

Revisiting Kernel Temporal Segmentation as an Adaptive Tokenizer for Long-form Video Understanding

Mohamed Afham Satya Narayan Shukla Omid Poursaeed Pengchuan Zhang
Ashish Shah Sernam Lim
Meta AI

Abstract

While most modern video understanding models operate on short-range clips, real-world videos are often several minutes long with semantically-consistent segments of variable length. A common approach to process long videos is applying a short-form video model over uniformly sampled clips of fixed temporal length and aggregating the outputs. This approach neglects the underlying nature of long videos since fixed-length clips are often redundant or uninformative. In this paper, we aim to provide a generic and adaptive sampling approach for long-form videos in lieu of the de facto uniform sampling. Viewing videos as semantically-consistent segments, we formulate a task-agnostic, unsupervised and scalable approach based on Kernel Temporal Segmentation (KTS) for sampling and tokenizing long videos. We evaluate our method on long-form video understanding tasks such as video classification and temporal action localization, showing consistent gains over existing approaches and achieving the state-of-the-art performance on long-form video modeling.

1. Introduction

Majority of video understanding models are devised to learn representations of short-form videos ranging from 5 to 10 seconds [10, 37, 19, 43, 9, 3, 22, 26]. These models usually suffer from computation and memory bottlenecks when processing videos of longer length. A common approach to overcome this bottleneck is to uniformly divide long videos into fixed-length clips, process each clip separately and aggregate the results. This approach is highly redundant as nearby clips often convey similar information and short clips that overlap semantically meaningful segments are often uninformative.

Several works [28, 23, 41, 12, 20] have previously investigated adaptive sampling to learn video representations in an efficient manner. These methods often devise a learnable adaptive sampler to select more representative frames of the

video based on the reward or penalty provided by the final prediction score. However, these methods are often limited to the classification task and are heavily dependent on the specific tasks and datasets on which they are trained and cannot easily transfer to unseen tasks or datasets.

Most of these adaptive sampling approaches are not scalable to sampling large number of frames which is required for understanding long-form videos. In fact, all the recent approaches [18, 38] for long-form video understanding use the de facto uniform sampling for sampling fixed-length clips from long videos.

In this work we propose a task-agnostic, adaptive and unsupervised sampling approach for long videos. Motivated by the intuition that humans perceive videos as semantically-consistent segments of variable length, we decompose the video to semantically meaningful segments using Kernel Temporal Segmentation (KTS) [30]. KTS extracts features from sparsely sampled candidate frames, computes the matrix of frame-to-frame similarity, and outputs a set of optimal change points corresponding to the boundaries of temporal segments. We then sample frames from each segment uniformly which comprises the input to the video understanding model. Our KTS-based input tokenization achieves the following desirable attributes: (a) it is agnostic to the downstream task, (b) it yields semantically-consistent segments without relying on training data, and (c) it is scalable to arbitrary number of segments and frames for a given long video.

We validate generalizability of KTS-based adaptive sampling on multiple downstream tasks and benchmarks. We evaluate KTS-based sampling for video classification on Breakfast [21] and LVU [38] benchmarks achieving state-of-the-art performance. We also report results for temporal action localization on ActivityNet [8], showing effectiveness of KTS-based sampling over standard uniform sampling. Furthermore, we provide a comparison with existing adaptive frame sampling methods on ActivityNet video classification and show that our approach outperforms the baselines.

The main contribution of our work can be summarized

as follows:

- We propose an adaptive, unsupervised, and task-agnostic frame sampling mechanism for long videos based on Kernel Temporal Segmentation (KTS), which overcomes deficiencies of common sampling approaches.
- We extensively evaluate KTS-based adaptive sampling against existing sampling techniques on video classification and temporal action localization tasks, showing consistent improvements and achieving state-of-the-art performance on long-form video understanding.

2. Related Work

Most of the video understanding models are devised to learn the representations of short-form videos ranging from 5 to 10 seconds [10, 37, 19, 43, 9, 3, 22, 26]. While these approaches use various architectures such as 2D CNNs [19, 6, 43], 3D CNNs [5, 10, 37, 36] and Vision Transformers [3, 9, 22, 26], they often share uniform sampling for input tokenization. These models usually suffer from computation and memory bottlenecks when processing videos of longer length.

Recent approaches for long-form video modeling can be broadly divided into two categories: a) building specialized models for learning from long-form videos, and b) adaptive sampling approaches for selecting frames from long-form videos. We discuss the related works in both the areas below:

2.1. Long-form Video Understanding

Several works have been introduced to study the capability of video models in modeling videos of longer length. A movie based question answering dataset was introduced by Tapaswi *et al.* [35] and Bain *et al.* [4] introduced a text-to-video retrieval benchmark based on videos from movies. However, those line of works explore the video-language learning ability of the model hence not ideal for video-only evaluation.

Recent works [15, 16, 38, 18] improve the ability of learning long-range dependencies in the temporal domain of the videos in video classification setting. ViS4mer [18] introduces a state-space sequence layer to model the extracted the short term clip features in a long video. The object transformer model in [38] aims to capture the long-range interactions between tracked objects. Wu *et al.* [38] recently introduced a long-video benchmark (LVU) comprised of 7 classification tasks and 2 regression tasks based on movie videos, which has become a standard benchmark for long-form video understanding. Another line of work focuses on temporal action localization (TAL) [44, 25] task which requires modeling the long-range dependencies and

evaluated on long-video datasets such as ActivityNet [8] and Thumos [17].

While the proposed approaches in video classification and temporal action localization show promising performance in the modeling aspect, uniform sampling is employed as the default input sampling strategy and hence, these approach require a large number of frames for understanding the long-form videos. Instead, in this work, we deploy the KTS-based adaptive sampling as input tokenization for both video classification and temporal action localization to study effectiveness of it over the standard uniform sampling.

2.2. Adaptive sampling

Several adaptive sampling based strategies [40, 20, 47, 23, 41, 46, 12] have been proposed to overcome the computation issues faced by the standard uniform sampling in video classification. SCSampler [20] used a light-weight network to predict the saliency score of short-clips sampled uniformly in the long video. AdaFrame [40] introduces an LSTM network augmented with a global memory, to learn how to adaptively select frames conditioned on inputs for efficient video recognition. FrameExit [12] investigates an early existing procedure by employing a cascade of gating modules to automatically determine the earliest point in processing where an inference is sufficiently reliable. OCSampler [23] effectively samples few frames from a selected number of frame candidates to dynamically localize and attend to the instance-specific condensed clip of each video. Zhi *et al.* design an adaptive sampling strategy named MGSampler [47] aiming to choose a more effective input with a fixed length in trimmed and short.

While our work is closely related to both OCSampler and MGSampler, in contrast to them KTS-based sampling is task-agnostic and applicable to various long-video understanding tasks (*e.g.*, video recognition, temporal action localization). Unlike the prior adaptive sampling approaches, *e.g.* OCSampler [23] where sampler is first trained separately, KTS-based sampling does not require two-stage training. KTS-based adaptive sampling is scalable and can be used to sample large number of frames from long-range videos effectively unlike the prior works which focus on sampling a small number of frames and are not easily scalable. KTS based sampling is also unsupervised and can be performed independently to the downstream task as it is based on the change points of the video features.

3. Method

Conventional long-range video models process uniformly sampled short clips from the video and aggregate the results. However, relevant information in a long video is often not evenly distributed. Humans perceive videos as a sequence of coherent scenes/events and can have a se-




Figure 1: An overview of KTS-based adaptive sampling for Video Classification and Temporal Action Localization. The input video is initially downsampled and $m - 1$ change points are computed using the KTS algorithm. k frames are then uniformly sampled from each of the m segments and are processed for the downstream task.

mantic understanding of the scenes given a few sampled frames. Motivated by this intuition, we propose a similar approach for sampling and tokenizing long videos. We decompose videos into semantically consistent segments leveraging Kernel Temporal Segmentation (KTS) and sample frames uniformly from each segment. We first give an overview of the KTS algorithm in Sec. 3.1. Then we describe our sampling strategy for long-form video classification and action localization in Sec. 3.2. Finally, we elaborate on the effectiveness of KTS over the other adaptive sampling techniques in the context of long-form video understanding.

3.1. Kernel Temporal Segmentation

The initial motivation behind KTS is to detect change points in the input and decompose the video into semantically consistent segments. KTS is a kernel-based algorithm that operates independently and in an unsupervised manner, hence it does not require any additional training to yield meaningful video segments. KTS has been extensively leveraged by several video summarization approaches [27, 45, 31, 42, 49] as the segmentation output provided by KTS has a significant impact on identifying highlights of the video and yielding a high-quality summarization of the video. Here we briefly describe the KTS algorithm.

Given a long-form video, we initially downsample it, e.g.

to one frame per second, and extract frame-level features using a pre-trained feature extractor f_θ . Let $(x_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbf{X}$ represent the sampled frames, $\mathbf{K} : \mathbf{X} \times \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ represent a kernel function (Gram matrix) between descriptors $f_\theta(x_i)$ and $\phi : \mathbf{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ be the associated feature map with norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$. Suppose we want to choose $m - 1$ change points $x_{t_1}, \dots, x_{t_{m-1}}$, which correspond to m segments $[x_{t_0}, x_{t_1}], [x_{t_1}, x_{t_2}], \dots, [x_{t_{m-1}}, x_{t_m}]$ with $x_{t_0} = 0$ and $x_{t_m} = T$ being length of the video.

The KTS algorithm minimizes the sum of the within-segment variances:

$$\min_{m, t_1, \dots, t_{m-1}} \sum_{i=1}^m \text{var}(t_{i-1}, t_i) \quad (1)$$

where:

$$\text{var}(t_{i-1}, t_i) = \sum_{t=t_{i-1}}^{t_i-1} \|\phi(x_t) - \mu_i\|^2 \quad (2)$$

and μ_i is the within-segment mean:

$$\mu_i = \frac{\sum_{t=t_{i-1}}^{t_i-1} \phi(x_t)}{t_i - t_{i-1}} \quad (3)$$

We can also make KTS adaptive to each video by making the number of segments m variable. To avoid over-segmentation we add a penalty term $g(m, n)$ to the objective

function. A common choice for $g(m, n)$ is $m \log(\frac{m}{n} + 1)$. In this case, our final objective is:

$$\min_{m, t_1, \dots, t_{m-1}} \sum_{i=1}^m \text{var}(t_{i-1}, t_i) + g(m, n) \quad (4)$$

In order to solve Equation 1 and 4, we first compute the kernel for each pair of descriptors. We use a dot-product kernel in practice. Then the segment variances are computed for each possible starting point and segment duration. Finally, we use dynamic programming to minimize the objective and find the change points. Refer to [30] for more details.

3.2. Adaptive sampling with KTS

KTS algorithm yields a set of change points $x_{t_1}, \dots, x_{t_{m-1}}$ which decompose the video into m segments. Note that unlike shot boundary detection methods which focus on local differences between consecutive frames, KTS takes into account the differences between all pairs of frames. Therefore it provides semantically consistent and general segments. To represent each segment we uniformly sample k frames from it. Long-form video models often consist of a backbone to process short-range clips and an aggregation mechanism (e.g. via a transformer or simple averaging). We feed sampled frames from each segment to the clip-level model which learns the representation for each segment/scene. The aggregation mechanism then combines scene-level information to obtain a global video-level representation. This is in line with how humans perceive videos. Despite its simplicity, we show that our sampling approach achieves state-of-the-art performance on long-form video modeling and outperforms existing samplers on several tasks and benchmarks.

3.3. Discussion

As explained in Sec. 2 there are several other adaptive sampling techniques proposed in the literature. Our approach differs from these samplers in several ways. KTS-based sampling is generic and can be applied to various downstream tasks without training on them. However, existing samplers are task-specific and are often limited to video classification. We show in our experiments that our approach outperforms existing samplers on the video classification task. Unlike current approaches which disregard large portions of the video, KTS-based sampling minimizes loss of information as it samples from all the segments. This makes our approach well-suited for tasks such as action localization which need to preserve local information.

4. Experiments

In this section, we present our experiments and results. We focus on video classification and temporal action localization tasks. We perform temporal action localization and

classification on the ActivityNet [8] dataset, and video classification on the Breakfast dataset [21] and the LVU Benchmark [38]. We also perform ablation experiments to show the impact of the number of frames used for video classification, number of change points estimated by KTS, and the backbone used as the feature extractor.

4.1. Datasets

Breakfast [21] is a human activity dataset focused on cooking-oriented actions. It comprises of 10 categories of cooking breakfast. It contains 1712 videos in total with 1357 for training and 335 for testing. The average length of a video is 2.3 minutes. The cooking actions were performed by 52 actors with 44 for training and 8 for testing. This makes the task more challenging since the actors performing the actions during test time are not seen during training.

LVU (long-form video understanding benchmark) [38] is compiled from the publicly available MovieClips dataset [1] which contains around 30,000 short movie snippets. The benchmarks consist of 9 diverse tasks that require long-form video understanding. These tasks could be mainly categorized into content understanding (*'relationship', 'speaking style', 'scene/place'*), movie metadata prediction (*'director', 'genre', 'writer', 'movie release year'*) and user engagement prediction (*'YouTube like ratio', 'YouTube popularity'*). Content understanding and movie metadata prediction can be considered as classification tasks hence are evaluated using the top-1 accuracy metric and user engagement prediction is a regression task and is evaluated using mean squared error (MSE). Each video is generally one to three minutes long. For both Breakfast and LVU datasets, we follow the training configuration suggested in ViS4mer.

ActivityNet [8] dataset contains around 20,000 untrimmed videos spanning 200 action classes of daily activities. The average length of a video is 117 seconds, and the average length of action segments is 48 seconds. Thus it can be considered as a long-form video dataset. Following the standard practice [2, 44], we train on the training split of the dataset and evaluate on the validation split. We report average $mAP@[0.5 : 0.05 : 0.95]$ similar to Actionformer [44] for fair comparison.

4.2. Video Classification

We perform video classification experiments on Breakfast [21] and LVU [38] datasets to study the effectiveness of KTS-based adaptive sampling.

Baseline: We adopt the recently introduced ViS4mer [18] as the baseline model to evaluate the performance of KTS-based adaptive sampling against the uniform sampling on

Table 1: Video Classification results on Breakfast. We evaluate KTS-based sampling against uniform sampling with ViS4mer [18] as the baseline. Our approach achieves state-of-the-art performance with significantly less computation.

Method	Frames	Accuracy
VideoGraph [15]	64×8	69.50
Timeception [16]	1024×8	71.30
GHRM [48]	64×8	75.49
ViS4mer [18]	32×32	85.63
ViS4mer [18]	512×32	88.17
ViS4mer + KTS (Ours)	32×32	89.86

video classification tasks. ViS4mer is a long-range video classification model comprised of a standard Transformer encoder [7, 26] and a multi-scale temporal S4 [13] decoder. It extracts features from input video tokens using the Transformer encoder which are then fed to the multi-scale S4 decoder that learns hierarchical spatio-temporal video representations. ViS4mer uses Vision Transformer [7] to extract features for experiments on the LVU benchmark and uses Video Swin Transformer [26] to extract features in experiments on the Breakfast dataset. Despite innovation in the modeling aspect, ViS4mer leverages uniform sampling to tokenize the input video. We adopt KTS-based adaptive sampling in both settings owing to its task-agnostic nature.

Implementation Details: Given a video, we downsample it to one frame per second and use the downsampled frames as candidates for computing the change points. We use GoogleNet [34] pre-trained on ImageNet-1K for extracting the feature descriptors. We sample $m \times k$ frames for each video as described in Sec. 3.2, and the sampled frames are then fed to the video classification model.

Results: Table. 1 demonstrates the video classification results on the Breakfast dataset. We observe that KTS-based adaptive sampling achieves state-of-the-art results on the Breakfast dataset while utilizing $16 \times$ fewer frames per video compared to the original ViS4mer baseline which uses uniform sampling. When compared with uniform sampling using the same setting [32×32], we observe a significant gain of 4.23% in terms of accuracy with KTS-based adaptive sampling, showing its superiority over uniform sampling.

Table. 2 shows the results on the LVU benchmark. KTS-based adaptive sampling achieves state-of-the-art performance on 7 out of 9 tasks and outperforms uniform sampling in 8 out of 9 tasks. In particular, in the *scene prediction* under content understanding task of the benchmark, KTS-based tokenization yields a performance boost of 12.79% while in the *genre prediction* task under movie metadata prediction, KTS-based tokenization outperforms

uniform sampling with a significant margin of 11.15%. Similar performance gains can be observed consistently throughout different tasks on the benchmark. Note that the LVU benchmark is more challenging than the Breakfast dataset. The tasks in LVU require long-term dependencies to be captured carefully, where the current short-range video models are proven to fail even with strong pre-training mechanisms [38]. KTS-based input tokenization shows promising performance consistently throughout the benchmark which states the need to perform an adaptive sampling strategy to process long-form videos.

4.3. Temporal Action Localization

Temporal Action localization (TAL) aims to identify the action instances present in a video in the temporal domain and recognize the action categories. Despite the steady progress in TAL performance in the modeling aspects (e.g., action proposals [24], pretraining [2], single-stage TAL [44]), uniform sampling is adopted as the de facto sampling approach in most of the action localization models. We analyze the impact of the KTS-based adaptive sampling mechanism on action localization.

Baseline: We investigate the performance of KTS-based sampling on the strong Actionformer [44] baseline, which achieves the current state-of-the-art performance on TAL for ActivityNet. It comprises a multi-scale transformer encoder which encodes the sequence of embedded video clip features into a feature pyramid. The feature pyramid is then followed by a classification and a regression head to recognize the action instance and estimate the action boundaries respectively. TSP [2] model pre-trained on ActivityNet video classification task is used to extract non-overlapping clip-level features. Refer to [44] for a complete description of Actionformer.

Implementation Details: Given a video, we downsample it to one frame per second when computing the KTS change points and use ResNet-50 [14] pre-trained on ImageNet-1K to extract feature descriptors for KTS computation. We adopt a similar training configuration as the Actionformer to study the impact of KTS-based adaptive sampling in TAL. Actionformer employs clips of 16 frames at a frame rate of 15 fps and a stride of 16 frames (i.e., non-overlapping clips) as input to the feature extractor followed by the localization module. This gives one feature vector per $\frac{16}{15} \approx 1.067$ seconds and $M = \frac{15}{16}T$ segments where T is the video length. We can also consider $\frac{M}{2}, \frac{M}{4}, \dots$ segments by sampling every $2^{nd}, 4^{th}, \dots$ frame. Similarly, we can choose $\frac{M}{2}, \frac{M}{4}, \dots$ segments in our KTS-based sampling strategy. For the baseline, all the segments have the same length while our adaptive sampling technique yields variable-length segments. Within each segment, we uniformly sample 16 frames in both cases. These frames are then fed to the action localization model. Fig. 2 provides a comparison of KTS

Table 2: Evaluation of KTS-based sampling on the LVU benchmark. Our approach shows consistent improvements over uniform sampling on the majority of video understanding tasks.

Method	Content (↑)			Metadata (↑)			User (↓)		
	Relation	Speak	Scene	Director	Genre	Writer	Year	Like	Views
SlowFast + NL [10]	52.40	35.80	54.70	44.90	53.00	36.30	52.50	0.38	3.77
VideoBERT [33]	52.80	37.90	54.90	47.30	51.90	38.50	36.10	0.32	4.46
Object Transformer [38]	53.10	39.40	56.90	51.20	54.60	34.50	39.10	0.23	3.55
ViS4mer [18]	57.24	40.79	67.44	62.62	54.71	48.8	44.75	0.26	3.63
ViS4mer + KTS (Ours)	59.52	40.79	80.23	69.16	65.86	54.16	<u>48.25</u>	0.29	3.29




Figure 2: KTS vs Uniform sampling comparison on ActivityNet Action Localization. We report average mAP when varying the number of segments. M corresponds to the number of segments when each segment length is $\frac{16}{15}$ seconds as used in the Actionformer baseline.

vs. uniform sampling, showing improved performance, especially for smaller number of segments.

Results: Fig. 2 shows the empirical analysis of KTS-based sampling on TAL. Note that the performance gain of using KTS-based adaptive sampling is clearly observed for smaller number of segments (e.g., $\frac{M}{3}$ and below), and the gap in performance increases when reducing the number of segments. In particular, for $\frac{M}{6}$ segments uniform sampling achieves 31.05% average mAP while KTS-based sampling attains 32.58% average mAP on ActivityNet, yielding 1.53% gain. For larger number of segments, the performance of KTS is nearly similar to uniform sampling. For M segments, KTS reduces to uniform sampling as there are M change point candidates when using one frame per second for sampling candidates. Similarly, for $\frac{M}{2}$ we select half of the candidates as change points, which makes it quite similar to uniform sampling.

4.4. Comparison with Existing Adaptive Sampling Methods

Table. 3 compares KTS-based adaptive tokenization with existing efficient frame sampling methods for video

Table 3: Comparison of our approach with existing adaptive sampling strategies on ActivityNet video classification.

Method	Backbone	mAP (%)	GFLOPs
NSNet [41]	ResNet-101	74.9	73.2
AdaFrame [40]	ResNet-101	71.5	78.7
LiteEval [39]	ResNet-101	72.7	95.1
KTS (Ours) (84×84) [8 frames]	ResNet-101	80.9	67.1
Uniform	ResNet-50	72.5	65.8
Random	ResNet-50	71.2	65.8
SCSampler [20]	ResNet-50	72.9	41.9
AdaMML [29]	ResNet-50	73.9	94.0
AR-Net [28]	ResNet-50	73.8	33.5
ListenToLook [11]	ResNet-50	72.3	81.4
OCSampler [23]	ResNet-50	79.8	67.2
KTS (Ours) (84×84) [6 frames]	ResNet-50	74.8	29.7
KTS (Ours) (84×84) [8 frames]	ResNet-50	80.0	32.1
KTS (Ours) (112×112) [8 frames]	ResNet-50	80.3	37.4

classification on the ActivityNet dataset. We use MobileNetV2 [32] pre-trained on ImageNet-1K to extract the features. For a fair comparison with previous methods in terms of accuracy and computational cost, we initially uniformly sample 16 frames resized to a smaller resolution (e.g., 112×112) in a given video as the change point candidates and estimate change points. We sample one frame within each segment and train the ResNet50 classifier (pre-trained on Imagenet-1K) for video classification on ActivityNet. Our results show that KTS-based sampling yields a competitive performance when compared to existing adaptive sampling approaches. In particular, KTS-based sampling improves the classification accuracy by 1.03% over AR-Net [28] while minimizing the computational cost by 3.8 GFLOPs. KTS algorithm incurs only around 0.004 GFLOPs in our experiments which is comparatively negligible to the computational cost incurred by ResNet50 and MobileNetV2. KTS-based sampling method also outperforms OCSampler [23] while incurring significantly less computation.

4.5. Ablation and Analysis

In this section, we perform ablation experiments to show the impact of the number of frames used for video classification, number of change points estimated by KTS, and the backbone used as the feature extractor.




Figure 3: KTS vs Uniform sampling comparison on classification tasks of the LVU benchmark by varying the number of input frames. Consistent performance gain shows the effectiveness of KTS-based adaptive sampling over standard uniform sampling.

Table 4: Impact of the number of change points in KTS-based adaptive video tokenization. We analyze the performance of our sampling approach on Breakfast video classification for different configurations of the number of change points. m : Number of video segments., k : Number of frames selected to process within each segment.

Total Frames	$m \times k$	Uniform	KTS	Δ
256	16×16	78.87	81.69	+2.82%
	32×8	81.13	84.51	+3.38%
512	16×32	80.56	84.51	+3.95%
	32×16	83.09	88.17	+5.08%
1024	64×8	83.66	87.04	+3.38%
	32×32	85.63	89.86	+4.23%
	64×16	85.63	86.76	+1.13%

4.5.1 Impact of the number of frames

We evaluate KTS-based adaptive sampling against uniform sampling on Breakfast and LVU dataset. We vary the number of input frames per video used for the classification us-




Figure 4: KTS vs Uniform sampling comparison on Breakfast video classification with a varying number of frames.

ing both the sampling approach. Fig. 3 presents the results on the LVU benchmark on four tasks: scene prediction, genre prediction, writer prediction, and director pre-




Figure 5: KTS vs Uniform sampling comparison on the view count prediction task of LVU benchmark.

diction. We vary the number of frames sampled for modeling. KTS-based adaptive sampling yields a consistent performance gain over standard uniform sampling in all configurations.

Fig. 4 demonstrates the results on Breakfast dataset. KTS-based adaptive sampling shows consistent performance gain over uniform sampling in all settings. In particular, KTS-based sampling gives an accuracy of 84.51% when using 256 frames for each video in the 32×8 setting while uniformly sampling 512 frames yields 83.09% in the same setting. This shows KTS-based tokenization not only improves the performance but also requires significantly less number of frames to process when compared to uniform sampling. Table. 1 also validates this claim where KTS-based adaptive input tokenization achieves state-of-the-art performance on Breakfast video classification with $(1/16)^{th}$ number of frames as that of uniform sampling.

Table. 4 reports the empirical results on different configurations of change points for a given number of frames input to the model. We observe that increasing the number of change points improves the performance of the model up to a certain point. We also observe that KTS-based sampling consistently achieves significantly better performance compared to uniform sampling when compared in the same setting over all configurations. In particular, we obtain a performance gain of 4.23% in the 32×32 setting where the number of change points estimated by the KTS algorithm is 31. Similarly, 5.08% boost is observed in 32×16 configuration over uniform sampling in the ViS4mer baseline.

Fig. 5 demonstrates the results on the regression task (view count prediction) of the LVU benchmark. We vary the number of frames sampled for modeling. KTS-based adaptive sampling consistently achieves lower mean-squared error (MSE) compared to uniform sampling across different configuration settings.

Table 5: Impact of the feature extractor of KTS on the Breakfast video classification task

$m \times k$	ResNet50	MobileNetv2	GoogleNet
64×8	81.12	83.38	87.04
32×16	81.41	83.94	88.17

4.5.2 Impact of the feature extractor on KTS

We investigate the choice of feature extractor in the KTS algorithm in Table. 5. We consider three standard image feature extractors namely: ResNet50 [14], MobileNetv2 [32] and GoogleNet [34]. We use the pre-trained models after discarding the final classification layer. We observe that in both 32×16 and 64×8 settings, the GoogleNet backbone produces better results on the Breakfast dataset. Hence, similar to the choice of the number of frames, the choice of feature extractor plays a significant role in the KTS algorithm.

5. Limitations and Future Work

We identify two major limitations of KTS based input tokenization in long-form video understanding: (1) KTS, as a kernel based change point detection algorithm, is not learnable. The segmentation defects happening in KTS would directly affect the downstream task performance. However, learning change points specific to a task (*e.g.*, video classification on Breakfast) can make transferability limited. We plan to investigate a learnable alternative to our current approach in the future. (2) While KTS performs superior to uniform sampling in several training configurations as shown in our analysis, the optimal choice of number of change points and the choice of feature extractor for KTS-based sampling still remains to be hand-picked. A possible future direction could be to investigate a learnable mechanism to select the optimal number of change points for a given video.

6. Conclusion

In this work, we present an adaptive and task-agnostic frame sampling mechanism for long-form video modeling. Our approach leverages Kernel Temporal Segmentation (KTS) to generate semantically-consistent segments used for sampling frames. We perform a comprehensive set of experiments on video classification and temporal action localization on several long-form video understanding datasets and benchmarks and show the superiority of KTS-based adaptive sampling against existing sampling strategies. In spite of its simplicity, our sampling approach achieves state-of-the-art performance on long-form video understanding benchmarks while being efficient. We plan to explore other variants of adaptive sampling based on temporal segmentation, which could operate in a learnable man-

ner, in the future.

References

- [1] Movieclips. <https://www.youtube.com/c/MOVIECLIPS>.
- [2] Humam Alwassel, Silvio Giancola, and Bernard Ghanem. TSP: Temporally-sensitive pretraining of video encoders for localization tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops*, pages 3173–3183, 2021.
- [3] Anurag Arnab, Mostafa Dehghani, Georg Heigold, Chen Sun, Mario Lučić, and Cordelia Schmid. Vivit: A video vision transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 6836–6846, 2021.
- [4] Max Bain, Arsha Nagrani, Andrew Brown, and Andrew Zisserman. Condensed movies: Story based retrieval with contextual embeddings. In *Proceedings of the Asian Conference on Computer Vision*, 2020.
- [5] Joao Carreira and Andrew Zisserman. Quo vadis, action recognition? a new model and the kinetics dataset. In *proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6299–6308, 2017.
- [6] Jeffrey Donahue, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Sergio Guadarrama, Marcus Rohrbach, Subhashini Venugopalan, Kate Saenko, and Trevor Darrell. Long-term recurrent convolutional networks for visual recognition and description. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2625–2634, 2015.
- [7] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [8] Bernard Ghanem Fabian Caba Heilbron, Victor Escorcia and Juan Carlos Niebles. Activitynet: A large-scale video benchmark for human activity understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 961–970, 2015.
- [9] Haoqi Fan, Bo Xiong, Karttikeya Mangalam, Yanghao Li, Zhicheng Yan, Jitendra Malik, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. Multiscale vision transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 6824–6835, 2021.
- [10] Christoph Feichtenhofer, Haoqi Fan, Jitendra Malik, and Kaiming He. Slowfast networks for video recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, October 2019.
- [11] Ruohan Gao, Tae-Hyun Oh, Kristen Grauman, and Lorenzo Torresani. Listen to look: Action recognition by previewing audio. In *CVPR*, 2020.
- [12] Amir Ghodrati, Babak Ehteshami Bejnordi, and Amirhossein Habibian. Frameexit: Conditional early exiting for efficient video recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15608–15618, 2021.
- [13] Albert Gu, Karan Goel, and Christopher Ré. Efficiently modeling long sequences with structured state spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.00396*, 2021.
- [14] Kaiming He, X. Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 770–778, 2015.
- [15] Noureldien Hussein, Efstratios Gavves, and Arnold WM Smeulders. Videograph: Recognizing minutes-long human activities in videos. In *ICCV Workshop on Scene Graph Representation and Learning*, 2019.
- [16] Noureldien Hussein, Efstratios Gavves, and Arnold W. M. Smeulders. Timeception for complex action recognition. *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 254–263, 2018.
- [17] Haroon Idrees, Amir R Zamir, Yu-Gang Jiang, Alex Gorban, Ivan Laptev, Rahul Sukthankar, and Mubarak Shah. The thumos challenge on action recognition for videos “in the wild”. *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, 155:1–23, 2017.
- [18] Md Mohaiminul Islam and Gedas Bertasius. Long movie clip classification with state-space video models. In Shai Avidan, Gabriel Brostow, Moustapha Cissé, Giovanni Maria Farinella, and Tal Hassner, editors, *Computer Vision – ECCV 2022*, pages 87–104, 2022.
- [19] Andrej Karpathy, George Toderici, Sanketh Shetty, Thomas Leung, Rahul Sukthankar, and Li Fei-Fei. Large-scale video classification with convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1725–1732, 2014.
- [20] Bruno Korbar, Du Tran, and Lorenzo Torresani. Scsampl: Sampling salient clips from video for efficient action recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 6232–6242, 2019.
- [21] H. Kuehne, A. B. Arslan, and T. Serre. The language of actions: Recovering the syntax and semantics of goal-directed human activities. In *Proceedings of Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference (CVPR)*, 2014.
- [22] Yanghao Li, Chao-Yuan Wu, Haoqi Fan, Karttikeya Mangalam, Bo Xiong, Jitendra Malik, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. Mvitv2: Improved multiscale vision transformers for classification and detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4804–4814, 2022.
- [23] Jintao Lin, Haodong Duan, Kai Chen, Dahua Lin, and Limin Wang. Ocsampler: Compressing videos to one clip with single-step sampling. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13894–13903, 2022.
- [24] Tianwei Lin, Xiao Liu, Xin Li, Errui Ding, and Shilei Wen. Bmn: Boundary-matching network for temporal action proposal generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 3889–3898, 2019.
- [25] Xiaolong Liu, Qimeng Wang, Yao Hu, Xu Tang, Shiwei Zhang, Song Bai, and Xiang Bai. End-to-end temporal action detection with transformer. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing (TIP)*, 2022.

- [26] Ze Liu, Jia Ning, Yue Cao, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Han Hu. Video swin transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3202–3211, 2022.
- [27] Behrooz Mahasseni, Michael Lam, and Sinisa Todorovic. Unsupervised video summarization with adversarial lstm networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 202–211, 2017.
- [28] Yue Meng, Chung-Ching Lin, Rameswar Panda, Prasanna Sattigeri, Leonid Karlinsky, Aude Oliva, Kate Saenko, and Rogerio Feris. Ar-net: Adaptive frame resolution for efficient action recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.15796*, 2020.
- [29] Rameswar Panda, Chun-Fu Richard Chen, Quanfu Fan, Ximeng Sun, Kate Saenko, Aude Oliva, and Rogerio Feris. Adamml: Adaptive multi-modal learning for efficient video recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 7576–7585, 2021.
- [30] Danila Potapov, Matthijs Douze, Zaid Harchaoui, and Cordelia Schmid. Category-specific video summarization. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, Proceedings, Part VI 13*, pages 540–555. Springer, 2014.
- [31] Mrigank Rochan, Linwei Ye, and Yang Wang. Video summarization using fully convolutional sequence networks. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 347–363, 2018.
- [32] Mark Sandler, Andrew Howard, Menglong Zhu, Andrey Zhmoginov, and Liang-Chieh Chen. Mobilenetv2: Inverted residuals and linear bottlenecks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4510–4520, 2018.
- [33] Chen Sun, Austin Myers, Carl Vondrick, Kevin Murphy, and Cordelia Schmid. Videobert: A joint model for video and language representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 7464–7473, 2019.
- [34] Christian Szegedy, Wei Liu, Yangqing Jia, Pierre Sermanet, Scott E. Reed, Dragomir Anguelov, D. Erhan, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Andrew Rabinovich. Going deeper with convolutions. *2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 1–9, 2014.
- [35] Makarand Tapaswi, Yukun Zhu, Rainer Stiefelhagen, Antonio Torralba, Raquel Urtasun, and Sanja Fidler. Movieqa: Understanding stories in movies through question-answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4631–4640, 2016.
- [36] Du Tran, Heng Wang, Lorenzo Torresani, and Matt Feiszli. Video classification with channel-separated convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 5552–5561, 2019.
- [37] Xiaolong Wang, Ross Girshick, Abhinav Gupta, and Kaiming He. Non-local neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7794–7803, 2018.
- [38] Chao-Yuan Wu and Philipp Krahenbuhl. Towards long-form video understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1884–1894, 2021.
- [39] Zuxuan Wu, Caiming Xiong, Yu-Gang Jiang, and Larry S Davis. Liteeval: A coarse-to-fine framework for resource efficient video recognition. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [40] Zuxuan Wu, Caiming Xiong, Chih-Yao Ma, Richard Socher, and Larry S Davis. Adaframe: Adaptive frame selection for fast video recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1278–1287, 2019.
- [41] Boyang Xia, Wenhao Wu, Haoran Wang, Rui Su, Dongliang He, Haosen Yang, Xiaoran Fan, and Wanli Ouyang. Nsnet: Non-saliency suppression sampler for efficient video recognition. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XXXIV*, pages 705–723. Springer, 2022.
- [42] Ting Yao, Tao Mei, and Yong Rui. Highlight detection with pairwise deep ranking for first-person video summarization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 982–990, 2016.
- [43] Joe Yue-Hei Ng, Matthew Hausknecht, Sudheendra Vijayanarasimhan, Oriol Vinyals, Rajat Monga, and George Toderici. Beyond short snippets: Deep networks for video classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2015.
- [44] Chen-Lin Zhang, Jianxin Wu, and Yin Li. Actionformer: Localizing moments of actions with transformers. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 492–510, 2022.
- [45] Ke Zhang, Wei-Lun Chao, Fei Sha, and Kristen Grauman. Video summarization with long short-term memory. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part VII 14*, pages 766–782. Springer, 2016.
- [46] Yin-Dong Zheng, Zhaoyang Liu, Tong Lu, and Limin Wang. Dynamic sampling networks for efficient action recognition in videos. *IEEE transactions on image processing*, 29:7970–7983, 2020.
- [47] Yuan Zhi, Zhan Tong, Limin Wang, and Gangshan Wu. Mgsampler: An explainable sampling strategy for video action recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1513–1522, 2021.
- [48] Jiaming Zhou, Kun-Yu Lin, Haoxin Li, and Wei-Shi Zheng. Graph-based high-order relation modeling for long-term action recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8984–8993, 2021.
- [49] Wencheng Zhu, Jiwen Lu, Jiahao Li, and Jie Zhou. Dsnet: A flexible detect-to-summarize network for video summarization. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 30:948–962, 2020.