

ABC-EVAL: BENCHMARKING LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS ON SYMBOLIC MUSIC UNDERSTANDING AND INSTRUCTION FOLLOWING

Jiahao Zhao¹ Yunjia Li² Wei Li² Kazuyoshi Yoshii³

¹Graduate School of Informatics, Kyoto University, Japan

²College of Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence, Fudan University, China

³Graduate School of Engineering, Kyoto University, Japan

ABSTRACT

As large language models (LLMs) continue to develop, the feasibility and significance of text-based symbolic music tasks have become increasingly prominent. While symbolic music has been widely used in generation tasks, LLM capabilities in understanding and reasoning about symbolic music remain largely underexplored. To address this gap, we propose ABC-Eval, the first open-source benchmark dedicated to the understanding and instruction-following capabilities in text-based ABC notation scores. It comprises 1,086 test samples spanning 10 sub-tasks, covering scenarios from basic musical syntax comprehension to complex sequence-level reasoning. Such a diverse scope poses substantial challenges to models' ability to handle symbolic music tasks. We evaluated seven state-of-the-art LLMs on ABC-Eval, and the results reveal notable limitations in existing models' symbolic music processing capabilities. Furthermore, the consistent performance of individual baselines across different sub-tasks supports the reliability of our benchmark.

Index Terms— Music information retrieval, benchmark, large language models, symbolic music understanding

1. INTRODUCTION

Symbolic music, often regarded as the *language of music* [1], encodes musical information into discrete, human-readable or machine-interpretable symbols. This form of representation enables diverse applications from digital preservation to computational analysis [2]. The discrete nature of symbolic music allows it to be tokenized and processed by language models. Specialized music language models (MLMs) such as MusicBERT [3] and Pianobart [4] have thus demonstrated strong performance in various downstream tasks.

The success of large language models [5] (LLMs) in natural language processing has naturally enabled their extension to music-related applications. Since the pre-training corpora of LLMs typically contain large amounts of music-related text and raw symbolic music data, LLMs have exhibited capabilities in symbolic music tasks [6]. Recent studies have




Fig. 1: A conceptual example of input instructions and corresponding LLM output in ABC-Eval benchmark.

shown that LLMs can attain competitive performance in music question-answering (Music QA) [7, 8] and conditional music generation [9]. However, the symbolic music understanding and instruction-following capabilities of LLMs remain unexplored. A comprehensive and challenging benchmark is urgently needed to systematically evaluate and thereby improve LLMs' symbolic music processing capabilities.

To address this issue, we introduce ABC-Eval, the first benchmark for symbolic music understanding and instruction-following that is specifically designed for text-based LLMs. The benchmark uses ABC notation as its input format and comprises 10 sub-tasks with 1,086 test samples in total. A conceptual example of ABC-Eval test samples is shown in Fig 1. We release this benchmark for research and academic use to facilitate progress in this emerging area.¹

Another contribution is to design a diverse and comprehensive set of evaluation tasks that span multiple levels of musical understanding and instruction-following. Our benchmark includes both segment-level and sequence-level tasks, ranging from fundamental musical syntax parsing to high-level musical semantic reasoning. The evaluation protocol encompasses standard multiple-choice questions as well as more challenging protocols with structured output that require precise instruction-following capability.

We conduct extensive experiments on ABC-Eval using seven state-of-the-art LLMs, including both lightweight and ultra-large models. We demonstrate that the benchmark poses significant challenges even for the most advanced models,

This work was supported by JST FOREST No. JPMJFR2270 and JSPS KAKENHI Nos. 24H00742, 24H00748, 25K22841, and 25H01142.

¹<https://anonymous.4open.science/r/ABC-Eval-B622>

highlighting a critical gap between LLMs’ theoretical music knowledge and their practical symbolic music reasoning capabilities.

2. RELATED WORK

The evaluation of music understanding capabilities have primarily relied on task-specific datasets targeting individual musical dimensions. MoodyLyrics [10] and PMEmo [11] datasets, for example, were developed to assess emotion recognition capabilities, while GTZAN [12] and MagnaTagATune [13] datasets focused on genre classification tasks. These benchmarks, though valuable for their purposes, offered limited insight about comprehensive music understanding abilities.

Recent benchmarks have shifted toward comprehensive evaluation frameworks that assess multiple facets through diverse tasks and protocols. Li et al. [14] presented ZIQI-Eval, based on a manually-curated music question-answering (music QA) dataset that evaluates LLMs across various musical domains. Their findings revealed that LLMs can surpass PhD-level human performance in areas such as music history and theory, highlighting the significant potential of language models in music-related tasks. Building upon the work of ZIQI-Eval, several multimodal music understanding benchmarks have been proposed to evaluate audio-language models. Weck et al. [15] introduced MuChoMusic, a comprehensive multimodal music QA dataset. Similarly, Ma et al. [16] developed CMI-Bench, a benchmark that evaluates audio-text LLMs across traditional Music Information Retrieval (MIR) tasks. Notably, CMI-Bench emphasizes instruction-following capabilities and includes challenging note-level tasks such as beat tracking and melody extraction, which pose significant difficulties for current LLMs.

While these benchmarks have substantially advanced our understanding of multimodal music comprehension, they primarily address scenarios involving audio inputs. Despite the advantages of text-based symbolic music in generation tasks, particularly in its high controllability and expressiveness [17], the understanding capabilities of LLMs for text-encoded symbolic music remain largely unexplored. Mundada et al. [18] recently made initial progress in this direction with Wild-Score, which combines textual descriptions with sheet music images to evaluate reasoning capabilities across musical dimensions including harmony, tonality, and texture. However, this approach still relies on visual representations rather than pure text-based symbolic notation. Our benchmark adopts ABC notation—a lightweight, human readable, and LLM-friendly representation—as the primary music input format, addressing the lack of text-based symbolic music benchmarks.

3. THE ABC-EVAL BENCHMARK

This section presents the data sources, task categories, and corresponding sub-tasks of ABC-Eval. For each sub-task, we describe its task, evaluation protocol, and metrics employed.

Table 1: Statistical overview of the benchmark.

Category	Sub-task	Test Num
Basic Syntax Understanding	Bar Count Estimation	100
	Metadata QA	60
Segment-level Understanding	Next-Bar Prediction	119
	Bar Sequencing	119
	Error Detection (F1)	220
Sequence-level Understanding	Music Captioning	60
	Metadata Prediction	60
	Emotion Recognition	120
	Composer Recognition	96
	Genre Recognition	132
Total Num		1086

Note that all multiple-choice tasks use accuracy as the evaluation metric. The statistical overview of the benchmark is summarized in Table 1.

3.1. Data sources

For most tasks, we employ rule-based data construction using ABC scores from Nottingham [19] Music dataset and Irish Massive ABC Notation (IrishMAN) [20] dataset, selected for their public availability and high annotation quality. We utilize the bar count field from the IrishMAN dataset and the title field from the Nottingham dataset as ground truth for bar count estimation and music captioning tasks, respectively. The Error Detection task requires construction based on high-quality samples without syntactic errors; therefore, 22 samples were manually selected by experts. For emotion, genre, and composer recognition tasks, we use EMOPIA [21], ADL-piano MIDI [22], and Pianist8 [23] as data sources, respectively. Since only MIDI files are available in these datasets, we employed a state-of-the-art MIDI-to-score model [24] to transcribe the MIDI files to MusicXML format, then used the EasyABC library to convert them to ABC notation.

All data in this benchmark is intended strictly for non-commercial research purposes. We strictly adhered to the licenses of the original data sources during open-source release and ensured ethical compliance and usability.

3.2. Basic syntax understanding tasks

Basic syntax understanding tasks are designed to assess models’ fundamental understanding of ABC notation syntax and their basic instruction-following capabilities. These sub-tasks can serve as alignment datasets for model training.

Metadata Question Answering: Models are required to select the correct option from four choices corresponding to the key signature, meter, or note length field of the input score.

Bar Count Estimation: Models are required to directly output the number of bars in the input score. Accuracy metrics are used to evaluate this task, where only outputs that exactly match the ground truth are considered correct during metric computation.

3.3. Segment-level understanding tasks

Next-Bar Prediction: Given the first few bars of a score as input, models are required to select the most likely next bar segment from four options. The candidate options consist of the ground truth option and three randomly selected bars from the remaining portion of the current score.

Bar Sequencing: This task is comparatively challenging. Given several randomly shuffled bars as input, models must output the correct sequential order using corresponding indices (e.g., 0312). We employ the Kendall tau coefficient to measure the ordinal association between the output and ground truth sequences. The resulting coefficient is mapped from the interval $[-1, 1]$ to $[0, 1]$ to facilitate averaging with metrics from other tasks. We multiply the coefficient by a completeness penalty factor to penalize outputs that are too short, while excessively long or rule-violating outputs are assigned the minimum value of 0.

Error Detection: This task is highly challenging, primarily testing models’ comprehension abilities and instruction-following capabilities in complex scenarios. Given a complete score containing multiple errors as input, models must identify all bar numbers containing errors, with the metadata section considered part of the first bar. Macro-F1 score is used to provide a balanced evaluation of both precision and recall.

We employ a rule-based approach to construct samples for this task. Since errors or ambiguities in original scores may affect task performance, 22 high-quality scores are manually selected by music experts as generation samples. We insert several random errors at random positions in the samples. We designed diverse error categories ranging from basic syntactic errors to music theory violations:

1. Invalid metadata, such as invalid key signatures and time signatures (e.g., M:6/7, K: Rmin)
2. Invalid content (insert non-existent pitch numbers and note values, e.g., 'Z8')
3. Invalid bar durations (e.g., M:4/4 but actual duration sum in a bar is 3/4)
4. Unreasonable melodic leaps (modifying a note to create a sudden interval jump > 10 degrees)
5. Accidental errors outside the key signature (e.g., writing $\flat C$ in G major where flat C is not in the key signature)

Note that error type 1 (invalid metadata) does not co-occur with types 3, 4, and 5 to avoid logical conflicts

3.4. Sequence-level understanding tasks

Metadata Prediction: Models are required to select the right option for a specific metadata field of the input score from four choices. Unlike the previous Metadata QA task, we mask certain metadata fields in this task and require models to make judgments or predictions based on patterns within the score content.

Table 2: The prompt configurations used.

Prompt Template for Multiple-Choice Questions
<p>Input: <code>{input_content}</code> Task: <code>{task_instruction}</code> Options: 0. <code>{options[0]}</code> 1. <code>{options[1]}</code> 2. <code>{options[2]}</code> 3. <code>{options[3]}</code></p> <p>Please only output the index of the correct option (0, 1, 2, or 3), do not output any additional content.</p>
Prompt Template for Structured-Output Questions
<p>Input: <code>{input_content}</code> Task: <code>{task_instruction}</code> Template: <code>{structured_output_template}</code></p> <p>Please directly output the answer of the given task, without any explanation or additional content.</p>

Music Captioning: Models are required to select the right title for the input score from four options. We use the title fields provided with samples in the Nottingham dataset as ground truth labels, and randomly select three additional titles from the complete title collection to form the candidate options.

Emotion, Genre, and Composer Recognition: These tasks share the same structure and evaluation protocol. Models are required to select the right emotion/genre/composer label from four options based on the input score. The emotion label candidates correspond to the four quadrants of Russell’s circumplex model used by the EMOPIA [21] dataset, while composer and genre label candidates are randomly selected from the label sets of the Pianist8 [22] and ADL-piano MIDI [23] datasets.

4. EXPERIMENTS

This section reports a wide variety of experiments conducted for evaluating the comprehensive music understanding abilities of LLMs on the proposed ABC-Eval benchmark.

4.1. Experimental conditions

To assess the state-of-the-art performance in text-based symbolic music tasks, we use seven LLMs including three major families, e.g., DeepSeek-reasoner, DeepSeek-chat [25, 26], Gemini-2.5-flash, Gemini-2.5-pro [27], GPT-5, GPT-5-mini and GPT-5-nano [28]. We accessed these models via their official API services, primarily because these commercial LLMs represent the cutting-edge, allowing us to evaluate the most advanced capabilities of existing LLMs.

Table 3: Multi-task evaluation results across all baselines (best per row in **bold**). Bar Sequencing task and Error Detection task use Kendall’s τ coefficient and Macro-F1 score as their metrics, respectively; other sub-tasks use classification accuracy. All metrics are reported in percentage points (pts, higher is better).

Tasks	DeepSeek-chat	DeepSeek-reasoner	Gemini-pro	Gemini-flash	GPT-5-mini	GPT-5-nano	GPT-5
Bar Count Estimation	30.00	91.00	66.00	84.00	99.00	95.00	93.00
Metadata QA	100	98.33	98.33	98.33	100	98.33	100
Basic Syntax Average	65.00	94.67	82.17	91.17	99.50	96.67	96.5
Bar Sequencing (Kendall’s τ)	46.41	53.75	59.01	44.85	56.33	48.80	59.66
Next-Bar Prediction	32.77	42.86	43.70	26.89	43.70	38.66	50.42
Error Detection (Macro-F1)	6.29	25.34	27.22	25.86	25.62	17.87	24.12
Segment-level Average	28.49	40.65	43.31	32.53	41.88	35.11	44.73
Music Captioning	26.67	23.33	28.33	28.33	40.00	26.67	33.33
Metadata Prediction	78.33	86.67	93.33	63.33	93.33	90.00	95.00
Emotion Recognition	28.33	27.50	32.50	21.67	25.83	21.67	34.17
Composer Recognition	30.21	36.46	32.29	20.83	27.08	27.08	30.21
Genre Recognition	22.73	34.85	31.82	27.27	24.24	25.76	30.30
Sequence-level Average	37.25	41.76	43.65	32.29	42.10	38.24	44.60
Overall Average	40.17	52.01	51.25	44.14	53.51	48.98	55.02

To minimize the interference of random factors on test results, we set the *temperature* parameter to 0 and the *top-p* sampling parameter to 1, effectively disabling the models’ random sampling functionality. During test sample input, we employed identical prompt templates for all models. For fair comparison, we did not utilize roleplay or chain-of-thought (CoT) prompting techniques. The specific prompt templates we used are shown in Table 2. Our input consists of the ABC score, task instruction, options or templates defining the output format, and simple natural language instructions.

4.2. Experimental results

The evaluation results of each baseline are listed in Table 3. Most foundation models exceeded 90% accuracy on basic syntax understanding tasks, indicating their potential in symbolic music tasks. However, certain failure patterns (e.g., 30% accuracy achieved by DeepSeek-chat model) reveal that performances on even the simplest tasks are highly sensitive to prompt variations, indicating a significant lack of robustness.

Segment-level tasks proved more challenging, as all foundation models failed to tackle them effectively. In contrast, ultra-large or mixture-of-experts (MoE) models consistently demonstrated superior performance over their lighter-weight counterparts. This clear performance gap validates that the benchmark can effectively discriminate symbolic music understanding capabilities between models.

The sequence-level evaluation results reveal that complex musical reasoning tasks remain a great challenge for text-based LLMs, as evidenced by performances close to random guessing (25%) on emotion/composer/genre recognition tasks. However, their superior performance on the Metadata Prediction task confirms that these models are fully capable of basic

music reasoning, suggesting their potential in deep music reasoning tasks.

Among all evaluated foundation models, GPT-5 achieved the best performance across segment-level, sequence-level, and overall tasks, demonstrating state-of-the-art capabilities in symbolic music understanding and instruction-following among general-purpose LLMs. Ultra-large or MoE models (e.g., DeepSeek-reasoner and Gemini-2.5-pro) also delivered promising overall performance. Notably, performance comparisons within individual model families (e.g., GPT-5 versus GPT-5-nano) revealed that LLMs’ symbolic music understanding capabilities are strongly influenced by their parameter size and reasoning capacity. This observation provides valuable guidance for developing music-specific LLMs.

5. CONCLUSION

This study introduces ABC-Eval, a pioneering and comprehensive open-source benchmark designed to rigorously assess the symbolic music understanding and instruction-following capabilities of text-based LLMs. Comprising 1,086 diverse test samples across 10 distinct sub-tasks, it spans a broad spectrum of musical comprehension, from fundamental syntax parsing and segment-level understanding to sequence-level reasoning. Our extensive evaluation revealed notable limitations in the high-level understanding capabilities of LLMs.

ABC-Eval could serve as a vital tool for advancing music research in text-based symbolic music understanding by LLMs. Future work will focus on refining the benchmark with even finer-grained instruction-following tasks and leveraging these insights to develop more robust and semantically sophisticated LLM frameworks specifically tailored for symbolic music applications

6. REFERENCES

- [1] N. Carvalho and G. Bernardes, “Towards balanced tunes: A review of symbolic music representations and their hierarchical modeling,” in *ICCC*, 2020, pp. 236–242.
- [2] M. Schedl, E. Gómez, J. Urbano, et al., “Music information retrieval: Recent developments and applications,” *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, vol. 8, no. 2-3, pp. 127–261, 2014.
- [3] M. Zeng, X. Tan, R. Wang, Z. Ju, T. Qin, and T. Liu, “Musicbert: Symbolic music understanding with large-scale pre-training,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL/IJCNLP 2021*, pp. 791–800.
- [4] X. Liang, Z. Zhao, W. Zeng, Y. He, F. He, Y. Wang, and C. Gao, “Pianobart: Symbolic piano music generation and understanding with large-scale pre-training,” in *International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 1–6.
- [5] H. Naveed, A. U. Khan, S. Qiu, M. Saqib, S. Anwar, M. Usman, N. Akhtar, N. Barnes, and A. Mian, “A comprehensive overview of large language models,” *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 1–72, 2025.
- [6] Z. Zhou, Y. Wu, Z. Wu, X. Zhang, R. Yuan, Y. Ma, L. Wang, E. Benetos, W. Xue, and Y. Guo, “Can llms ’reason’ in music? an evaluation of llms’ capability of music understanding and generation,” in *Proceedings of the 25th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference, ISMIR 2024*, pp. 103–110.
- [7] R. Yuan, H. Lin, Y. Wang, Z. Tian, S. Wu, T. Shen, G. Zhang, Y. Wu, C. Liu, Z. Zhou, L. Xue, Z. Ma, Q. Liu, T. Zheng, Y. Li, Y. Ma, Y. Liang, X. Chi, R. Liu, Z. Wang, C. Lin, Q. Liu, T. Jiang, W. Huang, W. Chen, J. Fu, E. Benetos, G. Xia, R. B. Dannenberg, W. Xue, S. Kang, and Y. Guo, “Chatmusician: Understanding and generating music intrinsically with LLM,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2024*, pp. 6252–6271.
- [8] S. Liu, A. S. Hussain, C. Sun, and Y. Shan, “Music understanding llama: Advancing text-to-music generation with question answering and captioning,” in *2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2024, pp. 286–290.
- [9] S. Ji, X. Yang, and J. Luo, “A survey on deep learning for symbolic music generation: Representations, algorithms, evaluations, and challenges,” *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 7:1–7:39, 2024.
- [10] E. Çano and M. Morisio, “Moodylyrics: A sentiment annotated lyrics dataset,” New York, USA, 2017, ISMSI ’17, p. 118–124.
- [11] K. Zhang, H. Zhang, S. Li, C. Yang, and L. Sun, “The pmemo dataset for music emotion recognition,” in *International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval (ICMR)*, pp. 135–142.
- [12] B. L. Sturm, “The gtzan dataset: Its contents, its faults, their effects on evaluation, and its future use,” *arXiv e-prints*, pp. arXiv–1306, 2013.
- [13] E. Law and L. Von Ahn, “Input-agreement: a new mechanism for collecting data using human computation games,” in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2009, pp. 1197–1206.
- [14] J. Li, L. Yang, M. Tang, C. Chenchong, Z. Li, P. Wang, and H. Zhao, “The music maestro or the musically challenged, A massive music evaluation benchmark for large language models,” in *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2024*, pp. 3246–3257.
- [15] B. Weck, I. Manco, E. Benetos, E. Quinton, G. Fazekas, and D. Bogdanov, “Muchomusic: Evaluating music understanding in multimodal audio-language models,” in *Proceedings of the 25th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference, ISMIR 2024*, pp. 825–833.
- [16] Y. Ma, S. Li, J. Yu, E. Benetos, and A. Maezawa, “Cmi-bench: A comprehensive benchmark for evaluating music instruction following,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2506.12285, 2025.
- [17] Y. Wang, S. Wu, J. Hu, X. Du, Y. Peng, Y. Huang, S. Fan, X. Li, F. Yu, and M. Sun, “Notagen: Advancing musicality in symbolic music generation with large language model training paradigms,” 2025.
- [18] G. Mundada, Y. Vishe, A. Namburi, X. Xu, Z. Novack, J. McAuley, and J. Wu, “Wildscore: Benchmarking mlms in-the-wild symbolic music reasoning,” 2025.
- [19] James Allwright, “Abc version of the nottingham music database,” 2024.
- [20] S. Wu, X. Li, F. Yu, and M. Sun, “Tunesformer: Forming irish tunes with control codes by bar patching,” in *Proceedings of the 24th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference (ISMIR 2023)*.
- [21] H. Hung, J. Ching, S. Doh, N. Kim, J. Nam, and Y. Yang, “EMOPIA: A multi-modal pop piano dataset for emotion recognition and emotion-based music generation,” in *Proceedings of the 22nd International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference, ISMIR 2021*, pp. 318–325.
- [22] Y. Chou, I. Chen, C. Chang, J. Ching, and Y. Yang, “Midibert-piano: Large-scale pre-training for symbolic music understanding,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2107.05223, 2021.
- [23] L. N. Ferreira, L. H. Lelis, and J. Whitehead, “Computer-generated music for tabletop role-playing games,” 2020.
- [24] T. Beyer and A. Dai, “End-to-end piano performance-midi to score conversion with transformers,” in *Proceedings of the 25th International Society for Music Information Retrieval Conference, ISMIR 2024*, pp. 319–326.
- [25] D. Guo, D. Yang, H. Zhang, J. Song, R. Zhang, R. Xu, Q. Zhu, S. Ma, P. Wang, X. Bi, et al., “Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.
- [26] A. Liu, B. Feng, B. Xue, B. Wang, B. Wu, C. Lu, C. Zhao, C. Deng, C. Zhang, C. Ruan, et al., “Deepseek-v3 technical report,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437*, 2024.
- [27] G. Team, R. Anil, S. Borgeaud, J.-B. Alayrac, J. Yu, R. Soricut, J. Schalkwyk, A. M. Dai, A. Hauth, K. Millican, et al., “Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
- [28] OpenAI, “Chatgpt (gpt-5),” <https://chat.openai.com/>, 2025, Large language model.