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Abstract

When recognizing emotions, subtle nuances of emotion displays often cause ambiguity or uncertainty in emotion perception. Unfortunately, the ambiguity or uncertainty cannot be reflected in hard emotion labels. Emotion predictions with uncertainty can be useful for risk controlling, but they are relatively scarce in current deep models for emotion recognition. To address this issue, we propose to apply the multi-generational self-distillation algorithm to emotion recognition task towards better uncertainty estimation performance.

We firstly use deep ensembles to capture uncertainty, as an approximation to Bayesian methods. Secondly, the deep ensemble provides soft labels to its student models, while the student models can learn from the uncertainty embedded in those soft labels. Thirdly, we iteratively train deep ensembles to further improve the performance of emotion recognition and uncertainty estimation. In the end, our algorithm results in a single student model that can estimate in-domain uncertainty and a student ensemble that can detect out-of-domain samples. We trained our Efficient Multitask Emotion Networks (EMENet) on the Aff-wild2 dataset, and conducted extensive experiments on emotion recognition and uncertainty estimation. Our algorithm gives more reliable uncertainty estimates than Temperature Scaling and Monte Carlo Dropout.

1. Introduction

Understanding human affective states is an essential task for many interactive systems (e.g., social robots) or data mining systems (e.g., user profiling). However, unlike object recognition tasks, emotion perception is strongly affected by personal bias, cultural backgrounds and contextual information (e.g., environment), which increases the uncertainty of emotion perception. To obtain a gold standard for emotion recognition, it is common to invite a number of annotators and take the most-agreed emotions as hard labels in many emotion datasets [26, 31, 36, 34]. These hard labels fail to capture the ambiguity or uncertainty in emotion perception.

Previous works discussed the definition of emotion ambiguity (uncertainty). For example, Mower et al. [28] interpreted the ambiguous emotions as probability distributions assigned to any of k emotion classes. Han et al. [12] defined the emotion uncertainty as perception uncertainty (i.e., inter-rater disagreement), and proposed a soft prediction framework to predict the perception uncertainty. From a Bayesian viewpoint, we interpret the emotion uncertainty
as uncertainty that results from a posterior distribution over the model weights. It is affected by the noises, data distributions, and the model we choose. It does not require multiple raters’ annotations, as required by the perception uncertainty. In addition, we consider the uncertainty for multiple types of emotion labels (i.e., facial action units, basic emotions, valence and arousal), which have not been considered by past studies. The intuition is that human affective states are quite complex. We should describe emotions using a comprehensive set of emotional descriptors. The uncertainty of different emotion labels may be correlated. For example, a psychological hypothesis [2] suggested the relation between valence and arousal was controlled by the uncertainty of perceived valence.

Recently, an in-the-wild emotion dataset named Aff-wild2 [21, 16] was released, which facilitates multitask emotion solutions [19, 23, 7]. The Aff-wild2 dataset has three types of emotion labels: facial action units, emotion categories, valence and arousal. Past emotion datasets [26, 31, 36, 20] which only had one or two types of emotion labels. However, the Aff-wild2 dataset only provides hard emotion labels. To improve the emotion recognition and uncertainty estimation, we propose an iterative training algorithm to train multitask emotion networks. The algorithm was inspired by the multi-generational self-distillation algorithm [9]. The networks can produce predictions and uncertainty for each emotion label. The uncertainty is measured by Shannon’s entropy computed over the probabilistic output. We give an example in Figure 1, showing the results of our model given a facial image input.

Our primary contributions are as follows:

- For better uncertainty estimation performance, we propose to apply deep ensembles in the multi-generational self-distillation algorithm. The iterative training of neural networks improves not only the uncertainty estimation, but also the multitask emotion recognition.

- We design Efficient Multitask Emotion Networks (EMENet) for video emotion recognition. The visual model (EMENet-V) only has 1.68M parameters. The visual-audio (EMENet-VA) model has 1.91M parameters.

- Using our algorithm, the single models can estimate reliable uncertainty on in-domain data, and the ensembles can be useful in out-of-distribution (OOD) detection.

2. Related Works

2.1. Uncertainty in Emotion

In emotion recognition, uncertainty often refers to the perception uncertainty, in other words, the inter-rater disagreement. In this case, the annotations of multiple annotators must be available. Han et al. [12] took the standard deviation of K emotion labels given by K annotators as the perception uncertainty. Zhang et al. [35] used Kappa coefficient to represent inter-rater agreement level. In other cases, uncertainty in emotion recognition refers to the uncertainty in probabilistic models. A related work [5] for speech emotion recognition used a probabilistic Gaussian Mixture Regression (GMR) model to get the uncertainty of samples, and the authors found the emotion model performs better in low-uncertainty regions than high-uncertainty regions. Dang et al. [6] also used probabilistic models, and the uncertainty was applied when fusing the predictions from subsystems of multiple modalities. The past methods relied on hand-crafted features, since their probabilistic models cannot extract features from raw inputs.

2.2. Uncertainty Estimation

Ensemble-based methods are alternatives to Bayesian methods, which can estimate decision uncertainties. A Deep ensemble [24] consists of several neural networks with the same architecture, but their weights are initialized randomly and diversely. From a Bayesian viewpoint, the learned weights of each learner are "sampled" from a posterior distribution. Deep ensembles have been empirically proved to be robust on uncertainty estimation under dataset shift [30]. Similar to deep ensembles, the Monte-Carlo Dropout (MC Dropout) [10] is a Bayesian approximation method for estimating uncertainty. MC Dropout method uses dropout in the training time as well as the test time. During inference, a dropout model will be sampled T times, and the T predictions will be averaged. Besides ensemble-based methods, Temperature Scaling [11] (TS) is a post-hoc calibration method to improve uncertain estimation by optimizing a temperature values on a held-out validation set. The advantage of TS is that it does not increase computation during inference, but it is prone to get overfitted on the validation data.

2.3. Knowledge Distillation

Knowledge Distillation [13] was firstly proposed by Hinton et al. for model compression. A special case of knowledge distillation is the self-distillation algorithm [9], where the student model has the same architecture as its teacher model. The student model usually outperforms its teacher model, as shown in [9, 33]. The multi-generational self-distillation algorithm uses the student model in the previous generation as the teacher model in the next generation. As the number of generations increases, the generalization performance also becomes better[27]. Some studies aim to answer the reason behind this phenomenon. For example, Mobahi et al. [27] mathematically proved that self-distillation amplifies regularization in the Hilbert space.
Zhang et al. [37] related self-distillation to label smoothing, a commonly-used technique to prevent models from being over-confident [29]. They suggested that the regularization effect of self-distillation results from instance-level label smoothing. In this work, we aim to investigate the self-distillation for improving uncertainty performance.

3. Methodology

3.1. Notations

We denote the training set as \( \{X, Y\} \), where \( X \) denotes the input data and \( Y \) denotes the ground truth labels. The input data can be divided into two categories \( \{X^{vis}, X^{aud}\} \). \( X^{vis} \) represents the visual data and \( X^{aud} \) represents the audio data. \( X^{vis} \) contains facial images \( X^{vis} = \{x^{vis}_i | x^{vis}_i \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times H \times W}\}_{i=1}^N \), where the facial images are RGB images with a height (width) of \( H \) pixels. \( X^{aud} \) contains mel spectrograms \( X^{aud} = \{x^{aud}_i | x^{aud}_i \in \mathbb{W}^{W \times W}\} \). The mel spectrograms have two dimensions: one is the number of mel-filterbank features, the other is the number of audio frames. They both equal to \( W \) in our experiments.

The ground labels \( Y \) can be divided into three types: \( Y = \{Y^{AU} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 12}, Y^{EXPR} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 7}, Y^{VA} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 2}\} \). \( Y^{AU} \) are 12 facial action units labels, including AU1, AU2, AU4, AU6, AU7, AU10, AU12, AU15, AU24, AU25 and AU26. They are multi-label binary values, denoting the presence or absence of corresponding action units. \( Y^{EXPR} \) are one-hot vectors denoting \( 7 \) basic emotions. They are neutral, anger, disgust, fear, happiness, sadness and surprise. In the end, \( Y^{VA} \) are continuous values, representing valence and arousal in range \( \{-1, 1\} \). In our experiments, we transform the regression tasks into classification tasks by discretizing the continuous values. We discretize the valence score or the arousal score into 20 bins, so that the shape of \( Y^{VA} \) is \( N \times 40 \).

The single model function is denoted by \( f_\theta \), where \( \theta \) denotes the parameters. The ensemble model with \( T \) models is denoted by \( F_T \), where \( F_T(x) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f_\theta_t(x) \). \( \sigma(\cdot) \) is an activation function. The output of an ensemble model is the average predictions of all single members.

In our teacher-student algorithm, a teacher ensemble with \( T \) models can be denoted as \( F_T^{tea} \). The soft labels generated by the teacher ensemble are denoted as \( F_T^{teu}(X) \). The student ensemble in the \( k^{th} \) generation is denoted as \( F_T^{stu_k} \). The soft labels generated by this ensemble for the \( k+1 \) generation is \( F_T^{stu_{k+1}}(X) \). We run the self-distillation algorithm for \( K \) generations in total.

3.2. Architectures

We aim to design efficient architectures while preserving good performance in emotion recognition. Previous studies [7, 22, 18] on video emotion recognition showed that CNN-RNN architectures generally outperformed CNN architectures. This indicates that affective states are strongly temporal-dependent. Therefore, we choose efficient CNN architectures as feature extractors, and use GRU layers as temporal models because of its relative efficiency compared with LSTM layers.

For visual modality, our model receives a sequence of facial images as input. The facial images are firstly processed by the MobileFaceNet [4]. The MobileFaceNet is a light-weighed CNN initially designed for face recognition on mobile devices. The model was pretrained on face alignment task, and the weights are provided in [3]. We use the pretrained CNN weights on face alignment and finetune them. The feature vector is a 512-dimensional vector for each input image. The detailed architecture of the MobileFaceNet is given in [4]. It has around \( 1M \) parameters, and a computation cost of \( 221M \) FLOPs when the input is one \( 112 \times 112 \) RGB image.

For visual-audio model, we use a 1D-CNN to extract audio features from mel spectrograms. The audio CNN (MarbleNet) was proposed by Jia et al. [14] for voice activity detection. The detailed architecture of the MarbleNet is given in [14]. It has only \( 88K \) parameters. The audio feature vector from one mel spectrogram is a 128-dimensional vector. As stated in [14], the input is a \( 64 \times 64 \) mel spectrogram, which is produced by extracting 64 mel-filterbank features from 64 audio frames (640ms). In our experiments, we sample a sequence of facial images as well as a sequence of mel spectrograms. The sample rate is same as the frame rate of...
the input video file. We set the sequence length as \( L \) and the batch size as \( Bs \). The shapes of inputs to our visual-audio model are \((Bs, L, 3, 112, 112)\) for \( X^{vis} \) and \((Bs, L, 64, 64)\) for \( X^{aud} \). After the inputs are processed by feature extractors, the visual features and audio features are concatenated over the feature dimensions. This results in \((Bs, L, 640)\) feature vectors to be fed into the temporal models.

Each task has its own temporal model, which consists of one GRU layer, a ReLU activation function, and a linear output layer. The hidden sizes of all GRU layers are 128. We apply a 50% random dropout on the input features to the temporal models. For the final activation function, we use Sigmoid for the AU detection, and Softmax for 7 basic emotions, and valence/arousal prediction.

### 3.3. Loss Functions

To train teacher models, we minimize the loss functions between the teacher outputs and the ground labels. We refer to these losses as supervision losses. To train student models, we minimize the loss functions between the student outputs and the soft labels, which are generated by the teacher models or the student models in the previous generation. For these loss functions, we refer to them as the distillation losses.

**Supervision Losses.** For facial action units detection, we use a sum of class-reweighted binary cross entropy (BCE) functions. We reweight the losses using \( p_c \) based on the ratios between positive samples and negative samples in the training data.

\[
\mathcal{L}^{AU}(y, \tilde{y}) = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{c=1}^{C} \text{BCE}(y_c, \tilde{y}_c), \tag{1}
\]

\[
\text{BCE}(y_c, \tilde{y}_c) = -[p_c y_c \cdot \log (\sigma(\tilde{y}_c)) + (1 - y_c) \cdot \log (1 - \sigma(\tilde{y}_c))], \tag{2}
\]

\[
p_c = \frac{\# \text{ negative samples in class } c}{\# \text{ positive samples in class } c}. \tag{3}
\]

\( y \) denotes one ground truth label and \( \tilde{y} \) denotes one inference generated by the teacher model. \( \sigma(\cdot) \) in Equation 2 denotes the Sigmoid function. \( C \) is the total number of action units.

For basic emotion categories, we use a reweighted cross entropy (CE) function. The weights are determined by the distribution of different classes in the training set.

\[
\mathcal{L}^{EXPR}(y, \tilde{y}) = \text{CE}(y, \tilde{y}), \tag{4}
\]

\[
\text{CE}(y, \tilde{y}) = -p_c \sum_{c=1}^{C} y_c \cdot \log (\tilde{y}_c). \tag{5}
\]

For valence/arousal prediction, we use the Concordance Correlation Coefficient (CCC) between the scalar outputs and the ground truth labels. The CCC is defined as follows:

\[
\text{CCC}(y_c, \tilde{y}_c) = \frac{2 \rho \sigma_y \sigma_{\tilde{y}}}{\sigma_y^2 + \sigma_{\tilde{y}}^2 + (\mu_y - \mu_{\tilde{y}})^2}, \tag{6}
\]

where \( y_c \) denotes ground truth labels in a batch, and \( \tilde{y}_c \) denotes the scalar predictions of valence or arousal. \( \rho \) is the correlation coefficient between the ground truth labels and the predictions. \( \mu_y, \mu_{\tilde{y}}, \sigma_y \) and \( \sigma_{\tilde{y}} \) are the means and standard deviations computed over the batch. Since our model produces a 20-dimensional softmax vector for valence/arousal, we compute the expectation values over the 20 bins in the range of \([-1, 1]\) to transform probabilistic outputs to scalar outputs.

We compute two CCCs: one for valence, and one for arousal. The supervision loss for valence and arousal prediction is:

\[
\mathcal{L}^{VA}(y, \tilde{y}) = \sum_{c=1}^{2} (1 - \text{CCC}(y_c, \tilde{y}_c)). \tag{7}
\]

**Distillation Losses.** For action units detection, we use the binary cross entropy between the soft labels and the outputs of the student models.

\[
\mathcal{H}^{AU}(y^{tea}, \tilde{y}^{stu}) = \text{BCE}(y^{tea}, \tilde{y}^{stu}), \tag{8}
\]

\[
\text{BCE}(y^{tea}, \tilde{y}^{stu}) = -[p_c y^{tea} \cdot \log (\sigma(\tilde{y}^{stu})) + (1 - y^{tea}) \cdot \log (1 - \sigma(\tilde{y}^{stu})]. \tag{9}
\]

\( p_c \) in Equation 9 is the same as \( p_c \) in Equation 2. \( y^{tea} \) represents the soft labels. \( y^{tea} = F^{tea}(x) \) if it is in the first generation. \( y^{tea} = F^{stu}_k(x) \) if it is in the \((k + 1)^{th}\) generation. \( \tilde{y}^{stu} \) is the output of a single student model.

For 7 basic emotion recognition, the distillation loss we use is the KL divergence (KLD) loss between the soft labels and the student outputs.

\[
\mathcal{H}^{EXPR}(y^{tea}, \tilde{y}^{stu}) = \text{KLD}(y^{tea}, \tilde{y}^{stu}). \tag{10}
\]

For valence and arousal prediction, we still use negative CCC loss between the soft labels and scalar outputs of the student model.

\[
\mathcal{H}^{VA}(y^{tea}, \tilde{y}^{stu}) = \sum_{c=1}^{2} (1 - \text{CCC}(y^{tea}, \tilde{y}^{stu})). \tag{11}
\]

Note that \( y^{tea} \) and \( \tilde{y}^{stu} \) are all scalar outputs of the teacher ensemble and the student model.

**Combination of losses.** We take a weighted sum of the losses for different tasks. For example, when training teacher models, we use a combination of supervision losses for different emotion tasks:

\[
\mathcal{L} = \lambda^{AU} \mathcal{L}^{AU} + \lambda^{EXPR} \mathcal{L}^{EXPR} + \lambda^{VA} \mathcal{L}^{VA}. \tag{12}
\]
When training student models, we use a combination of distillation losses for all tasks.
\[ H = \lambda_{AU} R_{AU} + \lambda_{EXPR} R_{EXPR} + \lambda_{VA} R_{VA}. \] (13)

When training multiple tasks, it is important to balance the weights of different losses according to the difficulty levels of different tasks. We propose a heuristic method to balance the weights. The weight of the \( t \)th task’s loss depends on the number of epochs with no performance improvement on the validation set. If it is larger, we assign larger weights to this task’s loss to increase its influence on the gradients. The pseudo code for this heuristic method is given in Appendix B.

3.4. Algorithm

Our algorithm is a special case of the self-distillation algorithm. In the original self-distillation algorithm [9, 27], the teacher model and the student model are often single models with the same architecture. In our algorithm, we propose to use deep ensembles for the following benefits:

1. The deep ensembles can be naturally trained on a distributed system. The parallel computing facilities parallel training of each local model, which saves training time.

2. The soft labels provided by the teacher ensemble contain more reliable uncertainty information than that provided by a single teacher model.

3. We can use one single model or a few models in our student ensemble to perform emotion tasks, which brings more flexibility when it comes to computation cost.

In Figure 3, we illustrate the teacher-student algorithm for deep ensembles. \( \{X, Y\} \) is the original dataset. Most of instances in \( \{X, Y\} \) only have one type of emotion labels, while other two types of emotion labels are missing. The \( t \)th teacher model \( f_{t}^{tea} \) learns to fill in the missing labels. In the training batch of \( \{X, Y\} \), we sample an equal number of instances for three tasks, and then compute the loss in Equation 12. Note that \( \{f_{t}^{tea}\}_{t=1}^{T} \) are all trained on the same dataset \( \{X, Y\} \), but start with different random initialization. After training \( \{f_{t}^{tea}\}_{t=1}^{T} \) in parallelly, we take average over their predictions on the training data. This generates the soft labels for the student models in the first generation. The soft labels are denoted as \( F_{stu}^{tea}(X) \).

In the first generation, student models \( f_{stu}^{stu} \) are trained on \( \{X, F_{stu}^{tea}(X)\} \). After all student models are trained, we use the student ensemble to generate the soft labels for the next generation. We iterative the teacher-student training in order to find the best number of generations.

4. Experiments

4.1. Dataset

We only used the video data from the Aff-wild2[21] dataset. The Aff-wild2 dataset has three subsets, corresponding to the three emotion tasks. In each subset, the data distributions are quite unbalanced. We show the data distributions for the three subsets in Appendix A. The data distributions determine the class weights \( p_{c} \) in Equation 2 and 5. We also give the choices of \( p_{c} \) in Appendix A.

4.2. Hyper-parameters

We used Adam [15] as an optimizer. The learning rate was initialized as \( 1e^{-3} \). For visual model training, we trained the model for 10 epochs, and decrease the learning rate by a factor of 10 after every 3 epochs. For multimodal training, we trained the models for 15 epochs and decrease the learning rate by a factor of 10 after every 4 epochs.

4.3. Metrics

Emotion metrics. We used the same evaluation metrics as suggested in [17]. For facial AU detection, the evaluation metric is \( 0.5 \cdot F1 + 0.5 \cdot Acc \), where \( F1 \) denotes
Figure 4: The total emotion metrics for the visual model (EMENet-V) and the visual-audio model (EMENet-VA). For the single models’ results, we average the total emotion metric over five runs, and the standard deviations are shown with error bars. "Tea" stands for the teacher model (ensemble). "Stu1" stands for the student model (ensemble) in the first generation.

the unweighted F1 score for all 12 AUs, and Acc denotes the total accuracy. For expression classification, we used \(0.67 \cdot F1 + 0.33 \cdot Acc\) as the metric, where \(F1\) denotes the unweighted F1 score for 7 classes, and \(Acc\) is the total accuracy. For valence and arousal, we evaluated them with CCC.

Uncertainty metric. Same to [24], we evaluated the uncertainty estimation performance using the negative log-likelihood (NLL) for classification tasks (i.e.,EXPR and AU) and root mean square error (RMSE) for regression tasks (i.e., valence and arousal). Lower NLL or RMSE means better uncertainty estimation performance.

### 5. Results

#### 5.1. Task Performance

**Computation cost.** We designed two model architectures for visual modality and visual-audio modalities respectively. We refer to them as EMENet-V and EMENet-VA. The number of parameters and FLOPs for EMENet-V are 1.68M and 228M. For EMENet-VA, they are 1.91M and 234M. The FLOPs are the number of floating-point operations when the visual input is one RGB image (112x112) and audio input is one spectrogram (64x64).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiments</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>EXPR</th>
<th>VA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w/o re.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6773</td>
<td>0.5128</td>
<td>0.3830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o re.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6858</td>
<td>0.5355</td>
<td>0.4099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o re.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.6843</td>
<td>0.5449</td>
<td>0.4105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ re.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6632</td>
<td>0.5541</td>
<td>0.4202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ re.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6808</td>
<td>0.5779</td>
<td>0.4423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Experiment results with the teacher models using visual modality only. "w/ re." means we apply class reweighting for EXPR and AU. \(T = 1\) is the number of models in an ensemble. \(T = 1\) means it is a single model. Total emotion metric is the sum of all metrics of the three emotion tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th># Gen.</th>
<th># Param.</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>EXPR</th>
<th>VA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMENet-V</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.68M</td>
<td>0.6320</td>
<td>0.4639</td>
<td>0.4942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMENet-V</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.4M</td>
<td>0.6328</td>
<td>0.4704</td>
<td>0.5014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMENet-VA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.91M</td>
<td>0.6418</td>
<td>0.5046</td>
<td>0.5355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMENet-VA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.55M</td>
<td>0.6528</td>
<td>0.5041</td>
<td>0.5326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The emotion metrics on the test set of the Aff-wild2 dataset. "# Gen." denotes the number of generations. "# Param." denotes the number of parameters. The ensembles have five times larger number of parameters than single models.

**Class reweighting.** We show the effect of class reweighting in Table 1. After applying class reweighting, we found the EXPR metric for single models was improved significantly, where the F1 score increased by 12.6\%, and the accuracy of EXPR increased by 1.7\%. Although the AU metric degraded after using class reweighting, its F1 score increased by 12.5\%. The AU metric degraded because its accuracy dropped from 0.8947 to 0.8249. We think it is due to the high unbalanced data distribution in the AU subset.

**Ensemble size.** We changed the ensemble size when training teacher models without class reweighting. The results are reported in Table 1. From single models (\(T = 1\)) to ensemble models (\(T = 5\)), the total emotion metric increased by 4\%. However, from \(T = 5\) to \(T = 1\), the total emotion metric only increased by 0.58\%. We kept the ensemble size \(T = 5\) for the rest of experiments because of its relative efficiency.

**Teacher-Student training.** We trained our teacher models and student models using our proposed algorithm (Figure 3). The total emotion metrics for both the teachers and students in multiple generations are shown in Figure 4. Our first finding is that ensembles always outperform single models on the total emotion metric. As we increased the number of generations, the performance gap between the single models and ensembles became smaller. This is probably because the predictions variations become smaller and smaller after generations of self-distillation. Our second finding on the results of EMENet-V is that the emotion
Table 3: The NLL values for 12 action units, which are evaluated on the validation set of the Aff-wild set. We compare our single teacher models and single student models with other methods, i.e., TS (temperature scaling [11]) and MC (Monte-Carol Dropout [10]). The model architecture used in this comparison is EMENet-V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>AU1</th>
<th>AU2</th>
<th>AU4</th>
<th>AU6</th>
<th>AU7</th>
<th>AU10</th>
<th>AU12</th>
<th>AU15</th>
<th>AU23</th>
<th>AU24</th>
<th>AU25</th>
<th>AU26</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.442</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu1</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu2</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu3</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu4</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS [11]</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC [10]</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: The NLL values for EXPR recognition and the RMSE values for valence and arousal prediction. Metrics are evaluated on the validation set. TS optimizes temperature for lower NLL on a held-out validation set, which is not beneficial for RMSE in regression tasks. Therefore, we only compare our models with TS for EXPR task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>EXPR NLL</th>
<th>Valence RMSE</th>
<th>Arousal RMSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu1</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu2</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu3</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu4</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>0.370</td>
<td>0.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS [11]</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC [10]</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The optimal temperature was optimized on a randomly-split half of the validation set, and then NLL was evaluated on the other half of the validation set with the optimal temperature. For MC Dropout, we averaged the probability outputs of ten forward passes, where the model weights were sampled randomly for every forward pass from the dropout. The NLL values are listed in Table 3, where the model architecture is EMENet-V. The validation performances for the EMENet-VA architecture are given in Appendix C.

The results in Table 3 show that the single student models in the higher generations (i.e., 2, 3 and 4) have better uncertainty estimation performance than TS and MC Dropout. When it comes to the averaged NLL values, our method outperforms TS by 10.8% and MC Dropout by 9.5%.

In Table 4, we list the uncertainty metrics for facial expressions (EXPR), valence and arousal. We find that the single student models have better uncertainty performance than TS and MC Dropout for both tasks. Our algorithm improves the EXPR NLL by 10.3% when compared with TS and 15.5% when compared with MC Dropout. As for valence/arousal RMSE scores, our method outperforms MC Dropout by 7.0%/8.0%.

5.3. Uncertainty Distribution

There are two types of uncertainties we are interested in: the aleatoric uncertainty and the epistemic uncertainty. The aleatoric uncertainty arises from the natural complexities of the underlying distribution, such as class overlap, label noise, input data noise, etc. The epistemic uncertainty arises from a lack of knowledge about the best model parameters. It can be explained away given enough data in that region. The latter uncertainty is an indicator of out-of-distribution (OOD) samples.

We capture the two types of uncertainties with deep ensembles. Following [8] and [25], we compute the two types of uncertainties as follows:

5.2. Uncertainty Performance

To evaluate AU uncertainty estimation performance, we computed the NLL values on the AU validation set. Besides the NLL values of our single teacher models and single student models, the NLLs values of Temperature scaling (TS) [11] and Monte-Carol Dropout (MC Dropout) [10] were also computed. For a fair comparison, we adopted the “test-time cross-validation” in [1] to compute NLL in TS.
\[ \mathcal{H}(E_p(\theta|D) [P(y|x, \theta)]) = E_p(\theta|D) [\mathcal{H}(P(y|x, \theta))] + \mathcal{M} \mathcal{I}[P(y), \theta|x,D] \]  

(14)

\( P(y) \) is the probabilistic distribution output of a single model given an input \( x \). \( \mathcal{H} \) is the Shannon’s entropy. \( p(\theta|D) \) is the posterior distribution of the model weights \( \theta \) which is trained on dataset \( D \).

\( \mathcal{H}(E_p(\theta|D) [P(y|x, \theta)]) = E_p(\theta|D) [\mathcal{H}(P(y|x, \theta))] + \mathcal{M} \mathcal{I}[P(y), \theta|x,D] \).  

For the aleatoric uncertainty on the in-domain data, we notice that some classes seem to have more high-uncertainty samples than other classes. For example, 88.8% of the samples which are predicted as "F" (Fear) have the aleatoric uncertainty larger than 0.5, while for "Su" (Surprise), this percentage is 20.2%. The high percentage of uncertain samples possibly results from noises, especially label noises in these classes.

For the epistemic uncertainty on the in-domain and out-of-domain data, we find distinct uncertainty distributions. An average percentage of 86% samples in in-domain data have the epistemic uncertainty smaller than 0.05, while for out-of-domain data, this percentage is only 4.5%. It shows that the epistemic uncertainty produced by our ensembles can detect the out-of-domain samples accurately. When estimating in-domain uncertainty, we may not need ensembles. The entropy of a single model’s probability output can be seen as an approximation to the aleatoric uncertainty from an ensemble’s output (Equation 14).

6. Conclusions

In this paper, we propose to apply deep ensemble models in the multi-generational self-distillation algorithm for better emotion uncertainty. Our designed model architectures are efficient, which potentially can be applied in mobile devices. In our experimental results, we show that our algorithm can improve the emotion metrics and uncertainty metrics as the number of generations increases. The uncertainty predictions given by our models are reliable indicators for in-domain and out-of-domain samples. In the future, we will study on the regularization effect of the self-distillation algorithm, and seek a better regularization method in replace of the time-consuming self-distillation.
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Appendices

A. Data Distribution

![Data Distribution Diagram]

Figure 6: The data distributions of the Aff-wild2 dataset.

The $p_e$ for class reweighting depends on the data distributions. From AU1 to AU26, $p = [7.7, 24.7, 5.3, 2.9, 1.5, 1.9, 3, 32.3, 32.3, 32.3, 0.59, 11.5]$ to alleviate the unbalanced data problem. For the EXPR subset, $p = [0.02, 0.2, 0.33, 0.24, 0.03, 0.05, 0.1]$ in Equation 5.

B. Multitask Balancing

Our multitask balancing algorithm is given as follows:

\begin{algorithm}
\begin{algorithmic}
\State \textbf{Input}
\State The multitask model $f$.
\State The training set $D_{\text{train}}$ and the validation set $D_{\text{val}}$.
\State Tasks set $T = \{AU, EXPR, VA\}$.
\State The number of tasks $n(T) = 3$.
\State The number of epochs with no performance improvement $M = \{m_{AU}, m_{EXPR}, m_{VA}\}$.
\State The weights for all tasks $\Lambda = \{\lambda_{AU}, \lambda_{EXPR}, \lambda_{VA}\}$.
\State The number of training epochs $M$.
\Procedure{Balancing Multitask Weights}{\textbf{procedure}}
\State $i := 1$
\While{$i < n(T)$}
\State $m_i := 1$
\State $\lambda_i := \frac{1}{n(T)}$
\While{$i < n(T)$}
\State $Val^i \leftarrow \text{validation performance of the } i^{th}\text{ task.}$
\If{$Val^i$ is improved} $m_i := 1$
\Else $m_i := m_i + 1$
\EndIf
\EndWhile
\State $\lambda_i := \max(1, \log_2(m_i))$
\EndWhile
\State $\lambda_i := \frac{\lambda_i}{\sum \lambda_i}$
\EndProcedure
\end{algorithmic}
\end{algorithm}

The main idea of this algorithm is to increase the weight of certain task if this task has not been improved on the validation set for a number of epochs. Once this task has been improved, the weight of the loss function for this task is set to its initial value.

We conducted ablation studies on the effect of Algorithm 1. The model we used is the EMENet-V trained on original dataset. From the experiment results in Table 5, we notice that the EXPR and arousal metrics are better without multitask balancing algorithm, but the total emotion metric is better when using multitask balancing algorithm. We value the performance of each emotion tasks equally. The Algorithm 1 was used in all other experiments for better total emotion metric.

C. Uncertainty Performance for EMENet-VA

We show the AU uncertainty performance using the EMENet-VA in Table 6. We also compare our single teacher models and single student models with Temperature Scaling (TS) and Monte-Carlo (MC) Dropout. Similar to the results in Table 3 (EMENet-V), the models using our algorithm achieved the lowest NLL value, compared with TS.
Table 5: Experiment results with the teacher models using visual modality only. "w/ ba." means we apply Algorithm 1 for multitask training. $T$ is the number of models in an ensemble. Total emotion metric is the sum of all metrics of the three emotion tasks.

and MC Dropout. The lowest AVg. NLL value is 0.348 for EMENet-VA, while for EMENet-V, the lowest average NLL value is 0.381. We find that when using audio features with visual features, the uncertainty (NLL) of facial actions can be improved by about 8.7%.

Table 7 shows the uncertainty performance for the EXPR task, valence and arousal detection. We evaluated NLL for classification tasks and RMSE for regression tasks. Comparing Table 7 with Table 4, we find that incorporating audio features with visual features, it improved the EXPR NLL by 5.2%. However, it failed to improve the valence RMSE, and barely had an influence on the arousal RMSE.

### D. Uncertainty distribution

The uncertainty distributions for the action units are shown in Figure 7, which are obtained using our student ensemble in third generation. The aleatoric uncertainty distributions for different AUs on the in-domain data are not drastically different. AU25 (lips parts) and AU7 (lid tightener) seem to have more noises than other AUs, because around 20% of their predictions have high entropy (close to 1). As for the epistemic uncertainty, we notice that almost all samples have low entropy, just like the entropy for EXPR task in Figure 5. This helps us to differentiate out-of-domain samples from in-domain samples, because the uncertainty (NLL) of facial actions on the out-of-domain data (i.e., Fashion-MNIST [32] dataset).

Finally, we demonstrate the uncertainty distributions for valence and arousal in Figure 8. The aleatoric uncertainty shows that our ensemble model is more uncertain about mild emotions. The samples with low valence/arousal predictions have high uncertainty. For more intense emotions (i.e., high valence or high arousal), the uncertainty values are much lower.

When comparing the epistemic uncertainty of in-domain data and that of out-of-domain data, unfortunately, we find that the epistemic uncertainty cannot help us to differentiate them accurately. The problem is that the epistemic uncertainty of in-domain data are scattered in $[0, 0.2]$. The high valence/arousal samples have relatively high epistemic uncertainty. This is not the same as the epistemic uncertainty for the EXPR task and the AU task. The epistemic uncertainty for the two tasks are very close to zero on in-domain data. We think it is caused by the unbalanced distribution of valence/arousal labels. As the data distribution in Figure shows, Aff-wild2 dataset has quite unbalanced data distribution. The samples with low arousal are very scarce. The samples with extreme valence are also infrequent. The unbalanced data distribution makes our ensemble model treat the less-frequent samples as out-of-domain samples, and give high epistemic uncertainty. In the future, we aim to obtain a better ensemble model for OOD samples detection, and the data imbalance problem needs to be solved or at least mitigated.
Table 6: The NLL values for 12 action units, which are evaluated on the validation set of the Aff-wild set. We compare our single teacher models and single student models with other methods, i.e., TS (temperature scaling [11]) and MC (Monte-Carol Dropout [10]). The model architecture used in this comparison is EMENet-VA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>AU1</th>
<th>AU2</th>
<th>AU4</th>
<th>AU6</th>
<th>AU7</th>
<th>AU10</th>
<th>AU12</th>
<th>AU15</th>
<th>AU23</th>
<th>AU24</th>
<th>AU25</th>
<th>AU26</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu1</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu2</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>0.349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu3</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.469</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>0.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS [11]</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC [10]</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: The NLL values for EXPR recognition and the RMSE values for valence and arousal prediction. Metrics are evaluated on the validation set. TS optimizes temperature for lower NLL on a held-out validation set, which is not beneficial for RMSE in regression tasks. Therefore, we only compare our models with TS for EXPR task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>EXPR NLL</th>
<th>Valence RMSE</th>
<th>Arousal RMSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tea</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu1</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu2</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu3</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS [11]</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC [10]</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: The distributions of two types of uncertainties for the valence and arousal. The x axis shows the range of . The y axis represents the normalized Shannon’s entropy.