
EventZoom: A Progressive Approach to Event-Based Data Augmentation for Enhanced Neuromorphic Vision

Yiting Dong^{1,3,4*}, Xiang He^{2,3*}, Guobin Shen^{1,3,4}
 Dongcheng Zhao^{3,4}, Yang Li^{2,3}, Yi Zeng^{1,2,3,4,5†}

¹School of Future Technology, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

²School of Artificial Intelligence, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

³Brain-inspired Cognitive Intelligence Lab, Institute of Automation, Chinese Academy of Sciences

⁴Center for Long-term Artificial Intelligence

⁵Key Laboratory of Brain Cognition and Brain-inspired Intelligence Technology, CAS

{dongyiting2020, hexiang2021, shenguobin2021,
 zhaodongcheng2016, liyang2019, yi.zeng}@ia.ac.cn

Abstract

Event data captured by Dynamic Vision Sensors (DVS) offers a unique approach to visual processing that differs from traditional video capture, showcasing its efficiency in dynamic and real-time scenarios. Despite advantages such as high temporal resolution and low energy consumption, the application of event data faces challenges due to limited dataset size and diversity. To address this, we developed EventZoom — a data augmentation strategy specifically designed for event data. EventZoom employs a progressive temporal strategy that intelligently blends time and space to enhance the diversity and complexity of the data while maintaining its authenticity. This method aims to improve the quality of data for model training and enhance the adaptability and robustness of algorithms in handling complex dynamic scenes. We have experimentally validated EventZoom across various supervised learning frameworks, including supervised, semi-supervised, and unsupervised learning. Our results demonstrate that EventZoom consistently outperforms other data augmentation methods, confirming its effectiveness and applicability as a powerful event-based data augmentation tool in diverse learning settings.

1 Introduction

Event data, as captured by Dynamic Vision Sensors (DVS), signifies a paradigm shift from traditional frame-based video capture to more sophisticated event-based or neuromorphic vision systems. [1, 2, 3]. In contrast to conventional cameras, which record redundant frames at predetermined intervals, DVS cameras operate on a per-pixel basis, activating only when changes in luminance are detected [4]. This mechanism generates asynchronous data streams and embodies several critical advantages, including high temporal resolution, low energy requirements, and substantial reductions in data redundancy. These attributes render event-based data particularly advantageous for scenarios where traditional video processing proves inefficient and resource-intensive [5]. This unique, non-continuous, and asynchronous data capture method provides a finer granularity in capturing dynamic real-world changes. It offers considerable potential for applications such as visual navigation [6, 7], autonomous driving [8], and gesture recognition [9, 10], by facilitating enhanced real-time

[†]Corresponding Author.

^{*}Equal contribution.

decision-making and perception capabilities. This paradigm enhances our understanding of and responsiveness to complex dynamic environments.

However, the deployment of event-based data systems in practical applications encounters significant challenges, predominantly due to the constraints on dataset availability and diversity [2]. Most current event data datasets are limited in scale and scope, which impedes developing and training robust neuromorphic processing systems. The dependency on specialized event camera hardware and specific environmental conditions for data collection complicates the creation of extensive and diverse datasets. These limitations often result in suboptimal model training and validation, increased susceptibility to overfitting, and diminished generalizability in real-world deployments. Additionally, the inherent sparsity and the non-uniform temporal distribution of event data introduce complexities in data processing. Traditional processing techniques are often inadequate for capturing the dynamic features intrinsic to event-based vision effectively [11]. This has spurred the development of specialized algorithms and methodologies tailored to efficiently exploit the unique informational properties of event data. In this context, a deep understanding and effective processing of event data have become particularly crucial, prompting us to explore data augmentation techniques to better leverage the potential of this innovative visual data.

Data augmentation, a pervasive technique in conventional image and text processing [12, 13, 14], enhances the diversity and scale of datasets, offering a robust methodology for augmenting model capabilities across a broader array of scenarios that existing datasets may inadequately represent [15]. Within the domain of event data, characterized by its inherent sparsity and the non-uniform distribution of temporal events, the direct application of traditional data augmentation techniques presents significant challenges [16, 17]. These conventional methods, designed primarily for image data with regular temporal and spatial structures, might disrupt the intrinsic temporal and spatial correlations within event data, which primarily capture dynamic changes in illumination rather than static visual scenes. Innovative adaptations are necessary to suit this unique form of data. Employing data augmentation strategies specifically designed for event data can enhance the amount and quality of data available for model training and significantly improve the robustness and adaptability of algorithms in processing dynamic data. In our experiment, to achieve notable results, we observed that these data augmentation strategies need to preserve the temporal nature and spatial integrity of event data while introducing sufficient variability to improve model generalizability. Developing specialized data augmentation techniques for event data thus becomes a critical advancement in this technological field. Through those research, we can more effectively leverage the unique advantages of event data, supporting the processing of highly dynamic and variable real-world scenarios.

To address the challenges associated with processing event data, we developed EventZoom — an innovative data augmentation strategy specifically tailored for event data. EventZoom draws inspiration from sample mixing techniques, employing a carefully designed yet straightforward and efficient algorithm to synthesize new event sequences. By scaling random event sequences and embedding them into another sample for mixing, we maintain the integrity of spatial information. We also emphasize the importance of temporal continuity in preserving the information content of event sequences, embedding the event sequences to vary progressively along the temporal dimension. This technique retains the original data’s authenticity and significantly enhances its diversity and complexity, offering a richer dataset for model training. Our strategy distinctly focuses on augmenting the data’s temporal and spatial dimensions, preserving the inherent temporal continuity and spatial integrity more effectively than traditional methods. By more accurately mimicking the natural variations captured by sensors, EventZoom extends the scope and applicability of training datasets. EventZoom has performed extensive validation across a variety of learning paradigms, including supervised, semi-supervised, and unsupervised learning. In these tasks, the diversity and breadth of the augmented data play a pivotal role in the models’ learning efficacy, thereby serving as a robust metric of the effectiveness of our data augmentation strategy. Through these tests, we not only validate the applicability of EventZoom in various learning environments but also demonstrate how it effectively enhances model performance and processing capabilities by providing complex and diverse training samples. The experimental results clearly indicate that EventZoom significantly improves the generalization ability and overall performance of event data processing algorithms, particularly in handling unknown or complex scenarios.




Figure 1: Visualization of the samples sampled by EventZoom. The Zoom Image is embedded into the original image.

2 Related Work

Data augmentation is a crucial technique in the field of machine learning, particularly for image processing tasks, as it artificially expands the size and diversity of training datasets. This process helps prevent overfitting, enhances the model’s generalization capabilities, and is also robustness to adversarial attack. Traditionally, data augmentation for image data is categorized into geometric transformations and photometric transformations [18, 19, 20]. Geometric transformations include operations like rotation, translation, scaling, and flipping, which alter the spatial structure of the images. Photometric transformations involve adjustments to an image’s color, contrast, brightness, and sharpness. In addition to these basic transformations, several advanced data augmentation techniques have emerged that significantly impact model robustness and training efficiency. For example, the Mixup [20] technique blends features and labels from two or more images to create new samples. Cutout randomly masks parts of the input image, compelling the network to focus on less prominent features. CutMix [13] combines elements of Mixup and Cutout by replacing part of an image with a segment from another and appropriately blending their labels. Techniques like PuzzleMix[21] and SaliencyMix[22] further strategically utilize salient regions from different images to enhance the training process. Moreover, automated methods such as AutoAugment[23] and RandAugment[24] employ reinforcement learning or random searches to discover the most effective augmentation strategies, optimizing them for specific datasets or tasks.

The augmentation techniques for event data are specifically designed for their unique attributes, as this type of data, by capturing the dynamic changes in pixel brightness, is closely tied to time. This makes traditional image augmentation methods inapplicable. These event-based techniques need not only capture changes in the imagery but also accurately maintain the temporal information and authenticity of the events. EventDrop[25] enhances the regularization ability of the model by randomly dropping events. [16] by analyzing the impact of various traditional data augmentation methods on event data and applying them accordingly. EventMix[26] randomly samples a Gaussian distribution in the event stream and replaces the area with a corresponding area from a random sample. EventRPG[27] utilizes CAM and region salience detection techniques to correlate the cut-out area with significant regions. ShapeAug[28] achieves data augmentation by moving simple shapes within the image. EventAugment [29] searches for optimal combinations of enhancements through automatic parameter tuning. However, these methods still face issues such as poor effectiveness, loss of information during the enhancement process, and overly complex strategies that make them difficult to apply easily. Our experiments have demonstrated the importance of preserving complete spatial and temporal information for enhancing event data. Moreover, our method is simple, efficient, and introduces minimal additional computational load.

Data augmentation is essential in semi-supervised [30, 31, 32, 33] and unsupervised learning scenarios[34, 35, 36, 37], particularly when labeled data is either scarce or completely unavailable. In semi-supervised learning, augmentation techniques effectively expand the limited unlabeled

datasets, thereby enhancing the utility of extensive unlabeled data. Techniques such as consistency regularization [33] rely heavily on data augmentation. They demand that models maintain consistent predictions across different augmented versions of the same data, thereby significantly boosting the reliability of unlabeled data distribution during training sessions. In the context of unsupervised learning [36, 37], where no labels are present, data augmentation is instrumental in learning multiple perspectives of samples and developing robust feature representations. By subjecting input data to various transformations, models can discern the intrinsic structures and variations within the data, which is vital for tasks like contrastive learning. Essentially, data augmentation serves as a form that prompts learning algorithms to concentrate on the data’s most informative features, eliminating the need for external labels.

3 Methods

To address the challenge of enhancing the diversity and richness of event data, we developed a novel data augmentation strategy called EventZoom. This approach synthesizes new event sequences, sharing a concept akin to mixed-sample techniques. The sequences generated by EventZoom introduce variability while preserving the intrinsic properties of the event data, thereby improving the robustness and generalization capabilities of models.

3.1 EventZoom

Let x represent an event sequence within the format $x \in R^{TCHW}$, and y the corresponding label. EventZoom augments data by randomly selecting another event sequence, which is not confined to the same or different categories. To preserve spatial continuity, the selected sequence is scaled by a random factor λ , sampled from a Beta distribution $Beta(\lambda_{min}, \lambda_{max})$. The parameters λ_{min} and λ_{max} define the bounds of the distribution. In addition, the method applies a progressive, variable translation within the image boundaries, with r_x and r_y values ranging from $(0, W)$ to $(0, H)$, where W and H denote the width and height of the image, respectively. The methodology for this sample mixing is formally defined in Equation 1.

$$\tilde{x} = (1 - \mathbf{M}) \odot x_1 + Zoom(x_2) \tag{1}$$

In this context, M denotes the position mask for applying a patch, and O represents pixel-level multiplication. $Zoom$ refers to the progressive scaling and translation operations applied to the image x_2 . \tilde{x} is the event sequence synthesized via EventZoom. For label generation, to ensure simplicity and maintain the relevance of enhanced data to the original labels, the labels are weighted based on the percentage of the sample covered by M . The formal definition is as follows:

$$\tilde{y} = (1 - a)y_1 + ay_2 \tag{2}$$

In this formulation, a represents the percentage of the event sequence’s volume occupied by M . y_1 and y_2 are the one-hot encoded labels corresponding to x_1 and x_2 , respectively. The value of a is calculated using Equation 3, which is the ratio of the volume of M to the total volume of the event sequence (TCHW):

$$a = \left(\frac{Area\ of\ M}{T \cdot C \cdot H \cdot W} \right) \tag{3}$$

This ratio determines how the labels y_1 and y_2 are weighted to compute the new label for \tilde{x} .

3.2 A comparative discussion

The *CutMix* data augmentation technique, which employs a cut-and-paste strategy for image regions, is effective in conventional image processing scenarios but exhibits limitations when applied to event-based data. Firstly, *CutMix* replicates the exact cropping and pasting location, which reduces data diversity through simple spatial duplication, thus reducing the potential for enhancing data diversity through spatial variation. Secondly, as *CutMix* involves cutting a region from one image and pasting it into another, this approach leads to the loss of original event data, particularly the temporal label information related to the cropped area, which may not align with the new context, thereby causing label mismatches[21, 22]. In contrast, EventZoom leverages a more sophisticated approach

by dynamically mixing event sequences across both spatial and temporal dimensions. This method preserves a greater amount of the original data’s intrinsic temporal dynamics, effectively preventing information loss and label mismatches while enhancing the data’s diversity and complexity.

The *Mixup* method functions by directly mixing data at the pixel level between two images, effectively simulating a state that lies between them when dealing with static images. However, for event data, which captures variations in lighting, this straightforward method of data mixing can result in non-authentic lighting conditions, leading to generating data that does not accurately reflect the physical world’s lighting dynamics. *EventZoom* addresses this issue and, more precisely, simulates real-world lighting and dynamic changes, providing training data that is both more realistic and challenging.

Despite being designed for event data, *EventMix*, which increases temporal diversity by mixing different event streams, shares spatial issues similar to those of *CutMix*, which improves the effect of data augmentation to a certain extent. Specifically, *EventMix* may not effectively address the consistency of spatial positioning during the blending process, which can lead to label mismatches. *EventZoom* advances this concept by enriching temporal diversity and implementing precise spatial and temporal adjustment strategies. These enhancements ensure that the blended data maintains spatial and temporal consistency, thereby mitigating the risk of label mismatches and bolstering the model’s ability to generalize across complex scenarios.

To demonstrate the significance of information integrity and continuity for temporal event data augmentation, we conducted ablation experiments comparing the performance differences across three strategies. The experiments substantiated the necessity of preserving both spatial and temporal information for enhancing event-based data.

We experimented with **three** distinct methods to mix event data:

(1) *Random location and remain static*: This strategy involves positioning the scaled event data samples at random locations while maintaining temporal static. The scaling ratio and position are kept constant, validating whether the progressive changes in event sequences provide a more meaningful representation of attributes.

(2) *Linear scaling and shifting over time*: This strategy involves dynamically and linearly scaling the intensity and location of an event sample. It models moving objects or changing lighting conditions, introducing a temporal dimension to the augmentation process.

(3) *Random scaling and shifting*: this approach randomly changes the scale and location of events over time, introducing more complexity and variability. This strategy tests whether it is the variability or the progressive in event sequences that leads to performance improvements in models.

In summary, *EventZoom* tries to address the shortcomings of traditional data augmentation methods—such as reduced diversity, information loss, and unrealistic simulations—when handling event data. By employing a more refined and flexible approach in both spatial and temporal dimensions, *EventZoom* offers a more effective data augmentation strategy for machine learning applications with event data.

4 Experiment

To validate the effectiveness of *EventZoom*, we conducted comprehensive experiments across four distinct event-driven datasets: DVS-CIFAR10, N-Caltech101, UCF101-DVS, These datasets were rigorously tested in supervised, semi-supervised, and unsupervised learning settings to comprehensively evaluate *EventZoom*’s performance across varying learning paradigms. DVS-CIFAR10 is a dynamic vision version of the classic CIFAR10 image dataset, comprising dynamic visual data across ten categories, suitable for fundamental image recognition tasks. N-Caltech101, repurposed from the Caltech101 image dataset, includes data for 101 object categories captured by event cameras. UCF101-DVS, derived from the popular UCF101 video dataset, is tailored for action recognition studies and features a diverse array of motion scenarios. Our experiments spanned supervised, semi-supervised, and unsupervised learning tasks to demonstrate *EventZoom*’s efficacy under different label availability conditions. We used spiking neural networks (SNNs) [38, 39, 40, 41] for validation of each group of experiments. Additionally, to align with current training paradigms and ensure fair comparison with existing methodologies, we adopted the common practice of converting event sequences into frames to facilitate neural network training.

Table 1: Comparison of different data augmentation methods across various datasets.

Dataset	Data Augmentation	Training Method	Neural Network	Resolution	Accuracy
DVS-CIFAR10	EventDrop	STBP	Pre-Act Resnet18	(48,48)	77.73
	ShapeAug	STBP	Pre-Act Resnet18	(128,128)	75.70
	EventRPG	TET	Spike-VGG11	(48,48)	85.55
	NDA	STBP-tdBN	Spike-VGG11	(48,48)	79.60
	NDA	STBP-tdBN	Spike-VGG11	(128,128)	81.70
	EventMix	STBP	Pre-Act Resnet18	(48,48)	81.45
	EventZoom	STBP	Pre-Act Resnet18	(48,48)	<u>85.40</u>
	EventZoom	STBP	Spike-VGG11	(48,48)	85.90
N-Caltech101	EventDrop	STBP	Pre-Act Resnet18	(48,48)	74.04
	ShapeAug	STBP	Pre-Act Resnet18	(128,128)	68.70
	EventAugment	STBP	Spike-VGG11	(48,48)	75.23
	NDA	STBP-tdBN	Spike-VGG11	(48,48)	78.20
	NDA	STBP-tdBN	Spike-VGG11	(128,128)	83.70
	EventMix	STBP	Pre-Act Resnet18	(48,48)	79.47
	EventRPG	TET	Spike-VGG11	(128,128)	85.00
	EventZoom	TET	Spike-VGG11	(48,48)	<u>84.83</u>
UCF101-DVS	C3D	BP	ConvNet	(48,48)	<u>47.20</u>
	EventMix	BP	Resnet18-ANN	(48,48)	<u>60.63</u>
	EventZoom	STBP	Pre-Act Resnet18	(48,48)	62.38

4.1 Supervised Learning

To validate the effectiveness of the EventZoom data augmentation strategy, we conducted a series of experiments in a supervised learning environment using several datasets specifically designed for event data, including DVS-CIFAR10, N-Caltech101, UCF101-DVS. These datasets allowed for rigorous testing of data augmentation methods for neuromorphic vision tasks.

We performed extensive experiments to compare EventZoom with other event data augmentation strategies. Table 1 shows the accuracy of different methods across all datasets. The results clearly indicate that EventZoom significantly outperforms other event augmentation methods. Notably, slightly lower than EventRPG in N-CALTECH101, which is heavily Computationally intensive, but we are under weaker training setting, and even without any computation consumption. our approach surpasses the best-performing existing event augmentation methods.

Moreover, we compared EventZoom against traditional image data augmentation methods directly applied to event data. We highlight that, despite the distinct nature of the data types, these methods still demonstrate modest performance improvements when adapted to event data. Experimental results for each dataset are shown in Table 2. For instance, the mixup method was extended to the temporal dimension, blending corresponding frames between different samples. In the cutmix method, we pasted patches from one frame onto the corresponding position in another sample over time. As a contrast, we also implemented eventmix, which randomly selects Gaussian-distributed samples in the sequence and mixes them with others.

Table 2 demonstrates that EventZoom achieved the best performance. Eventmix, compared to CutMix, added more diversity to the event sequences over time, resulting in superior performance. Meanwhile, the MixUp method, which typically preserves structural integrity in neatly structured image data, might disrupt illumination information in event data, leading to poorer performance. EventZoom not only maintains complete spatial information without using patch synthesis by cropping but also preserves full temporal information, increasing diversity without disrupting coherence.

4.2 Semi-supervised Learning

In semi-supervised learning environments, our experiments focused on comparing the performance of EventZoom with other data augmentation strategies under conditions of limited labeled data. We conducted these experiments using the DVS-CIFAR10 datasets. We employed the architecture from [33], a benchmark commonly used in semi-supervised tasks, which effectively evaluates the

Table 2: Comparison of different conventional data augmentation methods across various datasets.

Model	Data Augmentation	DVS-CIFAR10	N-Caltech101	UCF101-DVS
Spiking-ResNet-18	No Augmentation	80.80	67.93	55.54
	MixUp [12]	81.40	68.62	56.36
	CutMix [13]	80.70	67.93	57.58
	EventMix [26]	84.60	70.45	58.26
	EventZoom	85.40	78.39	63.54
Shallow-Spiking-VGG11	No Augmentation	81.40	71.49	50.43
	MixUp[12]	83.60	68.96	53.91
	CutMix [13]	81.90	70.11	55.16
	EventMix [26]	84.40	73.67	57.20
	EventZoom	84.80	80.00	62.38

comparative effectiveness of different augmentation methods. In the semi-supervised setting, the efficacy of various data augmentation strategies often depends on how they enhance unlabeled data to adapt the model to the unlabeled distribution. To assess this, we set up experiments using varying proportions of labeled data to test each augmentation method’s ability to enhance model learning under conditions of label sparsity. The results of these experiments are summarized in Table 3, showing the accuracy of models trained with different augmentation techniques at various label quantities.

When comparing EventZoom with traditional image augmentations adapted for event data and other event-specific augmentations, EventZoom consistently demonstrated superior performance. This is evident from the higher accuracy rates across all label proportions, indicating its robustness in effectively utilizing both labeled and unlabeled data. EventZoom exhibited significant improvements over the baseline and outperformed other augmentation methods, particularly in extremely label-sparse settings (e.g., only 40 labeled instances per class). We find that with the gradual increase of labeled samples, the performance of the network is getting better. When EventZoom only has 40 labels, it can even have similar results as 100 labels without data augmentation. This improvement suggests that EventZoom’s method of creating complex synthetic event sequences helps models generalize better. By leveraging stronger data augmentation capabilities to make greater use of the unlabeled data distribution, EventZoom enhanced the model’s ability to learn more robust features from limited labels, and EventZoom can effectively bridge the gap between labeled and unlabeled data.

Table 3: Comparison of different data augmentation methods for semi-supervised learning tasks.

Model	Data Augmentation	DVS-CIFAR10		
		40 labels	100 labels	250 labels
ResNet-18	No Augmentation	53.30	70.20	78.90
	MixUp [12]	60.50	73.70	81.90
	CutMix [13]	61.90	74.40	80.80
	EventMix [26]	58.70	72.80	79.50
	EventZoom	71.60	76.80	82.40
Shallow-spiking-VGG11	No Augmentation	51.70	62.70	69.70
	MixUp [12]	58.20	63.70	71.80
	CutMix [13]	54.00	58.90	68.60
	EventMix[26]	50.20	60.50	69.00
	EventZoom	59.40	65.10	74.10

4.3 Unsupervised Learning

Unsupervised learning experiments are designed to evaluate the effectiveness of different data augmentation strategies in the absence of labeled data. In particular, we focus on the performance of contrastive learning algorithms with instance discrimination as a proxy task, which rely heavily on data augmentation to learn unique features from unlabeled data. We adopted the architecture in [37], a benchmark commonly used in unsupervised learning tasks, which learns the relationship between

the same sample under different augmentations. This architecture is well-suited for assessing the impact of various augmentation methods. We assessed network performance using a linear evaluation, which reflects the capability of data augmentation methods. In the linear evaluation, we freeze the parameters of the backbone network and append a linear classification layer for learning during this phase. Experiments were conducted on the DVS-CIFAR10 and N-Caltech101 datasets, which served respectively as the pre-training and fine-tuning datasets in our linear tests. The results are presented in Table 4.

EventZoom outperforms traditional augmentation methods and other event-based augmentation techniques. Traditional methods often fail to account for the temporal dynamics of event data, while other event augmentation techniques may not introduce sufficient diversity or maintain information integrity. EventZoom effectively utilizes the temporal and spatial characteristics of event data, providing effective augmentation information. It significantly enhances the ability of contrastive learning algorithms to extract and learn robust features from event data.

Table 4: Comparison of different data augmentation methods for unsupervised learning tasks.

Model	Data Augmentation	P:N-Caltech101 / F:N-Caltech101	P:N-Caltech101 / F:DVS-CIFAR10
Shallow-spiking-VGG11	No Augmentation	15.71	25.50
	MixUp [12]	27.29	37.50
	EventMix [26]	37.04	39.00
	EventZoom	42.78	44.10

5 Ablation Study

To gain a deeper understanding of the impact of various parameters on the effectiveness of the EventZoom data augmentation strategy, we conducted a series of ablation experiments. These experiments were performed on the DVS-CIFAR10 or N-Caltech101 dataset using the Shallow-Spiking-VGG11 or spiking-resnet18 as the training backbone network. To ensure fairness and consistency in testing, we maintained the same settings for all other experimental configurations, except for the parameters used in the ablation studies.

Changes in λ_{min} and λ_{max} The parameters λ_{min} and λ_{max} dictate the range of the random scaling factor λ , utilized during the EventZoom process. Adjusting these parameters enables control over the proportion of embedded event samples, thereby influencing the diversity encountered by the learning algorithm. We evaluated network performance across various settings of λ_{min} and λ_{max} to determine their optimal configuration for enhancing model accuracy and generalization capabilities. N-Caltech101 is used in this experiment. As indicated in Table 5, the model achieved optimal performance within the range of 0.5 to 1.5. Notably, a λ value greater than 1 results in data scaling that exceeds the size of the original samples, introducing greater scale diversity.

Table 5: Comparison of different λ_{min} and λ_{max} with model performance.

Model	Data Augmentation	0.0 - 0.0	0.2 - 0.6	0.3 - 0.7	0.3 - 1.0	0.4 - 1.3	0.5 - 1.5
Shallow-Spiking-VGG11	EventZoom	71.49	71.26 (-0.23)	72.29(+0.80)	74.94 (+3.45)	77.47 (+5.98)	80.00 (+8.51)

Different strategies We applied progressive scaling and shifting along the temporal dimension to the samples. To validate the efficacy of this progressive approach in preserving spatial and temporal information, we experimented with three distinct strategies: *Random location and remain static*, *Linear scaling and shifting over time*, and *Random scaling and shifting*. DVS-CIFAR10 is used in this experiment. The results, as detailed in Table 6, suggest that temporal dynamic adjustments enhance the data augmentation capability. However, these adjustments should follow a progressive pattern rather than a random one, ensuring meaningful data transformation.

Comparison of the number of embedded samples We also explore how many embedded samples are better for training the network. The parameter *minimum* represents the number of different

Table 6: Comparison of different strategies with model performance.

Model	Data Augmentation	Random Position and Static	Linear Scale and Shift	Random Scale and Shift
Spiking-resnet18	EventZoom	81.9	83.50	80.7

samples inserted during the augmentation process. Increasing $mixnum$ may introduce more diversity, but it could also increase the complexity and noise in the training data. N-Caltech101 is used in this experiment. with λ_{min} and λ_{max} are 0.3-0.7. We explored the impact of changing $mixnum$ on the effectiveness of EventZoom, aiming to enhance learning performance without overloading the network with too much variability. As shown in Table 7, we compared the network performance under different $mixnum$ setting.

Table 7: Comparison of different $mixnum$ with model performance.

Model	Data Augmentation	1	2	3	4	5
Spiking-VGG11	EventZoom	71.26	71.42	72.29	71.72	71.42

6 Conclusion

This article introduces an innovative data augmentation strategy EventZoom, tailored to the unique characteristics of event data and the challenges it faces in practical applications. Unlike traditional frame-based video capture techniques, event data is captured by dynamic visual sensors (DVS). However, the sparsity and non-uniform distribution temporal distribution of event data increase the complexity of data processing, making conventional data augmentation techniques unsuitable for such data. The EventZoom strategy synthesizes new event sequences using a progressive mixing samples technique, effectively preserving the spatiotemporal integrity of the data while introducing sufficient variability to enhance the model’s generalization capabilities. We conducted comprehensive tests of EventZoom across various learning frameworks, including supervised, semi-supervised, and unsupervised learning. Experimental results demonstrate that EventZoom not only improves the model’s predictive performance and processing capacity for complex and diverse training samples but also significantly enhances the generalization ability and overall performance of event data processing algorithms. Despite these advances, it is important to note that EventZoom has only been tested under different supervision frameworks. Due to the lack of suitable event datasets for other types of tasks, further testing on other types of tasks has not yet been conducted. This will be an area for future exploration. The development of EventZoom not only addresses some key issues in data augmentation for event data but also advances event-based visual processing technology, providing robust support for handling real-world scenes with high dynamics and variability.

References

- [1] Yuhuang Hu, Shih-Chii Liu, and Tobi Delbruck. v2e: From video frames to realistic dvs events. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1312–1321, 2021.
- [2] Guillermo Gallego, Tobi Delbruck, Garrick Orchard, Chiara Bartolozzi, Brian Taba, Andrea Censi, Stefan Leutenegger, Andrew J. Davison, Jorg Conradt, Kostas Daniilidis, and Davide Scaramuzza. Event-Based Vision: A Survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(1):154–180, January 2022. ISSN 0162-8828, 2160-9292, 1939-3539. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2020.3008413. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9138762/>.
- [3] Annamalai Lakshmi, Anirban Chakraborty, and Chetan S Thakur. Neuromorphic vision: From sensors to event-based algorithms. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 9(4):e1310, 2019.
- [4] Gemma Taverni, Diederik Paul Moeys, Chenghan Li, Celso Cavaco, Vasyl Motsnyi, David San Segundo Bello, and Tobi Delbruck. Front and back illuminated dynamic and active pixel

- vision sensors comparison. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, 65(5):677–681, 2018.
- [5] Catherine D Schuman, Thomas E Potok, Robert M Patton, J Douglas Birdwell, Mark E Dean, Garrett S Rose, and James S Plank. A survey of neuromorphic computing and neural networks in hardware. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.06963*, 2017.
- [6] Francisco Barranco, Cornelia Fermuller, Yiannis Aloimonos, and Tobi Delbruck. A dataset for visual navigation with neuromorphic methods. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 10:178231, 2016.
- [7] Andrejs Zujevs, Mihails Pudzs, Vitalijs Osadcuks, Arturs Ardavs, Maris Galauskis, and Janis Grundspenkis. An event-based vision dataset for visual navigation tasks in agricultural environments. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 13769–13775. IEEE, 2021.
- [8] Guang Chen, Hu Cao, Jorg Conradt, Huajin Tang, Florian Rohrbein, and Alois Knoll. Event-based neuromorphic vision for autonomous driving: A paradigm shift for bio-inspired visual sensing and perception. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 37(4):34–49, 2020.
- [9] Arnon Amir, Brian Taba, David Berg, Timothy Melano, Jeffrey McKinstry, Carmelo Di Nolfo, Tapan Nayak, Alexander Andreopoulos, Guillaume Garreau, Marcela Mendoza, et al. A low power, fully event-based gesture recognition system. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7243–7252, 2017.
- [10] Yuhan Zhang, Lindong Wu, Weihua He, Ziyang Zhang, Chen Yang, Yaoyuan Wang, Ying Wang, Kun Tian, Jianxing Liao, and Ying Yang. An event-driven spatiotemporal domain adaptation method for dvs gesture recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, 69(3):1332–1336, 2021.
- [11] Weihua He, YuJie Wu, Lei Deng, Guoqi Li, Haoyu Wang, Yang Tian, Wei Ding, Wenhui Wang, and Yuan Xie. Comparing snns and rnns on neuromorphic vision datasets: Similarities and differences. *Neural Networks*, 132:108–120, 2020.
- [12] Hongyi Zhang, Moustapha Cisse, Yann N. Dauphin, and David Lopez-Paz. mixup: Beyond Empirical Risk Minimization, April 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1710.09412>. arXiv:1710.09412 [cs, stat].
- [13] Sangdoon Yun, Dongyoon Han, Seong Joon Oh, Sanghyuk Chun, Junsuk Choe, and Youngjoon Yoo. CutMix: Regularization Strategy to Train Strong Classifiers with Localizable Features, August 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1905.04899>. arXiv:1905.04899 [cs].
- [14] Terrance DeVries and Graham W. Taylor. Improved Regularization of Convolutional Neural Networks with Cutout, November 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1708.04552>. arXiv:1708.04552 [cs].
- [15] Connor Shorten and Taghi M. Khoshgoftaar. A survey on Image Data Augmentation for Deep Learning. *Journal of Big Data*, 6(1):60, December 2019. ISSN 2196-1115. doi: 10.1186/s40537-019-0197-0. URL <https://journalofbigdata.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s40537-019-0197-0>.
- [16] Yuhang Li, Youngeun Kim, Hyoungseob Park, Tamar Geller, and Priyadarshini Panda. Neuro-morphic data augmentation for training spiking neural networks. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 631–649. Springer, 2022.
- [17] Guobin Shen, Dongcheng Zhao, and Yi Zeng. EventMix: An efficient data augmentation strategy for event-based learning. *Information Sciences*, 644:119170, October 2023. ISSN 0020-0255. doi: 10.1016/j.ins.2023.119170. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0020025523007557>.
- [18] Kiran Maharana, Surajit Mondal, and Bhushankumar Nemade. A review: Data pre-processing and data augmentation techniques. *Global Transitions Proceedings*, 3(1):91–99, June 2022. ISSN 2666-285X. doi: 10.1016/j.gltp.2022.04.020. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666285X22000565>.

- [19] Connor Shorten and Taghi M Khoshgoftaar. A survey on image data augmentation for deep learning. *Journal of big data*, 6(1):1–48, 2019.
- [20] Alhassan Mumuni and Fuseini Mumuni. Data augmentation: A comprehensive survey of modern approaches. *Array*, 16:100258, 2022.
- [21] Jang-Hyun Kim, Wonho Choo, and Hyun Oh Song. Puzzle mix: Exploiting saliency and local statistics for optimal mixup. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5275–5285. PMLR, 2020.
- [22] AFM Uddin, Mst Monira, Wheemyung Shin, TaeChoong Chung, Sung-Ho Bae, et al. Saliency-cymix: A saliency guided data augmentation strategy for better regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.01791*, 2020.
- [23] Ekin D Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Dandelion Mane, Vijay Vasudevan, and Quoc V Le. Autoaugment: Learning augmentation strategies from data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 113–123, 2019.
- [24] Ekin D Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Jonathon Shlens, and Quoc V Le. Randaugment: Practical automated data augmentation with a reduced search space. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 702–703, 2020.
- [25] Fuqiang Gu, Weicong Sng, Xuke Hu, and Fangwen Yu. Eventdrop: Data augmentation for event-based learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.05836*, 2021.
- [26] Guobin Shen, Dongcheng Zhao, and Yi Zeng. Eventmix: An efficient data augmentation strategy for event-based learning. *Information Sciences*, 644:119170, 2023.
- [27] Mingyuan Sun, Donghao Zhang, Zongyuan Ge, Jiayu Wang, Jia Li, Zheng Fang, and Renjing Xu. Eventrpg: Event data augmentation with relevance propagation guidance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09274*, 2024.
- [28] Katharina Bendig, René Schuster, and Didier Stricker. Shapeaug: Occlusion augmentation for event camera data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02274*, 2024.
- [29] Fuqiang Gu, Jiarui Dou, Mingyan Li, Xianlei Long, Songtao Guo, Chao Chen, Kai Liu, Xianlong Jiao, and Ruiyuan Li. Eventaugument: Learning augmentation policies from asynchronous event-based data. *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive and Developmental Systems*, 2024.
- [30] David Berthelot, Nicholas Carlini, Ian Goodfellow, Nicolas Papernot, Avital Oliver, and Colin A Raffel. Mixmatch: A holistic approach to semi-supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [31] Kihyuk Sohn, David Berthelot, Nicholas Carlini, Zizhao Zhang, Han Zhang, Colin A Raffel, Ekin Dogus Cubuk, Alexey Kurakin, and Chun-Liang Li. Fixmatch: Simplifying semi-supervised learning with consistency and confidence. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:596–608, 2020.
- [32] David Berthelot, Nicholas Carlini, Ekin D Cubuk, Alex Kurakin, Kihyuk Sohn, Han Zhang, and Colin Raffel. Remixmatch: Semi-supervised learning with distribution alignment and augmentation anchoring. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.09785*, 2019.
- [33] Qizhe Xie, Zihang Dai, Eduard Hovy, Thang Luong, and Quoc Le. Unsupervised data augmentation for consistency training. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 6256–6268, 2020.
- [34] Zhirong Wu, Yuanjun Xiong, Stella X Yu, and Dahua Lin. Unsupervised feature learning via non-parametric instance discrimination. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3733–3742, 2018.
- [35] Kaiming He, Haoqi Fan, Yuxin Wu, Saining Xie, and Ross Girshick. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9729–9738, 2020.

- [36] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1597–1607. PMLR, 2020.
- [37] Xinlei Chen and Kaiming He. Exploring simple siamese representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 15750–15758, 2021.
- [38] Xiangwen Wang, Xianghong Lin, and Xiaochao Dang. Supervised learning in spiking neural networks: A review of algorithms and evaluations. *Neural Networks*, 125:258–280, 2020.
- [39] Wei Fang, Zhaofei Yu, Yanqi Chen, Tiejun Huang, Timothée Masquelier, and Yonghong Tian. Deep residual learning in spiking neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:21056–21069, 2021.
- [40] Rui-Jie Zhu, Malu Zhang, Qihang Zhao, Haoyu Deng, Yule Duan, and Liang-Jian Deng. Tcja-snn: Temporal-channel joint attention for spiking neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2024.
- [41] Jibin Wu, Chenglin Xu, Xiao Han, Daquan Zhou, Malu Zhang, Haizhou Li, and Kay Chen Tan. Progressive tandem learning for pattern recognition with deep spiking neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(11):7824–7840, 2021.

NeurIPS Paper Checklist

1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The contributions are included in introduction.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A No or NA answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

2. Limitations

Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The contributions are included in Conclusion.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper has no limitation while the answer No means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.
- The authors are encouraged to create a separate "Limitations" section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren't acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

3. Theory Assumptions and Proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: We are a data augmentation method. There in no theoretical assumptions.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

4. Experimental Result Reproducibility

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We made our code publicly available.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- If the paper includes experiments, a No answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
 - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
 - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
 - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
 - (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

5. Open access to data and code

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We made our code publicly available.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so “No” is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://nips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).
- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

6. Experimental Setting/Details

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyper-parameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer, etc.) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [No]

Justification: Since we are the data augmentation method, we state the parameters about our method. The rest of the details about the model are not stated for space reasons, but we make our code publicly available and the unstated parameters can be found inside.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

7. Experiment Statistical Significance

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [No] ,

Justification: We did not specify error bars but we ran multiple experiments for each experimental result.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer "Yes" if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.
- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).
- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)

- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
- It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.
- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g. negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, The authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

8. Experiments Compute Resources

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [No]

Justification: Our approach adds little computation, so the speed of the model depends on the device. There is almost no impact on the computation time of the model.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.
- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

9. Code Of Ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics <https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines?>

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: We have read code of ethics and confirmed.

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer No, they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

10. Broader Impacts

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [NA]

Justification:

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer NA or No, they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.
- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.

- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.
- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

11. Safeguards

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pretrained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification:

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

12. Licenses for existing assets

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [NA]

Justification: **[TODO]**

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.
- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, paperswithcode.com/datasets has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.
- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.

- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset’s creators.

13. **New Assets**

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [NA]

Justification:

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

14. **Crowdsourcing and Research with Human Subjects**

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [NA]

Justification:

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.
- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

15. **Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approvals or Equivalent for Research with Human Subjects**

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer:[NA]

Justification:

Guidelines:

- The answer NA means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.
- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.
- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.