

HAVTR: Improving Video-Text Retrieval Through Augmentation Using Large Foundation Models

Yimu Wang¹, Shuai Yuan², Xiangru Jian¹, Wei Pang¹, Mushi Wang¹, and Ning Yu³

¹ University of Waterloo

² Duke University

³ Netflix

Abstract While recent progress in video-text retrieval has been driven by the exploration of powerful model architectures and training strategies, the representation learning ability of video-text retrieval models is still limited due to low-quality and scarce training data annotations. To address this issue, we present a novel video-text learning paradigm, HAVTR, which augments video and text data to learn more generalized features. Specifically, we first adopt a simple augmentation method, which generates self-similar data by randomly duplicating or dropping subwords and frames. In addition, inspired by the recent advancement in visual and language generative models, we propose a more powerful augmentation method through textual paraphrasing and video stylization using large language models (LLMs) and visual generative models (VGMs). Further, to bring richer information into video and text, we propose a hallucination-based augmentation method, where we use LLMs and VGMs to generate and add new relevant information to the original data. Benefiting from the enriched data, extensive experiments on several video-text retrieval benchmarks demonstrate the superiority of HAVTR over existing methods.

Keywords: Video-Text Retrieval · Augmentation · Generative Models

1 Introduction

Video-Text Retrieval (VTR) [25, 33, 35, 61, 68, 69, 129] is a fundamental task in visual-language understanding [26, 27, 40, 48, 74, 77, 102, 113] and has recently attracted much interest from both academia and industry. The recent progress in VTR is mostly driven by powerful pretraining models [33, 61, 68, 69], improved retrieval methods [2, 20, 44], and the newly emerged large-scale video-language benchmark datasets [9, 23, 114].

Current VTR research [64, 68, 69] mainly focuses on learning a joint feature space across the visual and textual modalities, where video and text data are compared for retrieval. Inspired by the success of CLIP [79], CLIP4Clip [68] finetunes CLIP [80] and investigates three similarity measures for video-sentence contrastive




Figure 1: Existing video retrieval works focus on improving representation learning ability by learning from benchmarks that have many semantically similar data points, as shown in the top rows. It leads to vague annotations and associations between videos and texts, further hindering the representation learning ability of video-text retrieval models. To counteract this issue, in this study, we propose HAVTR. Specifically, instead of learning from original noisy data, HAVTR augments data with three proposed augmentation methods, *i.e.*, simple augmentation, augmentation by text paraphrasing and video stylization (“Aug. by Paraphrasing” in the figure), and augmentation by hallucination (“Aug. by Hallucination” in the figure).

learning, which has achieved satisfying retrieval performance. Subsequently, X-CLIP [70] introduces a novel multi-grained contrastive learning framework to further enhance the detailed association between video and text modalities. Many other methods have also been proposed to improve VTR through better modeling or training techniques [7, 24, 43, 61, 64, 70, 78, 106, 109, 129].

Nevertheless, issues still exist on the data side. Most methods are trained using datasets with one-to-one video-text labels, assuming that the video and text data can be well-aligned one-to-one in the same feature space. However, this assumption may not hold tight [105] because in real applications one video could be interpreted by multiple different valid sentences, and vice versa. One example is shown in Fig. 1. In the training dataset, the basketball video in Fig. 1 is labeled as “various young people play challenging games of basketball”, although it can also be matched with many other semantically similar sentences such as “guy putting the basketball into the basket” or “a man shooting basketball into a hoop on an indoor basketball court”. There also exist many other videos that can correspond to the same current text label. Since most existing VTR benchmarks are based on datasets that are originally collected for other specific tasks (*e.g.*,

video captioning) [9, 23, 115], the label pairs provided are usually one-to-one and thus cannot reflect the one-to-many nature between video and text.

To solve this data issue, in this paper, we propose a simple yet effective framework, namely HAVTR, to augment data to enrich the one-to-one matching between video and text. As shown in Fig. 1, though videos and texts have many semantically similar neighbors, they still differ from each other with minor differences. Motivated by the success of data augmentation for better representation learning in computer vision and natural language processing, we utilize data augmentation to enlarge the minor differences between semantically similar data and then make them different from each other.

Specifically, we first introduce a simple augmentation method, which generates semantically similar videos and texts through random duplication or deletion of frames or subwords. Our experiments show that even such a simple augmentation method can improve the text-to-video Recall @1 on MSR-VTT from 46.1 to 50.8. Moreover, inspired by the success of the latest large foundation models such as large language models (LLMs) [4, 36, 91, 92] and visual generative models (VGMs) [3, 85, 96, 128], we utilize these models off-the-shelf and propose two augmentation strategies, *i.e.*, augmentation by text paraphrasing and video stylization (ATPVS) and augmentation by hallucination (AH). ATPVS employs off-the-shelf large models to generate semantically similar videos and text by stylization (*e.g.*, cartoon style) and/or paraphrasing. In addition, to infuse video and text with richer information, we introduce a hallucination-based augmentation method, where video and texts are expanded with imaginary information. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to exploit the latest foundation models to augment data for video-text retrieval.

To understand how our proposed augmentation methods improve video-text retrieval performance, extensive experiments on three representative video-text retrieval benchmarks highlight the superiority of HAVTR compared with previous methods.

In summary, our contributions are as follows,

- We identify the challenge of video-text retrieval as the ambiguous one-to-one labels that hinder learning robust representations. We explore augmentation techniques along several dimensions as a way to address this challenge.
- Our proposed HAVTR includes three augmentation methods, *i.e.*, simple augmentation (SA), augmentation by text paraphrasing and video stylization (ATPVS), and augmentation by hallucination (AH). We are among the pioneer work to utilize the latest large language models and visual generative models to assist augmentation for video-text retrieval.
- Extensive experiments show that HAVTR achieves state-of-the-art performances on three popular benchmarks MSR-VTT, MSVD, and ActivityNet.

2 Related Works

Video-Text Retrieval (VTR). VTR, which involves cross-modal alignment and abstract understanding of temporal images (videos), has been a popular

and fundamental task of language-grounding problems [100, 103, 104, 123]. Most existing conventional video-text retrieval frameworks [15, 20, 22, 30, 51, 72, 125, 132] focus on learning powerful representations for video and text and extracting separated representations. Inspired by the success of self-supervised pretraining methods [5, 18, 81] and vision-language pretraining [31, 58, 88] on large-scale unlabeled cross-modal data, recent works [13, 33, 35, 41, 52, 69, 77, 95, 98, 99, 101, 106, 129] have attempted to pre-train or fine-tune video-text retrieval models in an end-to-end manner. CLIP4Clip [68] finetunes models and investigates three similarity calculation approaches for video-sentence contrastive learning on CLIP [80]. Previous methods have focused on improving the representation learning ability by advanced architectures. However, due to the nature of benchmarks [9, 23, 114], learning from such benchmarks makes the learning procedure unstable. To address this issue, we propose to augment data using large language models and visual generative models.

Learning from data augmentation. In the past few years, the development of computer vision and natural language processing has been mainly advanced by the progress of deep network architectures [19, 38, 93], great computing power, and access to big data [6, 17, 60]. However, the lack of high-quality benchmarks in some areas hinders the development of corresponding research. Data augmentation [119], as an effective way to improve the sufficiency and diversity of training data, has become a necessary part of the successful application of computer vision [12, 63, 71, 126] and natural language processing [49, 107, 116, 130]. Similar to these methods, we first introduce a simple augmentation method that randomly duplicates and drops frames and words to generate self-similar data.

Learning from synthetic data. As the emergence of language and visual generative models [3, 4, 36, 85, 91, 92, 96, 128], generating data for learning representation has attracted extensive attention recently. In natural language processing, large language models have been used for generating data and labels [14, 47, 122] for a while. It shows an impressive ability to help researchers collect high-quality domain-specific data [57, 111]. On the other side, the attempt to use visual generative models to train models without any human-annotated data succeeds in image segmentation [28], domain adaptation [90], and more [8, 89, 118, 127]. Drawing inspiration from these works, we leverage generative models to augment data by caption paraphrasing and video stylization with hallucinated information conditioned on the original data for a better representation learning ability.

3 Method

In this section, we first give the definition of video-text retrieval, and then present the details of HAVTR along with three proposed simple but effective augmentation methods as shown in Fig. 1.

3.1 Problem Definition

In this paper, we focus on video-text retrieval (VTR), aiming to learn a pair of encoders that map data from video and text into a common space where they can

be directly compared. The query and gallery modalities are denoted as \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} . The (test) gallery, denoted by $G = \{\mathbf{g}_1, \dots, \mathbf{g}_{N_G}\}$, contains all the embeddings of the gallery data, where N_G is the size of the gallery data. In VTR, the gallery data does not overlap with the training data. A video is composed of several frames, as $V = [V_1, \dots, V_{N_{frames}}]$, where N_{frames} is the number of frames of that video, and V_i is the i -th frame of that video. A text is represented by multiple words, as $T = [T_1, \dots, T_{N_{words}}]$, where N_{words} is the number of (sub-)words, and T_i is the i -th (sub-)word. The goal of VTR is to learn a video encoder $f_{video}(\cdot)$ and a text encoder $f_{text}(\cdot)$ that map video and text into a common space, on which paired video-text data are close.

3.2 HAVTR

The motivation of HAVTR is that low-quality benchmarks [115] lead to unsatisfying representation learning as the simple self-augmenting method improves the retrieval performance shown in Fig. 1. Inspired by the results, we propose three simple but effective data augmentation methods to enrich data and further boost retrieval performance, as shown in Fig. 1.

Specifically, for each video V and text T , we augment it by generating positive views as \tilde{V} and \tilde{T} . Then, instead of doing multi-query retrieval, we concatenate the positive views with the original data for a fair comparison with previous methods. After that, we use a representative VTR method, *i.e.*, X-CLIP [70], as our learning method for aligning video and text spaces.

Augmentation 1: Simple Augmentation (SA). The first one focuses on generating self-similar data without any prior. A simple implementation is randomly duplicating and dropping some frames and words without changing the original order. Specifically, denoting the original video and text as $V = [V_1, \dots, V_{N_{frames}}]$ and $T = [T_1, \dots, T_{N_{words}}]$, we sample \tilde{N}_{frame} frames or \tilde{N}_{words} words with replacement to form the augmented videos \tilde{V} and texts \tilde{T} .

For example, for a 2-frame video $V = [V_1, V_2]$, we will have three different augmentations, *i.e.*, $[V_1, V_1]$, $[V_2, V_2]$, and $[V_1, V_2]$. Similarly, for a 2-subword text $T = [T_1, T_2]$, we also have three different augmentations, *i.e.*, $[T_1, T_1]$, $[T_2, T_2]$, and $[T_1, T_2]$. During training, we randomly choose one augmentation for training the model, while during inference, we concatenate them together to extract video and text embedding for evaluation.

Augmentation 2: Augmentation by Text Paraphrasing and Video Stylization (ATPVS)

The goal of HAVTR is to add as many as possible details in the video and text to enrich the data and thus further improve the representation learning ability for boosting retrieval performance. One straightforward approach to enriching data is generating videos and texts based on data from another modality using multi-modal generative models [16, 29, 53, 54, 83, 97]. That could be useful during training, as this would definitely improve the representation ability of models. However, this method cannot be used for the test time augmentation, as during

inference, the association between videos and texts is actually the target, which cannot be released to the models. That prompts us to focus on generalizations based on a single modality.

Recently, with the emergence of visual generative models (VGMs) and large language models (LLMs), enriching the video and text data by paraphrasing [1] and stylization [128]. Inspired by the advancement in LLMs and VGMs, we propose to use standard foundational LLMs and VGMs for generating the paraphrase of text and a new style of the original video.

Text paraphrasing. Specifically, for augmenting text captions, we use the following prompts,

`This is a hard problem.` The following is a caption from a video: ["text"]. Based on this caption, `carefully generate a paraphrased caption capturing the key information and main themes in one sentence with up to twenty words:`

Our prompt has two specific designs for generating high-quality paraphrased texts, which are essential for VTR as a more detailed caption will boost the retrieval performance by improving the representation learning ability, shown as follows,

Interrogative/instructive hints (`This is a hard problem`). As adding short interrogative/instructive sentences to the beginning of a prompt can improve zero-shot performance [50], we add the short sentence “this is a hard problem” at the beginning of our prompt for generating paraphrases. We found that this generally improved the quality of paraphrased captions.

Style transfer and contextual captions (`carefully generate a paraphrased caption capturing the key information and main themes in one sentence with up to twenty words`). The main goal of this generation technique is to enrich information by paraphrasing. To this end, we add specific guidance on this goal and lead LLMs to generate semantically similar captions.

Video stylization. For augmenting videos, though recent years have witnessed huge progress in video stylization [46, 108, 121] and generation [32, 76, 84, 86], the performance of video generation is still far behind image generation [3, 82, 85, 96, 128] and stylization [45, 59, 62, 120, 131], due to the high requirement of understanding temporal association and story at the same time. On the other side, as video generation methods have high computation requirements, due to the limitation of computational resources, instead of employing off-the-shelf video generation methods [75, 76, 86, 106], we employ image stylization methods [120, 128], which show better performance and efficiency. Specifically, we use each frame of a video as the input of ControlNet [128] and generate semantically similar frames without any text guidance using ControlNet under different predefined stylized text prompts.

Augmentation 3: Augmentation by Hallucination (AH)

While ATPVS shows satisfying retrieval performance, inspired by the halluci-

nation phenomenon in natural language generation and image generation, we propose the third augmentation method, Augmentation by Hallucination (AH), which utilizes the hallucination phenomenon to enrich the visual and language information in the video-text paired data instead of avoiding it.

Text hallucination. Specifically, for augmenting text captions with the hallucinated information, we use the following prompts,

This is a hard problem. The following is a caption from a video: ["text"]. Based on this caption, carefully generate a paraphrased caption capturing the key information and main themes in one sentence with up to twenty words (feel free to add more relevant details based on your knowledge and imagination):

Compared with the prompt used in ATPVS, we have one more special design to incorporate additional information in the hallucinated captions.

Encouraging and surfacing uncertainty (feel free to add more relevant details based on your knowledge and imagination). In our prompt design, we aim to encourage the model to include potential uncertainty in the paraphrased texts. The uncertainty can be seen as semantically similar information, which might be effective for better capturing the key features.

Video hallucination. For augmenting videos, similar to ATPVS, we employ image stylization methods [3, 85, 96, 128], use each frame of a video as the input of the image stylization model, and generate semantically similar frames as augmented views. But to inject hallucinated information, we use ControlNet [128] without any text guidance in guess mode.

3.3 Base Model and Training Objectives

In this part, we present a general video-text retrieval framework widely used by previous methods [61, 68]. With this paradigm, we obtain two representations for video and text modalities, *i.e.*, video representation \mathbf{e}_v and text representation \mathbf{e}_t by modality-dependent encoders $f_{video}(\cdot)$ and $f_{text}(\cdot)$. Then, the similarity between the video and the text $\text{sim}(\mathbf{e}_v, \mathbf{e}_t)$ is calculated by the cosine similarity as,

$$s = \text{cosine}(\mathbf{e}_v, \mathbf{e}_t). \quad (1)$$

Finally, by ranking the data from another modality, we complete the retrieval procedure. Our base model is X-CLIP (ViT-B/32) [69].

The training objective is the contrastive loss. Following Clip4Clip [68], we employ the symmetric InfoNCE loss over the similarity matrix to optimize the retrieval model as,

$$\ell_{sim} = \ell_{v2t} + \ell_{t2v} = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \log \frac{\exp(s_{i,i})}{\sum_{j \in [N]} \exp(s_{i,j})} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \in [N]} \log \frac{\exp(s_{i,i})}{\sum_{j \in [N]} \exp(s_{j,i})},$$

where $s_{i,j}$ is similarity between i -th video and j -th text and N is the number of paired data.

4 Experiments

Benchmarks. To evaluate the proposed HAVTR, we use three representative video-text retrieval benchmarks, *i.e.*, MSR-VTT [114], MSVD [9], and ActivityNet [23].

MSR-VTT [114] contains 10,000 videos with length varying from 10 to 32 seconds, each paired with about 20 human-labeled captions. Following the evaluation protocol from previous works [73, 124], we use the training-9k / test 1k-A splits for training and testing respectively.

MSVD [9] contains 1,970 videos with a split of 1200, 100, and 670 as the train, validation, and test set, respectively. The duration of videos varies from 1 to 62 seconds. Each video is paired with 40 English captions.

ActivityNet [23] is consisted of 20,000 Youtube videos with 100,000 densely annotated descriptions. For a fair comparison, following the previous setting [30, 68], we concatenate all captions together as a paragraph to perform a video-paragraph retrieval task by concatenating all the descriptions of a video. Performances are reported on the “val1” split of the ActivityNet.

Evaluation Protocols. To evaluate the retrieval performance of our proposed HAVTR, we use recall at Rank K (R@K, higher is better), median rank (MdR, lower is better), and mean rank (MnR, lower is better) as retrieval metrics, which are widely used in previous retrieval works [68, 69, 80].

Implementation Details. Our baseline (base model) is X-CLIP [69]. Following [68, 69], we use a standard vision transformer [21] with 12 layers that are initialized with the public CLIP [80] checkpoints. We use SeqTransformer as the temporal encoder similar to [68]. We directly use the text encoder of CLIP as our text encoder which is also initialized with the public CLIP checkpoints. All models are optimized for 5 epochs on MSR-VTT and MSVD, and for ActivityNet, the models are trained for 20 epochs. We use AdamW [66] with a weight decay of 0.2 and decay the learning rate using a cosine schedule [65], following the method used in CLIP [80]. For all experiments, we uniformly sample 12 frames from every video, resizing each frame to 224x224 as per previous works [68, 69]. For text augmentation, we use LLaMA2 [92] while for video frame augmentation, we employ ControlNet [128].

4.1 Quantitative Results

In this part, we present a series of experiments on MSR-VTT, MSVD, and ActivityNet to demonstrate the effectiveness of HAVTR in Tabs. 1 to 3.

MSR-VTT. The results are shown in Tab. 1. HAVTR significantly outperforms all previous methods across different retrieval metrics, achieving remarkable top scores with a Recall@1 of 60.8 and 60.6, Recall@5 of 84.5 and 85.2, and Recall@10 of 91.4 and 92.5, for text-to-video and video-to-text, respectively. This leap in performance highlights the effectiveness of the approach taken by HAVTR, setting a new benchmark for the field.

MSVD. Corresponding results are shown in Tab. 2. With a Text-to-Video Retrieval Recall@1 of 61.6, Recall@5 of 87.1, and Recall@10 of 93.2, alongside a

Table 1: Video-Text retrieval results on MSR-VTT. The best results are marked in bold. “NeurComp” refers to Neurocomputing.

Methods	Venue	Text-to-Video Retrieval					Video-to-Text Retrieval				
		R@1↑	R@5↑	R@10↑	MdR↓	MnR↓	R@1↑	R@5↑	R@10↑	MdR↓	MnR↓
VLM [112]	ACL’21	28.1	55.5	67.4	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	
HERO [55]	EMNLP’21	16.8	43.3	57.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	
VideoCLIP [113]	EMNLP’21	30.9	55.4	66.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	
EvO [87]	CVPR’22	23.7	52.1	63.7	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	
OA-Trans [94]	CVPR’22	35.8	63.4	76.5	3.0	-	-	-	-	-	
RaP [110]	EMNLP’22	40.9	67.2	76.9	2.0	-	-	-	-	-	
LGDN [67]	NeurIPS’22	43.7	71.4	80.3	2.0	-	42.6	71.6	80.6	2.0	
<i>BLIP-based</i>											
LiteVL-S [10]	EMNLP’22	46.7	71.8	81.7	2.0	-	-	-	-	-	
<i>ViT (CLIP)-based</i>											
CLIP [79]	ICML’21	31.2	53.7	64.2	4.0	-	27.2	51.7	62.6	5.0	
CLIP4Clip [68]	NeurComp’22	44.5	71.4	81.6	2.0	15.3	-	-	-	-	
CLIP2Video [77]	Arxiv’21	45.6	72.6	81.7	2.0	14.6	43.5	72.3	82.1	2.0	
CAMoE [13]	Arxiv’21	47.3	74.2	84.5	2.0	11.9	49.1	74.3	84.3	2.0	
CLIP2TV [34]	Arxiv’21	49.3	74.7	83.6	2.0	13.5	46.9	75.0	85.1	2.0	
VCM [7]	AAAI’22	43.8	71.0	-	2.0	14.3	45.1	72.3	82.3	2.0	
DiscreteCodebook [61]	ACL’22	43.4	72.3	81.2	-	14.8	42.5	71.2	81.1	-	
HiSE [95]	ACM MM’22	45.0	72.7	81.3	2.0	-	46.6	73.3	82.3	2.0	
X-Pool [35]	CVPR’22	46.9	72.8	82.2	2.0	14.3	-	-	-	-	
TS2-Net [64]	ECCV’22	47.0	74.5	83.8	2.0	13.0	45.3	74.1	83.7	2.0	
NCL [78]	EMNLP’22	43.9	71.2	81.5	2.0	15.5	44.9	71.8	80.7	2.0	
CenterCLIP [129]	SIGIR’22	44.2	71.6	82.1	2.0	15.1	42.8	71.7	82.2	2.0	
Align&Tell [98]	TMM’22	45.2	73.0	82.9	2.0	-	43.4	70.9	81.8	2.0	
TABLE [11]	AAAI’23	47.1	74.3	82.9	2.0	13.4	47.2	74.2	84.2	2.0	
VOP [39]	CVPR’23	44.6	69.9	80.3	2.0	16.3	44.5	70.7	80.6	2.0	
PIDRo [37]	CVPR’23	48.2	74.9	83.3	2.0	12.6	47.4	74.8	84.1	2.0	
HBI [42]	CVPR’23	48.6	74.6	83.4	2.0	12.0	46.8	74.3	84.3	2.0	
UATVR [24]	CVPR’23	47.5	73.9	83.5	2.0	12.3	46.0	73.7	82.8	2.0	
CLIP-ViP [117]	ICLR’23	55.9	77.0	86.8	1.0	-	59.1	83.9	91.3	1.0	
Cap4Video [109]	ICCV’23	49.3	74.3	83.8	2.0	12.0	47.1	73.7	84.3	2.0	
UCoFiA [106]	ICCV’23	49.4	72.1	-	-	12.9	47.1	74.3	-	-	
ProST [56]	ICCV’23	48.2	74.6	83.4	2.0	12.4	46.3	74.2	83.2	2.0	
DiffusionRet [43]	ICCV’23	49.0	75.2	82.7	2.0	12.1	47.7	73.8	84.5	2.0	
X-CLIP [70] (Baseline)	ACM MM’22	46.1	74.3	83.1	2.0	13.2	46.8	73.3	84.0	2.0	
HAVTR		60.8	84.5	91.4	1.0	5.8	60.6	85.2	92.5	1.0	

Table 2: Text-Video retrieval results on MSVD. The best results are marked in bold.

Methods	Venue	Text-to-Video Retrieval					Video-to-Text Retrieval				
		R@1↑	R@5↑	R@10↑	MdR↓	MnR↓	R@1↑	R@5↑	R@10↑	MdR↓	MnR↓
CLIP4Clip	NeurComp’22	45.2	75.5	84.3	2.0	10.3	62.0	87.3	92.6	1.0	4.3
CLIP2Video	Arxiv’21	47.0	76.8	85.9	2.0	9.6	58.7	85.6	91.6	1.0	4.3
HiSE	ACM MM’22	45.9	76.2	84.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
X-Pool	CVPR’22	47.2	77.4	86.0	-	9.3	-	-	-	-	-
NCL	EMNLP’22	47.8	77.5	85.9	2.0	9.9	69.6	89.9	95.4	1.0	3.3
CenterCLIP	SIGIR’22	47.6	76.8	85.6	2.0	9.9	57.9	83.6	90.5	1.0	5.2
TABLE	AAAI’23	49.9	79.3	87.4	2.0	9.1	-	-	-	-	-
PIDRo	CVPR’23	47.5	77.5	86.0	2.0	9.2	-	-	-	-	-
UATVR	CVPR’23	46.0	76.3	85.1	2.0	10.4	-	-	-	-	-
Cap4Video	ICCV’23	51.8	80.8	88.3	1.0	8.3	-	-	-	-	-
UCoFiA	ICCV’23	47.4	77.6	-	-	9.6	-	-	-	-	-
DiffusionRet	ICCV’23	46.6	75.9	84.1	2.0	15.7	-	-	-	-	-
X-CLIP	ACM MM’22	47.1	77.8	-	-	9.5	60.9	87.8	-	-	4.7
HAVTR		61.6	87.1	93.2	1.0	5.6	71.3	89.4	96.0	1.0	4.0

Table 3: Text-Video retrieval results on ActivityNet. Best in **bold**.

Methods	Venue	Text-to-Video Retrieval					Video-to-Text Retrieval				
		R@1↑	R@5↑	R@10↑	MdR↓	MnR↓	R@1↑	R@5↑	R@10↑	MdR↓	MnR↓
CLIP4Clip	NeurComp’22	40.5	72.4	98.1	2.0	7.4	42.5	74.1	85.8	2.0	6.6
VCM	AAAI’22	40.8	72.8	-	2.0	7.3	42.6	74.9	-	2.0	6.4
TS2-Net	ECCV’22	41.0	73.6	84.5	2.0	8.4	-	-	-	-	-
NCL	EMNLP’22	45.9	76.8	98.3	2.0	6.7	46.8	76.5	86.8	2.0	6.2
Align&Tell	TMM	42.6	73.8	-	2.0	-	43.5	73.6	-	2.0	-
CenterCLIP	SIGIR’22	43.5	75.0	85.9	2.0	6.9	44.5	75.3	86.0	2.0	6.7
PIDRo	CVPR’23	44.9	74.5	86.1	2.0	6.4	-	-	-	-	-
HBI	CVPR’23	42.2	73.0	84.6	2.0	6.6	42.4	73.0	86.0	2.0	6.5
UCoFiA	ICCV’23	45.7	76.0	-	-	6.6	46.3	76.5	-	-	-
DiffusionRet	ICCV’23	45.8	75.6	86.3	2.0	6.5	-	-	-	-	-
X-CLIP	ACM MM’22	44.3	74.1	-	-	7.9	43.9	73.9	-	-	7.6
HAVTR		59.1	82.9	95.3	1.0	5.2	58.4	85.2	88.7	1.0	5.7

Median Rank (MdR) and Mean Rank (MnR) of 1.0 and 5.6 respectively, HAVTR establishes new benchmarks. Similarly, in Video-to-Text Retrieval, it achieves a Recall@1 of 71.3, Recall@5 of 89.4, and Recall@10 of 96.0, with both MdR and MnR impressively set at 1.0 and 4.0.

ActivityNet. Corresponding results are shown in Tab. 3. HAVTR achieves the highest scores across both text-to-video and video-to-text retrieval tasks, with Text-to-Video Retrieval scores of Recall@1 at 59.1, Recall@5 at 82.9, and Recall@10 at 95.3, alongside the lowest Median Rank (MdR) and Mean Rank (MnR) of 1.0 and 5.2, respectively. Similarly, in Video-to-Text Retrieval, HAVTR secures top positions with Recall@1 at 58.4, Recall@5 at 85.2, and Recall@10 at 88.7, with both MdR and MnR impressively at 1.0 and 5.7. These results not only underscore the efficacy of HAVTR in navigating the complex dynamics of ActivityNet’s video-text retrieval but also highlight its significant advancement over other approaches like NCL, CenterCLIP, and UCoFiA, further emphasizing the innovative edge of HAVTR’s retrieval capabilities.

4.2 Qualitative Results

To qualitatively validate the effectiveness of HAVTR, we present examples of augmented data in Figure 2, respectively. For paraphrasing text, we employ LLaMA [92] and OLMo [36]. For generating semantically similar video frames, we use ControlNet [128] and Instruct-Pix2Pix [3]. We notice that for text paraphrasing, both LLaMA and OLMo are able to grasp the main idea based on the input and generate semantically similar texts. For video frame generation, though the generation for a frame is independent of other frames, we still observe that ControlNet can generate frames within a similar style, while the frames generated by Instruct-Pix2Pix are always in different styles. A failure case is the second frame in the last row where a man is holding a human head as a basketball.

Due to the limitation of space, the qualitative results on retrieval are deferred to the Appendix.




Figure 2: Qualitative examples of data generated by HAVTR. “ATPVS” and “AH” refer to augmentation by text paraphrasing and video stylization and augmentation by hallucination.

4.3 Ablation Studies

In this section, we present the ablation studies on HAVTR regarding the number of paraphrased texts and generated videos on MSR-VTT.

Number of paraphrased texts. Tab. 4 offers an insightful look into the effects of varying the number of augmented text on the retrieval performance in the MSR-VTT dataset, utilizing HAVTR with X-CLIP (ViT-B/32) as the base model. With simple augmentation, a gradual increase in performance is seen with the number of texts, peaking at 4 texts for text-to-video retrieval with a Recall@1 of 51.6, and similarly for video-to-text retrieval at 53.9. This suggests that self-generated augmentations contribute positively to the model’s understanding and retrieval capabilities. Moving to augmentation by text paraphrasing and video stylization, the performance leaps further, highlighting the value of leveraging external, sophisticated models to enrich the dataset. The best results are achieved with 3 texts, indicating an optimal balance between augmentation quantity and retrieval efficacy. The last augmentation method, augmentation by hallucination, showcases the most significant performance boosts, especially with 5 texts, achieving the highest Recall@1 of 60.8 for text-to-video and 60.6 for video-to-text retrieval,

Table 4: Retrieval performance with different numbers of augmented captions using three augmentation methods on MSR-VTT. The best results are marked in **bold**.

# of Text	Text-to-Video Retrieval					Video-to-Text Retrieval				
	R@1↑	R@5↑	R@10↑	MdR↓	MnR↓	R@1↑	R@5↑	R@10↑	MdR↓	MnR ↓
Baseline	46.1	74.3	83.1	2.0	13.2	46.8	73.3	84.0	2.0	9.1
<i>Augmentation 1: Simple Augmentation</i>										
1	50.8	76.7	84.6	1.0	11.1	53.6	76.6	85.2	1.0	8.7
2	50.1	75.3	84.1	1.0	12.2	51.3	76.3	84.1	1.0	9.5
3	51.3	77.0	85.5	1.0	11.3	52.9	78.1	85.0	1.0	8.3
4	51.6	76.4	84.7	1.0	11.5	53.9	78.0	84.7	1.0	8.3
5	52.0	76.5	84.7	1.0	11.0	51.2	76.5	85.3	1.0	10.0
<i>Augmentation 2: Augmentation by Text Paraphrasing and Video Stylization</i>										
1	56.1	81.3	89.4	1.0	9.7	52.4	77.3	84.9	1.0	8.0
2	55.7	80.8	88.8	1.0	9.6	53.4	80.4	87.7	1.0	8.3
3	56.0	80.5	88.7	1.0	10.0	55.2	81.4	89.3	1.0	8.0
<i>Augmentation 3: Augmentation by Hallucination</i>										
1	56.7	83.0	90.1	1.0	8.1	56.7	83.1	90.4	1.0	6.5
2	60.1	83.1	90.1	1.0	5.9	57.7	84.2	91.6	1.0	6.2
3	60.4	85.3	91.0	1.0	5.8	60.3	84.1	91.3	1.0	6.6
4	59.2	84.0	91.1	1.0	7.1	57.3	83.8	90.3	1.0	7.4
5	60.8	84.5	91.4	1.0	5.8	60.6	85.2	92.5	1.0	5.9

Table 5: Retrieval performance with different numbers of generated videos using three augmentation methods on MSR-VTT. The best results are marked in **bold**.

# of Video	Text-to-Video Retrieval					Video-to-Text Retrieval				
	R@1↑	R@5↑	R@10↑	MdR↓	MnR↓	R@1↑	R@5↑	R@10↑	MdR↓	MnR ↓
Baseline	46.1	74.3	83.1	2.0	13.2	46.8	73.3	84.0	2.0	9.1
<i>Augmentation 1: Self-Augmenting</i>										
1	50.4	75.8	84.9	1.0	11.2	52.1	76.9	85.0	1.0	9.1
2	48.7	75.6	84.3	2.0	11.4	50.7	76.6	84.2	1.0	8.9
3	50.0	75.0	84.2	1.5	12.4	48.9	76.5	84.4	2.0	9.6
4	49.8	74.4	82.8	2.0	11.6	49.9	74.1	84.3	2.0	10.3
5	50.4	77.2	86.0	1.0	10.7	51.6	77.6	85.4	1.0	8.5
<i>Augmentation 2: Augmentation by Text Paraphrasing and Video Stylization</i>										
1	53.8	80.7	88.6	1.0	9.9	55.6	79.6	88.2	1.0	7.7
2	54.4	79.3	87.4	1.0	10.1	56.4	80.3	87.9	1.0	7.2
3	54.7	80.3	88.9	1.0	9.3	55.3	80.8	87.9	1.0	6.8
<i>Augmentation 3: Augmentation by Hallucination</i>										
1	60.4	84.4	91.4	1.0	6.2	59.3	84.8	91.5	1.0	6.5
2	60.0	84.0	91.2	1.0	6.4	58.8	85.9	91.4	1.0	7.0
3	60.8	84.5	91.4	1.0	5.8	60.6	85.2	92.5	1.0	5.9

along with the best Recall@5, Recall@10, and the lowest MdR and MnR scores. This illustrates the power of hallucination-based augmentation in dramatically enhancing retrieval accuracy by introducing more diverse and complex semantic representations into the training process.

Number of generated videos. Tab. 5 presents an ablation study on the impact of different numbers of generated videos. For simple augmentation, we notice

Table 6: Video-Text retrieval results on MSR-VTT using different LLMs for generating paraphrased captions. The best results are marked in **bold**.

Methods	LLMs	Text-to-Video Retrieval					Video-to-Text Retrieval				
		R@1↑	R@5↑	R@10↑	MdR↓	MnR↓	R@1↑	R@5↑	R@10↑	MdR↓	MnR↓
Baseline	-	46.1	74.3	83.1	2.0	13.2	46.8	73.3	84.0	2.0	9.1
<i>Augmentation 2: Augmentation by Text Paraphrasing and Video Stylization</i>											
HAVTR	LLaMA-2-7b-chat-hf	54.7	80.3	88.9	1.0	9.3	55.3	80.8	87.9	1.0	6.8
	OLMo-7b	53.2	77.9	86.3	1.0	9.8	53.7	77.4	87.2	1.0	7.5
<i>Augmentation 3: Augmentation by Hallucination</i>											
HAVTR	LLaMA-2-7b-chat-hf	60.8	84.5	91.4	1.0	5.8	60.6	85.2	92.5	1.0	5.9
	OLMo-7b	58.7	81.2	89.5	1.0	7.5	59.2	83.7	90.3	1.0	7.1

considerable improvements, particularly with 5 videos, achieving a Text-to-Video Retrieval (T2V) R@1 of 50.4, and a Video-to-Text Retrieval (V2T) R@1 of 51.6. When moving to augmentation by text paraphrasing and video stylization, it further elevates the performance, with the best results observed when using 3 videos, where T2V R@1 reaches 54.7 and V2T R@1 peaks at 56.4. This suggests that leveraging foundation models for augmentation can significantly impact retrieval effectiveness, likely due to the richer, more diverse semantic representations introduced. The last strategy, augmentation by hallucination, achieves the highest T2V R@1 of 60.8 and V2T R@1 of 60.6, alongside the best R@5 and R@10 scores, underscoring the efficacy of hallucination-based augmentation in capturing nuanced, diverse semantic content, thus markedly improving retrieval precision. The progressive increase in retrieval performance across the augmentation strategies, especially with the augmentation by hallucination, highlights the potential of sophisticated, creative augmentation techniques in enhancing the capabilities of text-video retrieval.

Choice of LLM for paraphrasing. To understand how LLMs impact retrieval performance, we also use OLMo [36] for generating paraphrased captions. The results are shown in Tab. 6. The data showcases a notable improvement when using LLMs over the baseline, with LLaMA achieving the highest performance across all metrics, underscoring its superiority in understanding and generating nuanced paraphrased captions that significantly benefit retrieval accuracy. Specifically, LLaMA demonstrates exceptional capability in both augmentation strategies but particularly excels in Augmentation by Hallucination, where it achieves the best recall rates (60.8 in Text-to-Video and 60.6 in Video-to-Text) and the lowest rank metrics (MdR and MnR at 1.0 and 5.8/5.9, respectively). These findings underscore the importance of selecting appropriate LLMs for paraphrase generation in multimedia retrieval tasks, highlighting how advanced models like LLaMA can effectively bridge semantic gaps between text and video content to improve retrieval outcomes.

Choice of image generation methods. To understand how image generation methods impact retrieval performance, we also use Instruct-Pix2Pix [3] for generating video frames. The results are shown in Tab. 7. It underscores the superiority of the ControlNet method in the Augmentation by Hallucination category, marking it with the highest recall scores (60.8 for Text-to-Video and

Table 7: Video-Text retrieval results on MSR-VTT using different image generation methods for generating stylized video frames. The best results are marked in **bold**.

Methods	VGMs	Text-to-Video Retrieval					Video-to-Text Retrieval				
		R@1↑	R@5↑	R@10↑	MdR↓	MnR↓	R@1↑	R@5↑	R@10↑	MdR↓	MnR↓
Baseline	-	46.1	74.3	83.1	2.0	13.2	46.8	73.3	84.0	2.0	9.1
<i>Augmentation 2: Augmentation by Foundation Model</i>											
HAVTR	ControlNet	54.7	80.3	88.9	1.0	9.3	55.3	80.8	87.9	1.0	6.8
	instruct-pix2pix	56.7	83.0	90.1	1.0	8.1	56.7	83.1	90.4	1.0	6.5
<i>Augmentation 3: Augmentation by Hallucination</i>											
HAVTR	ControlNet	60.8	84.5	91.4	1.0	5.8	60.6	85.2	92.5	1.0	5.9
	instruct-pix2pix	57.8	82.9	90.2	1.0	7.9	58.2	81.4	87.8	1.0	8.0

60.6 for Video-to-Text) and the lowest ranks (MdR and MnR of 1.0 and 5.8/5.9, respectively), significantly outperforming the baseline and showcasing the potential of leveraging hallucination techniques in enhancing video-text retrieval tasks. It also highlights the pivotal role of advanced image generation methods in improving the semantic alignment between video and text, offering promising directions for future research in multimedia retrieval.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed a novel video-text learning paradigm, HAVTR, which effectively aligned video and text spaces using generated information conditioned on original data. First, we showed a simple but effective method, self-augmenting, which generated self-similar data without any parameters by randomly duplicating or removing frames and subwords, significantly enhancing representation learning and mitigating overfitting issues commonly observed with current models. Second, inspired by the advancement in large language models (LLMs) and video generative models (VGMs), HAVTR employed a novel augmentation method, augmentation by foundation models, which augmented data through paraphrasing captions and transferring video styles. Last, to enrich video and text data with hallucinated information, we proposed to augment data with hallucination, which encouraged LLMs and VGMs to inject relevant, yet novel information into the generated data. This method significantly enriched the data pool, contributing to the robustness and depth of the learned representations. Finally, comprehensive experiments conducted on several video-text retrieval benchmarks underline the superior performance of HAVTR over existing methods.

Limitations. It would be interesting to test whether the proposed augmentation methods can improve the performance of other models as we only test them on X-CLIP. Moreover, limited by the computation resources, we only use image generation methods to augment videos. It would be interesting to investigate the power of video generation methods that consider temporal association in the input video.

References

1. Bansal, H., Gopalakrishnan, K., Dingliwal, S., Bodapati, S., Kirchhoff, K., Roth, D.: Rethinking the role of scale for in-context learning: An interpretability-based case study at 66 billion scale. In: Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers). pp. 11833–11856 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.660> **6**
2. Bertasius, G., Wang, H., Torresani, L.: Is space-time attention all you need for video understanding? In: Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2021, 18-24 July 2021, Virtual Event. pp. 813–824 (2021) **1**
3. Brooks, T., Holynski, A., Efros, A.A.: Instructpix2pix: Learning to follow image editing instructions. In: CVPR (2023) **3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 13**
4. Brown, T.B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D.M., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., Amodei, D.: Language models are few-shot learners (2020) **3, 4**
5. Brown, T.B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D.M., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., Amodei, D.: Language models are few-shot learners. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual (2020) **4**
6. Caesar, H., Uijlings, J.R.R., Ferrari, V.: COCO-Stuff: Thing and Stuff Classes in Context. In: 2018 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2018, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, June 18-22, 2018. pp. 1209–1218 (2018) **4**
7. Cao, S., Wang, B., Zhang, W., Ma, L.: Visual consensus modeling for video-text retrieval. In: Thirty-Sixth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2022, Thirty-Fourth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2022, The Twelveth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2022 Virtual Event, February 22 - March 1, 2022. pp. 167–175 (2022) **2, 9**
8. Cascante-Bonilla, P., Shehada, K., Smith, J.S., Doveh, S., Kim, D., Panda, R., Varol, G., Oliva, A., Ordonez, V., Feris, R., Karlinsky, L.: Going beyond nouns with vision & language models using synthetic data. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). pp. 20155–20165 (2023) **4**
9. Chen, D., Dolan, W.: Collecting highly parallel data for paraphrase evaluation. In: Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies. pp. 190–200 (2011) **1, 3, 4, 8**
10. Chen, D., Tao, C., Hou, L., Shang, L., Jiang, X., Liu, Q.: LiteVL: Efficient video-language learning with enhanced spatial-temporal modeling. In: Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. pp. 7985–7997 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.545> **9**
11. Chen, Y., Wang, J., Lin, L., Qi, Z., Ma, J., Shan, Y.: Tagging before Alignment: Integrating Multi-Modal Tags for Video-Text Retrieval. In: AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (2023) **9**

12. Chen, Y., Lu, C.: Rankmix: Data augmentation for weakly supervised learning of classifying whole slide images with diverse sizes and imbalanced categories. In: IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2023, Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 17-24, 2023. pp. 23936–23945 (2023) [4](#)
13. Cheng, X., Lin, H., Wu, X., Yang, F., Shen, D.: Improving video-text retrieval by multi-stream corpus alignment and dual softmax loss. *CoRR* (2021) [4](#), [9](#)
14. Chong, D., Hong, J., Manning, C.: Detecting label errors by using pre-trained language models. In: Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. pp. 9074–9091 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.618> [4](#)
15. Croitoru, I., Bogolin, S., Leordeanu, M., Jin, H., Zisserman, A., Albanie, S., Liu, Y.: Teactext: Crossmodal generalized distillation for text-video retrieval. In: 2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2021, Montreal, QC, Canada, October 10-17, 2021. pp. 11563–11573 (2021) [4](#)
16. Daras, G., Dimakis, A.G.: Discovering the hidden vocabulary of DALLE-2. *CoRR* (2022) [5](#)
17. Deng, J., Dong, W., Socher, R., Li, L.J., Li, K., Fei-Fei, L.: ImageNet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In: IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 248–255 (2009) [4](#)
18. Devlin, J., Chang, M.W., Lee, K., Toutanova, K.: BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In: Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers). pp. 4171–4186 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1423> [4](#)
19. Devlin, J., Chang, M.W., Lee, K., Toutanova, K.: BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. arXiv:1810.04805 [cs] (2019) [4](#)
20. Dong, J., Li, X., Xu, C., Ji, S., He, Y., Yang, G., Wang, X.: Dual encoding for zero-example video retrieval. In: IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2019, Long Beach, CA, USA, June 16-20, 2019. pp. 9346–9355 (2019) [1](#), [4](#)
21. Dosovitskiy, A., Beyer, L., Kolesnikov, A., Weissenborn, D., Zhai, X., Unterthiner, T., Dehghani, M., Minderer, M., Heigold, G., Gelly, S., Uszkoreit, J., Houshy, N.: An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In: 9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021 (2021) [8](#)
22. Dzabraev, M., Kalashnikov, M., Komkov, S., Petiushko, A.: MDMMT: multidomain multimodal transformer for video retrieval. In: IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops, CVPR Workshops 2021, virtual, June 19-25, 2021. pp. 3354–3363 (2021) [4](#)
23. Fabian Caba Heilbron, Victor Escorcia, B.G., Niebles, J.C.: Activitynet: A large-scale video benchmark for human activity understanding. In: Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 961–970 (2015) [1](#), [3](#), [4](#), [8](#)
24. Fang, B., Wu, W., Liu, C., Zhou, Y., Song, Y., Wang, W., Shu, X., Ji, X., Wang, J.: UATVR: Uncertainty-adaptive text-video retrieval. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision (ICCV). pp. 13723–13733 (2023) [2](#), [9](#)
25. Fang, X., Liu, D., Zhou, P., Hu, Y.: Multi-modal cross-domain alignment network for video moment retrieval. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* (2022) [1](#)

26. Fang, X., Liu, D., Zhou, P., Nan, G.: You can ground earlier than see: An effective and efficient pipeline for temporal sentence grounding in compressed videos. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 2448–2460 (2023) [1](#)
27. Fang, X., Liu, D., Zhou, P., Xu, Z., Li, R.: Hierarchical local-global transformer for temporal sentence grounding. IEEE Transactions on Multimedia (2023) [1](#)
28. Feng, Q., Gadde, R., Liao, W., Ramon, E., Martinez, A.: Network-free, unsupervised semantic segmentation with synthetic images. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 23602–23610 (2023) [4](#)
29. Feng, Q., Sui, Y., Zhang, H.: Uncovering limitations in text-to-image generation: A contrastive approach with structured semantic alignment. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023. pp. 8876–8888 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.595> [5](#)
30. Gabeur, V., Sun, C., Alahari, K., Schmid, C.: Multi-modal transformer for video retrieval. In: Computer Vision - ECCV 2020 - 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part IV. pp. 214–229 (2020) [4](#), [8](#)
31. Gan, Z., Chen, Y., Li, L., Zhu, C., Cheng, Y., Liu, J.: Large-scale adversarial training for vision-and-language representation learning. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6–12, 2020, virtual (2020) [4](#)
32. Gao, Y., Zhou, Y., Wang, J., Li, X., Ming, X., Lu, Y.: High-fidelity and freely controllable talking head video generation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 5609–5619 (2023) [6](#)
33. Gao, Z., Liu, J., Chen, S., Chang, D., Zhang, H., Yuan, J.: CLIP2TV: an empirical study on transformer-based methods for video-text retrieval. CoRR (2021) [1](#), [4](#)
34. Gao, Z., Liu, J., Sun, W., Chen, S., Chang, D., Zhao, L.: CLIP2TV: Align, Match and Distill for Video-Text Retrieval (2022) [9](#)
35. Gorti, S.K., Vouitsis, N., Ma, J., Golestan, K., Volkovs, M., Garg, A., Yu, G.: X-pool: Cross-modal language-video attention for text-video retrieval. In: IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, June 18–24, 2022. pp. 4996–5005 (2022) [1](#), [4](#), [9](#)
36. Groeneveld, D., Beltagy, I., Walsh, P., Bhagia, A., Kinney, R., Tafjord, O., Jha, A.H., Ivison, H., Magnusson, I., Wang, Y., Arora, S., Atkinson, D., Authur, R., Chandu, K.R., Cohan, A., Dumas, J., Elazar, Y., Gu, Y., Hessel, J., Khot, T., Merrill, W., Morrison, J., Muennighoff, N., Naik, A., Nam, C., Peters, M.E., Pyatkin, V., Ravichander, A., Schwenk, D., Shah, S., Smith, W., Strubell, E., Subramani, N., Wortsman, M., Dasigi, P., Lambert, N., Richardson, K., Zettlemoyer, L., Dodge, J., Lo, K., Soldaini, L., Smith, N.A., Hajishirzi, H.: Olmo: Accelerating the science of language models (2024) [3](#), [4](#), [10](#), [13](#)
37. Guan, P., Pei, R., Shao, B., Liu, J., Li, W., Gu, J., Xu, H., Xu, S., Yan, Y., Lam, E.Y.: Pidro: Parallel isomeric attention with dynamic routing for text-video retrieval. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision. pp. 11164–11173 (2023) [9](#)
38. He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., Sun, J.: Deep Residual Learning for Image Recognition. In: IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 770–778 (2016) [4](#)
39. Huang, S., Gong, B., Pan, Y., Jiang, J., Lv, Y., Li, Y., Wang, D.: VoP: Text-Video Co-Operative Prompt Tuning for Cross-Modal Retrieval. In: Proceedings

- of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 6565–6574 (2023) [9](#)
40. Jian, X., Wang, Y.: Invgc: Robust cross-modal retrieval by inverse graph convolution (2023) [1](#)
 41. Jian, X., Wang, Y.: InvGC: Robust cross-modal retrieval by inverse graph convolution. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023. pp. 836–865 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.60> [4](#)
 42. Jin, P., Huang, J., Xiong, P., Tian, S., Liu, C., Ji, X., Yuan, L., Chen, J.: Video-text as game players: Hierarchical banzhaf interaction for cross-modal representation learning. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition (CVPR). pp. 2472–2482 (2023) [9](#)
 43. Jin, P., Li, H., Cheng, Z., Li, K., Ji, X., Liu, C., Yuan, L., Chen, J.: DiffusionRet: Generative Text-Video Retrieval with Diffusion Model. In: International Conference on Computer Vision (2023) [2, 9](#)
 44. Jin, W., Zhao, Z., Zhang, P., Zhu, J., He, X., Zhuang, Y.: Hierarchical cross-modal graph consistency learning for video-text retrieval. In: SIGIR '21: The 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, Virtual Event, Canada, July 11-15, 2021. pp. 1114–1124 (2021) [1](#)
 45. Kang, M., Lee, D., Kim, J., Kim, S., Han, B.: Variational distribution learning for unsupervised text-to-image generation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 23380–23389 (2023) [6](#)
 46. Khachatryan, L., Movsisyan, A., Tadevosyan, V., Henschel, R., Wang, Z., Navasardyan, S., Shi, H.: Text2video-zero: Text-to-image diffusion models are zero-shot video generators. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). pp. 15954–15964 (2023) [6](#)
 47. Khalifa, M., Abdul-Mageed, M., Shaalan, K.: Self-training pre-trained language models for zero- and few-shot multi-dialectal Arabic sequence labeling. In: Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume. pp. 769–782 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.eacl-main.65> [4](#)
 48. Kim, T., Ahn, P., Kim, S., Lee, S., Marsden, M., Sala, A., Kim, S.H., Han, B., Lee, K.M., Lee, H., Bae, K., Wu, X., Gao, Y., Zhang, H., Yang, Y., Guo, W., Lu, J., Oh, Y., Cho, J.W., jin Kim, D., Kweon, I.S., Kim, J., Kang, W., Jhoo, W.Y., Roh, B., Mun, J., Oh, S., Ak, K.E., Lee, G.G., Xu, Y., Shen, M., Hwang, K., Shin, W., Lee, K., Park, W., Lee, D., Kwak, N., Wang, Y., Wang, Y., Gu, T., Lv, X., Sun, M.: Nice: Cvpr 2023 challenge on zero-shot image captioning (2023) [1](#)
 49. Kobayashi, S.: Contextual augmentation: Data augmentation by words with paradigmatic relations. In: Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers). pp. 452–457 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N18-2072> [4](#)
 50. Kojima, T., Gu, S.S., Reid, M., Matsuo, Y., Iwasawa, Y.: Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022 (2022) [6](#)
 51. Kong, F., Yuan, S., Hao, W., Henao, R.: Mitigating test-time bias for fair image retrieval. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2024) [4](#)

52. Lei, J., Li, L., Zhou, L., Gan, Z., Berg, T.L., Bansal, M., Liu, J.: Less is more: Clipbert for video-and-language learning via sparse sampling. In: IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2021, virtual, June 19-25, 2021. pp. 7331–7341 (2021) [4](#)
53. Li, J., Li, D., Savarese, S., Hoi, S.: BLIP-2: Bootstrapping Language-Image Pre-training with Frozen Image Encoders and Large Language Models (2023) [5](#)
54. Li, J., Li, D., Xiong, C., Hoi, S.: BLIP: Bootstrapping Language-Image Pre-training for Unified Vision-Language Understanding and Generation (2022) [5](#)
55. Li, L., Chen, Y.C., Cheng, Y., Gan, Z., Yu, L., Liu, J.: HERO: Hierarchical encoder for Video+Language omni-representation pre-training. In: Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP). pp. 2046–2065 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.161> [9](#)
56. Li, P., Xie, C.W., Zhao, L., Xie, H., Ge, J., Zheng, Y., Zhao, D., Zhang, Y.: Progressive Spatio-Temporal Prototype Matching for Text-Video Retrieval. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision. pp. 4100–4110 (2023) [9](#)
57. Li, R., Wang, X., Yu, H.: Two directions for clinical data generation with large language models: Data-to-label and label-to-data. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023. pp. 7129–7143 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.474> [4](#)
58. Li, X., Yin, X., Li, C., Zhang, P., Hu, X., Zhang, L., Wang, L., Hu, H., Dong, L., Wei, F., Choi, Y., Gao, J.: Oscar: Object-semantics aligned pre-training for vision-language tasks. In: Computer Vision - ECCV 2020 - 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23-28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XXX. pp. 121–137 (2020) [4](#)
59. Li, Y., Liu, H., Wu, Q., Mu, F., Yang, J., Gao, J., Li, C., Lee, Y.J.: Gligen: Open-set grounded text-to-image generation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 22511–22521 (2023) [6](#)
60. Lin, T.Y., Maire, M., Belongie, S., Hays, J., Perona, P., Ramanan, D., Dollár, P., Zitnick, C.L.: Microsoft COCO: Common Objects in Context. In: Computer Vision – ECCV 2014. pp. 740–755 (2014) [4](#)
61. Liu, A., Jin, S., Lai, C.L., Rouditchenko, A., Oliva, A., Glass, J.: Cross-modal discrete representation learning. In: Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers). pp. 3013–3035 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.215> [1, 2, 7, 9](#)
62. Liu, H., Wu, Y., Zhai, S., Yuan, B., Zhang, N.: Riatig: Reliable and imperceptible adversarial text-to-image generation with natural prompts. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 20585–20594 (2023) [6](#)
63. Liu, Y., Yan, S., Leal-Taixé, L., Hays, J., Ramanan, D.: Soft augmentation for image classification. In: IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2023, Vancouver, BC, Canada, June 17-24, 2023. pp. 16241–16250 (2023) [4](#)
64. Liu, Y., Xiong, P., Xu, L., Cao, S., Jin, Q.: Ts2-net: Token shift and selection transformer for text-video retrieval. In: Computer Vision - ECCV 2022 - 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23-27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XIV. pp. 319–335 (2022) [1, 2, 9](#)
65. Loshchilov, I., Hutter, F.: SGDR: stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts. In: 5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings (2017) [8](#)

66. Loshchilov, I., Hutter, F.: Decoupled weight decay regularization. In: 7th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2019, New Orleans, LA, USA, May 6-9, 2019 (2019) [8](#)
67. Lu, H., Ding, M., Fei, N., Huo, Y., Lu, Z.: LGDN: Language-guided denoising network for video-language modeling. In: NeurIPS (2022) [9](#)
68. Luo, H., Ji, L., Zhong, M., Chen, Y., Lei, W., Duan, N., Li, T.: Clip4clip: An empirical study of CLIP for end to end video clip retrieval and captioning. *Neuro-computing* pp. 293–304 (2022) [1](#), [4](#), [7](#), [8](#), [9](#)
69. Ma, Y., Xu, G., Sun, X., Yan, M., Zhang, J., Ji, R.: X-CLIP: end-to-end multi-grained contrastive learning for video-text retrieval. In: MM '22: The 30th ACM International Conference on Multimedia, Lisboa, Portugal, October 10 - 14, 2022. pp. 638–647 (2022) [1](#), [4](#), [7](#), [8](#)
70. Ma, Y., Xu, G., Sun, X., Yan, M., Zhang, J., Ji, R.: X-CLIP: End-to-end multi-grained contrastive learning for video-text retrieval. In: ACM international conference on multimedia. pp. 638–647 (2022) [2](#), [5](#), [9](#)
71. Majurski, M., Manescu, P., Padi, S., Schaub, N., Hotaling, N., Jr, C.S., Bajcsy, P.: Cell image segmentation using generative adversarial networks, transfer learning, and augmentations. In: IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops, CVPR Workshops 2019, Long Beach, CA, USA, June 16-20, 2019. pp. 1114–1122 (2019) [4](#)
72. Miech, A., Alayrac, J., Smaira, L., Laptev, I., Sivic, J., Zisserman, A.: End-to-end learning of visual representations from uncurated instructional videos. In: 2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2020, Seattle, WA, USA, June 13-19, 2020. pp. 9876–9886 (2020) [4](#)
73. Miech, A., Zhukov, D., Alayrac, J., Tapaswi, M., Laptev, I., Sivic, J.: Howto100m: Learning a text-video embedding by watching hundred million narrated video clips. In: 2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2019, Seoul, Korea (South), October 27 - November 2, 2019. pp. 2630–2640 (2019) [8](#)
74. Miyawaki, S., Hasegawa, T., Nishida, K., Kato, T., Suzuki, J.: Scene-text aware image and text retrieval with dual-encoder. In: Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop. pp. 422–433 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-srw.34> [1](#)
75. Muaz, U., Jang, W., Tripathi, R., Mani, S., Ouyang, W., Gadde, R.T., Gecer, B., Elizondo, S., Madad, R., Nair, N.: Sidgan: High-resolution dubbed video generation via shift-invariant learning. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). pp. 7833–7842 (2023) [6](#)
76. Ni, H., Shi, C., Li, K., Huang, S.X., Min, M.R.: Conditional image-to-video generation with latent flow diffusion models. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 18444–18455 (2023) [6](#)
77. Park, J.S., Shen, S., Farhadi, A., Darrell, T., Choi, Y., Rohrbach, A.: Exposing the limits of video-text models through contrast sets. In: Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies. pp. 3574–3586 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.naacl-main.261> [1](#), [4](#), [9](#)
78. Park, Y., Azab, M., Moon, S., Xiong, B., Metze, F., Kundu, G., Ahmed, K.: Normalized contrastive learning for text-video retrieval. In: Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. pp. 248–260 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.emnlp-main.17> [2](#), [9](#)

79. Radford, A., Kim, J.W., Hallacy, C., Ramesh, A., Goh, G., Agarwal, S., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Mishkin, P., Clark, J., Krueger, G., Sutskever, I.: Learning Transferable Visual Models From Natural Language Supervision. In: Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning. pp. 8748–8763 (2021) [1](#), [9](#)
80. Radford, A., Kim, J.W., Hallacy, C., Ramesh, A., Goh, G., Agarwal, S., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Mishkin, P., Clark, J., Krueger, G., Sutskever, I.: Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In: Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2021, 18-24 July 2021, Virtual Event. pp. 8748–8763 (2021) [1](#), [4](#), [8](#)
81. Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., Sutskever, I.: Language models are unsupervised multitask learners (2019) [4](#)
82. Rangwani, H., Bansal, L., Sharma, K., Karmali, T., Jampani, V., Babu, R.V.: Noisytwins: Class-consistent and diverse image generation through stylegans. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 5987–5996 (2023) [6](#)
83. Reed, S.E., Akata, Z., Yan, X., Logeswaran, L., Schiele, B., Lee, H.: Generative Adversarial Text to Image Synthesis. In: Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2016, New York City, NY, USA, June 19-24, 2016. pp. 1060–1069 (2016) [5](#)
84. Ruan, L., Ma, Y., Yang, H., He, H., Liu, B., Fu, J., Yuan, N.J., Jin, Q., Guo, B.: Mm-diffusion: Learning multi-modal diffusion models for joint audio and video generation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 10219–10228 (2023) [6](#)
85. Saharia, C., Chan, W., Saxena, S., Li, L., Whang, J., Denton, E.L., Ghasemipour, K., Gontijo Lopes, R., Karagol Ayan, B., Salimans, T., Ho, J., Fleet, D.J., Norouzi, M.: Photorealistic text-to-image diffusion models with deep language understanding (2022) [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [7](#)
86. Shen, X., Li, X., Elhoseiny, M.: Mostgan-v: Video generation with temporal motion styles. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 5652–5661 (2023) [6](#)
87. Shvetsova, N., Chen, B., Rouditchenko, A., Thomas, S., Kingsbury, B., Feris, R., Harwath, D., Glass, J., Kuehne, H.: Everything at Once – Multi-modal Fusion Transformer for Video Retrieval. In: 2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 19988–19997 (2022) [9](#)
88. Singh, A., Hu, R., Goswami, V., Couairon, G., Galuba, W., Rohrbach, M., Kiela, D.: FLAVA: A foundational language and vision alignment model. In: IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, June 18-24, 2022. pp. 15617–15629 (2022) [4](#)
89. Takmaz, A., Schult, J., Kaftan, I., Akçay, M., Leibe, B., Sumner, R., Engelmann, F., Tang, S.: 3d segmentation of humans in point clouds with synthetic data. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). pp. 1292–1304 (2023) [4](#)
90. Tang, H., Jia, K.: A new benchmark: On the utility of synthetic data with blender for bare supervised learning and downstream domain adaptation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 15954–15964 (2023) [4](#)
91. Touvron, H., Lavril, T., Izacard, G., Martinet, X., Lachaux, M.A., Lacroix, T., Rozière, B., Goyal, N., Hambro, E., Azhar, F., Rodriguez, A., Joulin, A., Grave, E., Lample, G.: Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models (2023) [3](#), [4](#)

92. Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., Bikel, D., Blecher, L., Ferrer, C.C., Chen, M., Cucurull, G., Esiobu, D., Fernandes, J., Fu, J., Fu, W., Fuller, B., Gao, C., Goswami, V., Goyal, N., Hartshorn, A., Hosseini, S., Hou, R., Inan, H., Kardas, M., Kerkez, V., Khabsa, M., Kloumann, I., Korenev, A., Koura, P.S., Lachaux, M.A., Lavril, T., Lee, J., Liskovich, D., Lu, Y., Mao, Y., Martinet, X., Mihaylov, T., Mishra, P., Molybog, I., Nie, Y., Poulton, A., Reizenstein, J., Rungta, R., Saladi, K., Schelten, A., Silva, R., Smith, E.M., Subramanian, R., Tan, X.E., Tang, B., Taylor, R., Williams, A., Kuan, J.X., Xu, P., Yan, Z., Zarov, I., Zhang, Y., Fan, A., Kambadur, M., Narang, S., Rodriguez, A., Stojnic, R., Edunov, S., Scialom, T.: Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models (2023) [3](#), [4](#), [8](#), [10](#)
93. Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A.N., Kaiser, L., Polosukhin, I.: Attention is All you Need. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. pp. 5998–6008 (2017) [4](#)
94. Wang, A.J., Ge, Y., Cai, G., Yan, R., Lin, X., Shan, Y., Qie, X., Shou, M.Z.: Object-aware Video-language Pre-training for Retrieval. In: *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. pp. 3303–3312 (2022) [9](#)
95. Wang, H., Xu, D., He, D., Li, F., Ji, Z., Han, J., Ding, E.: Boosting video-text retrieval with explicit high-level semantics. In: *MM '22: The 30th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, Lisboa, Portugal, October 10 - 14, 2022. pp. 4887–4898 (2022) [4](#), [9](#)
96. Wang, J., Liu, X., Di, Z., Liu, Y., Wang, X.: T2IAT: Measuring valence and stereotypical biases in text-to-image generation. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*. pp. 2560–2574 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-acl.160> [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [7](#)
97. Wang, P., Yang, A., Men, R., Lin, J., Bai, S., Li, Z., Ma, J., Zhou, C., Zhou, J., Yang, H.: OFA: Unifying Architectures, Tasks, and Modalities Through a Simple Sequence-to-Sequence Learning Framework. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. pp. 23318–23340 (2022) [5](#)
98. Wang, X., Zhu, L., Zheng, Z., Xu, M., Yang, Y.: Align and tell: Boosting text-video retrieval with local alignment and fine-grained supervision. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* pp. 1–11 (2022) [4](#), [9](#)
99. Wang, Y., Jian, X., Xue, B.: Balance act: Mitigating hubness in cross-modal retrieval with query and gallery banks. In: *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. pp. 10542–10567 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.652> [4](#)
100. Wang, Y., Lu, S., Zhang, L.: Searching privately by imperceptible lying: A novel private hashing method with differential privacy. In: *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. p. 2700–2709 (2020) [4](#)
101. Wang, Y., Shi, P.: Video-text retrieval by supervised sparse multi-grained learning. In: *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*. pp. 633–649 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.46> [4](#)
102. Wang, Y., Song, R.J., Wei, X.S., Zhang, L.: An adversarial domain adaptation network for cross-domain fine-grained recognition. In: *2020 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*. pp. 1217–1225 (2020) [1](#)
103. Wang, Y., Wei, X., Xue, B., Zhang, L.: Piecewise hashing: A deep hashing method for large-scale fine-grained search. In: *Pattern Recognition and Computer Vision - Third Chinese Conference, PRCV 2020, Nanjing, China, October 16-18, 2020, Proceedings, Part II*. pp. 432–444 (2020) [4](#)

104. Wang, Y., Xue, B., Cheng, Q., Chen, Y., Zhang, L.: Deep unified cross-modality hashing by pairwise data alignment. In: Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-21. pp. 1129–1135 (2021) [4](#)
105. Wang, Z., Wu, Y., Narasimhan, K., Russakovsky, O.: Multi-query Video Retrieval. In: Computer Vision – ECCV 2022. pp. 233–249 (2022) [2](#)
106. Wang, Z., Sung, Y.L., Cheng, F., Bertasius, G., Bansal, M.: Unified coarse-to-fine alignment for video-text retrieval. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). pp. 2816–2827 (October 2023) [2](#), [4](#), [6](#), [9](#)
107. Wei, J., Zou, K.: EDA: Easy data augmentation techniques for boosting performance on text classification tasks. In: Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP). pp. 6382–6388 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D19-1670> [4](#)
108. Wu, J.Z., Ge, Y., Wang, X., Lei, S.W., Gu, Y., Shi, Y., Hsu, W., Shan, Y., Qie, X., Shou, M.Z.: Tune-a-video: One-shot tuning of image diffusion models for text-to-video generation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). pp. 7623–7633 (2023) [6](#)
109. Wu, W., Luo, H., Fang, B., Wang, J., Ouyang, W.: Cap4Video: What Can Auxiliary Captions Do for Text-Video Retrieval? In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. pp. 10704–10713 (2023) [2](#), [9](#)
110. Wu, X., Gao, C., Lin, Z., Wang, Z., Han, J., Hu, S.: RaP: Redundancy-aware video-language pre-training for text-video retrieval. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022. pp. 3036–3047 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.findings-emnlp.221> [9](#)
111. Xiao, R., Dong, Y., Zhao, J., Wu, R., Lin, M., Chen, G., Wang, H.: FreeAL: Towards human-free active learning in the era of large language models. In: Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. pp. 14520–14535 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.896> [4](#)
112. Xu, H., Ghosh, G., Huang, P.Y., Arora, P., Aminzadeh, M., Feichtenhofer, C., Metze, F., Zettlemoyer, L.: VLM: Task-agnostic video-language model pre-training for video understanding. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021. pp. 4227–4239 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.findings-acl.370> [9](#)
113. Xu, H., Ghosh, G., Huang, P.Y., Okhonko, D., Aghajanyan, A., Metze, F., Zettlemoyer, L., Feichtenhofer, C.: VideoCLIP: Contrastive pre-training for zero-shot video-text understanding. In: Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing. pp. 6787–6800 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.emnlp-main.544> [1](#), [9](#)
114. Xu, J., Mei, T., Yao, T., Rui, Y.: MSR-VTT: A large video description dataset for bridging video and language. In: 2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2016, Las Vegas, NV, USA, June 27–30, 2016. pp. 5288–5296 (2016) [1](#), [4](#), [8](#)
115. Xu, J., Mei, T., Yao, T., Rui, Y.: MSR-VTT: A Large Video Description Dataset for Bridging Video and Language. In: 2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 5288–5296 (2016) [3](#), [5](#)
116. Xu, X., Wang, G., Kim, Y.B., Lee, S.: AugNLG: Few-shot natural language generation using self-trained data augmentation. In: Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long

- Papers). pp. 1183–1195 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.95> 4
117. Xue, H., Sun, Y., Liu, B., Fu, J., Song, R., Li, H., Luo, J.: CLIP-ViP: Adapting Pre-trained Image-Text Model to Video-Language Alignment. In: The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations (2023) 9
 118. Yang, K., Deng, J., An, X., Li, J., Feng, Z., Guo, J., Yang, J., Liu, T.: Alip: Adaptive language-image pre-training with synthetic caption. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). pp. 2922–2931 (2023) 4
 119. Yang, S., Xiao, W., Zhang, M., Guo, S., Zhao, J., Shen, F.: Image data augmentation for deep learning: A survey (2023) 4
 120. Yang, Z., Wang, J., Gan, Z., Li, L., Lin, K., Wu, C., Duan, N., Liu, Z., Liu, C., Zeng, M., Wang, L.: Reco: Region-controlled text-to-image generation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 14246–14255 (2023) 6
 121. Yin, S., Wu, C., Yang, H., Wang, J., Wang, X., Ni, M., Yang, Z., Li, L., Liu, S., Yang, F., Fu, J., Gong, M., Wang, L., Liu, Z., Li, H., Duan, N.: NUWA-XL: Diffusion over diffusion for eXtremely long video generation. In: Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers). pp. 1309–1320 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.73> 6
 122. You, W., Hammoudeh, Z., Lowd, D.: Large language models are better adversaries: Exploring generative clean-label backdoor attacks against text classifiers. In: Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023. pp. 12499–12527 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.findings-emnlp.833> 4
 123. Yu, Q., Liu, Y., Wang, Y., Xu, K., Liu, J.: Multimodal federated learning via contrastive representation ensemble. In: The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations (2023) 4
 124. Yu, Y., Kim, J., Kim, G.: A joint sequence fusion model for video question answering and retrieval. In: Computer Vision - ECCV 2018 - 15th European Conference, Munich, Germany, September 8-14, 2018, Proceedings, Part VII. pp. 487–503 (2018) 8
 125. Yu, Y., Ko, H., Choi, J., Kim, G.: End-to-end concept word detection for video captioning, retrieval, and question answering. In: 2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2017, Honolulu, HI, USA, July 21-26, 2017. pp. 3261–3269 (2017) 4
 126. Yuan, S., Yu, S., Kim, H., Tomasi, C.: Semarflow: Injecting semantics into unsupervised optical flow estimation for autonomous driving. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision. pp. 9566–9577 (2023) 4
 127. Zeng, Y., Jiang, C., Mao, J., Han, J., Ye, C., Huang, Q., Yeung, D.Y., Yang, Z., Liang, X., Xu, H.: CLIP2: Contrastive language-image-point pretraining from real-world point cloud data. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition (CVPR). pp. 15244–15253 (2023) 4
 128. Zhang, L., Rao, A., Agrawala, M.: Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models (2023) 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10
 129. Zhao, S., Zhu, L., Wang, X., Yang, Y.: Centerclip: Token clustering for efficient text-video retrieval. In: Proceedings of the 45th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval. p. 970–981 (2022) 1, 2, 4, 9

130. Zhou, R., Li, X., He, R., Bing, L., Cambria, E., Si, L., Miao, C.: MELM: Data augmentation with masked entity language modeling for low-resource NER. In: Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers). pp. 2251–2262 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.160> 4
131. Zhou, Y., Liu, B., Zhu, Y., Yang, X., Chen, C., Xu, J.: Shifted diffusion for text-to-image generation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 10157–10166 (2023) 6
132. Zhu, L., Yang, Y.: Actbert: Learning global-local video-text representations. In: 2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2020, Seattle, WA, USA, June 13-19, 2020. pp. 8743–8752 (2020) 4

A Qualitative Results - Retrieval Examples




Figure 3: Retrieval examples by the baseline and HAVTR. “Rank x ” means that the example is ranked at x . The numbers in blue represent the similarity to the query. “(GT)” means the ground truth (the corresponding text/video to the query data). Texts in blue and video frames surrounded by blue lines are augmented data.

To qualitatively validate the effectiveness of HAVTR, we present examples of video-to-text and text-to-video retrieval on MSR-VTT in Figure 3, respectively. The retrieval results show the satisfactory performance of HAVTR, benefiting from hallucination-based augmentation. Notably, HAVTR demonstrates precise identification of objects (*beach*, *pond*), and humans (*child*, *men*, *boys*, *girl*), indicating its proficiency in capturing intricate details. Moreover, the augmented data introduces informative and plausible information, *e.g.*, “with beach child at the age of six”, “a robot brain was injected into an animated film”, further contributing to the retrieval performance.