

# Correlation Net : spatio temporal multimodal deep learning

Novanto Yulistira, Takio Kurita, *Member, IEEE*,

**Abstract**—This paper describes a network that is able to capture spatiotemporal correlations over arbitrary periods of time. The proposed scheme operates as a complementary, extended network over spatiotemporal regions. Recently, multimodal fusion has been extensively researched in deep learning. For action recognition, the spatial and temporal streams are vital components of deep Convolutional Neural Network (CNNs), but reducing the occurrence of overfitting and fusing these two streams remain open problems. The existing fusion approach is to average the two streams. To this end, we propose a correlation network with a Shannon regularizer to learn a CNN that has already been trained. Long-range video may consist of spatiotemporal correlation over arbitrary periods of time. This correlation can be captured using simple fully connected layers to form the correlation network. This is found to be complementary to the existing network fusion methods. We evaluate our approach on the UCF-101 and HMDB-51 datasets, and the resulting improvement in accuracy demonstrates the importance of multimodal correlation.

**Index Terms**—Correlation Net, CNN, activity recognition, deep learning, fusion.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Video recognition, particularly that of human action, has progressed from handcrafted to learned features to provide the necessary rich spatiotemporal information. Established handcrafted features include dense trajectories [1] along with descriptors such as Histogram of Flows, Histogram of Gradients, and Motion Boundary Descriptors, an improved version of dense trajectories [20], an action bank that applies steerable filters through the spatiotemporal domain [2], motion features, atoms and phrases (MoFAP) [3], and cross-correlation [4]. Following the rise of deep Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs), state-of-the-art methods have gradually come to use deep-learned features because of their scalability and richness of information. However, if there are insufficient training data, deep CNNs give equivalent performance to handcrafted features [5]. In this case, one possibility is to use transfer learning from a bigger dataset followed by fine tuning.

CNNs have been applied to many computer vision tasks, particularly action recognition. A number of studies have investigated the deep CNN architecture, as this can significantly increase the image classification accuracy on ImageNet. The challenging part, however, is to fuse information from different sources into a combined perception. Recently, action recognition techniques have employed spatial and motion information, which complement one another. Research on information fusion has integrated statistical learning with deep learning fusion schemes for pattern recognition applications. The baseline recognition method over spatiotemporal domains is average pooling, as used by Simonyan et al. [6] for a

two-stream network and Feichtenhofer et al. [7] for two-stream network fusion. However, the problem of overfitting means that there is still a gap between the training and testing datasets. Yulistira et al. [8] proposed a softmax gating mechanism as an additional network for handling stream selection. However, this requires the gating stream to be tuned, which is computationally expensive if the gating stream is also a deep network. If the number of modalities is high, such a gating network will be advantageous. However, if there are only two or three modes, it is better to apply a simple network. Recently, fusion based on an independent stream or convolutional stack has been studied, but the associated correlation information has not yet been investigated.

For the case of video recognition, long-range temporal information should be considered to obtain better perception. To tackle this problem, Limin et al. [9] extended the two-stream approach by providing a segmental training scheme. The temporal structure of this scheme improves performance compared with the usual snippet sampling [6]. However, the aggregation process can result in some information loss. A correlation network has the potential to identify this information loss on a frame-by-frame basis over arbitrary time periods for the entire video. Several methods for capturing temporal information in CNNs have been proposed, such as [10], citevarol2017long, [12]. However, these are mainly based on dense sampling and a predefined temporal range. Our proposed method has the potential to provide complementary information for multimodal networks.

Motivated by the aforementioned problems, the contributions of this study can be elaborated as follows:

- 1) Propose a correlation training model that captures spatiotemporal correlation on a frame-by-frame basis without time correspondence.
- 2) Introduce Shannon fusion to select features based on the distribution entropy.
- 3) When applied to a temporally segmented network, the proposed method is shown to provide complementary information for long-range video recognition.

Our letter is organized as follows, section II explains about correlation network (CorrNet) architecture, section III explains about training and test strategies of correlation network, and section IV details about experiment conducted on UCF-101 and HMDB-51.

## II. CNN ARCHITECTURE WITH CORRELATION NETWORK

Consider an image sequence  $I = (i_0, i_1, \dots, i_{t1})$  and flow sequence  $F = (f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{t2})$ , where  $t1$  is the number of images and  $t2$  is the number of flows. Note that each image

$i$  contains three color channels (RGB) and  $f$  contains 10 consecutive flow field channels. For each iteration,  $i \in I$  and  $f \in F$  are selected at random and fed into  $S_i(i, W_i)$  (spatial stream) and  $S_f(f, W_f)$  (temporal stream), respectively.

Our architecture is based on two expert streams and one correlation stream. The correlation stream acts as a CNN that can find patterns based on the autocorrelation between the two vector outputs. The input for each stream is an arbitrary frame such that, in every iteration, we obtain a random combination of output vectors within the video sequence. This acts as an additional training scheme besides the independently trained spatial and temporal streams.

The output of each stream is commonly represented by the class number after smoothing with softmax cross-entropy. The spatial and temporal streams use the Inception network with batch normalization and weighting, as described by Wang et al. [9].

As shown in Figure 1, a correlation map can be produced from the output of the two streams. There are two kinds of two-stream architectures: those that use per-frame training and those based on long-range temporal training. In the latter, long-range video frames are segmented into  $n$  parts and the loss function is calculated by summing the output of frames from the respective segments. This was developed to handle long-range recognition, especially for optical flows, because there is a different generalization between one frame and the average of all frames.

Based on Figure 1, there is  $C$  which refers to correlation between output streams. The  $C$  term hold:

$$C = I^T \otimes M \quad (1)$$

This is basically the tensor product between the spatial ( $I$ ) and temporal ( $M$ ) output vectors from the spatial and temporal streams, respectively. The tensor product has dimensions equal to the product of its two factors.  $C$  is normalized using L2 normalization for each row, such that:

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{I_0 M_0}{\|\text{col}_0 \mathbf{C}^T\|} & \frac{I_0 M_1}{\|\text{col}_0 \mathbf{C}^T\|} & \cdots & \frac{I_0 M_m}{\|\text{col}_0 \mathbf{C}^T\|} \\ \frac{I_1 M_0}{\|\text{col}_1 \mathbf{C}^T\|} & \frac{I_1 M_1}{\|\text{col}_1 \mathbf{C}^T\|} & \cdots & \frac{I_1 M_m}{\|\text{col}_1 \mathbf{C}^T\|} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{I_n M_0}{\|\text{col}_n \mathbf{C}^T\|} & \frac{I_n M_1}{\|\text{col}_n \mathbf{C}^T\|} & \cdots & \frac{I_n M_m}{\|\text{col}_n \mathbf{C}^T\|} \end{bmatrix} \quad (2)$$

This contains the class relationship, which is represented by the correlation of each pair of elements from the two vectors. The advantage of this representation is that, though the data types are real-valued numbers, they have both negative and positive signs. If one element is negative and the other positive, their product will be negative, in which case the two can be considered uncorrelated. If both elements are negative, which would suggest they are uncorrelated, the fully connected layers will adjust their weights during training. The results are then fed to a multilayer perceptron consisting of three fully connected classifier layers: fc1, with an input dimension the same as the output of each stream and an output dimension of 4096; fc2, with input and output dimensions of 4096; and fc3, with an input dimension of 4096 and an output dimension the same as the number of classes.

We use loss function of:

$$L(G, y) = -y_i \log\left(\frac{\exp(\text{Corr}_j)}{\sum_{j=0}^K \exp(\text{Corr}_j)}\right) - \sum_{i=0}^K y_i \log\left(\frac{F_j}{\sum_{j=0}^K \exp(F_j)}\right) \quad (3)$$

$y_i$  is the groundtruth label corresponding to class  $i$ .  $\text{Corr}$  is output vector of CorrNet.  $G$  is sum of  $I, M$ , and  $\text{Corr}$ . If the spatial and motion stream are fixed, which the case CNN streams have been trained and fixed, the loss function is only  $(\frac{\exp(\text{Corr}_j)}{\sum_{j=0}^K \exp(\text{Corr}_j)})$ . It is the same in terms of optimization. For the update by using backpropagation, the gradient is calculated using the term of:

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial W_c} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \text{fc3}} \frac{\partial \text{fc3}}{\partial \text{fc2}} \frac{\partial \text{fc2}}{\partial \text{fc1}} \frac{\partial \text{fc1}}{\partial W_c} \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial W_s} = \frac{\partial L}{\partial F} \sum_{i=0}^K \frac{\partial F}{\partial A(s_m, W_s)} \frac{\partial A(s_m, W_s)}{\partial W_s} \quad (5)$$

According to (3), CorrNet is optimized independently with a segmental consensus of one. Moreover, through the fully connected layers with parameters  $W$ ,  $f$ , and  $c$ , the correlation structure is learned through backpropagation (3) using (1). Equation (4), where  $K$  is the number of segments, is differentiable, which allows us to use frames in the respective segments to train the parameter  $W$  with standard backpropagation algorithms. The backpropagation process updates the gradient of the CNN parameter  $W$  with respect to the loss value  $L$ .

### III. TRAINING AND TESTING STRATEGIES FOR CORRELATION NETWORK

A two-stream network architecture is selected based on the previous success of temporal segment networks (TSN) [9]. This uses the BN-Inception CNN, which offers a good balance between accuracy and speed. The learned weights are transferred and fixed, so there is no update process during the training stage on this two-stream network. For the correlation network architecture, there is a choice between a CNN or a multilayer perceptron, because the dimension of the correlation tensor  $C$  is  $\text{dim}(I) \times \text{dim}(M)$ . For testing, we introduce Shannon filtering to select features based on the dominance of one element by looking at their entropy. The Shannon entropy (SE) is defined as:

$$SE = - \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} p_i \log_2 p_i \quad (6)$$

Where  $p$  is the output vector. CorrNet can be affected by input vectors that have sparse entropy rather than a few dominant elements. To this end, if  $SE(\text{softmax}(\text{Corr}) + I + M) \geq th$ , the CorrNet output is not included in the fusion. In our experiments, we set  $th = 1.0$ . The final fusion of the testing scheme is  $\text{softmax}(\text{Corr}) + I + M$  or  $\text{softmax}(\text{Corr}) + 0.5(I + M)$ .

For comparison with the previous TSN and two-stream networks, we experimented using 24 RGB images and optical flow stacks with equally spaced spatial and temporal nets. For each sampled frame, we obtained 10 inputs by cropping and horizontally flipping the four corners and center region. We




Fig. 1: Architecture of correlation network which trains output layer of both trained streams.




Fig. 2: Testing architecture of correlation network which use both two streams output information as final prediction.

divide the 24 sampled frames into  $N$  equal segments. In our experiments, we set  $N = 3$ .

#### IV. EXPERIMENT

Experiments were conducted on the UCF-101 [13] and HMDB-51 [14] datasets. UCF-101 contains 13320 videos with 101 classes, whereas HMDB-51 consists of 6766 videos and 51 classes. The videos were collected from Youtube and have a high degree of freedom, making the task of video or action classification somewhat challenging. Both datasets contain three splits with different combinations of training and testing data. We used the training and testing scheme of the original dataset to make the results comparable to those of previous

methods. The results using split 1 and the average all over splits are reported for each dataset.

The flow modality is an optical flow that has been extracted using the TVL1 algorithm [15]. The flow was generated using the OpenCV framework, and contains magnitude and angular information, which is then transformed into RGB images using a linear transformation. For the deep learning framework, we used the Chainer [16] training scheme to test our correlation network. The two-stream networks were TSN and a two-stream network [17] with weights trained using Caffe [18]. TSN uses the BN-Inception network, whereas the two-stream network uses VGGNet-16. TSN was trained using a temporally segmented network (TSN is basically a two-stream CNN

network), with segmental training to capture long-range video actions. This network has achieved state-of-the-art results on both UCF-101 and HMDB-51. To optimize the correlation network, we used stochastic gradient descent and mini-batches of 8 runs through 200 epochs, with a momentum factor of 0.9 and a learning rate of 0.001.

As the HMDB-51 dataset has far fewer training data than UCF101, a transfer learning approach was used in which the network was trained on UCF-101 split 1 before being applied to all splits of HMDB-51. Because the output of HMDB-51 has 51 classes whereas UCF-101 consists of 101 classes, we applied a tiling strategy to produce 101 trained weights for the first layer of the correlation network (fc1). The network was then fine-tuned for training on the HMDB-51 dataset.

We evaluated two types of late fusion with correlation net: the average of the final fusion of both streams and the non-averaged fusion. We compare TSN and the two-stream network without correlation net against the proposed method with CorrNet. TSN was trained using three segments.

In Table I, it is clear that the method using CorrNet gives improved performance on UCF-101 split 1. The results for TSN and the two-stream network are based on weights transferred from the original Caffe. TSN with the correlation network gives better results, indicating that additional spatiotemporal correlation is important. The improvement over TSN on split 1 is 0.6%, whereas that over the original two-stream network is 0.5%. From Table II, we see that the correlation network improves the performance on UCF-101 splits 2 and 3 by 0.2% over TSN. The overall average of 94.3% confirms that CorrNet enables better recognition than both TSN and the two-stream network.

Table III reports the results on HMDB-51. TSN with the correlation network gives the best results, again showing that additional spatiotemporal correlation is important. The improvement over TSN and the original two-stream network on split 1 is 0.6% and 0.5%, respectively. Table reftab:3 illustrates the improvement in performance on HMDB-51 using the correlation network: on split 1, there is an improvement of 0.7% over the original TSN, while on split 2, the improvement is 0.8%. On split 3, the margin of improvement is 0.3%. The overall average is 68.8% and 69% when correlation is considered, which confirms the better recognition ability compared to TSN and the two-stream network.

As a method of fusing both modalities, CorrNet should be investigated against other fusion methods. Thus, we evaluated the proposed method in comparison with the two-stream late fusion described by Feichtenhofer [7], a multiplicative approach [19], and TSN with a gating network [8]. Fusion methods represent an interesting approach for gaining better perception of multimodal streams. The results in Table IV demonstrate that the independent streams of TSN with correlation outperform the fusion methods on UCF-101 split 1 by a margin of 3.4% over late fusion and 5% over the multiplicative and gating network approaches, despite having fewer parameters.

We also compared the proposed CorrNet with state-of-the-art techniques using the HMDB-51 and UCF-101 datasets. The results in Table V compare handcrafted and deep-learned

TABLE I: UCF-101 split 1 accuracy

	accuracy
Two stream	89.4
avg(Two stream) + Corrnnet	<b>89.7</b>
Two stream + Corrnnet	<b>89.9</b>
TSN	93.5
avg(TSN) + Corrnnet	<b>94.1</b>
TSN + Corrnnet	<b>94.1</b>

TABLE II: UCF-101 all split accuracy

	split 1	split 2	split 3	average
spatial	85.9	84.9	84	84.9
motion	87.9	90.3	91	89.7
correlation	88.3	87.6	87.9	87.9
s+m	93.5	94.5	94	94
avg(s,m)+corr	<b>94.1</b>	<b>94.6</b>	<b>94.1</b>	<b>94.3</b>
s+m+corr	<b>94.1</b>	<b>94.7</b>	<b>94.2</b>	<b>94.3</b>

features. The comparative methods use the Fisher Vector (FV) and Hybrid Supervector (HSV) to find improved trajectory (IDT) features [20][21] and multi-level motion features (MoFAP) [3]. Good results are obtained by applying handcrafted FV encoding to the end-to-end learning of Trajectory-Pooled Deep-Convolutional Descriptors (TDD) [22]. The full end-to-end learning of two streams with SVM fusion gives reliable performance, albeit worse than that of the proposed method. CNN learning using the temporal segmentation strategy of TSN gives better accuracy than the previous per-frame approach based on two streams [9]. As shown in Table V, the results of TSN with our correlation network outperform conventional TSN by 0.3% and 1% on UCF-101 and HMDB-51, respectively.

TABLE III: HMDB-51 all splits accuracy

	split 1	split 2	split 3	average
spatial	54.3	50.2	50.4	51.6
motion	62.3	63.5	64.2	63.3
correlation	66.6	65.8	65.5	66
s+m	69.9	67.1	67.1	68
avg(s,m)+corr	<b>70.6</b>	<b>67.9</b>	<b>67.8</b>	<b>68.8</b>
s+m+corr	<b>70.6</b>	<b>67.9</b>	<b>68.1</b>	<b>69</b>

## V. CONCLUSION

We have described a correlation network that captures spatiotemporal correlations across arbitrary time periods. State-of-the-art CNN training of video recognition, however, is done on a frame-by-frame basis using spatial and motion streams. Our proposed method is able to add spatiotemporal information to long-range video recognition. The final layers of already-trained spatial and temporal networks are correlated to form a two-dimensional correlation tensor. This is then fed to the three fully connected layers for training. Predictions are formed by fusing the output of the correlation network with that from the spatial and temporal streams. Experimental

TABLE IV: Comparison to another fusion methods on splits 1

Fusion methods	# of parameters	spatial	motions	fusion
multiplicative [19]	>138M (VGG19)	-	-	89.1
Two-Stream (late fusion) [7]	<181.42M (2 VGG-M)	74.2	82.3	85.94
Two-Stream (late fusion) [7]	257M (2 VGG-16)	82.6	86.3	90.62
Two-Stream (ReLU5 + FC8) [7]	181.68M (2VGG-M)	-	-	86.04
TSN gating network [8]	>150M (2 bn-inception & 1 VGG-16)	85.9	87.9	<b>94.1</b>
TSN cornet (ours)	<100M (2 bn-inception & 1 cornet)	85.9	87.9	<b>94.1</b>

TABLE V: Comparison to the state of the art on UCF-101

	UCF-101	HMDB-51
IDT+FV [20]	85.9	57.2
IDT+HSV [21]	87.9	61.1
MoFAP [3]	88.3	61.7
TDD+FV [22]	90.3	63.2
Two-stream [6]	88	59.4
TSN [9]	94	68
TSN Cornet (ours)	<b>94.3</b>	<b>69</b>

results show that this correlation network contributes to an increase in recognition accuracy, revealing the importance of spatiotemporal correlation for long-range video recognition.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank KAKENHI project no. for funding the research

#### REFERENCES

- [1] H. Wang, A. Kläser, C. Schmid, and C.-L. Liu, "Dense trajectories and motion boundary descriptors for action recognition," *International journal of computer vision*, vol. 103, no. 1, pp. 60–79, 2013.
- [2] S. Sadanand and J. J. Corso, "Action bank: A high-level representation of activity in video," in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2012 IEEE Conference on*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 1234–1241.
- [3] L. Wang, Y. Qiao, and X. Tang, "Mofap: A multi-level representation for action recognition," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 119, no. 3, pp. 254–271, 2016.
- [4] T. Matsukawa and T. Kurita, "Action recognition using three-way cross-correlations feature of local motion attributes," in *Pattern Recognition (ICPR), 2010 20th International Conference on*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 1731–1734.
- [5] A. Karpathy, G. Toderici, S. Shetty, T. Leung, R. Sukthankar, and L. Fei-Fei, "Large-scale video classification with convolutional neural networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2014, pp. 1725–1732.
- [6] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman, "Two-stream convolutional networks for action recognition in videos," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2014, pp. 568–576.
- [7] C. Feichtenhofer, A. Pinz, and A. Zisserman, "Convolutional two-stream network fusion for video action recognition," 2016.
- [8] N. Yudistira and T. Kurita, "Gated spatio and temporal convolutional neural network for activity recognition: towards gated multimodal deep learning," *EURASIP Journal on Image and Video Processing*, vol. 2017, no. 1, p. 85, 2017.
- [9] L. Wang, Y. Xiong, Z. Wang, Y. Qiao, D. Lin, X. Tang, and L. Van Gool, "Temporal segment networks: Towards good practices for deep action recognition," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2016, pp. 20–36.
- [10] J. Y.-H. Ng, M. Hausknecht, S. Vijayanarasimhan, O. Vinyals, R. Monga, and G. Toderici, "Beyond short snippets: Deep networks for video classification," in *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2015 IEEE Conference on*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 4694–4702.
- [11] G. Varol, I. Laptev, and C. Schmid, "Long-term temporal convolutions for action recognition," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 2017.
- [12] F. Husain, B. Dellen, and C. Torras, "Action recognition based on efficient deep feature learning in the spatio-temporal domain," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 984–991, 2016.
- [13] K. Soomro, A. R. Zamir, and M. Shah, "Ucf101: A dataset of 101 human actions classes from videos in the wild," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.0402*, 2012.
- [14] H. Kuehne, H. Jhuang, E. Garrote, T. Poggio, and T. Serre, "Hmdb: a large video database for human motion recognition," in *Computer Vision (ICCV), 2011 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 2556–2563.
- [15] C. Zach, T. Pock, and H. Bischof, "A duality based approach for realtime tv-l1 optical flow," in *Joint Pattern Recognition Symposium*. Springer, 2007, pp. 214–223.
- [16] S. Tokui, K. Oono, S. Hido, and J. Clayton, "Chainer: a next-generation open source framework for deep learning," in *Proceedings of workshop on machine learning systems (LearningSys) in the twenty-ninth annual conference on neural information processing systems (NIPS)*, vol. 5, 2015.
- [17] L. Wang, Y. Xiong, Z. Wang, and Y. Qiao, "Towards good practices for very deep two-stream convnets," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.02159*, 2015.
- [18] Y. Jia, E. Shelhamer, J. Donahue, S. Karayev, J. Long, R. Girshick, S. Guadarrama, and T. Darrell, "Caffe: Convolutional architecture for fast feature embedding," in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM international conference on Multimedia*. ACM, 2014, pp. 675–678.
- [19] E. Park, X. Han, T. L. Berg, and A. C. Berg, "Combining multiple sources of knowledge in deep cnns for action recognition," in *Applications of Computer Vision (WACV), 2016 IEEE Winter Conference on*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–8.
- [20] H. Wang and C. Schmid, "Action recognition with improved trajectories," in *Computer Vision (ICCV), 2013 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 3551–3558.
- [21] X. Peng, L. Wang, X. Wang, and Y. Qiao, "Bag of visual words and fusion methods for action recognition: Comprehensive study and good practice," *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, vol. 150, pp. 109–125, 2016.
- [22] L. Wang, Y. Qiao, and X. Tang, "Action recognition with trajectory-pooled deep-convolutional descriptors," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2015, pp. 4305–4314.