

Data-Driven Analysis of Text-Conditioned AI-Generated Music: A Case Study with Suno and Udio

Luca Casini Laura Cros Vila, David Dalmazzo, Anna-Kaisa Kaila,
Bob L.T. Sturm

KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden
{casini,lcros,dalmazzo,akaila,bobs}@kth.se

Abstract

Online AI platforms for creating music from text prompts (AI music), such as Suno and Udio, are now being used by hundreds of thousands of users. Some AI music is appearing in advertising, and even charting, in multiple countries. How are these platforms being used? What subjects are inspiring their users? This article answers these questions for Suno and Udio using a large collection of songs generated by users of these platforms from May to October 2024. Using a combination of state-of-the-art text embedding models, dimensionality reduction and clustering methods, we analyze the prompts, tags and lyrics, and automatically annotate and display the processed data in interactive plots. Our results reveal prominent themes in lyrics, language preference, prompting strategies, as well as peculiar attempts at steering models through the use of metatags. To promote the musicological study of the developing cultural practice of AI-generated music we share our code and resources.¹

Submitted for revision to the Transactions of the International Society for Music Information Retrieval, "Digital Musicology" Special Issue

1 Introduction

The application of artificial intelligence (AI) to creating media such as text, graphics and music has expanded from academic research into the commercial realm, with powerful generative tools now available to a broad public. While obviously central for large language models like ChatGPT [1], text has become the main interface for other modalities like images, after the success of generative models like OpenAI's DALL-E [2] and Stable Diffusion [3]. Textual conditioning inputs are commonly referred to as "prompts" and the idea of "prompt engineering" is emerging around shared best practices [4]. AI-generated music (AI music) is starting to appear in the cultural mainstream, e.g., charting in Europe [5], [6], [7] and appearing in marketing campaigns [8]. Professional music creators are also integrating AI into their workflows. A 2024 survey showed that 35% of GEMA and SACEM members have used AI technologies in their work, reaching 51% for those under 35 years old [9].

There are many AI-powered systems for music creation from big companies like Google, Meta, Microsoft, Open AI, Stability AI and Spotify and startups like Aiva Technologies, Boomy, Riffusion, Suno and Udio. Given their rising popularity, how can we study the use of AI-music generation systems based on the text-to-music interaction modality? What large-scale patterns can we observe? What can we learn about the users of these systems and their goals? This paper focuses on analyzing AI-generated music from the platforms Suno and Udio, as they represent the most popular services to offer text-to-music generation, with hundreds of thousands of users [10] and active communities on social media like Reddit and Discord.²

We approach these musicological questions with a data-driven methodology, using tools from natural language processing and data science. This methodology allows one to manage the unique nature of this new music practice by shifting from in-depth analysis of individual works to a broader, data-driven exploration of music produced by a broad community, thereby uncovering large-scale trends in AI music. We start by collecting a large dataset of over 100,000 songs generated by users of Suno and Udio from May to October 2024. This dataset consists of textual prompts, lyrics and tags associated with the music generated by these platforms. In the course of our exploration, another

¹https://github.com/mister-magpie/aims_prompts

²At the time of writing Suno's discord has 397,642 members and Udio has 17,435.

dataset of AI music appeared: the SONICS dataset [11]—but this dataset is collected for studying the problem of AI music detection, and is not representative of how Suno and Udio are being used. We perform exploratory data analysis of the textual metadata in our dataset to discover patterns and trends. This allows us to answer questions tied to demographic aspects such as what languages and alphabets are the most prevalent. Through textual analysis and clustering we can answer questions about prompts and lyrics: What emerging prompting strategies can we observe? What type of qualifiers appear most often in the style prompt? What are the most common themes that appear in the lyrics? How many prompts reference real musicians? Are users trying to impersonate real artists?

Despite the growing prominence of AI music generation platforms, there has been no systematic analysis of how these systems are actually being used in practice [12]. This work aims to address this lack and promote the emerging field of AI music studies. This paper presents three main contributions. We develop and apply a new methodology for the study of AI music from text-controlled systems based on textual features. We do this by combining well established techniques and state-of-the-art tools from related fields and putting them to the test for this specific domain. To facilitate reproducibility, future research and comparative studies, we share our code along with a list of URLs for the songs in our dataset.³ Finally, we produce interactive visualizations that can help explore and navigate the dataset we assembled.⁴

The article is structured as follows: Section 2 provides background information on lyrics and prompt analysis, and Section 3 describes the interaction modality of these platforms, and explains how they integrate metadata in the generation process. Section 4 details the methodology of our study. Section 5 describes the dataset we collect and use for our analyses. Section 6 illustrates the results we obtain from our analyses of prompts, lyrics, tags and metatags. Section 7 contains a discussion of the results and points to further work. Finally, Section 8 concludes the paper.

2 Related Work

We first review work done in prompt analysis, particularly in the context of text-to-image generation. Then we present research on lyrics analysis, focusing on computational methods for extracting meaning, sentiment, and stylistic patterns from song lyrics.

2.1 Prompt Analysis

To the best of our knowledge there is no work that studies prompting in the context of music generation. For this reason we turn to similar works in the context of image generation. A notable example is the work by [13], investigating text-to-image generation practices by looking at *DiffusionDB* [14], a dataset of 14 million real images and prompts from real users of Stable Diffusion. Their analyses result in a taxonomy of specifiers found in the prompts and clusters to find macro categories, along with a classifier trained to follow it. An extension of this work comes from [15], who include data from *Midjourney* and provide some additional clustering and topic modeling. Both papers make use of the HDBSCAN clustering algorithm in conjunction with UMAP dimensionality reduction.

2.2 Lyrics Analysis

In MIR tasks such as mood and genre classification, lyrics and other textual features have been analyzed using natural language processing (NLP) techniques [16], [17]. In the context of genre classification, [18] demonstrate how to measure song similarity using NLP techniques applied to lyrics. [19] use a number of specialized linguistic features to address genre classification, rating prediction and publication time prediction. [20] use a mix of NLP models and audio signal processing techniques to create song mood classifiers.

Similar techniques can also be used to investigate sociocultural questions, moving beyond classification and retrieval tasks. For example, [21] looked at the decreasing linguistic complexity of lyrics in six decades of popular American music, using compressibility as a proxy, and studied correlation to ecological, social and cultural factors in order to explain it. [22] apply sentiment analysis techniques to lyrics of popular music since the 1950s and show how certain feelings like anger, disgust, fear, sadness, and conscientiousness have increased significantly, while joy, confidence, and openness expressed in pop song lyrics have declined. In their analysis of lyrical complexity, structure, emotion,

³https://github.com/mister-magpie/aims_prompts

⁴An interactive version is available online at https://mister-magpie.github.io/aims_prompts/




Figure 1: *Suno* website interface when “Custom” mode is selected. Here the user can input the lyrics as well as the style of the music. Last accessed Dec. 16, 2024.

and popularity across five decades, [23] similarly demonstrate an increase in negative emotions, as well as a decrease in both lexical and structural complexity over time.

3 The interaction modality of Text-to-Music generation systems

Figure 1 shows the music creation interface in Suno. To start generating a song, the user can click on the “Create” button in the sidebar. This will show a textbox for prompting the AI model. Lyrics and style tags will be generated according to the prompt and used as conditioning for the model. Users can also specify, using a radio button, if they prefer an instrumental track. An additional radio button labeled “Custom” can be toggled, offering direct control over lyrics and style prompts. While the interface suggests tags that are added as comma-separated elements, the textbox also accepts free text.

Figure 2 shows an example of the generation interface in Udio. The interaction happens in largely the same way as Suno. The user is first asked to describe the song they want and popular tags are suggested. There is a button to fill this part with a randomly generated prompt. After that, lyrics can be written manually or automatically or skipped to generate an instrumental song. The interface suggests pressing the / key to show a list of popular meta-tags that are added to the lyrics between square brackets and allow for additional control.

The text fields in the interfaces accept any Unicode input, including emojis and non-Latin characters. At the time of writing, new functionalities are being added to the interfaces of both platforms (e.g., audio prompting, new models); but we do not consider any additions beyond the last date we collected (October 2024).




Figure 2: Creation interface for Udio (as of Feb 18th 2025). Selecting the Custom allows for manual adjustments even if the prompts are automatically generated.

4 Methodology

We now describe our methodology, drawing on similar work analyzing AI generated images [13], [15]. Our method can be summarized in six steps.

1. We scrape the regularly updated playlists from Suno and Udio’s “new songs” public-facing homepage.
2. We extract the metadata from these playlists (prompt, lyrics, and tags) and cast it as a dataframe consisting of rows (songs) and columns (metadata). This allows us to filter the rows based on content (e.g., language, length, null values).

We perform separate analyses on prompts, tags and lyrics. For any of those datatypes:

3. We embed it using a pretrained model such as *NV-Embedv2* [24].
4. We perform dimensionality reduction and clustering on the embeddings.
5. For each of the clusters, we derive a label using an automated procedure and manually refine.
6. We create a 2D scatter plot of the clustered elements for visual analysis.

We iterate steps three to six multiple times, experimenting with the hyperparameters for dimensionality reduction and clustering.

In more detail, we perform scraping using a script that extracts metadata from the HTTP request we find in the homepage code for both platforms. We save the metadata in JSON format for each song in a file which is refined into a dataframe for each platform. Some of the analyses we perform require filtering the dataset. We remove some entries only in those specific cases. Specifically, this means ignoring languages other than English from both the lyrics and prompt subsets, removing entries that are too short or too long, and dropping empty rows from the dataframe. We use a language

classification model to filter out non-English elements because these could prove problematic for English-tuned NLP tools. We choose the classification model included in the `fasttext` library from Meta.⁵ The model outputs labels for languages according to the ISO 639-3 standard⁶ together with an indication of the alphabet used.

To generate embeddings for clustering, we use two state-of-the-art deep learning models specifically designed for text embedding. We use *NV-Embedv2* by NVIDIA [24]. This model uses decoder-only transformers along with a modified attention mechanism and ad-hoc contrastive learning pre-training to learn text embeddings, outperforming previous methods based on masked language models. We employ the implementation made available by the authors through the Huggingface library⁷.

The latent representation produced by NV-Embed has a dimensionality of 4096. We use dimensionality reduction as an intermediate step before clustering. Our choice for this task is *UMAP* [25], which works by building a high-dimensional graph with weighted connections that is reduced to a smaller dimensional graph while trying to preserve its structure. We employ the python implementation provided by the `umap-learn` package⁸. UMAP has a number of important parameters that influence the final result. The number of approximate nearest neighbors when building the high-dimensional graph regulates the trade-off between global and local structure, and this in turn influences the outcomes of clustering in our pipeline. The minimum distance between points in the reduced dimensional space directly affects how closely the algorithm packs together similar points. At clustering time, this can lead to too many clusters if set too low, while at visualization time it can result in small clusters being too far away from the rest, making the plot difficult to read.

For clustering, we use *HDBSCAN* [26], which is an extension of the DBSCAN algorithm that enables robust identification of clusters with varying densities [27]. This clustering algorithm is recommended by [25], in conjunction with UMAP, when operating in high-dimensional embedding spaces. One benefit of *HDBSCAN* compared to other clustering algorithms is the automatic detection of outliers. We use the implementation in the `scikit-learn` package⁹. The algorithm has hyper-parameters for the minimum and maximum cluster size, as well as a factor ϵ that controls how likely clusters are to be merged together. We set these values for each analysis through trial and error, aiming for the best combination of hyper-parameters that gives a meaningful number of clusters.

To facilitate exploration, especially in the case of lyrics with a high number of clusters, we devise a strategy to automatically name them. After forming clusters of tags, we use a bag-of-words strategy by counting term prevalence and then select the N most common ones. We find that $N = 3$ is enough to topically characterize clusters. For lyrics and prompts, we remove stop-words, perform lemmatization and finally select the top-3 words after TF-IDF ranking using the `spacy` package. We manually inspect clusters and then possibly rename each with more descriptive labels. We find, however, that the top word often provides a good characterization of the cluster. Additionally, we assign tags to a set of macro categories by either using a list of genres or instruments, or by running regular expressions on specific technical terms (e.g., BPM). This influences dimensionality reduction and clustering, making the final clusters more informative and reflective of higher-level categories.

5 Dataset

Our dataset consists of a total of 101,953 songs — 20,519 from Udio and 81,434 from Suno — collected between May and October 2024. Table 1 summarizes the columns relevant for our study out of all those present in the metadata JSON object we have.

There are inconsistencies around the actual meaning of `prompt` and `tags` due to differences between the two platforms. In the context of Suno, `prompt` means any text input in the lyrics textbox before having it generate a song (Fig. 1). This text can be written either by a user, or generated by an LLM prompted with a user’s description, stored as `gpt_description_prompt`. In Suno, what gets labeled as `tags` in the metadata comes from a textbox labeled in the interface as *Style of Music*, with a popover that invites the user to: “Describe the style of music you want (e.g., acoustic pop). Suno’s models do not recognize artists’ names but do understand genres and vibes.”. Although suggestions are provided, resulting in comma-separated keywords if clicked, the string does not appear to be post-processed and often results in very long individual tags. The way

⁵<https://huggingface.co/facebook/fasttext-language-identification>

⁶https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ISO_639:3

⁷<https://huggingface.co/nvidia/NV-Embed-v2>

⁸<https://umap-learn.readthedocs.io/>

⁹<https://scikit-learn.org>

Field	Suno	Udio
<code>id</code>	Unique song ID	Unique song ID
<code>title</code>	Title of the song	Title of the song
<code>tags</code>	Tags derived from the user input	User tags
<code>replaced_tags</code>	N/A	dictionary with tags replacements
<code>lyrics</code>	N/A	Song lyrics
<code>prompt</code>	Song lyrics	User input
<code>gpt_description_prompt</code>	User prompt for lyrics generation	N/A
<code>optimized_prompt</code>	N/A	Refined user input

Table 1: The subset of the metadata from Suno and Udio we analyze

that these are stored is reflected in the interface too. Udio offers a textbox for a general prompt, which is then translated into tags by the system, unless *Manual Mode* is enabled. Additionally, a number of suggested tags is provided, which updates as the user selects them or writes in the textbox. The post-processing of tags is most notable when the name of a real artist is mentioned; these get replaced with generic tags, as opposed to Suno, which just blocks their use. The metadata contains the original prompt and tags, as well as their post-processed version, if any. The interface has a section for lyrics, which can be either AI- or user-generated. In both cases they are stored as *lyrics* without any indication of their provenance. The *optimized prompt* field for Udio is used inconsistently. When present, it seems to overlap with the *replaced tags* field.

In the context of this paper, we use the following terminology in order to clear the ambiguity around certain fields of our metadata:

lyrics: `prompt` in the case of Suno and `lyrics` in the case of Udio;

tags: `tags` and their replaced/optimized version in the case of Udio and high level labels for each song

prompt: `gpt_description_prompt` in the case of Suno and `prompt` in the case of Udio

6 Results

We now detail the specifics of several analyses and discuss the results.

6.1 Language Detection

Table 2 shows the 15 most prevalent languages in lyrics on both platforms, accounting for more than 90% of the dataset. For each language, prevalence in each platform is given in percentage points, with its rank depending on their sum across platforms. For both services, we see prompts written in a variety of languages, with English being by far the most prevalent. This is to be expected as both companies are based in the USA. The tail of the distribution features the major European and Asian languages. The differences in use of certain languages might be explained by different release patterns on the global market. Additionally, the user-base of Udio appears to be smaller than Suno, which may be due to its more recent establishment.

6.2 Prompts

In our dataset of 101,953 songs, we find 41,108 that have a prompt: 20,589 from Suno and 20,519 from Udio. The median value is around 80 characters, but for Udio, there is a heavier tail of long prompts pushing the 99th percentile to 1,325 characters. Using this number as a threshold, we remove 206 prompts based on their length. To avoid distorting the results because of different languages and repeated prompts, we filter out any text in languages different than English and remove duplicates. This results in a subset of 16,881 prompts.

We use *NV-Embed v2* to embed the prompts and reduce the resulting embedding to five dimensions using UMAP with `n_neighbors=10` and `min_dist=0.15`. We run *HBDSCAN* with a minimum cluster size of 20 and maximum of 200, with $\epsilon = 0.25$, resulting in 81 clusters. Figure 3 shows the resulting plot. For each cluster in the plot, its label is manually reviewed and revised based on the procedure described in Sec. 4.

taining only duplicates of the same prompt, which shows that some users publish multiple attempts at generating the same song. We can speculate that most of the generations on the platform are of this nature but since they remain unpublished we cannot confirm this.

Beyond semantic content, it appears that there are two main tendencies in the way prompts are built. On the one hand, we find prompts constructed like a list of comma-separated qualifiers, with the length varying between a couple of words to over ten. (e.g., “modern country, contemporary folk, introspective, melodic, bittersweet”). On the other, we have more literary prompts that describe the content of the song (e.g., “A song about ...”) or the sound of the song (e.g., “A jazz ballad with trumpet, etc., ...”). We can view these two as extremes on a spectrum, with most prompts being a combination of both approaches.

Prompts might sometimes contain references to real artists, with text like “A song in the style of ...” or “Sung by ...”. It appears, however, that Suno uses the prompt only for generating the lyrics, while tags do not allow the use of real artists names. Udio is instead more flexible, extracting tags from the prompt automatically and in many cases allowing artists’ names. Section 6.5 contains a list of artists we find in the Udio subset. Overall, it appears that prompts contain a mix of information about themes and style. The former emerges more clearly from analyzing lyrics, while the latter is better observed in the tags.

6.3 Lyrics

In our dataset, we find almost 11% (Udio) and 15% (Suno) are instrumental, and thus have no or few lyrics. We filter all lyrics that are not detected as English. Looking at the distribution of lyrics character length shows that the 99th percentile is 3,460 for Udio and 2,999 for Suno. We thus remove from consideration English-detected lyrics longer than 3,600 characters and instrumental entries, giving a total size of 42,163 lyrics that we analyze.

We combine song lyrics and song title into a single string for analysis. Since lyrics can include structural information inside square brackets, e.g., “[chorus]”, we remove all such occurrences using a regular expression. Following [15], we reduce the embeddings of the lyrics to five dimensions using `umap-learn` default parameters (except the `metric` setting that was set to `cosine`). We then apply the HDBSCAN in the reduced latent space. After some experimentation, we decide to use default settings and set the minimum cluster size to 20. The algorithm gives us 190 clusters, with cardinalities ranging from 20 to 854, and a group of outliers of size 25,794. This high number of outliers is not problematic since our goal is not to classify all the elements perfectly but to find meaningful anchors in the latent space with which to infer what each cluster represents.

We manually refine the auto-generated cluster names by listening to the songs closer to the centroid of each cluster and renaming the cluster in cases where we find the original name imprecise or ambiguous. We then manually group clusters into macro-categories based on shared semantic similarities. We obtain 26 macro-categories, plus one for the outliers. Table 3 summarizes this result and Fig- 4 shows the bi-dimensional reduction of the embedding space, where each song is a dot colored according to cluster whose name is printed near the centroid.

We see certain types of use and users emerge from the clusters. As one might expect, the biggest group is songs with variations around the theme of love with many smaller clusters that capture the different aspects like: unrequited love, breakups, distance, longing, etc. The biggest individual cluster, however, is the one with 854 number of worship songs, where `love`, `god` and `lord` are the most prevalent words. In this cluster, Christianity and Islam seem to be the dominant subjects. There is a group of songs that are created to celebrate a specific event like holidays, or family members. This suggests that users sometimes use these services to generate bespoke songs for particular people on celebratory occasions, or in relation to certain experiences like trips or sport events, or daily routines like school life. Songs about pets, animals and food are also a recognizable category. These clusters demonstrate an unprecedented “musicalization of everyday life” as noted by [28]. Current geopolitical events are also reflected on the platform. We find a cluster of political songs about the 2024 USA elections and candidates. Clusters for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict are also present, but in the plot we only see a cluster with Palestine-related keywords. Songs with Israel-related keywords are not absent from dataset but rather they are mostly labeled as Hebrew by the language detection and thus are not considered in our analyses. Not all traces of languages other than English are filtered out, however. A subset of users seems to be creating songs using bilingual lyrics. This is especially true for Asian languages, likely because of the popularity of J-Pop and K-Pop. Themes from fiction like high fantasy, horror and monsters, and post-atomic worlds all appear with their clusters of songs, with the first being the largest. There are multiple small clusters about video-games, with classics like `pokemon` and recent releases like `hellydivers`. We find

Category	Cluster
abstract	clashing, afrofuturism, dreams, religion, sleep, chaos, flying, post-atomic, shadows, carpe diem, money, war, mirrors, mask, photo
animals	frog, butterfly, bees, firefly, capybara, chicken, animals, dogs, cats
celebration	birthday, xmas, halloween
daily life	weekend, monotony, school, rent, Monday, daily work, clean dishes
dance	dance, swing, moonlight, heartbeat, groove
driving	speed, driving, road trip
family	friendship, mother, father, family
fantasy	werewolves, vikings, demons, shadows, fantasy, vampire, spooky
feelings	old place, revenge, freedom, good ol days, pain, peaceful, happiness, yesterday, weariness, madness, loneliness, fade away
food	coffee, candy, cheese, banana fruit
genre	guitar, rock'n'roll, blues, country music, trap-like, heavy metal, emo
location	desert, capital city, egypt, earth, beach, river, america, australia, forest, sea
love	wandering, longing, holding on, distance, time, burning, stay, light, missing, i miss you, breakup, crazy, return, feel, togetherness, always, unrequited, electric, whisper, hand, letting go, apology, goodbye, wait, hearthbrake, dream, forever, eyes
meme	weed, memes, poop, fuck
languages	russian, korean, chinese, japanese, indonesian, hindi, jamaican, spanish
motivational	rise and shine, dreams, dawn, phoenix, unstoppable, rising
other	raven, gpt glitch, alphabet, instrumental, boots?, minimalist?
outliers	outliers
politics	palestine, biden, protest songs
weather/ seasons	autumn, summer, rain, frozen, moonlight, sunshine
sports	sports, training
stars/night	quite night, stars, cosmic
technology	math, crypto, digital, AI, code
time	midnight, sunset, time, morning
urban	city, neons, lost, street
videogames	pokemon, helldivers, videogames

Table 3: Macro categories and clusters in the lyrics embedding space

a thematic cluster of songs about technology. Especially for AI, there seems to be an equal number of songs in praise of AI and against it. In the meme category we find clusters of songs featuring humorous, sometimes crass, lyrics or that feature words from popular online memes (e.g. **skibidi**, **sigma**, **Ohio**). In the “other” group, we find some clusters that are peculiar and some that seem to be artifacts of the clustering algorithm (highlighted by a question mark in the table). In the former group, we have songs based on Edgar Allan Poe’s poem *The Raven*, which appear to be related to a community-organized challenge on the Suno Discord Server¹². An example of the latter is in the cluster labeled **gpt glitch**, featuring lyrics that look like the output of an LLM, containing text such as ‘‘I’m sorry but I can’t create that for you.’’.

Manually inspecting the outliers shows that most of them are spread among existing clusters and could reasonably be merged. Most notably, most of the points in the large outliers patch to the bottom left of the “fantasy” cluster could be part of it. Likewise, there is a dense group of outliers below the dance-related clusters that share the same semantic content. There are however a few small clumps of points labeled outliers that are distinct groups. For example, next to the other mixed languages clusters, there seems to be an undetected Arabic cluster. Additionally, some of the outliers in this area feature either ASCII art or emojis in the lyrics. In the upper part of the plot, there seems to be a certain number of sea shanties, mainly using “The Wellerman” lyrics. On

¹²<https://discord.com/channels/1069381916492562582/1231954456007151736/1253680890593280062> Last accessed Mar. 12 2025




Figure 5: Length of the tags field in characters for Suno (yellow) and Udio (red). Suno tags are usually longer and more discursive compared to Udio.



Figure 6: Word cloud for Suno (left) and Udio (right). Font size is scaled according to prevalence.

Using a part-of-speech tagger, we find single-word adjectives in the remaining tags. The remainder of the set contains the other classes that we spot in the first clustering attempt plus some outliers we sort out manually. We match voice tags to anything containing the words “voice”, “vocal” and “singer”. Similarly, structural tags are all those that contain keywords for song sections like chorus or intro. Tempo tags could be a subset of this category but stand out by the fact that they all contain the word `tempo`. “BPM”, years (e.g., “60s”) and key signatures (e.g., “D flat major”) are all matched using regular expressions. We refine these classes manually after checking the clustering results, which only needs minor adjustments.

We end up with 58 clusters, mostly following the macro-categories we specify manually. Figure 7 shows the result of our clustering pipeline, where UMAP is conditioned on our high-level taxonomy. The five-dimensional UMAP uses `n_neighbors=15` and `min_dist=0.15`. HDBSCAN uses minimum and maximum cluster sizes of 5 and 50 and $\epsilon = 0.32$. The two-dimensional UMAP uses `n_neighbors=150` and `min_dist=0.45`.

Figure 7 shows that genres, qualifiers, and instruments make up most of the dataset and are clearly separated. Voice-related tags also form two compact groups of notable size for male and female voices, respectively. We can see small, well-defined clusters for year, BPM and key specifiers. Structural tags are the most spread out, as tags like `drop` and `beat` are pushed towards clusters featuring related genres. Qualifiers are grouped into fewer and larger clusters, which appear to go




Figure 7: Clusters of the most common tags (combined ranking from both services). Colors correspond to macro categories defined manually. Text corresponds to the most prevalent tag in each cluster of the clusters we find with HDBSCAN. Grey indicates outliers.

from more abstract concepts (e.g., atmospheric) to more musical adjectives (e.g., melodic) that are closer to the genre clusters. Genres are more easily separated and seem to cluster according to the similarity of the associated styles. In some cases, like country or metal, the cluster is very compact and separated, as each entry is a combination of the genre name and an adjective (**black metal**, **thrash metal**, etc.). Instruments cluster together in three separate areas, with the guitar cluster lying next to rock and country, the piano cluster being closer to jazz and instrumental genres, and the synth cluster being closer to electronic music. There are a number of elements that were not clustered and are represented in gray in Fig. 7. Most of these outliers are quite prevalent tags that might however lie in between many different genres and concepts in the embedding space, e.g., acoustic, and are geometrically difficult to place.

6.5 Real Artist Names in Udio

Udio replaces real artist names in the tags with a set of generic descriptors, which might be a way for the company to avoid producing outputs that infringe intellectual property rights while retaining the ability for a user to describe what music they want. In the metadata, the `replaced_tags` field is structured like a dictionary with labels for the nature of the replacement, making it easy for us to identify replaced artists. In our collection of 20,519 Udio songs, we find 1000 such instances corresponding to 703 unique artists. Table 4 shows the 20 most prevalent replaced artist names, along with the number of times they appear, and an example of the tags substituted for them. Udio appears to match different spellings of the same name (e.g., Bjork or Björk) and the replaced tags are not always the same, suggesting a dynamic system behind the replacement and not just simply a lookup table.

6.6 Metatags in the Lyrics

Lyrics often contain elements that are not words to be sung by the model. We will refer to these elements as *metatags*, following a guide compiled by Suno user *wetcircuit* found on <https://www.suno.wiki>. Their purpose appears to be steering the music generation by providing additional information about characteristics like structure, instrumentation, delivery and dynamics. Metatags mostly appear between square brackets, although they might also appear without special markings (e.g., **Verse** followed by a new line) or using other symbols like parentheses. We limit ourselves to looking for square brackets as it seems to be the dominant pattern. Some user appear to put lyrical content like call and response phrases or second voices inside square brackets, these however drop to the bottom of our list since they only appear once. Table 5 contains the 25 most common metatags and their prevalence in each platform.

Artist	#	Replaced Tags
XXXTentacion26		emo rap, alternative r&b, hip hop, contemporary r&b, r&b, pop rap, aggressive, self-hatred, boastful, depressive
Drake	19	male vocalist, pop rap, contemporary r&b, hip hop, r&b, alternative r&b, atmospheric, introspective, apathetic, mellow, bittersweet
Taylor Swift	18	alt-pop, singer-songwriter, synthpop, nocturnal, romantic, love, atmospheric, lonely, sentimental, longing, concept album, lethargic, passionate, 2020s
Foo Fighters	18	male vocalist, alternative rock, post-grunge, acoustic rock, energetic, melodic
The Beatles	17	male vocalist, psychedelic pop, pop rock, psychedelia, sunshine pop, art pop, melodic, lush, love, fantasy, optimistic, dense, pastoral
Depeche Mode	17	male vocalist, synthpop, downtempo, ambient pop, electronic, melancholic, melodic, calm, soothing, lush, mellow, nocturnal]
Adele	17	female vocalist, pop soul, adult contemporary, pop, blue-eyed soul, passionate, sad, sentimental
J. S. Bach	16	classical music, baroque music
The Weeknd	14	male vocalist, alternative r&b, electropop, r&b, electronic, synthpop, nu-disco, party, hedonistic
ABBA	14	female vocalist, europop, euro-disco, dance, pop, disco, optimistic, energetic, uplifting, melodic, rhythmic, party, lush

Table 4: The ten most replaced artists found in Udio’s metadata under *replaced_tags*. The full list contains 703 artists.

Most of the metatags we find are used to suggest structure, with **verse** and **chorus** dominating the list. Metatags for repeated parts often come with numbers, e.g., **chorus 2** but we opted to remove them and just consider the main metatag. Words specifying the instrumentation for the section like **guitar solo** or **instrumental intro** were very common.

Some users go a step further by including multiple instructions in a single metatag. Looking at the least frequent elements in the subset, we find some unique and very elaborate metatags. A few examples of recurring elements are: chord progressions, precise duration, specific instruction on instrumentation, dynamics or tempo. However, as noticed in *suno.wiki*, long sequences of metatags seem to get ignored by the AI model and can be misinterpreted as lyrics and be sung instead.

The heterogeneity in the way these sequences are used suggests this is an evolving practice, with users experimenting and trying to build shared knowledge of how to best interact with the systems. Udio also differs from Suno in that they actively encourage users to experiment by providing a tool-tip with suggestions that the user can summon using the / key. We can speculate that this behavior could be exploited by Udio to ultimately improve the platform’s prompting capabilities by leveraging crowd-source labels.

Like we see with tags, sometimes metatags include the names of real artists. This is especially important in Suno where providing such names in the tags is forbidden. Table 6 contains a few randomly selected examples of such metatags, where the name of an artist is used in an attempt to evoke their voice or music style.

7 Discussion

We now critically discuss our work and point out limitations. The principal goal of this article is to present the first systematic analysis of the users of AI music generation platforms through their prompts and lyrics. We focus our analysis on two specific popular platforms: Suno and Udio. We

Sequence	Suno	Udio	Total
verse	73722	14548	88270
chorus	48670	16672	65342
bridge	17826	4665	22491
outro	6163	2386	8549
pre-chorus	3725	2914	6639
end	3747	289	4036
intro	2436	1171	3607
instrumental	2682	710	3392
drop	662	1403	2065
guitar solo	1212	835	2047
hook	912	468	1380
break	943	212	1155
interlude	538	398	936
fade out	644	208	852
instrumental break	504	280	784
solo	537	236	773
instrumental solo	633	39	672
instrumental intro	596	64	660
breakdown	260	277	537
refrain	314	203	517
instrumental interlude	452	55	507
yeah	3	466	469
pre-hook	426	15	441
build	163	267	430
final chorus	144	255	399

Table 5: Top 25 most prevalent metatags. In cases where numbers appears, e.g., Chorus 2, those were stripped and merged into one category.

Artist	Metatag
Bob Marley	produced by bob marley and lee perry
Journey	journey separate ways synth arpeggio
Kanye West	verse 2: kanye west
Madonna	influence: madonna, michael jackson

Table 6: A few examples of metatags that mention real artists

aim to understand how these platforms are being used, and what topics are inspiring their users. To this end, we collect a large dataset of metadata from these platforms, and build a processing pipeline and a set of interactive visualizations that allow us to identify and characterize prevalent semantic groups of prompts, tags and lyrics.

The resulting picture of AI music is of course limited by the six-month time frame of our data collection, namely May to October 2024. Certain trends might not be captured, and the prevalence of certain themes or tags can be due to their temporal context. For example, memes and geopolitical references shift continuously and sometimes very quickly. Another aspect that can be important for some users but is not captured by our dataset is the presence of different versions for each service. There can be interesting differences in the way different model versions respond to prompting, which in turn will be reflected in different prompting practices being used. Finally, our dataset consists only of songs published by users, which inevitably introduces a bias on the quality of songs in the dataset, as well as the prevalence of certain themes. Unfortunately, we see no way around this limitation.

Our focus on English is a clear limitation of this study, and so future work should look for trends and peculiarities in other languages. Cultural differences might emerge in the way users with different linguistic and national backgrounds engage with AI music generation. An interesting aspect to consider is how the distribution of languages on the platforms does not seem to follow the distribution of the most commonly spoken languages in the world. This might be due to asymmetries in the way the services were released and advertised across the world, as well as economic factors and internet access.

While the clustering methodology we employ is extremely effective at extracting information from such a large and heterogeneous collection, it ends up labeling many points as outliers. Manually inspecting these outliers, however, shows that there are undetected groups that could still be recovered by introducing a classifier trained on data that has been labeled and validated by humans. Future work might consider a multi-step procedure that involves active learning to have total cover-

age. Additionally, this would allow continuous addition of new songs to the dataset and automatic labeling of them. While in our work we named clusters using a coarse procedure that required some manual refinement, a more sophisticated pipeline could be employed, possibly including large language models for naming the clusters.

While performing this research, we often found ourselves at methodological crossroads. On the one hand, we want to capture the most representative user behaviors and song themes in our dataset, giving special attention to establishing well-defined clusters and analyzing the major ones. On the other hand, outliers stick out from the bulk of the data and contain interesting behaviors that can reveal something about the more nuanced inner workings of the platforms and the environment around them. We try to strike a balance in this article, but future work might focus on specific thematic or linguistic subgroups identifiable with our methodology.

Ethnographic studies can be carried out targeting specific user groups and their unique practices. AI music communities can also be studied by integrating relevant data from Discord or Reddit into the analysis. General discussions in those forums might provide insight on how AI music is received and what strategies and practices are applied in the process and are considered the best. For example, studying challenges organized by community members can provide multiple songs with a common thematic baseline to be analyzed, helping highlight differences.

8 Conclusion

This article is the first to study textual metadata from a large dataset of AI music collected from two platforms offering text-to-music models: Suno and Udio. The dataset we collect is the first one of its kind, and allows us to look at the growing phenomenon of AI music. We draw from existing literature on AI-image generation, and we adapt an established methodology to study prompt-based systems. We focus on prompts, tags and lyrics as they are the main interface to these music generation systems and provide insight into the users of the platforms and how they use them. Our analyses identify clusters of themes in the data and highlighting behaviorism and trends in the prompts and tags of the users. Due to uncertainty regarding the sharing of our dataset with regards to intellectual property rights, we only make available a list of URLs with which one can retrieve the data. Our novel methodology and data can be used by other researchers in the field that are interested in furthering this exploration. We believe that a number of relevant downstream tasks can be based on our data and methods. Ethnographic studies might target subgroups in the user base and studying specific aspects that we only touched upon like non-English prompts and lyrics, while more technical research can benchmark new MIR pipelines on the large dataset. In the future, we plan on extending on this work by leveraging both audio and textual features and their interplay to support further analyses.

9 Reproducibility

We provide the code we use to gather the data and to produce our visualization and analysis at the following repository https://github.com/mister-magpie/aims_prompts. For legal concerns we do not publish our dataset with the song metadata. However, we include a list of URLs to the songs we collected from both services. The availability of songs is subject to changes as users can decide to delete their songs or accounts. At the time of submission we observed that 4.59% and 1.02 of URLs from Udio and Suno respectively are not reachable.

10 Ethics and consent

As AI generated media and services used to produce it become more widespread, it is important to study it and its impact [12]. Since this technology exists in the public sphere it should be studied in this real context with real users. Our research questions revolve around users and their use, and so we focus on observing AI music as users have created and published it over a six month time period. Our collection of data from the Suno and Udio website are not permitted by their terms of service; but that does not mean this research is illegal or unethical. As we are a publicly funded research group focused on understanding the nature of AI music and its broader implications, we are permitted to collect such data and study it under the Copyright Directive (EU) 2019/790 [29].

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the grant ERC-2019-COG No. 864189 MUSAiC: Music at the Frontiers of Artificial Creativity and Criticism, and by the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program – Humanities and Society (WASP-HS) funded by the Marianne and Marcus Wallenberg Foundation (Grant 2020.0102)

References

- [1] S. Bubeck et al., “Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712*, 2023.
- [2] A. Ramesh, P. Dhariwal, A. Nichol, C. Chu, and M. Chen, “Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125*, vol. 1, no. 2, p. 3, 2022.
- [3] 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.
- [4] J. Oppenlaender, R. Linder, and J. Silvennoinen, “Prompting ai art: An investigation into the creative skill of prompt engineering,” *International journal of human–computer interaction*, pp. 1–23, 2024.
- [5] W. Simpson, *The first ever ai-generated track to hit the charts has landed in germany, and people aren’t happy — musicradar*, <https://www.musicradar.com/news/first-ever-ai-chart-germany>, Accessed: 2024-11-19, 2024.
- [6] C. A. Klevjer, *Står bak noregs første ki-hit – nrk kultur og underholdning*, <https://www.nrk.no/kultur/star-bak-noregs-forste-ki-hit-1.16471806>, Accessed: 2024-11-19, 2024.
- [7] A. Kriisa, *Ai-generated song tops swedish charts - kulturnytt — swedish radio*, <https://sverigesradio.se/artikel/ai-genererad-lat-toppar-svensk-topplista>, Accessed: 2024-11-19, 2024.
- [8] Å. Holst, “Åkestam holst creates entire italian ‘80s pop culture universe to sell swedish cinnamon buns,” *Little Black Book*, 2024, Accessed: 2024-11-19.
- [9] Goldmedia, “Ai and music: Market development of ai in the music sector and impact on music authors and creators in germany and france,” GEMA and SACEM, Tech. Rep., 2024, Research report commissioned by GEMA and SACEM. [Online]. Available: <https://www.gema.de/documents/d/guest/gema-sacem-goldmedia-ai-and-music-pdf>
- [10] Peter Yang, *Inside suno: The ai music app you won’t stop listening to*, Last accessed Feb. 18, 2025., 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://creatoreconomy.so/p/inside-suno-the-ai-music-app-you-wont-stop-listening-to-product>
- [11] M. A. Rahman, Z. I. A. Hakim, N. H. Sarker, B. Paul, and S. A. Fattah, “Sonics: Synthetic or not—identifying counterfeit songs,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.14080*, 2024.
- [12] B. L. Sturm et al., “AI music studies: Preparing for the coming flood,” in *AI Music Creativity*, 2024.
- [13] T. Sanchez, “Examining the text-to-image community of practice: Why and how do people prompt generative ais?” In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference on Creativity and Cognition*, ser. C&C ’23, Virtual Event, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2023, pp. 43–61, ISBN: 9798400701801. DOI: 10.1145/3591196.3593051 [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3591196.3593051>
- [14] Z. J. Wang, E. Montoya, D. Munechika, H. Yang, B. Hoover, and D. H. Chau, “Large-scale prompt gallery dataset for text-to-image generative models,” *arXiv:2210.14896 [cs]*, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.14896>
- [15] J. McCormack, M. T. Llano, S. J. Krol, and N. Rajcic, “No longer trending on artstation: Prompt analysis of generative ai art,” in *International Conference on Computational Intelligence in Music, Sound, Art and Design (Part of EvoStar)*, Springer, 2024, pp. 279–295.
- [16] R. Mayer and A. Rauber, “Music genre classification by ensembles of audio and lyrics features,” in *Proc. ISMIR*, 2011, pp. 675–680.
- [17] R. Mayer and A. Rauber, “Multimodal aspects of music retrieval: Audio, song lyrics - and beyond?” *Studies in Computational Intelligence*, vol. 274, pp. 333–363, 2010.

- [18] B. Logan, A. Kositsky, and P. Moreno, “Semantic analysis of song lyrics,” in *2004 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)(IEEE Cat. No. 04TH8763)*, IEEE, vol. 2, 2004, pp. 827–830.
- [19] M. Fell and C. Sporleder, “Lyrics-based analysis and classification of music,” in *Proceedings of COLING 2014, the 25th international conference on computational linguistics: Technical papers*, 2014, pp. 620–631.
- [20] K. Pyrovolakis, P. Tzouveli, and G. Stamou, “Multi-modal song mood detection with deep learning,” *Sensors*, vol. 22, no. 3, p. 1065, 2022.
- [21] M. E. Varnum, J. A. Krems, C. Morris, A. Wormley, and I. Grossmann, “Why are song lyrics becoming simpler? a time series analysis of lyrical complexity in six decades of american popular music,” *PloS one*, vol. 16, no. 1, e0244576, 2021.
- [22] K. Napier and L. Shamir, “Quantitative sentiment analysis of lyrics in popular music,” *Journal of Popular Music Studies*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 161–176, 2018.
- [23] E. Parada-Cabaleiro et al., “Song lyrics have become simpler and more repetitive over the last five decades,” *Scientific Reports*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 5531, 2024.
- [24] C. Lee et al., “Nv-embed: Improved techniques for training llms as generalist embedding models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17428*, 2024.
- [25] L. McInnes, J. Healy, and J. Melville, “Umap: Uniform manifold approximation and projection for dimension reduction,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.03426*, 2018.
- [26] R. J. Campello, D. Moulavi, and J. Sander, “Density-based clustering based on hierarchical density estimates,” in *Pacific-Asia conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, Springer, 2013, pp. 160–172.
- [27] M. Ester, H.-P. Kriegel, J. Sander, X. Xu, et al., “A density-based algorithm for discovering clusters in large spatial databases with noise,” in *kdd*, vol. 96, 1996, pp. 226–231.
- [28] S. Tan, “Are we all musicians now? authenticity, musicianship, and ai music generator suno,” 2024.
- [29] European Union, *Directive (EU) 2019/790 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2019 on copyright and related rights in the Digital Single Market*, Official Journal of the European Union, L 130, 17 May 2019, pp. 92–125, 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/dir/2019/790/oj>