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Abstract

We use large-scale commonsense knowledge bases, e.g. ConceptNet, to provide context cues to establish semantic relationships among entities directly hypothesized from video signal, such as putative object and actions labels, and infer a deeper interpretation of events than what is directly sensed. One approach is to learn semantic relationships between objects and actions from training annotations of videos and as such, depend largely on statistics of the vocabulary in these annotations. However, the use of prior encoded commonsense knowledge sources alleviates this dependence on large annotated training datasets. We represent interpretations using a connected structure of basic detected (grounded) concepts, such as objects and actions, that are bound by semantics with other background concepts not directly observed, i.e. contextualization cues. We mathematically express this using the language of Grenander's pattern generator theory. Concepts are basic generators and the bonds are defined by the semantic relationships between concepts. We formulate an inference engine based on energy minimization using an efficient Markov Chain Monte Carlo that uses the ConceptNet in its move proposals to find these structures. Using three different publicly available datasets, Breakfast, CMU Kitchen and MSVD, whose distribution of possible interpretations span more than 15000 possible solutions for over 5000 videos, we show that the proposed model can generate video interpretations whose quality are comparable or better than those reported by approaches such as discriminative approaches, hidden Markov models, context free grammars, deep learning models, and prior pattern theory approaches, all of whom rely on learning from domain-specific training data.

1. Introduction

There has been tremendous progress in object and action category recognition. Effort has shifted to generating simple sentences descriptions [26, 27, 31, 18] or answering simple yes or no questions about image content [30, 25, 13, 2]. The next step is to go beyond what is directly observable in the given image or video. Generating semantically coherent interpretations for a given video involves establishing semantic relationships between the atomic elements (or concepts) of the activity. This requires the use of prior contextual information. We have to contextualize the actions and objects detected or rather, hypothesized from the image and video signal to arrive at coherent semantic interpretations.

As defined by Gumperz [11], primarily for linguistics, contextualization refers to the use of knowledge acquired from past experience to retrieve presuppositions required to maintain involvement in the current task. We adapt this concept to computer vision to refer to the integration of past knowledge of concepts to aid in achieving the objective of the current task, i.e. interpreting activities observed in videos. To make it more concrete, in human activity recognition, “concept” includes actions and objects that constitute an activity; “presuppositions” refers to the background knowledge of concepts, their properties and relationships among such concepts. Note that the goal is to generate interpretations of a given activity rather than just recognition.

Extant approaches have explored the use of context and semantic knowledge in different ways. Graphical approaches [7, 14], attempt to explicitly model the semantic relationships that characterize human activities [15, 14] using a variety of methods such as context-free grammars [12], Markov networks [17], and AndOr graphs [29, 1] to name a few. These approaches require labeled training data whose sizes increases non-linearly with different semantic combinations of possible actions and objects in the scene.

Deep learning [18, 27, 20, 31] models the semantic relationships among actions and objects from training annotations. They are restricted by the quality, quantity, and vocabulary of the annotations present in the dataset. Balance of vocabulary is necessary for these models to acquire
Figure 1: Overall architecture proposed in this paper. Deep learning or machine learning-based approaches result in putative object and action labels; there are multiple possible labels associated with each image/video location. Pattern theory formalism integrates information from ConceptNet to arrive at an interpretative representation, a connected structure expressed using Grenander’s language of generators and bonds.

It allows us to leverage the knowledge gleaned from a variety of sources and hence not restrict the knowledge to a particular domain and/or dataset.

The contribution of this paper is threefold: (1) we are, to the best of our knowledge, among the first to introduce the notion of contextualization in video activity recognition, (2) we show that the introduction of contextualization improves upon the performance reported by state-of-the-art methods and (3) reduce the training requirements by negating the need for large amounts of annotations for capturing semantic relationships.

We start with discussion about how semantic knowledge is captured within the ConceptNet semantic network and how contextualization cues can be constructed. We then explain how interpretations are represented using pattern theory formulations followed by discussion on establishing semantic relationships among concepts using the ConceptNet semantic network. The Monte-Carlo inference process that rely on a Markov Chain induced by the structure of the ConceptNet is explained, followed by demonstration of efficacy of the approach on three large datasets.

2. Contextualization using ConceptNet

Contextualization cues can be of two types - semantic knowledge of basic concepts and relational connection of the current activity to similar ones in the recent past. The former, explored further in this paper, provides background knowledge about detected objects and actions to aid the interpretation of the video content. It leads to an understanding of why entities interact with each other. The latter, on the other hand, allows us to anticipate the entities that may be present in the current context based on relational and temporal cues from experience in the recent past. Combining both types of knowledge derived from contextualization allows us to propose models that are able to express their inferred knowledge through meaningful use of language that leads to better human-machine interaction.

We propose the use of a commonsense knowledge base as a source for contextualization. ConceptNet, proposed by Liu and Singh [16] and expanded to ConceptNet5 [22], is one such knowledge base that maps concepts and their semantic relationships in a traversable semantic network structure. Spanning more than 3 million concepts, the ConceptNet framework serves as a source of cross-domain semantic information from general human knowledge while supporting commonsense knowledge as expressed by humans in natural language. Technically, it encodes and expresses knowledge in a hypergraph, with the nodes representing concepts and edges representing semantic assertions.

There are more than 25 relations (also referred to as assertions) by which the different nodes are connected, with each of these relations contributing to the semantic relation-
relationship between the two concepts such as HasProperty, IsA, and RelatedTo to name a few. Each relation has a weight that determines the degree of validity of the assertion given the sources and hence provides a quantifiable measure of the semantic relation between concepts. Positive values indicate assertions and negative values indicate the opposite. Figure 2 illustrates these ideas; for example, the edge between nodes egg and plate represents an assertion with the relation AtLocation to indicate that eggs can be placed or found in plates. While ConceptNet has several assertions that represent different semantic relationships between the different concepts, we currently utilize a subset; more specifically - RelatedTo, IsA, HasA, HasProperty, CapableOf, UsedFor, and Similarity. We also use these relations to link concepts detected in videos via contextual cues to form semantically coherent interpretations.

Two concepts that do have a direct relationship can be correlated using contextualization cues. Relations, represented by the assertions, such as IsA and HasProperty, connect a particular concept with other concepts that represent their contextual properties. For example in Figure 2, there is no a direct semantic relationship between the concepts egg and put, but the contextualization cue plate connects them and provides a semantic context, i.e. eggs can be put on plate. Contextualization cues allow us to capture the semantic relationships among concepts which we could not have obtained if we rely only on semantic assertions that directly connect concepts.

Formally, let concepts be represented by $g_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, N$ and let $g_i, R_{g_j}$ represent relations (or assertion) between two concepts, then contextualization cue, $g_k$, satisfies the following expression not $(g_i, R_{g_j}) \land g_k, R_{g_k} \land g_k, R_{g_j}$

Figure 2: ConceptNet is semantic network of commonsense knowledge. Illustrated here is a very small snippet of the concepts present in the ConceptNet framework to show how various semantic relationships between concepts are expressed.

Figure 3: Representation of an interpretation using the language of pattern theory. Black circles are generators that represent grounded concepts and red generators represent ungrounded concepts that provide contextualization cues. The red links represent contextual bonds. The dashed links represent the shortest path between two grounded concepts. Note that there are open links for each of the generators present in the configuration, which allow the expansion of the concept, if desired. Note that only a selection of the bond structure of each generator is shown in this example.

3. Starting Point: Grounded Concepts

The starting point consists of putative object and action labels for each region in the image or video, which are our concepts with direct evidence from data. There might be multiple possible labels for each region. We allow for labeling errors and consider top-k possible labels for each instance. We have experimented with both handcrafted and automated features using well known methods.

Handcrafted features consist of Histogram of Optical Flow (HOF) [4] for generating action labels and Histogram of Oriented Gradients (HOG) [6] for object labels. HOF features were extracted by computing dense optic flow frames from three temporally sequential segments - each representing the start, development and end of the action sequence respectively. A histogram of optic flow (weighted by magnitude) is then constructed for these temporal segments to characterize the integral stages of the action. The composite feature for action recognition is then composed by ordered concatenation of the individual HOFs. Action and object labels were generated using linear support vector machines (SVM).

We experimented with two different strategies for extracting automated features. First, used deep learning models such as Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN) on images to capture the feature descriptions for objects and CNNs based on optic flows for actions (CNN-Flow) as was done in [9, 8]. In the second strategy, we follow the work in [27] and use mean-pooled values extracted from $f_{C7}$ layer for each frame from a CNN model pre-trained on a subset
of the ImageNet dataset [21].

In addition to video based inference, we allow for audio-based inference using bag-of-audio words (BoAW) and spectrogram features as auditory feature descriptors.

4. Video Interpretation Representation

Interpreting video content consists of constructing a semantically coherent composition of basic, atomic elements of knowledge called concepts detected from videos. These concepts represent the individual actions and objects that are required to form an interpretation of an activity. We use Grenander’s pattern theory language [10] to represent interpretations. Unlike prior uses of Grenander’s pattern theory for video description [9, 8], we do not need the manual specification of the alphabets and associate rules of this language. They are naturally determined by ConceptNet.

4.1. Representing Concepts: Generators

Following Grenander’s notations [10], each concept represents a single, atomic component called a generator \( g_i \in G_S \) where \( G_S \) is the generator space. The generator space represents a finite collection of all possible generators that can exist in a given environment. In the proposed approach, the collection of all concepts present within ConceptNet serves as the generator space.

The generator space \( (G_S) \) consists of three disjoint subsets that represent three kinds of generators - feature generators \( (F) \), grounded concept generators \( (G) \) and ungrounded context generators \( (C) \). Feature generators \( (g_{f1}, g_{f2}, g_{f3}, \ldots, g_{fn} \in F) \) correspond to the features extracted from videos and are used to infer the presence of the basic concepts (actions and objects) called grounded concept generators \( (g_1, g_2, g_3, \ldots, g_k \in G) \). Individual units of information that represent the background knowledge of these grounded concept generators are called ungrounded context generators \( (\bar{g}_1, \bar{g}_2, \bar{g}_3, \ldots, \bar{g}_q \in C) \). The term grounding is used to distinguish between generators with direct evidence in the video data and those that define the background knowledge of these concepts.

4.2. Connecting Generators: Bonds

Each generator \( g_i \) has a fixed number of bonds called the arity of a generator \( (\omega(g_i) \leq G_S) \). These bonds represent the semantic assertions from ConceptNet. Bonds are differentiated at a structural level by the direction of information flow that they represent - in-bonds and out-bonds as can be seen from Figure 4 (a) where the bonds representing RelatedTo and feature represent in-bonds and HasProperty and Isa represent out-bonds for the generator put. Each bond is identified by a unique coordinate and bond value taken from a set \( B \) such that the \( j^{th} \) bond of a generator \( g_i \in G_S \) is denoted as \( \beta_{dir}(g_i) \), where \( dir \) denotes the direction of the bond.

Types of Bonds

There exist two types of bonds - semantic bonds and support bonds. The direction of semantic bonds signify the semantics of a concept and the type of relationship a particular generator shares with its bonded generator or concept. These bonds are analogous to the assertions present in the ConceptNet framework. For example, Figure 3 illustrates an example configuration with pour, oil, liquid, etc. representing generators and the connections between them, given by RelatedTo, Isa, etc., representing the semantic bonds. The bonds highlighted in red indicate the presence of ungrounded context generators, representing the presence of contextual knowledge. Support bonds connect (grounded) concept generators to feature generators that represent direct image evidence. The these bonds are quantified using confidence scores from classification models.

Bond Compatibility

The viability of a closed bond between two generators is determined by the bond...
relation function \( \rho \). This function determines whether two bonds \( \beta(g_i) \) and \( \beta(g_j) \) between two generators, \( g_i \) and \( g_j \), are compatible and is denoted by \( \rho(\beta(g_i), \beta(g_j)) \) or simply as \( \rho(\beta, \beta) \). This function represents whether a given bond \( \beta_{dir}^{ij}(g_i) \) is either closed or open. The bond relation function is given by

\[
\rho(\beta(g_i), \beta(g_j)) = \{\text{TRUE}, \text{FALSE}\}; \forall g_i, g_j \in G_S \tag{1}
\]

A bond is said to be open if it is not connected to another generator through a bond; i.e., an out-bond of a generator \( g_i \) is connected to a generator \( g_j \) through one of its in-bonds or vice versa. For example, take the first case from Figure 4 (b) representing the bonded generator pair \{put and HOF\}. The bonds representing HasProperty, Isa and RelatedTo are considered to be open, whereas the bond representing feature represents a closed bond.

**Quantifying Bond Strength** The bonds between the generators are quantified using the strength of the semantic relationships between generators being quantified by the bond energy function:

\[
a(\beta'(g_i), \beta''(g_j)) = q(g_i, g_j) \tanh(f(g_i, g_j)). \tag{2}
\]

where \( f(.) \) is the weight associated with the relation in ConceptNet between concepts \( g_i \) and \( g_j \) through their respective bonds \( \beta' \) and \( \beta'' \). The \( \tanh \) function normalizes the score output by \( f(.) \) to range from -1 to 1. \( q(g_i, g_j) \) weights the score output by the \( \tanh \) function according to the bond connection type (e.g., semantic or support) \( \beta' \) and \( \beta'' \) forms. It helps us tradeoff between direct evidence and prior knowledge, i.e., context. If we want direct evidence to play a larger role in the inference we choose a larger value for \( q(g_i, g_j) \) for support bonds than semantic bonds, and vice-versa.

**4.3. Interpretations: Configurations of Generators**

Generators can be combined together through their local bond structures to form structures called configurations \( c \), which, in our case, represent semantic interpretations of video activities. Each configuration has an underlying graph topology, specified by a connector graph \( \sigma \). The set of all feasible connector graphs \( \sigma \) is denoted by \( \Sigma \), also known as the connection type. Formally, a configuration \( c \) is a connector graph \( \sigma \) whose sites \( 1, 2, \ldots, n \) are populated by a collection of generators \( g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_n \) expressed as,

\[
c = \sigma(g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_n); g_i \in G_S. \tag{3}
\]

The collection of generators \( g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_i \) represents the semantic content of a given configuration \( c \). For example, the collection of generators from the configuration in Figure 3 gives rise to the semantic content “pour oil (liquid) (fuel) (black)”.

**Configuration Probability** The probability of a particular configuration \( c \) is determined by its energy as given by the relation

\[
P(c) \propto e^{-E(c)} \tag{4}
\]

where \( E(c) \) represents the total energy of the configuration \( c \). The energy \( E(c) \) of a configuration \( c \) is the sum of the bond energies formed by the bond connections that combine the generators in the configuration, as described in Equation 5.

\[
E(c) = - \sum_{(\beta', \beta'')} a(\beta'(g_i), \beta''(g_j)) + Q(c) \tag{5}
\]

where \( Q \) is the cost factor associated with using ungrounded context generators that do not contribute to the overall description as seen from Equation 6; i.e., any ungrounded context generator that possesses bonds that do not connect to grounded generators increases the energy of the configuration and hence reduces its probability.

The cost factor \( Q \) of a given configuration \( c \) is given by

\[
Q(c) = k \sum_{g_i \in G'} \sum_{\beta_{out}^{ij}(g_i) \in \bar{g}_i} [D(\beta_{out}^{ij}(g_i))]. \tag{6}
\]

where \( G' \) is a collection of ungrounded contextual generators present in the configuration \( c \), \( \beta_{out}^{ij} \) represents each out-bond of each generator \( g_j \) and \( D(\beta) \) returns is function that true of the given bond is open. \( k \) is an arbitrary constant that quantifies the extent of the detrimental effect that the ungrounded context generators have on the quality of the interpretation.

The cost factor \( Q(c) \) restricts the inference process from constructing configurations with degenerate cases such as those composed of unconnected or isolated generators that do not have any closed bonds and as such do not connect to other generators in the configuration. It also prevents the inference from spawning generators that do not add semantic value to the overall quality of the configuration thereby reducing the search space to arrive at an optimal interpretation.

**5. Inferring Interpretations**

Searching for the best semantic description of a video involves minimizing the energy function \( E(c) \) and represents the inference process. The solution space spanned by the generator space is very large as both the number of generators and structures can be variable. For example, the combination of a single connector graph \( \sigma \) and a generator space \( G_S \) give rise to a space of feasible configurations \( C(\sigma) \). While the structure of the configurations \( c \in C(\sigma) \) is identical, their semantic content is varied due to the different assignments of generators to the sites of a connector graph. A feasible optimization solution for such exponentially large
space, is to use a sampling strategy. We follow the work in [9] and employ a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) based simulated annealing process. The MCMC based simulation method requires two types of proposal functions - global and local proposal functions. A connector graph $\sigma$ is given by a global proposal function which makes structural changes to the configuration that are reflected as jumps from a subspace to another. To this end, we follow the global proposal from [9]. A swapping transformation is applied to switch the generators within a configuration to change of semantic content of a given configuration $c$. Algorithm 1 shows the local proposal function which induces the swapping transformation. This results in a new configuration $c'$, thus constituting a move in the configuration space $C(\sigma)$.

Initially, the global proposal function gives introduces a set of grounded concept generators derived from machine learning classifiers. Then, a set of ungrounded context generators, representing the contextualization cues, are populated for each grounded concept within the initial configuration. Bonds are established between compatible generators when each generator is added to the configuration. Each jump given by the local proposal function gives rise to a configuration whose semantic content represents a possible interpretation for the given video. Interpretations with the least energy are considered to have a higher probability of possessing a more semantic coherence. Hence an additional optimization constraint is to minimize the cost factor $Q$ given in 6 by ensuring the least number of open bonds for each ungrounded contextual generator in the configuration.

### 6. Results

We begin with discussion on the three publicly available datasets that we use, followed by presentation of qualitative and quantitative results on them. Performance is quantified using measures that facilitate the comparison with other approaches, such as precision, F-Score, and BLEU score [19]. We compare performances against a variety of competing approaches – discriminative methods (DM) [14], hidden Markov models (HMM) [14], context free grammars (CFG+HMM) [14] factor graphs [26], different manifestations of deep recurrent neural networks [27, 18, 31], and generic pattern theory (PT) approaches [9]. We also consider a variation of pattern theory approach in [9], where we use the ConceptNet edge weights instead of training from domain ontology, called “PT+weights”.

#### 6.1. Datasets

The Breakfast Actions dataset consists of more than 1000 recipe videos, consisting of different scenarios with a combination of 10 recipes, 52 subjects and differing viewpoints captured from up to 5 cameras, which provides differing qualities of videos with varying amounts of clutter and occlusion. The units of interpretation are temporal video segments of these videos, given by the video annotation provided along with the dataset. We used handcrafted features (HOG and HOF) discussed in Section 3.

The Carnegie Mellon University Multimodal Activity dataset (CMU) contains multimodal measures of human activities such as cooking and food preparation. The dataset contains five different recipes: brownies, pizza, sandwich, salad and scrambled eggs. Spriggs et al. [23] generated the ground truth for some videos and recipes. The experiments were performed on the brownie recipe videos for performance comparison with [8] and used the same deep learned features as used by them.

The Microsoft Video Description Corpus (MSVD) is a publicly available dataset that contains 1,970 videos taken from YouTube. On an average, there 40 English descriptions available per video. We follow the split proposed in prior works [26, 27, 31, 18], and use 1,200 videos for training, 100 for validation and 670 for testing. We used the deep learning features that came with the dataset, i.e. the second learning features as used by them.

#### 6.2. Qualitative Results

Figure 5 shows four example interpretations generated (last column) for each of the videos represented in the first column. These can be compared against the results from prior pattern theory approach that requires training (PT+training, second column) and its variation where we replaced training with Similarity weights from ConceptNet (PT+weights, third column). As is evident, the representation of our approach is richer with contextualization cues that go beyond what is seen in the image. For example, take a video with groundtruth as “read brownie box”. Our ap-
Ground truth  

Put egg on plate  

PT + training  

Put salt-pepper on glass  

PT + weights  

Add egg to plate  

Our approach  

Put (chicken) egg (food) on plate

Put fruit into bowl  

Stir tea, dough  

Put tea in bowl  

Put (food) fruit (orange) in bowl  

Pour dough on pan  

Pour juice to dough  

Put from glass to bowl  

Pour (liquid) (semisolid) dough on pan  

Read brownie box  

Take brownie box  

Stir brownie box  

Read (food) (recipe) on brownie box (container)

Figure 5: Video descriptions generated by the pattern theory method in [9] (PT+training), this pattern theory model but with ConceptNet weights instead of training (PT+weights) and our approach of this paper. The corresponding equivalent text is shown below each figure. The text in parentheses represent conceptualization cues. Black circles denote grounded concepts and red circles denote ungrounded, contextualization cues.

6.3. Quantitative Results

Breakfast Actions Dataset The proposed approach outperforms both the performance of the HMM-based and the Context Free Grammar models reported by Hilde [14] as well as the pattern theory model [9] as seen from Table 1. It is important to note that the performance of the proposed approach was able to content the presence of the grounded concepts read and brownie box through the ungrounded contextual generators container, food and recipe. Without contextualization cues, not only are there errors in the interpretations of the prior pattern theory approaches, but they are not as rich and descriptive.
The approach is remarkable considering that the model is neither trained specifically for the kitchen domain nor on the dataset itself other than for obtaining the starting grounded action and object labels. Other methods are restricted by the vocabulary of the training data to build their descriptions. For example, the Context Free Grammar method makes use of temporal information such as states and transitions between states to build the final descriptions which is not the case with our approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Precision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM [14]</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMM [14]</td>
<td>14.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFG + HMM [14]</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT+training (Top 10) [9]</td>
<td>38.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Approach (Top 10)</td>
<td>39.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Results on Breakfast Action dataset. Top 10 means that we consider the best 10 interpretations generated by the approach.

**CMU Dataset** We explore the use of multi-modal features to leverage the auditory features present in the CMU activities dataset. Table 2 compares our performance with the best performing feature set reported in [8] (PT+training), and its variation that replaces training with ConceptNet Similarity edge weights (PT+weights).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>F-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT+training [8]</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT+weights</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Approach</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Results on CMU kitchen dataset using audio + video features.

**MSVD Dataset** On the Microsoft Video Description Corpus (MSVD) dataset, we report the BLEU score to compare against other comparable approaches. The proposed approach outperforms the other approaches as is very close to the top performing approach as seen from Table 3. An important aspect to note is that the other state-of-the-art approaches take into account more complex features that are more descriptive of the concepts within the video; by contrast, we take into account only the mean pooled CNN features across frames for generating candidate labels for all concepts. For example, the HRNE model [18] makes use of temporal characteristics in the video; the Temporal Attention model [31] leverages the frame-level representation from GoogleNet [24] as well as video-level representation using a 3-D Convolutional Neural Network trained on hand-crafted descriptors in addition to an attention model that provides dynamic attention to specific temporal regions of the video for generating descriptions.

**Immunity to Unbalance in Training Data:** Not all labels are equally represented in most training data. This is particularly acute as number of labels increase. To demonstrate that our method is immune to this effect, we partitioned the activity classes labels into 4 different categories based on amount of training data available. Table 4 shows the performance for our approach as compared to prior pattern theory approaches, PT+training and PT+weights. As expected, performance of PT+training that rely on annotations [9] increase with increase in training data. Whereas, our approach is stable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Num. of samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PT+training [8]</td>
<td>≤ 10 10 - 20 20 - 40 ≥ 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.81% 17.36% 22.98% 35.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT+weights</td>
<td>25.41% 36.57% 37.10% 34.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Approach</td>
<td>34.76% 40.07% 38.23% 38.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Impact of training data imbalance. We show the performances (F-Score) of our approach (red) and prior pattern theory approach (PT+training), and its variation (PT+weights) for four different categories of labels that differ in number of training samples.

**7. Conclusion**

Contextualization based on commonsense knowledge, such as ConceptNet, can be used to generate rich semantic interpretation of video (and audio data) that go beyond what is directly observable. This also helps us break the ever increasing demands on large training data with output description sizes. There is no training required beyond that needed for the starting object and action labels. We demonstrated how the language of Grenander’s pattern theory can be used to naturally capture the semantics and context in ConceptNet and infer rich interpretative structures. The inference process allows for multiple putative objects and action labels for each video event to overcome errors in classification. These structures are intermediate representations that can be basis for generation of sentences or even used
for visual question and answers. Extensive experiments demonstrate the applicability of the approach to a wide set of domains and its highly competitive performance.
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