T. Virtanen, "Automatic recognition of lyrics in singing," *EURASIP J. Audio Speech Music Process.*, vol. 2010, no. 1, Dec. 2010.
- [3] H. Fujihara, M. Goto, T. Kitahara, and H. G. Okuno, "A modeling of singing voice robust to accompaniment sounds and its application to singer identification and vocal-timbre-similarity-based music information retrieval," *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 638–648, 2010.
- [4] Z. Rafii and B. Pardo, "A simple music/voice separation method based on the extraction of the repeating musical structure," 06 2011, pp. 221 – 224.
- [5] J. Kato, T. Nakano, and M. Goto, "Textalive: Integrated design environment for kinetic typography," in *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, ser. CHI '15. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2015, p. 3403–3412. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2702123.2702140>

- [6] P. Seetharaman, F. Pishdadian, and B. Pardo, "Music/voice separation using the 2d fourier transform," in *2017 IEEE Workshop on Applications of Signal Processing to Audio and Acoustics (WASPAA)*, 2017, pp. 36–40.
- [7] G. J. Mysore, P. Smaragdis, and B. Raj, "Non-negative hidden markov modeling of audio with application to source separation," in *Latent Variable Analysis and Signal Separation*, V. Vigneron, V. Zarzoso, E. Moreau, R. Gribonval, and E. Vincent, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010, pp. 140–148.
- [8] J.-L. Durrieu, B. David, and G. Richard, "A musically motivated mid-level representation for pitch estimation and musical audio source separation," *J. Sel. Topics Signal Processing*, vol. 5, pp. 1180–1191, 10 2011.
- [9] P.-S. Huang, M. Kim, M. Hasegawa-Johnson, and P. Smaragdis, "Singing-voice separation from monaural recordings using deep recurrent neural networks." in *ISMIR*, 2014, pp. 477–482.
- [10] Z.-C. Fan, J.-S. R. Jang, and C.-L. Lu, "Singing voice separation and pitch extraction from monaural polyphonic audio music via dnn and adaptive pitch tracking," *2016 IEEE Second International Conference on Multimedia Big Data (BigMM)*, 2016.
- [11] A. Jansson, E. J. Humphrey, N. Montecchio, R. M. Bittner, A. Kumar, and T. Weyde, "Singing Voice Separation with Deep U-Net Convolutional Networks." in *Proceedings of the 18th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference*. Suzhou, China: ISMIR, Oct. 2017, pp. 745–751. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1414934>
- [12] K. W. E. Lin, B. T. Balamurali, E. Koh, S. Lui, and D. Herremans, "Singing voice separation using a deep convolutional neural network trained by ideal binary mask and cross entropy," *Neural Computing and Applications*, vol. 32, no. 4, p. 1037–1050, 2018.
- [13] D. Stoller, S. Ewert, and S. Dixon, "Wave-u-net: A multi-scale neural network for end-to-end audio source separation," 2018.
- [14] Y. Luo and N. Mesgarani, "Tasnet: time-domain audio separation network for real-time, single-channel speech separation," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 696–700.
- [15] N. J. Bryan, G. J. Mysore, and G. Wang, "Isse: An interactive source separation editor," in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, ser. CHI '14. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2014, p. 257–266. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2556288.2557253>
- [16] T. Nakano, Y. Koyama, M. Hamasaki, and M. Goto, "Interactive deep singing-voice separation based on human-in-the-loop adaptation," *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*, 2020.
- [17] A. Ozerov, C. Févotte, R. Blouet, and J.-L. Durrieu, "Multichannel nonnegative tensor factorization with structured constraints for user-guided audio source separation," in *2011 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2011, pp. 257–260.
- [18] M. Delange, R. Aljundi, M. Masana, S. Parisot, X. Jia, A. Leonardis, G. Slabaugh, and T. Tuytelaars, "A continual learning survey: Defying forgetting in classification tasks," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, p. 1–1, 2021. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2021.3057446>
- [19] D. Rolnick, A. Ahuja, J. Schwarz, T. P. Lillicrap, and G. Wayne, "Experience replay for continual learning," 2019.
- [20] S.-A. Rebuffi, A. Kolesnikov, G. Sperl, and C. H. Lampert, "icarl: Incremental classifier and representation learning," 2017.
- [21] D. Isele and A. Cosgun, "Selective experience replay for lifelong learning," 2018.
- [22] P. Mazumder, P. Singh, and P. Rai, "Few-shot lifelong learning," 2021.
- [23] A. Mallya and S. Lazebnik, "Packnet: Adding multiple tasks to a single network by iterative pruning," 2018.
- [24] A. A. Rusu, N. C. Rabinowitz, G. Desjardins, H. Soyer, J. Kirkpatrick, K. Kavukcuoglu, R. Pascanu, and R. Hadsell, "Progressive neural networks," 2016.
- [25] A. Mallya, D. Davis, and S. Lazebnik, "Piggyback: Adapting a single network to multiple tasks by learning to mask weights," 2018.
- [26] A. Jansson, E. J. Humphrey, N. Montecchio, R. M. Bittner, A. Kumar, and T. Weyde, "Singing voice separation with deep u-net convolutional networks," in *ISMIR*, 2017.
- [27] Z. Rafii, A. Liutkus, F.-R. Stöter, S. I. Mimilakis, and R. Bittner, "The MUSDB18 corpus for music separation," Dec. 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1117372>
- [28] A. Liutkus, D. Fitzgerald, Z. Rafii, B. Pardo, and L. Daudet, "Kernel additive models for source separation," *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 62, no. 16, pp. 4298–4310, 2014.
- [29] B. McFee, V. Lostanlen, A. Metsai, M. McVicar, S. Balke, C. Thomé, C. Raffel, F. Zalkow, A. Malek, Dana, K. Lee, O. Nieto, J. Mason, D. Ellis,

E. Battenberg, S. Seyfarth, R. Yamamoto, K. Choi, viktorandreevichmorozov, J. Moore, R. Bittner, S. Hidaka, Z. Wei, nullmightybofo, D. Hereñú, F.-R. Stöter, P. Friesch, A. Weiss, M. Vollrath, and T. Kim, “librosa/librosa: 0.8.0,” Jul. 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3955228>

- [30] E. Vincent, R. Gribonval, and C. Fevotte, “Performance measurement in blind audio source separation,” *IEEE Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 1462–1469, 2006.