

Self-supervised Learning for Semi-supervised Temporal Language Grounding

Fan Luo, Shaoxiang Chen, Jingjing Chen, Zuxuan Wu, Yu-Gang Jiang*

Shanghai Key Lab of Intelligent Information Processing, School of Computer Science, Fudan University
 {fluo20, sxchen13, chenjingjing, zxwu, ygj}@fudan.edu.cn

Abstract

Given a text description, Temporal Language Grounding (TLG) aims to localize temporal boundaries of the segments that contain the specified semantics in an untrimmed video. TLG is inherently a challenging task, as it requires to have comprehensive understanding of both video contents and text sentences. Previous works either tackle this task in a fully-supervised setting that requires a large amount of manual annotations or in a weakly supervised setting that cannot achieve satisfactory performance. To achieve good performance with limited annotations, we tackle this task in a semi-supervised way and propose a unified Semi-supervised Temporal Language Grounding (STLG) framework. STLG consists of two parts: (1) A pseudo label generation module that produces adaptive instant pseudo labels for unlabeled data based on predictions from a teacher model; (2) A self-supervised feature learning module with two sequential perturbations, i.e., time lagging and time scaling, for improving the video representation by inter-modal and intra-modal contrastive learning. We conduct experiments on the ActivityNet-CD-OOD and Charades-CD-OOD datasets and the results demonstrate that our proposed STLG framework achieve competitive performance compared to fully-supervised state-of-the-art methods with only a small portion of temporal annotations.

1 Introduction

Video understanding is a challenging task in computer vision. Many related tasks have been extensively studied due to its wide applications, such as video captioning (Chen et al. 2020b), action localization (Shou, Wang, and Chang 2016) and video question answering (Tapaswi et al. 2016). Temporal language grounding (TLG) (Gao et al. 2017; Hendricks et al. 2017), which aims at automatically locating the temporal boundaries of the segments indicated by natural language descriptions in an untrimmed video, has attracted increasing attention recently because of its potential applications in search engines and video retrieval.

The state-of-the-art models for tackling the temporal language grounding task in a fully-supervised setting can be mainly categorized into two groups: *proposal-based* models (Gao et al. 2017; Ge et al. 2019; Jiang et al. 2019; Liu et al. 2018a,b, 2021; Zhang et al. 2020a) and *regression-based* models (Yuan, Mei, and Zhu 2019; Zeng et al. 2020;

Opazo et al. 2020; Chen et al. 2020a; Wang, Huang, and Wang 2019; Mun, Cho, and Han 2020; Nan et al. 2021; Zhao et al. 2021; Zhou et al. 2021b; Zhang et al. 2021). Their major difference is the way of generating temporal predictions and training/inference efficiency (e.g., memory consumption and convergence rate). But all of these methods require precise temporal annotations for model training. As manually annotating precise temporal labels is expensive and time-consuming, it is extremely challenging to scale such fully-supervised methods to thousands of classes.

To alleviate the annotation cost, weakly-supervised and semi-supervised learning methods are common solutions. Weakly-supervised temporal language grounding methods require only video-sentence pairs for training, that is, without the requirement for temporal boundary annotations. However, recent studies have shown that the overall performance of weakly supervised methods (Duan et al. 2018; Gao et al. 2019; Mithun, Paul, and Roy-Chowdhury 2019; Song et al. 2020; Tan et al. 2019; Zhou et al. 2021a) are greatly inferior to the fully-supervised methods in temporal language grounding. Compared with weakly-supervised learning, semi-supervised learning can make use of a limited amount of annotated data as necessary supervision to achieve higher performance. Thus, semi-supervised methods could be a more appropriate solution for problems where annotation are expensive to obtain. Though semi-supervised learning has been widely explored in tasks such as object detection (Tang et al. 2021; Zhou et al. 2021b), temporal action localization (Ji, Cao, and Niebles 2019; Wang et al. 2021), to the best of our knowledge, we are the first to explore semi-supervised learning for temporal language grounding.

The major challenge in semi-supervised temporal language grounding is how to learn from the large amount of the coarsely annotated data. Besides generating pseudo labels, preserving consistency between different versions of augmented data has been proven to be an effective method to make use of unlabeled data (Miyato et al. 2019). Meanwhile, some self-supervised methods (Pathak et al. 2016; Han, Xie, and Zisserman 2019) propose to explore the underlying structure of data to learn better representations. However, these methods have not made full use of the temporal structure of sequential data such as video.

To tackle the above challenges, in this paper, we introduce self-supervised learning to improve the semi-supervised

*Corresponding author.

temporal language grounding. Our proposed framework consists of two parts: pseudo label generation and self-supervised feature learning. The pseudo label generation aims at producing more precise pseudo labels for different types of grounding models. In the semi-supervised training process, a teacher model that produces instant pseudo labels is used to leverage unlabeled data. The self-supervised feature learning contains inter-modal and intra-modal contrastive learning. We design two types of sequential data perturbations: time lagging and time scaling, which can make the grounding model more robust and also focus more on the semantics of video content to preserve consistency within the video modality and between the video and text modalities. Our proposed framework is named as **Semi-supervised Temporal Language Grounding (STLG)**.

In summary, our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- To the best of our knowledge, we are the first study semi-supervised temporal language grounding and propose a general framework that works well for both regression-based and proposal-based grounding models.
- We have designed two effective temporal perturbations and inter-modal and intra-modal contrastive losses for self-supervised feature learning to improve language grounding performance.
- We extensively tested the proposed STLG on two challenging out-of-distribution datasets and achieve results comparable to fully-supervised baselines for regression-based and proposal-based models.

2 Related Work

Temporal language grounding that aims to locate the temporal boundary of events in untrimmed videos using language queries, is a challenging task introduced recently (Gao et al. 2017; Hendricks et al. 2017). Existing methods for temporal language grounding can be mainly categorized into two groups. Proposal-based methods (Gao et al. 2017; Hendricks et al. 2017; Liu et al. 2018a,b; Ge et al. 2019; Jiang et al. 2019; Liu et al. 2021; Wang, Ma, and Jiang 2020; Zhang et al. 2020a) retrieve the most confident proposal from a set of generated candidates. Initially, Gao et al. (2017) follow a two-stage paradigm, which first generates the candidates by temporal sliding windows and then matches language query with these candidates. Zhang et al. (2020a) design a fine-grained and flexible 2D temporal feature map proposal generation mechanism to capture relations among temporal segmentations. Although those methods achieve promising performance, they are limited by the need of extra computational cost and high-quality ground-truth labels. Regression-based methods (Yuan, Mei, and Zhu 2019; Zeng et al. 2020; Opazo et al. 2020; Chen et al. 2020a; Wang, Huang, and Wang 2019; Mun, Cho, and Han 2020; Nan et al. 2021; Zhao et al. 2021) are proposed to solve temporal language grounding task in an end-to-end manner. Some methods (Yuan, Mei, and Zhu 2019) focus on cross-modal attention, and some work proposes to learn a fine-grained cross-modal interaction with a segment tree (Zhao et al. 2021) or local-global context (Mun, Cho, and Han 2020). Zhang et al. (2021) attempt to address grounding in a

span-based question answering way. Since annotations are expansive, recently, significant effort has been devoted to solving temporal language grounding problem in a weakly-supervised way (Duan et al. 2018; Gao et al. 2019; Mithun, Paul, and Roy-Chowdhury 2019; Zhang et al. 2020c,b; Ma et al. 2020). The mainstream approaches mostly follow the multiple instance learning paradigm (Mithun, Paul, and Roy-Chowdhury 2019). Apart from this, Zhang et al. (2020c) propose to solve the weakly-supervised temporal language grounding based on contrastive learning.

Semi-supervised learning (SSL) is a dominant approach in machine learning to facilitate learning with limited labeled data and large amounts of unlabeled data. Especially in image classification, SSL has been extensively studied (Arazo et al. 2020; Xie et al. 2020; Sohn et al. 2020; Pham et al. 2021; Laine and Aila 2017; Tarvainen and Valpola 2017). Their focus can be roughly categorized into two groups: pseudo label generation and consistency regularization. The main idea of pseudo label generation is generating artificial labels by a teacher model for unlabeled data and using them for further training the student model. Arazo et al. (2020) propose to train the student model with a fixed pre-trained teacher model. Subsequent studies deeply investigate the usage of pseudo labels. For instance, Xie et al. (2020) propose Noisy-Student to train a student model with an iterative teacher model, Sohn et al. (2020) propose Fix-Match to apply different levels of augmentation to pseudo label generation and pseudo label prediction, and Pham et al. (2021) update the teacher model from the feedback of the student model. Consistency regularization methods encourage models to generate consistent outputs from perturbed input data and have been widely used in the field of SSL. Laine and Aila (2017) maintain a regularization for ensemble prediction. Tarvainen and Valpola (2017) update the teacher model by averaging weights of the student model at each training step so as to promote the quality of labels. Most related are two previous methods that study semi-supervised temporal action localization (SSTAL). Ji, Cao, and Niebles (2019) design two sequential perturbations based on the mean teacher framework, Wang et al. (2021) propose to incorporate self-supervised learning into SSTAL. But language grounding is much more complicated than action localization.

Self-supervised learning leverages unlabeled data to make the model learn intrinsic knowledge from data. Previous methods rely on pretext tasks to learning a better feature representation, representative ones are order verification (Misra, Zitnick, and Hebert 2016), sequence sorting (Lee et al. 2017), masked feature reconstruction and clip-order prediction (Wang et al. 2021). Recently, contrastive learning methods (Pathak et al. 2016; Han, Xie, and Zisserman 2019; Chen et al. 2020c,d; He et al. 2019; Chen et al. 2020e), have attracted increasing attention since they are proven to be able to learn more powerful feature representations for downstream tasks. Its basic idea is to align similar samples in feature space and push away the dissimilar samples, so that the learned features can be discriminative.




Figure 1: Overview of our STLG. In fully-supervised training phase, we train the model with labeled data to initialize teacher model. In semi-supervised training phase, teacher model generates pseudo label for unlabeled data, and gets instant update from student model in each epoch. After sequential perturbing, i.e. time lagging, time scaling or identity transformation (ID), the feature representations are applied to semi-supervised loss and self-supervised loss calculation.

3 Our Approach

In this section, we first give the problem definition of the semi-supervised temporal language grounding task. Then we introduce the details our proposed STLG framework, which includes pseudo label generation, sequential perturbation, and self-supervised feature learning.

3.1 Problem Formulation

Given an untrimmed video $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^T$ and a corresponding sentence description $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, where T is the length of video sequence and N is the number of words, temporal language grounding aims at locating the video segment $\tau = [s, e]$ which is most related to the sentence. In the semi-supervised setting, only a part of the video-sentence pairs are provided with temporal boundary ground truth while the remaining are not available during training. The grounding model can be formulated as:

$$\tau = f(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{S}), \quad (1)$$

where $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a composite of feature encoding, cross-modal processing, segment predicting, and post-processing steps.

3.2 Pseudo Label Generation

The loss functions of temporal language grounding can take different forms, requiring different methods for generating pseudo labels. Below, we discuss how to derive pseudo labels for regression-based grounding and proposal-based grounding, respectively. **Regression-based Model.** Generally, regression-based grounding models can be formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_r &= f_r(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{S}), \\ f_r(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{S}) &= \Omega_r(\Phi_{int}(\varphi_V(\mathbf{V}), \varphi_S(\mathbf{S}))), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\Omega_r(\cdot)$ denotes the temporal boundary regression module, $\Phi_{int}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the cross-modal interaction module, and

$\varphi_V(\cdot)$ and $\varphi_S(\cdot)$ are the feature encoding modules for the video and sentence, respectively. Following previous work (Yuan, Mei, and Zhu 2019), φ_V is comprised of a CNN and a bi-directional LSTM unit, φ_S is comprised of a Glove embedding layers and a bi-directional LSTM unit. Φ_{int} denotes an iterative cross-modal co-attention operation:

$$\mathbf{h}_r, \mathbf{a} = \Phi_{int}(\varphi_V(\mathbf{V}), \varphi_S(\mathbf{S})), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{h}_r \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D_h}$ is the attended video feature and $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^T$ is the corresponding attention weights. Then the temporal segment is predicted as:

$$\tau_r = [s, e] = \Omega_r(\mathbf{h}_r), \quad (4)$$

where $\Omega_r(\cdot)$ can be a multi-layer perceptron.

During training, there are two types of loss functions:

$$\mathcal{L}_r^{task} = \mathcal{L}_r^{reg} + \alpha_r \mathcal{L}_r^{cal}. \quad (5)$$

\mathcal{L}_r^{reg} is the temporal boundary regression loss, which is the smooth L1 loss

$$\mathcal{L}_r^{reg}(\tau_r, \hat{\tau}_r) = \text{SmoothL1}(s, \hat{s}) + \text{SmoothL1}(e, \hat{e}), \quad (6)$$

where $\hat{\tau}_r$ is the ground truth segment label¹. \mathcal{L}_r^{cal} is the attention calibration loss to encourage the alignment between the attention weights and the ground truth $\hat{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathbb{R}^T$:

$$\mathcal{L}_r^{cal}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \mathbf{a}) = -\frac{\sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\mathbf{a}}_t \log \mathbf{a}_t}{\sum_{i=1}^T \hat{\mathbf{a}}_i}, \quad (7)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_t$ is 1 if $s \leq t \leq e$, and 0 otherwise.

We design pseudo labels for both type of losses. τ_r^* and \mathbf{a}^* correspond to ground truth labels $\hat{\tau}_r$ and $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$. We directly use the teacher-model's boundary prediction $\tilde{\tau}_r$ as the pseudo label τ_r^* , and then construct attention weight pseudo label \mathbf{a}^*

¹We denote ground truth labels by symbols with a hat (e.g., $\hat{\tau}_r$), and pseudo labels by symbols with an asterisk (e.g., τ_r^*).

based on τ_r^* . At time step t , the attention weight is expected to be close to 1 if $s^* \leq t \leq e^*$, and otherwise it should be close to 0:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_r^* &= [s^*, e^*] = \tilde{\tau}, \\ \mathbf{a}_t^* &= \begin{cases} 1 & s^* \leq t \leq e^*, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Proposal-based Model. The proposal-based methods can be formulated as follow:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_p &= f_p(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{S}), \\ f_p(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{S}) &= \Omega_p(\Phi_{int}(\varphi_V(\mathbf{V}), \varphi_S(\mathbf{S}))). \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

In contrast to regression-based methods, the output of $f_p(\cdot, \cdot)$ are the candidate proposals, i.e., $\omega_p \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times K}$ represents K anchors at each of the T time steps. And the final segment τ_p is selected for ω_p with a non-maximum suppression (NMS) process. To make this a fair comparison, the feature encoding module φ_V and φ_S are kept consistent with the above regression-based method. The cross-modal interaction module Φ_{int} in the proposal-based model firstly fuses multi-modal feature with a linear transformation, then applies self-attention to generate the contextual integration feature $\mathbf{h}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D_h}$:

$$\mathbf{h}_p = \Phi_{int}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{S}). \quad (10)$$

Following (Wang, Ma, and Jiang 2020), the proposal generation module Ω_p is a combination of an anchor prediction submodule and a boundary prediction submodule:

$$\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b} = \Omega_p(\mathbf{h}_p), \quad (11)$$

where $\mathbf{c} \in [0, 1]^{T \times K}$ is the confidence score of each candidate proposal, and $\mathbf{b} \in [0, 1]^T$ represents the probability of being a boundary point. During inference, the anchor score and boundary probability are jointly used to produce the final score of a candidate proposal. The proposal-based loss \mathcal{L}_p^{task} is then defined as below:

$$\mathcal{L}_p^{task} = \mathcal{L}_p^{anchor} + \alpha_p \mathcal{L}_p^{boundary}. \quad (12)$$

The anchor loss \mathcal{L}_p^{anchor} is calculated with the prediction \mathbf{c} and label $\hat{\mathbf{c}} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times K}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_p^{anchor}(\hat{\mathbf{c}}, \mathbf{c}) &= - \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{k=1}^K w_k^+ \hat{c}_{tk} \log c_{tk} + \\ &w_k^- (1 - \hat{c}_{tk}) \log (1 - c_{tk}), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where \hat{c}_{tk} is 1 if the corresponding proposal has a temporal IoU with the ground truth segment $\hat{\tau}$ larger than 0.5 and 0 otherwise, and the w_k^+, w_k^- are the positive and negative sample weights of the k -th proposal. The boundary loss $\mathcal{L}_p^{boundary}$ is calculated with the label $\hat{\mathbf{b}} \in \mathbb{R}^T$, where \hat{b}_t is 1 if t equals s or e , otherwise b_t is 0. w_b^+ and w_b^- are positive and negative weights. The loss is formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_p^{boundary}(\mathbf{b}, \hat{\mathbf{b}}) &= - \sum_{t=1}^T w_b^+ \hat{b}_t \log b_t + \\ &w_b^- (1 - \hat{b}_t) \log (1 - b_t). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Compared with the regression-based method, there are a set of candidate proposals ω_p in the proposal-based model. We firstly select the candidate with the highest score as the pseudo label τ_p^* , then the boundary pseudo label \mathbf{b}^* is defined as:

$$\mathbf{b}_t^* = \begin{cases} 1 & t = s^* \text{ or } t = e^*, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

As for the anchor pseudo label \mathbf{c}^* , we first compute the IoU scores score_{tk} of each anchor with the pseudo segment label τ_p^* , and then the anchor pseudo labels are assigned as

$$\mathbf{c}_{tk}^* = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{score}_{tk} \geq 0.5, \\ 0 & \text{score}_{tk} < 0.5. \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

3.3 Sequential Perturbation

In the literature, applying stochastic perturbations to the inputs has been proven crucial for semi-supervised models (Ji, Cao, and Niebles 2019; Wang et al. 2021). Meanwhile, augmenting the inputs to force the model to focus on high-level semantics is also widely adopted by (self-supervised) contrastive learning methods (Pathak et al. 2016; Han, Xie, and Zisserman 2019).

In contrast to simply adding gaussian noise to feature maps in Mean Teacher (Tarvainen and Valpola 2017), we further utilize the inherent property of sequence data. Due to the temporal semantic consistency of video, moderate sequential disturbance such as adjusting the playback rate and short-term lagging would not change the semantics of sequence data. For example, when watching a video, people can still obtain information with different playback rates and occasional lagging. Based on this insight, for the sequential video feature $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D}$, we propose two essential types of sequential perturbations: time lagging and time scaling².

The **time lagging** perturbation performs random disturbance to a feature sequence. Given a sequential video feature \mathbf{V} , we randomly select a small segment $r = [r_s, r_e]$, ($1 \leq r_s \leq r_e \leq T$) and temporally flip the features within the segment. Previous work (Wang et al. 2021) performs temporal feature flipping which flips the whole feature sequence. The difference between temporal feature flipping and time lagging is that, temporal feature flipping reverses the whole feature while the time lagging randomly selects a small local segment. Thus time lagging retains more semantic information and temporal structure than temporal feature flipping. (Wang et al. 2021) is applied to temporal action localization, which emphasizes more on contextual correlation. In the temporal language grounding task, besides contextual correlation, the cross-modal dependency is equally important. Flipping the whole video sequence makes it more difficult to align the sentence and video. Therefore, our time lagging is a more appropriate data augmentation technique for temporal language grounding.

The **time scaling** perturbation temporally scales the sequence video feature with different playback rates. Given a

²Examples of time lagging and time scaling can be found in the Supplementary Materials.

playback rate θ , the scaling sequence video feature is constructed by equidistant sampling features along the temporal dimension and the resulting video feature length is $T' = \frac{1}{\theta}T$. The time scaled features can be regarded as video event representations with different playback rates but the same semantics, thus perturbing the playback rates leads to more attention being paid to the global video semantics.

3.4 Self-Supervised Feature Learning

Inspired by recent work (Wang et al. 2021), we also incorporate self-supervised feature learning. Based on two types of sequential data augmentation, we design inter-modal and intra-modal contrastive losses to assist the STLG to learn discriminative multi-modal feature representation.

We first give a general formulation of contrastive loss:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{CL}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{X}^-, \mathcal{Y}^-) = & \\ & \sum_{\mathbf{X}^- \in \mathcal{X}^-} \max[0, \Delta - l(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) + l(\mathbf{X}^-, \mathbf{Y})] + \\ & \sum_{\mathbf{Y}^- \in \mathcal{Y}^-} \max[0, \Delta - l(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) + l(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}^-)], \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $l(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a similarity function (e.g. cosine similarity), $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{D_h}$ is a pair of positive samples, and \mathcal{X}^- and \mathcal{Y}^- are the sets of chosen negative sample for \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} , respectively. Δ is the margin. The goal of \mathcal{L}_{CL} is to pull positive pairs closer and push negative pairs further in the embedding space.

Inter-modal contrastive loss. Consider a mini batch $\{\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{S}_i\}_{i=1}^B$ with B video and sentence features, the inter-modal contrastive loss is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{CL}^{inter} = \sum_{i=1}^B \mathcal{L}_{CL}(\mathbf{V}_i, \mathbf{S}_i, \mathcal{V}_i^-, \mathcal{S}_i^-), \quad (18)$$

where $\mathcal{V}_i^- = \{\mathbf{V}_j | j \in [1, B] \text{ and } j \neq i\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_i^- = \{\mathbf{S}_j | j \in [1, B] \text{ and } j \neq i\}$ are the negative samples for the i -th video and sentence pair. The inter-modal contrastive loss encourages the semantically related video and sentence to be similar, and decreases the similarity between semantically irrelevant video sentence pairs.

Intra-modal contrastive loss. To encourage the model to focus more on the semantics of the video, we also apply contrastive learning on augmented versions of video features.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}_{i1}, \mathbf{A}_{i2} = \text{Aug}(\mathbf{V}_i), \\ \mathcal{L}_{CL}^{intra} = \sum_{i=1}^B \mathcal{L}_{CL}(\mathbf{A}_{i1}, \mathbf{A}_{i2}, \mathcal{A}_{i1}^-, \mathcal{A}_{i2}^-), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $\text{Aug}(\cdot)$ takes a video sample and augments it twice using perturbations chosen randomly from the set {time lagging, time scaling, identity mapping}, and $\mathbf{A}_{i1}, \mathbf{A}_{i2} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D_h}$ are the augmented video features. Similar to inter-modal contrastive loss, intra-modal contrastive loss also regards the rest of $B - 1$ samples as negative, that $\mathcal{A}_{i1}^- = \{\mathbf{A}_{j1} | j \in [1, B] \text{ and } j \neq i\}$, $\mathcal{A}_{i2}^- = \{\mathbf{A}_{j2} | j \in [1, B] \text{ and } j \neq i\}$ are the negative samples for sample i .

The overall self-supervised loss is:

$$\mathcal{L}^{self} = \mathcal{L}_{CL}^{inter} + \mathcal{L}_{CL}^{intra}. \quad (20)$$

3.5 The Training Process

There are two phases in our grounding model training process. In the first phase, we pre-train the model with a limited amount of annotated data in a supervised manner to obtain a teacher model. In the second phase, the teacher model generates pseudo labels for the unlabeled data in each epoch. Following the instant-teaching (Zhou et al. 2021b) framework, we use instant pseudo labeling in our STLG. We then perform the semi-supervised training by optimizing the semi-supervised loss \mathcal{L}^{task} and self-supervised loss \mathcal{L}^{self} using all the training samples:

$$\mathcal{L}^{all} = \mathcal{L}^{task} + \beta \mathcal{L}^{self}, \quad (21)$$

where \mathcal{L}^{task} can be \mathcal{L}_r^{task} or \mathcal{L}_p^{task} , depending on the type of grounding model being trained, and β is a hyper parameter that controls the weight of self-supervised loss.

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets

With a small number of labeled data, it is very likely that the testing data distribution will be different to the training data. Hence, to better evaluate our semi-supervised method, we follow the settings in (Yuan et al. 2021) and use a novel split of existing datasets, in which the training and testing data are designed to have different distributions.

Charades-CD-OOD: Charades-CD-OOD is built on the Charades-STA dataset (Gao et al. 2017), which annotates sentence descriptions in a semi-automatic way. It contains 9,848 videos and 16,128 sentence-moment pairs. On average, the video and sentence length on the Charades-CD dataset are 29.8 seconds and 8.6 words respectively. Yuan et al. (2021) propose to split sentence-moment pairs into training, validation, and test-ood set of sizes 11,071, 859 and 3,375, respectively.

ActivityNet-CD-OOD: ActivityNet-CD-OOD is built on the ActivityNet Captions (Heilbron et al. 2015) dataset, which is originally for dense video captioning. The dataset has 19,970 videos and 17,031 sentence-moment pairs. Compared with Charades-STA, its variation of temporal segment lengths is much larger, ranging from a few seconds to several minutes. The average sentence length is 13.2 words, and the average video length is 117.74 seconds. According to (Yuan et al. 2021), ActivityNet-CD-OOD contains 51,415, 3,321, 13,578 sentence-moment pairs for training, validation, and test-ood respectively.

The rate ψ , which represents the percentage of labeled data in training data, is set to 5% in ActivityNet-CD-OOD and 30% in Charades-CD-OOD, to ensure that these two datasets can have similar amounts of labeled instances.

4.2 Metrics

Following the previous (Gao et al. 2017) setting, we use the "R@n, IoU=m" as the evaluation metrics. It is defined as the percentage of the query sentences that our model can produce at least one appropriate moment in the top- n results. A moment is appropriate when its IoU with the ground truth is larger than m . Specifically, we report the results as $n \in \{1, 5\}$ with $m \in \{0.3, 0.5, 0.7\}$ for Charades-CD-OOD and ActivityNet-CD-OOD.

Methods		ActivityNet-CD-OOD			Charades-CD-OOD		
		R@1, IoU=0.3	R@1, IoU=0.5	R@1, IoU=0.7	R@1, IoU=0.3	R@1, IoU=0.5	R@1, IoU=0.7
ACRN (Liu et al. 2018a)		16.06	7.58	2.48	44.69	30.03	11.89
TSP-PRL (Wu et al. 2020)		29.61	16.63	7.43	31.93	19.37	6.20
ABLR (Yuan, Mei, and Zhu 2019)		33.45	20.88	10.03	44.62	31.57	11.38
DRN (Zeng et al. 2020)		36.86	25.15	14.33	40.45	30.43	15.91
CTRL (Gao et al. 2017)		15.68	7.89	2.53	44.97	30.73	11.97
SCDM (Yuan et al. 2019)		31.56	19.14	9.31	52.38	41.60	22.22
2D-TAN (Zhang et al. 2020a)		30.86	18.38	9.11	43.45	30.77	11.75
WSSL (Duan et al. 2018)		17.00	7.17	1.82	35.86	23.67	8.27
regression-based	baseline@ ψ	30.32	16.24	6.13	44.56	22.19	6.46
	ours@ ψ	34.21	19.13	8.25	46.15	29.43	9.38
	baseline@100%	39.01	21.67	8.82	48.30	30.39	9.79
anchor-based	baseline@ ψ	31.45	16.27	6.33	42.25	23.26	10.87
	ours@ ψ	32.85	17.83	7.85	43.87	25.02	11.88
	baseline@100%	36.93	19.96	8.20	44.20	25.32	11.59

Table 1: Comparisons with state-of-the-arts on ActivityNet-CD-OOD and Charades-CD-OOD using C3D features, where ψ is the percentage of labeled data, is set to 5% for ActivityNet-CD-OOD and 30% for Charades-CD-OOD.

4.3 Implementation Details

We extract the C3D (Tran et al. 2015) visual features on both datasets. The description sentences are encoded by 300d GloVe (Pennington, Socher, and Manning 2014) word embedding vectors. The video length T is set as 128 for computing convenience, thus the video feature sequence will be uniformly sampled if length is greater than 128, otherwise zero-padded. The batch size is set to 32, in which the ratio of labeled data is ψ . Adam (Kingma and Ba 2015) is used as the optimizer, with a learning rate 0.001 for both regression-based method and proposal-based method. The dimension of all hidden layers is 512. Weight α_r and α_p are 0.01 and 1.0 respectively, and weight β is 1.0. The playback rate $\theta \in \{0.25, 0.5, 0.75\}$ and margin Δ is 1.0.

4.4 Performance Comparison

We first compare our proposed STLG with state-of-the-art temporal language grounding methods on both ActivityNet-CD-OOD and Charades-CD-OOD datasets. These SOTA methods can be categorized into several groups: (1) Regression-based methods: **ACRN** (Liu et al. 2018a): a memory-based attentive cross-modal retrieval network; **ABLR** (Yuan, Mei, and Zhu 2019): an iterative attention-based location regression network; **TSP-PRL** (Wu et al. 2020): a coarse-to-fine tree-structured policy based progressive reinforcement learning model; **DRN** (Zeng et al. 2020): a dense regression network with multiple regression loss. (2) Proposal-based methods: **CTRL** (Gao et al. 2017): Cross-modal semantics alignment temporal localizer, **SCDM** (Yuan et al. 2019): Language guided semantic conditioned dynamic modulation network, **2D-TAN** (Zhang et al. 2020a): 2D temporal adjacent semantic relation encoded network. (3) Weakly-supervised method: **WSSL** (Duan et al. 2018): a weakly-supervised crossing attention multi-model localization network. Note that the performance of these methods are reported by (Yuan et al. 2021), these methods will mostly experience a significant performance drop on the out-of-distribution test set compared to the original test set.

Comparisons with semi-supervised baseline. To

demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed pseudo label generation and self-supervised feature learning, we first compare our full method with a baseline method, which is obtained by removing the two components from our method. And to show that our proposed mechanisms can be broadly applied to different type of models, our final method can be regression-based and anchor-based. As shown in Table 1, our STLG has a significant improvement compared with the baseline for both regression-based and proposal-based models, highlighting that the proposed method can effectively utilize the coarsely annotated data to improve grounding performance. Especially for the regression-based model, our STLG boosts the baseline from 6.13 to 8.25 and from 6.46 to 9.38 in terms of R@1,IoU=0.7 on ActivityNet-CD-OOD and Charades-CD-OOD, respectively. Meanwhile, STLG achieves results comparable to the baseline that uses all labels (baseline@100%) for both models on both datasets. This indicates that the teacher model in STLG makes use of the feedback from the student model to iteratively improve the quality of pseudo labels. We can also observe that in both datasets, the regression-based model achieves more significant improvements than proposal-based model. One possible reason is that the proposal-based model relies more on the quality of labels and predefined anchor scales, thus is more sensitive to the noise in pseudo labels.

Comparisons with SOTA methods. We then compare our proposed STLG with fully-supervised and weakly-supervised SOTA methods. As shown in Table 1, our STLG significantly outperforms the weakly-supervised method WSSL in all metrics. Compared with fully-supervised methods, our regression-based model can achieve competitive performance on ActivityNet-CD-OOD and Charades-CD-OOD with only 5% and 30% data labeled with temporal boundary ground truth.

4.5 Ablation Study

To individually show the effectiveness of each component in our proposed STLG framework, we conduct an ablation study on both regression-based and proposal-based mod-

Row	Pre-train	Pseudo	Sequential Perturbations	Intra-modal Contrastive Loss	Inter-modal Contrastive Loss	R@1, IoU=0.1	R@1, IoU=0.3	R@1, IoU=0.5	R@1, IoU=0.7
1	✓					49.02	30.32	16.24	6.13
2	✓	✓				53.20	32.11	17.57	7.11
3	✓	✓	✓			53.41	32.41	17.77	7.23
4	✓	✓	✓	✓		54.23	32.46	17.57	7.15
5	✓	✓				54.40	33.24	18.44	7.80
6	✓	✓	✓		✓	55.31	34.05	18.90	7.98
7	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	55.43	34.21	19.13	8.25

Table 2: Ablation study of regression-based method on ActivityNet-CD-OOD.

Row	Pre-train	Pseudo	Sequential Perturbations	Intra-modal Contrastive Loss	Inter-modal Contrastive Loss	R@1, IoU=0.3	R@1, IoU=0.5	R@1, IoU=0.7
1	✓					31.45	16.27	6.33
2	✓	✓				31.37	16.09	6.54
3	✓	✓	✓			33.22	17.01	6.80
4	✓	✓	✓	✓		32.61	17.08	6.80
5	✓	✓			✓	33.01	17.72	7.46
6	✓	✓	✓		✓	32.10	17.71	7.77
7	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	32.85	17.83	7.85

Table 3: Ablation study of proposal-based method on ActivityNet-CD-OOD.

els on the ActivityNet-CD-OOD dataset, and the results are shown in Table 2 and Table 3.

Pseudo Label Generation. The performance of our STLG for regression-based model with and without pseudo label generation is shown in Table 2 (row 1 and 2). It can be observed that the pseudo label generation improves the temporal grounding accuracy by making use of instant pseudo labels. The improvements on R@1, IoU=0.3, IoU=0.5, and IoU=0.7 prove the effectiveness of our pseudo label generating module. And in Table 3 (row 1 and 2) we also observe that using pseudo labels leads to performance improvement on R@1, IoU=0.7, but the improvements are smaller than for regression-based models. We conjecture that the reason could be that proposal-based pseudo labels suffer from noise, so it is natural to introduce extra regularization to improve the teacher model and the label quality as well.

Sequential Perturbations. Our designed perturbations, time lagging and time scaling, are designed based on the insight that moderate noise is beneficial for representation learning. To investigate their effect as data augmentation, we compare the STLG’s performance with and without sequential perturbations, and the results are shown in Table 2 and Table 3 row 2 and 3. The results show that the grounding performance is improved by applying sequential perturbations to augment the training samples, and this validates that slightly altering the temporal structure of videos can help our model focus more on the semantics.

Inter-modal Contrastive Loss. In order to validate the effectiveness of the inter-modal contrastive loss, we evaluate the STLG with and without inter-modal contrastive loss. By comparing row 2 and 5 in both Table 2 and Table 3, we observe a significant boost of grounding performance for all metrics, e.g., the R@1, IoU=0.7 are improved relatively by 9.7% and 14% for regression-based and proposal-based models, respectively. Comparing row 3 and 6 in Table 2 and Table 3, we have the same conclusion, that intra-modal contrastive loss cooperates well with other compo-

nents. The inter-modal contrastive loss is designed to learn a more discriminative visual and language feature representation, and the stable improvement on all metrics verifies that this can effectively utilize the unannotated video-sentence pairs and is critical for the semi-supervised temporal language grounding task. As we suggested earlier, inter-modal self-supervised learning can be used as an implicit regularization to improve the label quality especially for the proposal-based model, and the results here also agree with our previous conjecture.

Intra-modal Contrastive Loss. Based on the sequential perturbations, we further investigate the effect of intra-modal contrastive loss. The results of row 3 and 4 in Table 2 and 3 show that the intra-modal contrastive loss alone can only slightly improve the grounding performances, but comparing row 6 and 7, we observe substantial performance improvement can be obtained by intra-modal contrastive loss if inter-modal contrastive loss is already applied. These results also indicate that aligning visual and textual features well in the feature space is the primary requirement for cross-modal tasks, and it can be the basis for further improvement of the feature distribution within a particular modality.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced a semi-supervised temporal language grounding framework assisted by contrastive self-supervised learning. We designed pseudo label generation mechanisms that fit different types of grounding models and can be used in an instant updating manner during semi-supervised learning. We also presented two effective sequential perturbations, and associated with contrastive self-supervised learning, which can further boost the performance of STLG. Our experiments show that STLG achieve competitive performance compared with fully-supervised methods using a limited amount of temporal annotations, and STLG is universally effective for different types of temporal language grounding models.

References

- Arazo, E.; Ortego, D.; Albert, P.; O'Connor, N. E.; and McGuinness, K. 2020. Pseudo-Labeling and Confirmation Bias in Deep Semi-Supervised Learning. In *IJCNN*, 1–8.
- Chen, L.; Lu, C.; Tang, S.; Xiao, J.; Zhang, D.; Tan, C.; and Li, X. 2020a. Rethinking the Bottom-Up Framework for Query-Based Video Localization. In *AAAI*, 10551–10558.
- Chen, S.; Jiang, W.; Liu, W.; and Jiang, Y. 2020b. Learning Modality Interaction for Temporal Sentence Localization and Event Captioning in Videos. In *ECCV*, volume 12349 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 333–351.
- Chen, T.; Kornblith, S.; Norouzi, M.; and Hinton, G. 2020c. A Simple Framework for Contrastive Learning of Visual Representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05709*.
- Chen, T.; Kornblith, S.; Swersky, K.; Norouzi, M.; and Hinton, G. 2020d. Big Self-Supervised Models are Strong Semi-Supervised Learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.10029*.
- Chen, X.; Fan, H.; Girshick, R.; and He, K. 2020e. Improved Baselines with Momentum Contrastive Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04297*.
- Duan, X.; Huang, W.; Gan, C.; Wang, J.; Zhu, W.; and Huang, J. 2018. Weakly Supervised Dense Event Captioning in Videos. In *NeurIPS*, 3063–3073.
- Gao, J.; Sun, C.; Yang, Z.; and Nevatia, R. 2017. TALL: Temporal Activity Localization via Language Query. In *ICCV*, 5277–5285.
- Gao, M.; Davis, L.; Socher, R.; and Xiong, C. 2019. WSLN: Weakly Supervised Natural Language Localization Networks. In *EMNLP-IJCNLP*, 1481–1487.
- Ge, R.; Gao, J.; Chen, K.; and Nevatia, R. 2019. MAC: Mining Activity Concepts for Language-Based Temporal Localization. In *WACV*, 245–253.
- Han, T.; Xie, W.; and Zisserman, A. 2019. Video Representation Learning by Dense Predictive Coding. In *ICCV workshop*.
- He, K.; Fan, H.; Wu, Y.; Xie, S.; and Girshick, R. 2019. Momentum Contrast for Unsupervised Visual Representation Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.05722*.
- Heilbron, F. C.; Escorcia, V.; Ghanem, B.; and Niebles, J. C. 2015. ActivityNet: A large-scale video benchmark for human activity understanding. In *CVPR*, 961–970.
- Hendricks, L. A.; Wang, O.; Shechtman, E.; Sivic, J.; Darrell, T.; and Russell, B. C. 2017. Localizing Moments in Video with Natural Language. In *ICCV*, 5804–5813.
- Ji, J.; Cao, K.; and Niebles, J. C. 2019. Learning Temporal Action Proposals With Fewer Labels. In *ICCV*, 7072–7081.
- Jiang, B.; Huang, X.; Yang, C.; and Yuan, J. 2019. Cross-Modal Video Moment Retrieval with Spatial and Language-Temporal Attention. In *ICMR*, 217–225.
- Kingma, D. P.; and Ba, J. 2015. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. In Bengio, Y.; and LeCun, Y., eds., *ICLR*.
- Laine, S.; and Aila, T. 2017. Temporal Ensembling for Semi-Supervised Learning. In *ICLR*.
- Lee, H.; Huang, J.; Singh, M.; and Yang, M. 2017. Unsupervised Representation Learning by Sorting Sequences. In *ICCV*, 667–676. IEEE Computer Society.
- Liu, D.; Qu, X.; Dong, J.; Zhou, P.; Cheng, Y.; Wei, W.; Xu, Z.; and Xie, Y. 2021. Context-aware Biaffine Localizing Network for Temporal Sentence Grounding. In *CVPR*, 11235–11244.
- Liu, M.; Wang, X.; Nie, L.; He, X.; Chen, B.; and Chua, T. 2018a. Attentive Moment Retrieval in Videos. In *SIGIR*, 15–24.
- Liu, M.; Wang, X.; Nie, L.; Tian, Q.; Chen, B.; and Chua, T. 2018b. Cross-modal Moment Localization in Videos. In *ACM MM*, 843–851.
- Ma, M.; Yoon, S.; Kim, J.; Lee, Y.; Kang, S.; and Yoo, C. D. 2020. VLANet: Video-Language Alignment Network for Weakly-Supervised Video Moment Retrieval. In *ECCV*, volume 12373 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 156–171.
- Misra, I.; Zitnick, C. L.; and Hebert, M. 2016. Shuffle and Learn: Unsupervised Learning Using Temporal Order Verification. In Leibe, B.; Matas, J.; Sebe, N.; and Welling, M., eds., *ECCV*, volume 9905 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 527–544. Springer.
- Mithun, N. C.; Paul, S.; and Roy-Chowdhury, A. K. 2019. Weakly Supervised Video Moment Retrieval From Text Queries. In *CVPR*, 11592–11601.
- Miyato, T.; Maeda, S.; Koyama, M.; and Ishii, S. 2019. Virtual Adversarial Training: A Regularization Method for Supervised and Semi-Supervised Learning. *TPAMI*, 41(8): 1979–1993.
- Mun, J.; Cho, M.; and Han, B. 2020. Local-Global Video-Text Interactions for Temporal Grounding. In *CVPR*, 10807–10816.
- Nan, G.; Qiao, R.; Xiao, Y.; Liu, J.; Leng, S.; Zhang, H.; and Lu, W. 2021. Interventional Video Grounding With Dual Contrastive Learning. In *CVPR*, 2765–2775.
- Opazo, C. R.; Marrese-Taylor, E.; Saleh, F. S.; Li, H.; and Gould, S. 2020. Proposal-free Temporal Moment Localization of a Natural-Language Query in Video using Guided Attention. In *WACV*, 2453–2462.
- Pathak, D.; Krähenbühl, P.; Donahue, J.; Darrell, T.; and Efros, A. A. 2016. Context Encoders: Feature Learning by Inpainting. In *CVPR*, 2536–2544.
- Pennington, J.; Socher, R.; and Manning, C. D. 2014. Glove: Global Vectors for Word Representation. In Moschitti, A.; Pang, B.; and Daelemans, W., eds., *EMNLP*, 1532–1543. ACL.
- Pham, H.; Dai, Z.; Xie, Q.; and Le, Q. V. 2021. Meta Pseudo Labels. In *CVPR*, 11557–11568.
- Shou, Z.; Wang, D.; and Chang, S. 2016. Temporal Action Localization in Untrimmed Videos via Multi-stage CNNs. In *CVPR*, 1049–1058.
- Sohn, K.; Berthelot, D.; Carlini, N.; Zhang, Z.; Zhang, H.; Raffel, C.; Cubuk, E. D.; Kurakin, A.; and Li, C. 2020. Fix-Match: Simplifying Semi-Supervised Learning with Consistency and Confidence. In *NeurIPS*.

- Song, Y.; Wang, J.; Ma, L.; Yu, Z.; and Yu, J. 2020. Weakly-Supervised Multi-Level Attentional Reconstruction Network for Grounding Textual Queries in Videos. *CoRR*, abs/2003.07048.
- Tan, R.; Xu, H.; Saenko, K.; and Plummer, B. A. 2019. wMAN: Weakly-supervised Moment Alignment Network for Text-based Video Segment Retrieval. *CoRR*, abs/1909.13784.
- Tang, Y.; Chen, W.; Luo, Y.; and Zhang, Y. 2021. Humble Teachers Teach Better Students for Semi-Supervised Object Detection. In *CVPR*, 3132–3141.
- Tapaswi, M.; Zhu, Y.; Stiefelwagen, R.; Torralba, A.; Urtasun, R.; and Fidler, S. 2016. MovieQA: Understanding Stories in Movies through Question-Answering. In *CVPR*, 4631–4640.
- Tarvainen, A.; and Valpola, H. 2017. Mean teachers are better role models: Weight-averaged consistency targets improve semi-supervised deep learning results. In *NeurIPS*.
- Tran, D.; Bourdev, L. D.; Fergus, R.; Torresani, L.; and Paluri, M. 2015. Learning Spatiotemporal Features with 3D Convolutional Networks. In *ICCV*, 4489–4497. IEEE Computer Society.
- Wang, J.; Ma, L.; and Jiang, W. 2020. Temporally Grounding Language Queries in Videos by Contextual Boundary-Aware Prediction. In *AAAI*, 12168–12175.
- Wang, W.; Huang, Y.; and Wang, L. 2019. Language-Driven Temporal Activity Localization: A Semantic Matching Reinforcement Learning Model. In *CVPR*, 334–343.
- Wang, X.; Zhang, S.; Qing, Z.; Shao, Y.; Gao, C.; and Sang, N. 2021. Self-Supervised Learning for Semi-Supervised Temporal Action Proposal. In *CVPR*, 1905–1914.
- Wu, J.; Li, G.; Liu, S.; and Lin, L. 2020. Tree-Structured Policy Based Progressive Reinforcement Learning for Temporally Language Grounding in Video. In *AAAI*, 12386–12393. AAAI Press.
- Xie, Q.; Luong, M.; Hovy, E. H.; and Le, Q. V. 2020. Self-Training With Noisy Student Improves ImageNet Classification. In *CVPR*, 10684–10695.
- Yuan, Y.; Lan, X.; Chen, L.; Liu, W.; Wang, X.; and Zhu, W. 2021. A Closer Look at Temporal Sentence Grounding in Videos: Datasets and Metrics. *CoRR*, abs/2101.09028.
- Yuan, Y.; Ma, L.; Wang, J.; Liu, W.; and Zhu, W. 2019. Semantic Conditioned Dynamic Modulation for Temporal Sentence Grounding in Videos. In Wallach, H. M.; Larochelle, H.; Beygelzimer, A.; d’Alché-Buc, F.; Fox, E. B.; and Garnett, R., eds., *NeurIPS*, 534–544.
- Yuan, Y.; Mei, T.; and Zhu, W. 2019. To Find Where You Talk: Temporal Sentence Localization in Video with Attention Based Location Regression. In *AAAI*, 9159–9166.
- Zeng, R.; Xu, H.; Huang, W.; Chen, P.; Tan, M.; and Gan, C. 2020. Dense Regression Network for Video Grounding. In *CVPR*, 10284–10293.
- Zhang, H.; Sun, A.; Jing, W.; Zhen, L.; Zhou, J. T.; and Goh, R. S. M. 2021. Natural Language Video Localization: A Revisit in Span-based Question Answering Framework. *TPAMI*, 1–1.
- Zhang, S.; Peng, H.; Fu, J.; and Luo, J. 2020a. Learning 2D Temporal Adjacent Networks for Moment Localization with Natural Language. In *AAAI*, 12870–12877.
- Zhang, Z.; Lin, Z.; Zhao, Z.; Zhu, J.; and He, X. 2020b. Regularized Two-Branch Proposal Networks for Weakly-Supervised Moment Retrieval in Videos. In *ACM MM*, 4098–4106.
- Zhang, Z.; Zhao, Z.; Lin, Z.; Zhu, J.; and He, X. 2020c. Counterfactual Contrastive Learning for Weakly-Supervised Vision-Language Grounding. In *NeurIPS*.
- Zhao, Y.; Zhao, Z.; Zhang, Z.; and Lin, Z. 2021. Cascaded Prediction Network via Segment Tree for Temporal Video Grounding. In *CVPR*, 4197–4206.
- Zhou, H.; Zhang, C.; Luo, Y.; Chen, Y.; and Hu, C. 2021a. Embracing Uncertainty: Decoupling and De-Bias for Robust Temporal Grounding. In *CVPR*, 8445–8454.
- Zhou, Q.; Yu, C.; Wang, Z.; Qian, Q.; and Li, H. 2021b. Instant-Teaching: An End-to-End Semi-Supervised Object Detection Framework. In *CVPR*, 4081–4090.