

# Analysing Affective Behavior in the First ABAW 2020 Competition

Dimitrios Kollias<sup>1</sup>, Attila Schults<sup>2</sup>, Elnar Hajiyeve<sup>2</sup> and Stefanos Zafeiriou<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Computing, Imperial College London, UK

<sup>2</sup> Realeyes

**Abstract**—The Affective Behavior Analysis in-the-wild (ABAW) 2020 Competition is the first Competition aiming at automatic analysis of the three main behavior tasks of valence-arousal estimation, basic expression recognition and action unit detection. It is split into three Challenges, each one addressing a respective behavior task. For the Challenges, we provide a common benchmark database, Aff-Wild2, which is a large scale in-the-wild database and the first one annotated for all these three tasks. In this paper, we describe this Competition, to be held in conjunction with the IEEE Conference on Face and Gesture Recognition, May 2020, in Buenos Aires, Argentina. We present the three Challenges, with the utilized Competition corpora. We outline the evaluation metrics, present both the baseline system and the top-3 performing teams' methodologies per Challenge and finally present their obtained results. More information regarding the Competition, the leaderboard of each Challenge and details for accessing the utilized database, are provided in the Competition site: <http://ibug.doc.ic.ac.uk/resources/fg-2020-competition-affective-behavior-analysis>.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The proposed Competition tackles the problem of affective behavior analysis in-the-wild, which is a major targeted characteristic of human computer interaction systems used in real life applications. The current 5<sup>th</sup> societal revolution aims at merging the physical and cyber spaces, providing services that contribute to people's well-being. The target is to create machines and robots that are capable of understanding people's feelings, emotions and behaviors; thus, being able to interact in a 'human-centered' and engaging manner with them, and effectively serving them as their digital assistants.

Affective behavior analysis in diverse environments, i.e., in-the-wild, will have a positive societal impact, by helping machines and robots to interact with and assist people in a natural way. Through human affect recognition, the reactions of the machine, or robot, will be consistent with people's emotions [16]; their verbal and non-verbal interactions will be positively received by humans. This will not be dependent on human's age, sex, ethnicity, educational, level, profession, or social position. A great improvement in generating trust, understanding and closeness between humans and machines in everyday societal environments will be achieved through development of intelligent systems able to analyze human behaviors in-the-wild.

Representing human emotions has been a basic topic of research in psychology. The most frequently used emotion representation is the categorical one, including the seven basic categories, i.e., Anger, Disgust, Fear, Happiness, Sadness, Surprise and Neutral [9]. Many research problems [37], [1]

have focused on this representation. Discrete emotion representation can also be described in terms of the Facial Action Coding System (FACS) model, in which all possible facial actions are described in terms of Action Units (AUs) [8]. Many automatic methodologies [10], [3] have been proposed to recognise this representation. Finally, the dimensional model of affect [33], [31] has been proposed as a means to distinguish between subtly different displays of affect and encode small changes in the intensity of each emotion on a continuous scale. The 2-D Valence and Arousal (VA) Space (valence shows how positive or negative an emotional state is, whereas arousal shows how passive or active it is) is the most usual dimensional emotion representation, depicted in Figure 1. Many approaches [4], [22], [20] have been developed to automatically recognise this representation.




Fig. 1. The 2D Valence-Arousal Space

The Competition will contribute to advancing the related technical state-of-the-art, by targeting, for the first time, dimensional (in terms of valence and arousal), categorical (in terms of the seven basic emotions) and facial action unit analysis and recognition. The Competition is split into three Challenges, namely Valence-Arousal estimation Challenge, Seven Basic Expression Classification Challenge and Eight Action Unit Detection Challenge. All these Challenges are based, for the first time, on the same large in-the-wild audiovisual database, the Aff-Wild2 [23], [19], [21], which contains annotations for all these tasks.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. We introduce the Competition corpora in Section II, the Competition evaluation metrics in Section III, the developed baseline and top-3 (in terms of performance) team's systems

per Challenge, along with the obtained results in Section IV, before concluding in Section V.

## II. COMPETITION CORPORA

The First Affective Behavior Analysis in-the-wild (ABAW) Competition relies on the Aff-Wild2 database [23], [19], [21]. Aff-Wild2 is the first ever database annotated for all three main behavior tasks: valence-arousal estimation, action unit detection and basic expression classification. These three tasks form the three Challenges of this Competition. In the following, we provide a short overview of each Challenge’s dataset and refer the reader to the original work for a more complete description. Finally, we describe the pre-processing steps that we carried out for cropping and aligning the images of Aff-Wild2. The cropped and aligned images have been provided to all Competition participating teams. Additionally, they were utilized in our baseline experiments.

### A. Aff-Wild2: Valence-Arousal Annotation

Aff-Wild2 consists of 545 videos with 2,786,201 frames. Sixteen of these videos display two subjects (both have been annotated). Aff-Wild2 is currently the largest (and audiovisual) in-the-wild database annotated for valence and arousal. All videos have been collected from YouTube. Aff-Wild2 is an extension of Aff-Wild [18], [35], [17]; 260 more YouTube videos, with 1,413,000 frames, have been added to Aff-Wild. Aff-Wild was the first large scale, captured in-the-wild, dimensionally annotated database, containing 298 YouTube videos that display subjects reacting to a variety of stimuli.

Aff-Wild2 shows both subtle and extreme human behaviours in real-world settings. The total number of subjects in Aff-Wild2 is 458; 279 of them are males and 179 females.

Four experts annotated Aff-Wild2 with respect to valence and arousal, using the method proposed in [6]. The annotators watched each video and provided their (frame-by-frame) annotations through a joystick. A time-continuous annotation was generated for each affect dimension. Valence and arousal values range continuously in  $[-1, 1]$ . The final label values were the mean of those four annotations. The mean inter-annotation correlation is 0.63 for valence and 0.60 for arousal. Let us note here that all subjects present in each video have been annotated. Figure 2 shows the 2D Valence-Arousal histogram of annotations of Aff-Wild2.

Aff-Wild2 is split into three subsets: training, validation and test. Partitioning is done in a subject independent manner, in the sense that a person can appear only in one of those three subsets. The resulting training, validation and test subsets consist of 346, 68 and 131 videos, respectively.

### B. Aff-Wild2: Seven Basic Expression Annotation

For the purposes of this Challenge, we build upon the former Aff-Wild2’s annotated part, for providing annotation in terms of the seven basic expressions; we annotate in total 539 videos consisting of 2,595,572 frames with 431 subjects, 265 of which are male and 166 female. Eight of




Fig. 2. 2D Valence-Arousal Histogram of Aff-Wild2

the videos display two subjects (all of which have been annotated).

Seven experts performed the annotation of Aff-Wild2 for the seven basic expressions in a frame-by-frame basis; a platform-tool was developed in order to split each video into frames and let the experts annotate each videoframe. Let us mention that in this platform-tool, an expert could score a videoframe as having either one of the seven basic expressions or none (since there are affective states other than the seven basic expressions). Let us note again that all subjects appearing in each video have been annotated.

Due to subjectivity of annotators and wide ranging levels of images difficulty, there were some disagreements among annotators. We decided to keep only the annotations on which at least five (out of seven) experts agreed. Table I shows the distribution of the seven basic expression annotations of Aff-Wild2.

TABLE I  
NUMBER OF ANNOTATED IMAGES IN EACH OF THE SEVEN BASIC EXPRESSIONS

Basic Expression	No of Images
Neutral	1,268,631
Anger	51,837
Disgust	32,258
Fear	27,388
Happiness	389,517
Sadness	172,612
Surprise	99,391

Aff-Wild2 is split into three subsets: training, validation and test. Partitioning is done in a subject independent manner. The resulting training, validation and test subsets consist of 253, 71 and 223 videos, respectively.

### C. Aff-Wild2: Eight Action Unit Annotation

Aff-Wild2 has been partly annotated in terms of eight action units, as well. The annotated part consists of 56 videos, with 63 subjects (32 males and 31 females), in 398,835 frames. Seven of these videos display two subjects (both have been annotated).

Three experts performed the annotation of Aff-Wild2 for the occurrence of eight action units in a frame-by-frame basis; a platform-tool (similar to the one used for annotating the seven basic expressions) was developed in order to split each video into frames and let the experts annotate each videoframe. The agreement between the annotators has not always been 100%. Therefore, we decided to keep the annotations, on which all three experts agreed. Let us also note that all subjects present in each video have been annotated. Table II shows the name of the eight action units that have been annotated, the action that they are associated with and the distribution of their annotations in Aff-Wild2.

TABLE II  
DISTRIBUTION OF AU ANNOTATIONS IN AFF-WILD2

Action Unit #	Action	Total Number of Activated AUs
AU 1	inner brow raiser	86,677
AU 2	outer brow raiser	4,166
AU 4	brow lowerer	56,327
AU 6	cheek raiser	25,226
AU 12	lip corner puller	35,675
AU 15	lip corner depressor	3,340
AU 20	lip stretcher	5,695
AU 25	lips part	9,048

Aff-Wild2 is split into three subsets: training, validation and test. Partitioning is done in a subject independent manner. The resulting training, validation and test subsets consist of 37, 7 and 12 videos, respectively.

#### D. Aff-Wild2 Pre-Processing: Cropped & Cropped-Aligned Images

At first, we split all videos into images (frames). Then, the SSH detector [27] based on the ResNet [11] and trained on the WiderFace dataset [34] was used to extract face bounding boxes from all the images. The cropped images according to these bounding boxes were provided to the participating teams. Also, 5 facial landmarks (two eyes, nose and two mouth corners) were extracted and used to perform similarity transformation (for face alignment [2]). The resulting cropped and aligned images were additionally provided to the participating teams. Finally, the cropped and aligned images were utilized in our baseline experiments, described in Section IV.

### III. EVALUATION METRICS PER CHALLENGE

Next, we present the metrics that will be used for assessing the performance of the developed methodologies of the participating teams in each Challenge.

#### A. Valence-Arousal Estimation Challenge

The Concordance Correlation Coefficient (CCC) is widely used in measuring the performance of dimensional emotion recognition methods, such as in the series of AVEC challenges [30]. CCC evaluates the agreement between two time series (e.g., all video annotations and predictions) by scaling their correlation coefficient with their mean square difference. In this way, predictions that are well correlated

with the annotations but shifted in value are penalized in proportion to the deviation. CCC takes values in the range  $[-1, 1]$ , where  $+1$  indicates perfect concordance and  $-1$  denotes perfect discordance. The higher the value of the CCC the better the fit between annotations and predictions, and therefore high values are desired. CCC is defined as follows:

$$\rho_c = \frac{2s_{xy}}{s_x^2 + s_y^2 + (\bar{x} - \bar{y})^2}, \quad (1)$$

where  $s_x$  and  $s_y$  are the variances of all video valence/arousal annotations and predicted values, respectively,  $\bar{x}$  and  $\bar{y}$  are their corresponding mean values and  $s_{xy}$  is the corresponding covariance value.

The mean value of CCC for valence and arousal estimation will be adopted as the main evaluation criterion.

$$\mathcal{E}_{total} = \frac{\rho_a + \rho_v}{2}, \quad (2)$$

#### B. Seven Basic Expression Classification Challenge

The  $F_1$  score is a weighted average of the recall (i.e., the ability of the classifier to find all the positive samples) and precision (i.e., the ability of the classifier not to label as positive a sample that is negative). The  $F_1$  score reaches its best value at 1 and its worst score at 0. The  $F_1$  score is defined as:

$$F_1 = \frac{2 \times \text{precision} \times \text{recall}}{\text{precision} + \text{recall}} \quad (3)$$

The  $F_1$  score for emotions is computed based on a per-frame prediction (an emotion category is specified in each frame).

Total accuracy (denoted as  $\mathcal{T}Acc$ ) is defined on all test samples and is the fraction of predictions that the model got right. Total accuracy reaches its best value at 1 and its worst score at 0. It is defined as:

$$\mathcal{T}Acc = \frac{\text{Number of Correct Predictions}}{\text{Total Number of Predictions}} \quad (4)$$

A weighted average between the  $F_1$  score and the total accuracy,  $\mathcal{T}Acc$ , will be the main evaluation criterion:

$$\mathcal{E}_{total} = 0.67 \times F_1 + 0.33 \times \mathcal{T}Acc, \quad (5)$$

#### C. Eight Action Unit Detection Challenge

To obtain the overall score for the AU detection Challenge, we first obtain the  $F_1$  score for each AU independently, and then compute the (unweighted) average over all 8 AUs (denoted as  $\mathcal{AF}_1$ ):

$$\mathcal{AF}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^8 F_1^i \quad (6)$$

The  $F_1$  score for AUs is computed based on a per-frame detection (whether each AU is present or absent).

The average between the  $\mathcal{AF}_1$  score and the total accuracy,  $\mathcal{T}Acc$ , will be the main evaluation criterion:

$$\mathcal{E}_{total} = 0.5 \times \mathcal{AF}_1 + 0.5 \times \mathcal{T}Acc \quad (7)$$

#### IV. BASELINE & PARTICIPATING TEAMS' SYSTEMS AND RESULTS

All baseline systems rely exclusively on existing open-source machine learning toolkits to ensure the reproducibility of the results. In this Section, we first describe the baseline systems developed for each Challenge, then we present the participating teams's algorithms that ranked in the top-3 of each Challenge and finally report their obtained results.

At first, let us mention that we utilized the cropped and aligned images from Aff-Wild2, as described in Section II-D. These images are then resized to dimension  $96 \times 96 \times 3$ . The pixel intensities are normalized to take values in  $[-1,1]$ . No on-the-fly or off-the-fly data augmentation technique [24], [14], [15] was utilized.

##### A. Baseline System: Valence-Arousal Estimation Challenge

The architecture that was used for estimating valence and arousal was based on that of PatchGAN [13], [38], [5]. PatchGAN is a deep convolutional neural network initially designed to classify patches of an input image, rather than the entire image, as real or fake. The PatchGAN was the discriminator of the pix2pix architecture [13]. The output of the network is a single feature map of real/fake predictions that was averaged to give a single score. In StarGAN [5], PatchGAN was additionally used as a classifier. Here, we adopt PatchGAN for valence-arousal regression. The exact architecture used, can be seen in Table III. It was implemented in TensorFlow, trained from scratch, for around two days on a Titan X GPU, with a learning rate of  $10^{-4}$ . PatchGAN's implementation code is publicly available from groups that implemented pix2pix, CycleGAN [38] and StarGAN.

TABLE III

PATCHGAN ADOPTED FOR VALENCE-AROUSAL ESTIMATION. LEAKY RELY FOLLOWS EACH CONVOLUTIONAL LAYER.

Name	Type	Filter
conv	weights	(4, 4, 3, 64)
conv 1	weights	(4, 4, 64, 128)
conv 2	weights	(4, 4, 128, 256)
conv 3	weights	(4, 4, 256, 512)
conv 4	weights	(4, 4, 512, 1024)
conv 5	weights	(4, 4, 512, 1024)
conv 6	weights	(4, 4, 1024, 2048)
conv 7	weights/D-label	(1, 1, 2048, 2)

##### B. Baseline System: Seven Basic Expression Classification & Eight Action Unit Detection Challenges

The architectures that were used for the tasks of classification into the seven basic expressions and detection of eight action units, were based on the architecture of MobileNetV2 [32]. MobileNetV2 belongs to the class of efficient models called MobileNets [12] that are light-weight deep neural networks. They are based on a streamlined architecture that uses depth-wise separable convolutions which dramatically reduce the complexity, cost and model size of the network. For more details regarding this class of architectures and the

MobileNetV2 network, we refer the interested reader to [32]. Table IV shows the basic structure of MobileNetV2.

TABLE IV  
THE MOBILENETV2 NETWORK

Name	Type	Filter
conv	weights	(3, 3, 3, 32)
expanded conv	depthwise	(3, 3, 32, 1)
expanded conv	project	(1, 1, 32, 16)
expanded conv 1	expand	(1, 1, 16, 96)
expanded conv 1	depthwise	(3, 3, 96, 1)
expanded conv 1	project	(1, 1, 96, 24)
expanded conv 2	expand	(1, 1, 24, 144)
expanded conv 2	depthwise	(3, 3, 144, 1)
expanded conv 2	project	(1, 1, 144, 24)
expanded conv 3	expand	(1, 1, 24, 144)
expanded conv 3	depthwise	(3, 3, 144, 1)
expanded conv 3	project	(1, 1, 144, 32)
expanded conv 4	expand	(1, 1, 32, 192)
expanded conv 4	depthwise	(3, 3, 192, 1)
expanded conv 4	project	(1, 1, 192, 32)
expanded conv 5	expand	(1, 1, 32, 192)
expanded conv 5	depthwise	(3, 3, 192, 1)
expanded conv 5	project	(1, 1, 192, 32)
expanded conv 6	expand	(1, 1, 32, 192)
expanded conv 6	depthwise	(3, 3, 192, 1)
expanded conv 6	project	(1, 1, 192, 64)
expanded conv 7	expand	(1, 1, 64, 384)
expanded conv 7	depthwise	(3, 3, 384, 1)
expanded conv 7	project	(1, 1, 384, 64)
expanded conv 8	expand	(1, 1, 64, 384)
expanded conv 8	depthwise	(3, 3, 384, 1)
expanded conv 8	project	(1, 1, 384, 64)
expanded conv 9	expand	(1, 1, 64, 384)
expanded conv 9	depthwise	(3, 3, 384, 1)
expanded conv 9	project	(1, 1, 384, 64)
expanded conv 10	expand	(1, 1, 64, 384)
expanded conv 10	depthwise	(3, 3, 384, 1)
expanded conv 10	project	(1, 1, 384, 96)
expanded conv 11	expand	(1, 1, 96, 576)
expanded conv 11	depthwise	(3, 3, 576, 1)
expanded conv 11	project	(1, 1, 576, 96)
expanded conv 12	expand	(1, 1, 96, 576)
expanded conv 12	depthwise	(3, 3, 576, 1)
expanded conv 12	project	(1, 1, 576, 96)
expanded conv 13	expand	(1, 1, 96, 576)
expanded conv 13	depthwise	(3, 3, 576, 1)
expanded conv 13	project	(1, 1, 576, 160)
expanded conv 14	expand	(1, 1, 160, 960)
expanded conv 14	depthwise	(3, 3, 960, 1)
expanded conv 14	project	(1, 1, 960, 160)
expanded conv 15	expand	(1, 1, 160, 960)
expanded conv 15	depthwise	(3, 3, 960, 1)
expanded conv 15	project	(1, 1, 960, 160)
expanded conv 16	expand	(1, 1, 160, 960)
expanded conv 16	depthwise	(3, 3, 960, 1)
expanded conv 16	project	(1, 1, 960, 320)
conv 1	weights	(1, 1, 320, 1280)

Let us note that: i) batch normalization is applied after each convolutional or expanded convolutional layer, ii) the non-linearity is Relu6 and iii) no average pooling is conducted in the end. After the final convolutional layer (shown in Table IV), a fully connected layer follows (with 7 units if the task is to predict the 7 basic expressions, or 8 units if the task is to detect the 8 action units) and on top of that is a softmax or sigmoid layer, respectively.

MobileNetV2 was implemented in TensorFlow, trained



from scratch, for around three days on a Titan X GPU, with a learning rate of  $10^{-4}$ . MobileNetV2 is released as part of tf-slim library.

### C. Top-3 Performing Teams per Challenge and their Methodologies

At first let us mention that in total sixty two (62) different teams registered for this Competition. Unfortunately due to the coronavirus a lot of these groups notified that they would not be able to send the test results before the final deadline for the Competition. Next, we present five methodologies that displayed the best performances in each Challenge and ranked in the top-3.

The NISL2020 team [7] participated in all three Challenges and ranked in the first, third and first place of the Valence-Arousal Estimation, Seven Basic Expression Classification and Eight Action Unit Detection Challenges, respectively. Their methodology tackled multi-task learning of these three tasks. The authors proposed an algorithm for their developed multi-task model to learn from partial labels. At first, they trained a teacher model to perform all three tasks, where each instance is trained by the ground truth label of its corresponding task. Then, they used the outputs of the teacher model and the ground truths to train the student model, resulting in the latter outperforming the teacher model. Finally, ensemble methodologies were used to further boost the performance of the model.

The TNT team [25] participated in all three Challenges and ranked in the second, first and second place of the Valence-Arousal Estimation, Seven Basic Expression Classification and Eight Action Unit Detection Challenges, respectively. Their methodology tackled multi-task learning of these three tasks using multi-modal (images and audio) input. The authors proposed a two-stream aural-visual analysis model in which audio and image streams are first processed separately and fed into a convolutional neural network. The authors did not use recurrent architectures for temporal analysis but used instead temporal convolutions. Furthermore, the model was given access to additional features extracted during face-alignment pre-processing. At training time, correlations between different emotion representations are exploited so as to improve the model's performance.

The ICT-VIPL-VA team [36] participated in the Valence-Arousal Estimation Challenge and ranked in the third place. Their methodology fused both visual features extracted from videos and acoustic features extracted from audio tracks. To extract the visual features, the authors followed a CNN-RNN paradigm, in which spatio-temporal visual features [29] are extracted with a 3D convolutional network and / or a pretrained 2D convolutional network, and are fused through a bidirectional recurrent neural network. The audio features are extracted from a GRU-MLP network.

The ICT-VIPL-Expression team [26] participated in the Seven Basic Expression Classification Challenge and ranked in the second place. Their methodology combined a Deep Residual Network with convolutional block attention module and also Bidirectional Long-Short-Term Memory Units. The

authors also visualized the learned attention maps and analyzed the importance of different regions in facial expression recognition.

The SALT team [28] participated in the Eight Action Unit Detection Challenge and ranked in the third place. Their methodology included a multi-label class balancing algorithm as a pre-processing step for overcoming the imbalanced occurrences of Action Units in the training dataset. Then a ResNet was trained using the augmented training dataset.

### D. Results

Table V presents the CCC evaluation of valence and arousal predictions on the Aff-Wild2 test (validation) set, of the baseline network (PatchGAN) and the networks developed by the top-3 performing teams of this Challenge. It can be observed that the NISL2020 team achieved the best overall score and the best arousal CCC, whereas the TNT team achieved the best valence CCC. It should be noted that all participating teams outperformed the baseline by a large margin.

TABLE V

BASLINE RESULTS FOR VA ESTIMATION ON THE TEST (VALIDATION) SET OF AFF-WILD2 OF: I) THE BASELINE NETWORK (PATCHGAN) AND II) THE NETWORKS DEVELOPED BY THE TOP-3 PERFORMING TEAMS; '-' MEANS THAT NO RESULT IS REPORTED IN THE CORRESPONDING PAPER;  $\mathcal{E}_{total}$  IS THE MEAN VALENCE AND AROUSAL CCC

Team	CCC		$\mathcal{E}_{total}$
	Valence	Arousal	
NISL2020	0.44 (0.335)	<b>0.454</b> (0.515)	<b>0.447</b> (0.425)
TNT	<b>0.448</b> (-)	0.417 (-)	0.433 (-)
ICT-VIPL-VA	0.361 (0.32)	0.408 (0.55)	0.385 (0.435)
Baseline	0.11 (0.14)	0.27 (0.24)	0.19 (0.19)

Table VI presents the performance on the test (validation) set of Aff-Wild2, of the baseline network (MobileNetV2), and of the networks developed by the top-3 performing teams of the Seven Basic Expression Classification Challenge. The performance metric is a weighted average between the F1 score and the total accuracy, as discussed in Section III-B. It can be observed that the TNT team outperformed by a large margin all other teams in both F1 Score and Total accuracy (and thus in the total evaluation metric). Let us mention that all participating teams outperformed the baseline.

TABLE VI

BASLINE RESULTS FOR BASIC EXPRESSION CLASSIFICATION ON THE TEST (VALIDATION) SET OF AFF-WILD2 OF: I) THE BASELINE NETWORK (MOBILENETV2) AND II) THE NETWORKS DEVELOPED BY THE TOP-3 PERFORMING TEAMS; '-' MEANS THAT NO RESULT IS REPORTED IN THE CORRESPONDING PAPER;  $\mathcal{E}_{total} = 0.67 \times F_1 + 0.33 \times TAcc$

Team	F1 Score	Total Accuracy	$\mathcal{E}_{total}$
TNT	<b>0.398</b> (-)	<b>0.734</b> (-)	<b>0.509</b> (-)
ICT-VIPL-Expression	0.286 (0.333)	0.655 (0.64)	0.408 (0.434)
NISL2020	0.27 (-)	0.68 (-)	0.405 (0.493)
Baseline	0.15 (0.21)	0.605 (0.664)	0.30 (0.36)

Table VII presents the performance on the test (validation) set of Aff-Wild2, of the baseline network (MobileNetV2), and of the networks developed by the top-3 performing teams of the Eight Action Unit Detection Challenge. The performance metric is the average between the F1 score and the total accuracy, as discussed in Section III-C. It can be seen that the NISL2020 team achieved the best performance in the average F1 Score, whereas the TNT team achieved the best one in the Total Accuracy. The NISL2020 team achieved a better overall performance, with a very small difference, than the TNT one. Again all participating teams outperformed the baseline.

TABLE VII

BASLINE RESULTS FOR ACTION UNIT DETECTION ON THE TEST (VALIDATION) SET OF AFF-WILD2 OF: I) THE BASELINE NETWORK (MOBILENETV2) AND II) THE NETWORKS DEVELOPED BY THE TOP-3 PERFORMING TEAMS; '-' MEANS THAT NO RESULT IS REPORTED IN THE CORRESPONDING PAPER;  $\mathcal{E}_{total} = 0.5 \times \mathcal{AF}_1 + 0.5 \times \mathcal{T}Acc$

Team	Average F1 Score	Total Accuracy	$\mathcal{E}_{total}$
NISL2020	<b>0.309</b> (-)	0.905 (-)	<b>0.607</b> (0.591)
TNT	0.27 (-)	<b>0.932</b> (-)	0.601 (-)
SALT	0.216 (0.24)	0.886 (-)	0.551 (0.59)
Baseline	0.16 (0.22)	0.36 (0.4)	0.26 (0.31)

## V. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have presented the Affective Behavior Analysis in-the-wild Competition (ABAW) 2020. It comprises three Challenges targeting: i) valence-arousal estimation, ii) seven basic expression classification and iii) eight action unit detection. The database utilized for this Competition has been derived from the Aff-Wild2, the large-scale and first database annotated for all these three behavior tasks. We have also presented the baseline networks and their results. Finally, we described the top-3 performing, per Challenge, team methodologies and presented their results.

## REFERENCES

- [1] K. Ali and C. E. Hughes. Facial expression recognition using disentangled adversarial learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.13135*, 2019.
- [2] Y. Avrithis, N. Tsapatsoulis, and S. Kollias. Broadcast news parsing using visual cues: A robust face detection approach. In *2000 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo. ICME2000. Proceedings. Latest Advances in the Fast Changing World of Multimedia (Cat. No. 00TH8532)*, volume 3, pages 1469–1472. IEEE, 2000.
- [3] J. C. Batista, V. Albiero, O. R. Bellon, and L. Silva. Aumpnet: simultaneous action units detection and intensity estimation on multipose facial images using a single convolutional neural network. In *2017 12th IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face & Gesture Recognition (FG 2017)*, pages 866–871. IEEE, 2017.
- [4] H. Chen, Y. Deng, S. Cheng, Y. Wang, D. Jiang, and H. Sahli. Efficient spatial temporal convolutional features for audiovisual continuous affect recognition. In *Proceedings of the 9th International on Audio/Visual Emotion Challenge and Workshop*, pages 19–26, 2019.
- [5] Y. Choi, M. Choi, M. Kim, J.-W. Ha, S. Kim, and J. Choo. Stargan: Unified generative adversarial networks for multi-domain image-to-image translation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8789–8797, 2018.
- [6] R. Cowie, E. Douglas-Cowie, S. Savvidou\*, E. McMahon, M. Sawey, and M. Schröder. 'feeltrace': An instrument for recording perceived emotion in real time. In *ISCA tutorial and research workshop (ITRW) on speech and emotion*, 2000.
- [7] D. Deng, Z. Chen, and B. E. Shi. Fau, facial expressions, valence and arousal: A multi-task solution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.03557*, 2020.
- [8] P. Ekman. Facial action coding system (facs). *A human face*, 2002.
- [9] P. Ekman. Darwin, deception, and facial expression. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1000(1):205–221, 2003.
- [10] J. He, D. Li, B. Yang, S. Cao, B. Sun, and L. Yu. Multi view facial action unit detection based on cnn and blstm-rnn. In *2017 12th IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face & Gesture Recognition (FG 2017)*, pages 848–853. IEEE, 2017.
- [11] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [12] A. G. Howard, M. Zhu, B. Chen, D. Kalenichenko, W. Wang, T. Weyand, M. Andreetto, and H. Adam. Mobilenets: Efficient convolutional neural networks for mobile vision applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.04861*, 2017.
- [13] P. Isola, J.-Y. Zhu, T. Zhou, and A. A. Efros. Image-to-image translation with conditional adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1125–1134, 2017.
- [14] D. Kollias, S. Cheng, M. Pantic, and S. Zafeiriou. Photorealistic facial synthesis in the dimensional affect space. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 475–491. Springer, 2018.
- [15] D. Kollias, S. Cheng, E. Ververas, I. Kotsia, and S. Zafeiriou. Deep neural network augmentation: Generating faces for affect analysis. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, pages 1–30, 2020.
- [16] D. Kollias, G. Marandianos, A. Raouziou, and A.-G. Stafylopatis. Interweaving deep learning and semantic techniques for emotion analysis in human-machine interaction. In *2015 10th International Workshop on Semantic and Social Media Adaptation and Personalization (SMAP)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2015.
- [17] D. Kollias, M. A. Nicolaou, I. Kotsia, G. Zhao, and S. Zafeiriou. Recognition of affect in the wild using deep neural networks. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW), 2017 IEEE Conference on*, pages 1972–1979. IEEE, 2017.
- [18] D. Kollias, P. Tzirakis, M. A. Nicolaou, A. Papaioannou, G. Zhao, B. Schuller, I. Kotsia, and S. Zafeiriou. Deep affect prediction in-the-wild: Aff-wild database and challenge, deep architectures, and beyond. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 127(6-7):907–929, 2019.
- [19] D. Kollias and S. Zafeiriou. Aff-wild2: Extending the aff-wild database for affect recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.07770*, 2018.
- [20] D. Kollias and S. Zafeiriou. A multi-component cnn-rnn approach for dimensional emotion recognition in-the-wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.01452*, 2018.
- [21] D. Kollias and S. Zafeiriou. A multi-task learning & generation framework: Valence-arousal, action units & primary expressions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.07771*, 2018.
- [22] D. Kollias and S. Zafeiriou. Exploiting multi-cnn features in cnn-rnn based dimensional emotion recognition on the omg in-the-wild dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01417*, 2019.
- [23] D. Kollias and S. Zafeiriou. Expression, affect, action unit recognition: Aff-wild2, multi-task learning and arcfac. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.04855*, 2019.
- [24] M. Kuchnik and V. Smith. Efficient augmentation via data subsampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.05222*, 2018.
- [25] F. Kuhnke, L. Rumberg, and J. Ostermann. Two-stream aural-visual affect analysis in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.03399*, 2020.
- [26] H. Liu, J. Zeng, S. Shan, and X. Chen. Emotion recognition for in-the-wild videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.05447*, 2020.
- [27] M. Najibi, P. Samangouei, R. Chellappa, and L. Davis. SSH: Single stage headless face detector. In *The IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2017.
- [28] J. Pahl, I. Rieger, and D. Seuss. Multi-label class balancing algorithm for action unit detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.03238*, 2020.
- [29] K. Rapantzikos, N. Tsapatsoulis, Y. Avrithis, and S. Kollias. Bottom-up spatiotemporal visual attention model for video analysis. *IET Image Processing*, 1(2):237–248, 2007.
- [30] F. Ringeval, B. Schuller, M. Valstar, N. Cummins, R. Cowie, L. Tavabi, M. Schmitt, S. Alisamir, S. Amiriparian, E.-M. Messner, et al. Avec 2019 workshop and challenge: state-of-mind, detecting depression with ai, and cross-cultural affect recognition. In *Proceedings of the 9th International on Audio/Visual Emotion Challenge and Workshop*, pages 3–12, 2019.

- [31] J. A. Russell. Evidence of convergent validity on the dimensions of affect. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 36(10):1152, 1978.
- [32] M. Sandler, A. Howard, M. Zhu, A. Zhmoginov, and L.-C. Chen. Mobilenetv2: Inverted residuals and linear bottlenecks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4510–4520, 2018.
- [33] C. Whissel. The dictionary of affect in language, emotion: Theory, research and experience: vol. 4, the measurement of emotions, r. Plutchik and H. Kellerman, Eds., New York: Academic, 1989.
- [34] S. Yang, P. Luo, C. C. Loy, and X. Tang. Wider face: A face detection benchmark. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2016.
- [35] S. Zafeiriou, D. Kollias, M. A. Nicolaou, A. Papaioannou, G. Zhao, and I. Kotsia. Aff-wild: Valence and arousal ‘in-the-wild’ challenge. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, pages 34–41, 2017.
- [36] Y.-H. Zhang, R. Huang, J. Zeng, S. Shan, and X. Chen.  $m^3$  t: Multi-modal continuous valence-arousal estimation in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.02957*, 2020.
- [37] H. Zhou, D. Meng, Y. Zhang, X. Peng, J. Du, K. Wang, and Y. Qiao. Exploring emotion features and fusion strategies for audio-video emotion recognition. In *2019 International Conference on Multimodal Interaction*, pages 562–566, 2019.
- [38] J.-Y. Zhu, T. Park, P. Isola, and A. A. Efros. Unpaired image-to-image translation using cycle-consistent adversarial networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2223–2232, 2017.