NoisyActions2M: A Multimedia Dataset for Video Understanding from Noisy Labels

Mohit Sharma
mohits@iiitd.ac.in
Indraprastha Institute of Information Technology Delhi
India

Raj Patra*
rpatra1267@gmail.com
National Institute of Technology Rourkela
Odisha, India

Harshal Desai*
harshaldesai01@gmail.com
National Institute of Technology Jamshedpur
Jharkhand, India

Shruti Vyas
shruti@crcv.ucf.edu
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Yogesh Rawat
yogesh@crcv.ucf.edu
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Rajiv Ratn Shah
rajivratn@iiitd.ac.in
Indraprastha Institute of Information Technology Delhi
India

arXiv:2110.06827v1 [cs.MM] 13 Oct 2021

ABSTRACT

Deep learning has shown remarkable progress in a wide range of problems. However, efficient training of such models requires large-scale datasets, and getting annotations for such datasets can be challenging and costly. In this work, we explore the use of user-generated freely available labels from web videos for video understanding. We create a benchmark dataset consisting of around 2 million videos with associated user-generated annotations and other meta information. We utilize the collected dataset for action classification and demonstrate its usefulness with existing small-scale annotated datasets, UCF101 and HMDB51. We study different loss functions and two pretraining strategies, simple and self-supervised learning. We also show how a network pretrained on the proposed dataset can help against video corruption and label noise in downstream datasets. We present this as a benchmark dataset in noisy learning for video understanding. The dataset, code, and trained models will be publicly available for future research.

KEYWORDS

datasets, neural networks, action classification, multimedia

ACM Reference Format:
Mohit Sharma, Raj Patra, Harshal Desai, Shruti Vyas, Yogesh Rawat, and Rajiv Ratn Shah. 2021. NoisyActions2M: A Multimedia Dataset for Video Understanding from Noisy Labels. In *Gold Coast '21: ACM Multimedia Asia, December 01–03, 2021, Gold Coast, Australia.* ACM, New York, NY, USA, 8 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn

*Both authors contributed equally to this research.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
Gold Coast '21, December 01–03, 2021, Gold Coast, Australia
© 2021 Association for Computing Machinery.
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM…$15.00
https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn

1 INTRODUCTION

The ImageNet dataset [5] has been one of the catalysts behind the exponential growth in Deep Learning [19] and large scale machine learning research, along with transfer learning adoption to adapt large trained networks on problems with little data. This has led to many large-scale datasets targeting various tasks such as classification, detection, segmentation, etc., and a rising interest in training bigger networks to capture more variations and transfer well. ImageNet [5], and Youtube8M [1] are enormous datasets in terms of size and annotations. Still, it is not always possible to construct such massive annotated datasets due to logistical and time constraints.

Collecting data from the web is getting much popularity due to its availability on several social media platforms (e.g., Webvision [23], and Clothing1M [43]). Along with these datasets, many other works [7] [4] have shown how learning from web data dramatically increases performance in related domains, despite labels which are mostly inferred from surrounding meta data and not manually verified. Moreover, the meta data itself acts as a rich source of information about the data point for tasks like image captioning, video understanding, etc.

As an active research area, there is a dire need to set a standard benchmark for efficient learning from noisy web data. With this objective in mind, we construct such a dataset with a primary focus on video modality. Our dataset consists of raw videos collected from Flickr, with surrounding meta data such as title, description, comments, etc. It has been collected using class labels from popular video classification benchmarks as search queries since these datasets have already established useful labels based on various criteria. We first look at various statistics of our dataset to set its importance and show some preliminary results for video action classification.

A major challenge that one encounters while learning from web collected data is its heavily imbalanced multi-label nature. Similar works [9] randomly select one label from the list of given multi labels. We compare various multi-label learning strategies in literature while pretraining on our dataset and also look at the setting of simple pretraining or combining it with self-supervised learning at various stages, hoping that this will set a benchmark for the research community. Finally, we also obtain some surprising

results around how models pretrained on the proposed noisy dataset provide some robustness against label noise and video corruption with just simple fine-tuning and no modification to the training pipeline.

We first talk about related work in Section 2. Next, in Section 3, we discuss our dataset construction and statistics. We describe our methodology in Section 4 and our experimental setup in Section 5. We finally present our results and a discussion around them in Section 6. We end with Section 7, discussing how this work can be further improved and new research directions from our proposed dataset.

2 RELATED WORK

2.1 Video Datasets

The UCF101 [37] and the HMDB51 [18] datasets were one of the first datasets to spark interest in video understanding. However, they are relatively small for training large networks and required a lot of annotation effort. To this end, Heilbron et al. [2] proposed ActivityNet, which covered many common human activities and relatively longer videos. Along the same lines, Sigurdsson et al. [36] released the Charades dataset with a focus on everyday household activities. Kay et al. [15] introduced the Kinetics dataset with a primary focus only on covering a broad range of human activities and had a much larger number of videos than its contemporaries. Gu et al. [12] proposed the AVA dataset, which densely annotates 80 'atomic' actions using movies. Goyal et al. [11] introduced the Something-Something dataset, where classes were defined as caption templates to enable solutions towards common sense understanding in videos. Finally, Zhao et al. [48] proposed the HACS dataset for action recognition and temporal localization, and models trained on this dataset showed excellent transfer learning performance.

Karpathy et al. [14] released a million scale weakly annotated dataset centered around sports. A similar scale dataset, proposed by Monfort et al. [30] emphasized on event understanding. Diba et al. [6] presented the HVU dataset, which is a multi-label dataset organized hierarchically in a semantic taxonomy, and constructed from Kinetics-600 [15], Youtube-8M [1] and the HACS dataset [48]. And lastly, Abu et al. [1] proposed the Youtube-8M dataset, which is the biggest multi-label dataset for video understanding but only provides frame-level features. These datasets involved manual annotation of samples that differentiate them from the proposed dataset where the labels are inferred from the associated meta-data or corresponding search query, which does not require manual curation.

2.2 Learning from Web Data

Training data collected from the web is often used directly for some objective with weak labels. Weak labels are inferred from the surrounding text or meta data and are not verified, like Webvision [23], and Clothing-1M [43]. They also have a clean validation set for benchmarking methods used to learn from it. Also referred to as webly supervised learning, this area has been explored thoroughly in the literature. Divvala et al. in [7] proposed a system to learn detectors for a given concept using different attributes from web data. Chen et al. in [4] presented a two-stage curriculum training, where they first learned from an easy set of images scraped from Google and then trained using images from Flickr.




Figure 1: Distribution of labels and videos (Log-Scale).

Mahajan et al. [27] trained an image classifier to predict hashtags on millions of social media images and observed huge gains in accuracies when the trained network is fine-tuned to various downstream datasets and tasks. Thomee et al. [39] proposed the YFCC100M dataset with the intention of large-scale multimedia research and released $800k$ videos with general entities, along with $99M$ images and their meta data. A work very similar to ours is by Ghadiyaram et al. [9], where they showed similar pretraining results for videos for improving downstream performance on action recognition along with interesting related experiments, but do not make their dataset public. Since there is a rising interest in research areas along these lines, our dataset will act as a benchmark to compare approaches to learn in webly supervised settings. Unlike other video datasets in this space, we also provide a rich set of meta data information corresponding to each video so that this dataset can be utilized for a variety of webly supervised training tasks beyond our current considered scope.

3 DATASET CONSTRUCTION AND ANALYSIS

We use the class labels from existing datasets which are listed in Table 1) as search queries and collect the videos from Flickr. We lemmatize all the action class names, which results in some duplicates between sets of classes in different datasets, and only consider classes with more than 10 videos. The total number of classes amounts to around 7000, corresponding to roughly 1.95 million videos. Around 0.05 million videos are also collected using long sentence queries, which are lemmatized captions taken from various caption datasets, listed in Appendix A.1. The resulting class distribution in log10 scale is shown in Figure 1.

For each video ID, we have the following information: tags (user assigned meta tags), comments, title, description, dates, geolocation, source (URL of the video with different sizes), duration, sentences (preprocessed long sentence queries), and concepts (the query action classes). Table 2 gives an overall picture of our datasets in terms of statistics (rounded off to nearest integer), demonstrating the various amounts of useful information this dataset will be able to provide. To look at the type of metadata present with the videos, we try to classify the title and concepts into some common types of entities. The details of the classification process are available in Appendix A.2. Figure 2 shows the distribution of videos, which

Table 1: A comparison of various datasets used for video understanding.

Dataset	# Classes	# Videos	Noisy	Meta Data	Multi-Label	Source	Year
HMDB51 [18]	51	7k	✗	✗	✗	Many	2011
UCF101 [37]	101	13k	✗	✗	✗	Youtube	2012
Sports-1M [14]	487	1M	✓	✗	✗	Youtube	2014
ActivityNet [2]	200	20k	✗	✗	✗	Youtube	2015
Charades [36]	157	10k	✗	✗	✗	Crowdsourced	2016
Youtube-8M [1]	4800	8M(features)	✓*	✗	✓	Youtube	2016
Kinetics [15]	600	500k	✗	✗	✗	Youtube	2017
Something-Something [11]	174	108k	✗	✗	✗	Crowdsourced	2017
AVA [12]	80	576k	✗	✗	✗	Youtube	2018
HACS [48]	200	140k	✗	✗	✗	Youtube	2019
HVU [6]	3457	572k	✗	✗	✓	Many	2019
Moments in Time [30]	339	1M	✗	✗	✗	Many	2019
Ours: NoisyActions2M	**7000**	**2M**	✓	✓	✓	**Flickr**	**2021**

* - Label Vocabulary constructed using Knowledge Graph API and human raters.




Figure 2: Different types of Entities present in the dataset.

indicates the presence of diverse topics in the meta data with the videos.

We also look at the regional diversity of our dataset, extracted using the geolocation attached with each video, shown in red in Figure 4. While many videos are from the North American and the European regions, other regions also have some representation. The Non-Popularity of Flickr in other regions might be one reason for not getting a large number of video samples from those regions.

Figure 3 shows a snapshot of the video frames and their corresponding meta data. The intent behind collecting this information was to make this dataset suitable for tasks beyond action recognition, as evident from the detailed information presented by the

Table 2: Some statistics from NoisyActions2M.

Total number of Countries	212
Average # videos per Country	980
Average # labels per Video	4
Average Duration	123s
# videos with duration < 60s	1723439
# videos between 60-120s	423512
Average # Entities per video	6
Total # videos with tags	968586
Average # tags per video	12
Total # videos with comments	230269
Average # comments per video	5

meta data about the video in Figure 3. Figure 5 shows frames from videos in various classes. It shows both the diversity present within classes and the kinds of noise that can be present in our dataset.

Table 1 shows a detailed comparison of our dataset with similar video benchmarks. Apart from its scale, one other defining feature of our dataset is the rich meta data information and multi-label information. While Youtube-8M [1] is a much larger multi-label dataset, they only provide frame-level features and don't provide meta data. Similarly, our dataset is much larger than another multi-labeled dataset, HVU [6] along with meta data. Our dataset is closely related to YFCC100M [39]. We focus more on action classes and video modality, whereas the YFCC100M dataset focuses more on general entities.

4 METHODOLOGY

To benchmark a wide variety of learning strategies with a limited compute constraint, we create a 25K and a 100K split of our dataset based on the amount of meta data present for each video. We concatenated all meta data and then picked the top 25K/100K videos where all meta data fields were present and had the maximum number of words. We benchmark various strategies on a 25K split and report results on a 100K split, which subsumes the 25K split.




Figure 3: Frames from some videos in NoisyActions2M, along with their meta data. Relevant meta information is highlighted in bold fonts.




Figure 4: Country Distribution of videos in the dataset

4.1 Loss Functions during Pretraining

We first look at various loss functions for pretraining. We can either do single-label training by selecting a random label for each video or multi-label training. We also devise a loss masking strategy (CCE-Mask), which is essentially single label training, but with masked loss during backpropagation for the ignored labels for a given video. We do this to not send negative feedback for the ignored labels. A detailed algorithm of loss masking is shown in Appendix B.1. For the single label setting, we look at the standard Categorical Cross-Entropy(CCE) loss. For the multi-label setting, we look at Binary Cross-Entropy Loss (BCELoss), Focal Loss (Focal) [25], and Distribution Balanced Focal Loss (Balanced-Focal) [42] since our dataset is heavily imbalanced and long tail with respect to the classes.

4.2 Different types of Pretraining

We also experiment with Self Supervised Learning (SSL) as a pretraining strategy. It has been shown previously [10] that SSL can provide robustness to label noise. Since our dataset can have label noise, we look at two settings: we first pretrain using SSL and then check downstream performance, and the other setting being that we first pretrain using SSL, then pretrain on our dataset with labels and finally check downstream performance, with the idea that performing SSL before will provide robustness against label noise in our dataset.

After benchmarking we run the final methods on the 100K dataset and show their downstream performance on UCF-101 [37] and HMDB51 [18].

4.3 Robustness to different types of Corruption

We use the models trained on the 100K split to demonstrate video corruption and synthetic label noise robustness. For synthetic label noise, we flip a percentage of true labels randomly to some other label. For video corruption, we either randomly flip each bit of the video with a given probability (Random Corruption) or select a random contiguous segment of the video and flip its bits (Contiguous




Figure 5: Frames of videos from various classes.

Corruption). The details for Synthetic Noise and Video Corruption experiments can be found in Appendix B.2.

5 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

The benchmarking experiments with 25K split are done using the 3D-Resnet-18 (R3D) architecture [13]. For the final experiments on the 100K splits, we use the R(2+1)D-18 [40] architecture since it performs better than 3D-Resnets, but at the cost of more GPU memory as shown by the results in the original paper [40]. For SSL, we use the Pretext Contrastive Learning setup [38].

We use the SGD optimizer and Nesterov Momentum with an initial learning rate of 0.03 and a cosine learning rate scheduler for all experiments. To train models faster on a single GPU, we also use mixed-precision training [28]. We also employ random skips to cover a good portion of the video during loading videos during pretraining, given our constraint of only using 16 frames from each video. For fine-tuning experiments, however, we use a skip rate of 1. During testing, we average out the results over all clips from a given test video. We use a multi-scale random crop of 112x112 on frames with a horizontal flip.

All models are pretrained for 50 epochs and all fine-tuning experiments were done for 100 epochs, and the best validation score is reported. A batch size of 64 is used for all experiments. We use split-1 of UCF101 and HMDB51 to report all our fine-tuning results. We use top-1 accuracy. Unless stated, the results for any experiment setup have been reported on split-1 of UCF101.

6 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

6.1 Loss Functions

We first report the results of using various loss functions during pretraining on our 25K split. All results are obtained by first pretraining on 3D-Resnet-18 and then finetuning on UCF101. In Table 3 we see that Distribution Balanced Focal Loss (Balanced-Focal) multi-label pretraining performs the best, while single label pretraining performs the worst. Single label training overfits very quickly, which might be why it has the least accuracy. To test this observation, we also finetuned single label pretrained models at different epoch steps (5, 50). We observed that the epoch 5 model got 44.54 and the epoch 50 model got 38.94 accuracy, which is roughly similar to the results when we don't pretrain and, in the other case, worse than scratch training. Loss Masking (CCE-Mask) helps, but it's still worse than scratch accuracy. Further, it seems that better multi-label training methods on our noisy and imbalanced dataset help downstream accuracy.

Table 3: Results of using various loss functions during pretraining with 25K set and finetuning on UCF101.

Pretraining	Loss Function	Accuracy
None	-	44.54
Single Label	CCE	39.78
Single Label	CCE-Mask	40.73
Multi Label	BCELoss	44.77
Multi Label	Focal	45.04
Multi Label	Balanced-Focal	**45.38**

Table 4: Results of using various pretraining strategies and their combinations with 25K split and finetuned on UCF101. MLP-BF: Multi Label Pretraining with Balanced-Focal loss.

Pretraining strategy	Accuracy
None	44.54
SSL-UCF	49.17
SSL-Kinetics	**53.21**
SSL-25k	51.57
SSL-25k + MLP-BF	51.73

6.2 Pretraining Strategies

Next, we report results on various types of pretraining, simple, SSL, and their combinations. We first do SSL on UCF101 itself to set

Table 5: Results on the 100k split using R2P1D.

	Accuracy	
Pretraining	UCF101	HMDB51
None	44.81	18.24
SSL-100K	**61.7**	**29.15**

Table 6: Synthetic Label Noise Results on UCF101 for the 100k split using R2P1D

Label Noise Percentage	W/o Pre-training	With Pretraining
Asymmetric 40%	29.32	**45.49**
Asymmetric 80%	12.74	**21.91**

Table 7: Video Corruption Results on the 100k split using R2P1D.

Corruption	W/o Pretraining	With Pretraining
Random Corruption	35.16	**45.28**
Contiguous Corruption	42.69	**56.46**

a baseline (SSL-UCF). Further, for better comparison, we create a similar-sized split of Kinetics by randomly sampling 26392 videos for 400 classes and perform SSL with this dataset (SSL-Kinetics). Finally, we perform SSL with our 25K split (SSL-25K). We observe that results on the model trained with our split perform better than SSL on UCF, but the model pretrained with Kinetics using SSL performs the best. This is expected since the Kinetics videos are very clean and much more correlated with the action labels to which they are assigned. One may argue that SSL does not use label information, but the presence of clean and informative videos seems to impact downstream performance. Balanced-Focal training on top of SSL does not seem to help the final downstream accuracy. Also, these results demonstrate that our noisy videos help with downstream tasks, and its effectiveness is not far from manually curated datasets like Kinetics.

Finally, we train R(2+1)D models on the 100K split, choosing the best methods from the benchmarking experiments on 25K. The results are shown in Table 5, and we can observe that we get a significant boost in accuracy by using a model which has been trained using SSL on 100k (SSL-100K).

6.3 Robustness Experiments

Next, we show the results on UCF101 with synthetic label corruption. Table 6 shows those results with 2 different label corruption percentages, with accuracy on the scratch network and accuracy after fine-tuning an R(2+1)D network pretrained with SSL on the 100k. We see significant improvements for both levels of synthetic noise, and even for an extreme synthetic noise percentage of 80%, we see an improvement of more than 8% for R(2+1)D. We attribute this robustness to the variety of examples our network learns from during pretraining. In our experiments with just multi-label pretraining, we observed the same robustness during fine-tuning, but the gap, in that case, was smaller than we get when we use SSL for pretraining. More investigation is needed here, especially on varying noise types (Symmetric, Noise Dependent, etc.).

For video corruption, we see similar trends. While the overall accuracy decreases, using a pretrained model gives us 10% more accuracy for random corruption. For contiguous corruption, the scratch accuracy decreases by 2%, but the pretrained network still maintains high accuracy. More investigation is needed to validate whether we get similar robustness behavior with other kinds of video corruption. With this, we can now see that pretraining on a noisy dataset will help with both label and video corruption.

7 FUTURE WORK AND DIRECTIONS

Having shown our dataset's effectiveness for video action classification, with absolutely no human supervision and verification, we now want to take this opportunity to talk about how our dataset can be used for many other tasks. We also talk about some further work that can be done on top of our current results.

7.1 Future Work

We performed an analysis with various loss functions and observed that multi-label learning in noisy datasets works. We hope that this will be a good starting point for future work in noisy multi-label learning. One source of obtaining better or more labels is the user-generated meta tags, title, description, and comments. Efficiently extracting labels from this meta data is a challenge. Our first attempts involved using Wordnet Synsets [29]. With limited preprocessing, we could extract some new useful labels for a given video, but this came at the cost of getting many redundant and noisy labels, making the whole process noisier than before. Good recovery of these implicit labels using video content and its meta data is an exciting challenge and will augment our above experiments. Given that we achieve very competitive results with just the 100K split, the first experiment will be to scale up this training towards all 2M Ids.

To collect this dataset, we use labels from all datasets in Table1 as our seed queries. These datasets have primarily been collected from Youtube, and our dataset has only been collected from Flickr. These factors allow another interesting use case for our dataset: studying content diversity and distribution shift across platforms for the same set of class labels.

We do not address the aspect of pretraining in the presence of noisy labels. Learning in the presence of label noise is a fairly well-studied problem in various settings [8, 20, 32, 33, 41, 43]. Weakly supervised settings almost always suffer from the problem of corrupted labels. The structure of noise in web scraped datasets is usually not very clear. Hence, using the standard label-noise tackling methods is challenging in such situations and a very interesting research direction. We hope that our dataset acts as a benchmark for such methods.

7.2 Future Directions

This dataset intends to set a standard benchmark to learn from noisy web data in various multimedia tasks. It can be used for pretraining or directly for cross-media retrieval tasks since we have videos, video frames (images), meta data (tags, comments, description), and video audio. Our dataset can act as a rich source of pretraining

for a variety of different multimedia problems. Some direct applications are Webly supervised cross-modal retrieval, Multimodal video understanding, Action localization, Video Captioning, Video Understanding, No-audio Multimodal Speech detection, Image Captioning, Image Description, and Multimedia Recommender systems. Various statistics about the dataset computed in Section 3 further support the above speculation on future usage.

Our dataset was collected using class labels from well-known datasets shown in Table 1. Due to this, subsets of our dataset can be used as web scraped alternatives to those datasets, allowing for some interesting experiments involving a comparison between web data (real-time distribution) and carefully annotated and curated data for the same set of classes.

Finally, inspired by results in Table 7 and Table 6, one can also examine how pretraining datasets similar to ours can lead to some downstream label and video corruption robustness. It will also be interesting to investigate how pretraining affects other properties of fine-tuned models like Adversarial Robustness, Domain Shift, Out of Distribution Detection, and Uncertainty Estimation.

8 CONCLUSION

This work proposes a new large-scale benchmark dataset for video understanding from noisy data. The proposed dataset is collected using labels from standard video benchmarks, with useful surrounding meta information and all multi-labels corresponding to each data point without human verification. We demonstrated its usefulness in downstream action recognition tasks on two standard action classification benchmarks, UCF101 and HMDB51, and reported significant gains in top-1 accuracies. We also demonstrated an interesting robustness property against varying asymmetric label noise. We hope that this dataset serves as a benchmark for research in noisy learning for videos and is helpful for various multimedia tasks.

REFERENCES

[1] Sami Abu-El-Haija, Nisarg Kothari, Joonseok Lee, Paul Natsev, George Toderici, Balakrishnan Varadarajan, and Sudheendra Vijayanarasimhan. 2016. Youtube-8m: A large-scale video classification benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.08675* (2016).

[2] Fabian Caba Heilbron, Victor Escorcia, Bernard Ghanem, and Juan Carlos Niebles. 2015. Activitynet: A large-scale video benchmark for human activity understanding. In *CVPR*. 961–970.

[3] Trenton Chang, Daniel Y Fu, Yixuan Li, and Christopher Ré. [n.d.]. Beyond the Pixels: Exploring the Effect of Video File Corruptions on Model Robustness. ([n. d.]).

[4] Xinlei Chen and Abhinav Gupta. 2015. Webly supervised learning of convolutional networks. In *CVPR*. 1431–1439.

[5] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. 2009. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *CVPR*. Ieee, 248–255.

[6] Ali Diba, Mohsen Fayyaz, Vivek Sharma, Manohar Paluri, Jürgen Gall, Rainer Stiefelhagen, and Luc Van Gool. 2019. Large Scale Holistic Video Understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.11451* (2019).

[7] Santosh K Divvala, Ali Farhadi, and Carlos Guestrin. 2014. Learning everything about anything: Webly-supervised visual concept learning. In *CVPR*. 3270–3277.

[8] Benoît Frénay and Michel Verleysen. 2013. Classification in the presence of label noise: a survey. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* 25, 5 (2013), 845–869.

[9] Deepti Ghadiyaram, Du Tran, and Dhruv Mahajan. 2019. Large-scale weakly-supervised pre-training for video action recognition. In *CVPR*. 12046–12055.

[10] Aritra Ghosh and Andrew Lan. 2021. Contrastive Learning Improves Model Robustness Under Label Noise. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) Workshops*. 2703–2708.

[11] Raghav Goyal, Samira Ebrahimi Kahou, Vincent Michalski, Joanna Materzynska, Susanne Westphal, Heuna Kim, Valentin Haenel, Ingo Fruend, Peter Yianilos, Moritz Mueller-Freitag, et al. 2017. The" Something Something" Video Database for Learning and Evaluating Visual Common Sense. In *ICCV*, Vol. 1. 5.

[12] Chunhui Gu, Chen Sun, David A Ross, Carl Vondrick, Caroline Pantofaru, Yeqing Li, Sudheendra Vijayanarasimhan, George Toderici, Susanna Ricco, Rahul Sukthankar, et al. 2018. Ava: A video dataset of spatio-temporally localized atomic visual actions. In *CVPR*. 6047–6056.

[13] Kensho Hara, Hirokatsu Kataoka, and Yutaka Satoh. 2018. Can Spatiotemporal 3D CNNs Retrace the History of 2D CNNs and ImageNet?. In *CVPR*. 6546–6555.

[14] Andrej Karpathy, George Toderici, Sanketh Shetty, Thomas Leung, Rahul Sukthankar, and Li Fei-Fei. 2014. Large-scale video classification with convolutional neural networks. In *CVPR*. 1725–1732.

[15] Will Kay, Joao Carreira, Karen Simonyan, Brian Zhang, Chloe Hillier, Sudheendra Vijayanarasimhan, Fabio Viola, Tim Green, Trevor Back, Paul Natsev, et al. 2017. The kinetics human action video dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.06950* (2017).

[16] Ranjay Krishna, Kenji Hata, Frederic Ren, Li Fei-Fei, and Juan Carlos Niebles. 2017. Dense-captioning events in videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 706–715.

[17] Ranjay Krishna, Yuke Zhu, Oliver Groth, Justin Johnson, Kenji Hata, Joshua Kravitz, Stephanie Chen, Yannis Kalantidis, Li-Jia Li, David A Shamma, et al. 2017. Visual genome: Connecting language and vision using crowdsourced dense image annotations. *International journal of computer vision* 123, 1 (2017), 32–73.

[18] Hildegard Kuehne, Hueihan Jhuang, Estíbaliz Garrote, Tomaso Poggio, and Thomas Serre. 2011. HMDB: a large video database for human motion recognition. In *ICCV*. IEEE, 2556–2563.

[19] Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey Hinton. 2015. Deep learning. *nature* 521, 7553 (2015), 436–444.

[20] Kuang-Huei Lee, Xiaodong He, Lei Zhang, and Linjun Yang. 2018. Cleannet: Transfer learning for scalable image classifier training with label noise. In *CVPR*. 5447–5456.

[21] Tomer Levinboim, Ashish Thapliyal, Piyush Sharma, and Radu Soricut. 2019. Quality Estimation for Image Captions Based on Large-scale Human Evaluations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.03396* (2019).

[22] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Ves Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2019. BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension. arXiv:1910.13461 [cs.CL]

[23] Wen Li, Limin Wang, Wei Li, Eirikur Agustsson, and Luc Van Gool. 2017. Webvision database: Visual learning and understanding from web data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.02862* (2017).

[24] Yuncheng Li, Yale Song, Liangliang Cao, Joel Tetreault, Larry Goldberg, Alejandro Jaimes, and Jiebo Luo. 2016. TGIF: A new dataset and benchmark on animated GIF description. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 4641–4650.

[25] Tsung-Yi Lin, Priya Goyal, Ross Girshick, Kaiming He, and Piotr Dollár. 2017. Focal loss for dense object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 2980–2988.

[26] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. 2014. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 740–755.

[27] Dhruv Mahajan, Ross Girshick, Vignesh Ramanathan, Kaiming He, Manohar Paluri, Yixuan Li, Ashwin Bharambe, and Laurens van der Maaten. 2018. Exploring the limits of weakly supervised pretraining. In *ECCV*. 181–196.

[28] Paulius Micikevicius, Sharan Narang, Jonah Alben, Gregory Diamos, Erich Elsen, David Garcia, Boris Ginsburg, Michael Houston, Oleksii Kuchaiev, Ganesh Venkatesh, et al. 2017. Mixed precision training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.03740* (2017).

[29] George A Miller. 1995. WordNet: a lexical database for English. *Commun. ACM* 38, 11 (1995), 39–41.

[30] Mathew Monfort, Alex Andonian, Bolei Zhou, Kandan Ramakrishnan, Sarah Adel Bargal, Tom Yan, Lisa Brown, Quanfu Fan, Dan Gutfreund, Carl Vondrick, et al. 2019. Moments in time dataset: one million videos for event understanding. *TPAMI* 42, 2 (2019), 502–508.

[31] Vicente Ordonez, Girish Kulkarni, and Tamara Berg. 2011. Im2text: Describing images using 1 million captioned photographs. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 24 (2011), 1143–1151.

[32] Giorgio Patrini, Alessandro Rozza, Aditya Krishna Menon, Richard Nock, and Lizhen Qu. 2017. Making deep neural networks robust to label noise: A loss correction approach. In *CVPR*. 1944–1952.

[33] David Rolnick, Andreas Veit, Serge Belongie, and Nir Shavit. 2017. Deep learning is robust to massive label noise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.10694* (2017).

[34] Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, Sebastian Goodman, and Radu Soricut. 2018. Conceptual Captions: A Cleaned, Hypernymed, Image Alt-text Dataset For Automatic Image Captioning. In *Proceedings of ACL*.

[35] Gunnar A Sigurdsson, Abhinav Gupta, Cordelia Schmid, Ali Farhadi, and Karteek Alahari. 2018. Charades-ego: A large-scale dataset of paired third and first person videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.09626* (2018).

[36] Gunnar A Sigurdsson, Gül Varol, Xiaolong Wang, Ali Farhadi, Ivan Laptev, and Abhinav Gupta. 2016. Hollywood in homes: Crowdsourcing data collection for

activity understanding. In *ECCV*. Springer, 510–526.
[37] Khurram Soomro, Amir Roshan Zamir, and Mubarak Shah. 2012. UCF101: A dataset of 101 human actions classes from videos in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.0402* (2012).
[38] Li Tao, Xueting Wang, and Toshihiko Yamasaki. 2020. Pretext-Contrastive Learning: Toward Good Practices in Self-supervised Video Representation Leaning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.15464* (2020).
[39] Bart Thomee, David A Shamma, Gerald Friedland, Benjamin Elizalde, Karl Ni, Douglas Poland, Damian Borth, and Li-Jia Li. 2016. YFCC100M: The new data in multimedia research. *Commun. ACM* 59, 2 (2016), 64–73.
[40] Du Tran, Heng Wang, Lorenzo Torresani, Jamie Ray, Yann LeCun, and Manohar Paluri. 2018. A closer look at spatiotemporal convolutions for action recognition. In *CVPR*. 6450–6459.
[41] Arash Vahdat. 2017. Toward robustness against label noise in training deep discriminative neural networks. In *NeurIPS*. 5596–5605.
[42] Tong Wu, Qingqiu Huang, Ziwei Liu, Yu Wang, and Dahua Lin. 2020. Distribution-balanced loss for multi-label classification in long-tailed datasets. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 162–178.
[43] Tong Xiao, Tian Xia, Yi Yang, Chang Huang, and Xiaogang Wang. 2015. Learning from Massive Noisy Labeled Data for Image Classification. In *CVPR*.
[44] Chenliang Xu, Shao-Hang Hsieh, Caiming Xiong, and Jason J Corso. 2015. Can humans fly? action understanding with multiple classes of actors. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2264–2273.
[45] Jun Xu, Tao Mei, Ting Yao, and Yong Rui. 2016. Msr-vtt: A large video description dataset for bridging video and language. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 5288–5296.
[46] Wenpeng Yin, Jamaal Hay, and Dan Roth. 2019. Benchmarking Zero-shot Text Classification: Datasets, Evaluation and Entailment Approach. arXiv:1909.00161 [cs.CL]
[47] Peter Young, Alice Lai, Micah Hodosh, and Julia Hockenmaier. 2014. From image descriptions to visual denotations: New similarity metrics for semantic inference over event descriptions. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 2 (2014), 67–78.
[48] Hang Zhao, Antonio Torralba, Lorenzo Torresani, and Zhicheng Yan. 2019. Hacs: Human action clips and segments dataset for recognition and temporal localization. In *ICCV*. 8668–8678.
[49] Luowei Zhou, Yannis Kalantidis, Xinlei Chen, Jason J Corso, and Marcus Rohrbach. 2019. Grounded video description. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 6578–6587.

A APPENDIX: DATASET CONSTRUCTION

A.1 Datasets used for Long Sentence Queries

ActivityNet Captions [16], MS COCO [26], MSR-VTT [45], Flickr30k Denotations [47], SBU [31], A2D [44], Visual Genome [17], Conceptual Captions [34], Charades [36], Charades-Ego [35], OID [21], TGIF [24], ActivityNet-Entities [49]

A.2 Entity Classification Process

To better understand the broader distribution of the dataset, we considered the 23 top entities used in the Youtube8M [1] paper to visualize the distribution of their labels. We consider each of the textual metadata attributes and pass it through an NLI-based Zero-Shot multilabel Text Classifier [46]. This uses the Bart-large-mnli [22] model with the top 23 entities as labels. We then combine the labels obtained over all the attributes and analyze the distribution. Each video may have multiple higher-level entities.

B APPENDIX: TRAINING METHODOLOGY

B.1 Loss Masking Algorithm

Algorithm 1 shows how loss masking is done during pretraining in our experiment.

Algorithm 1: Training using Loss Masking

input : A dataset of videos with multi labels.
output: A model M

Randomly initialize parameters of model M.
while *training epochs are left* **do**
  (1) Build a single label training dataset from the multi label dataset with partial labels using class thresholds. Iterate through the multi label list for the given video:
    a. If a label has less number of videos assigned than the threshold, simply assign it to the video.
    b. Otherwise move to the next label in the multi-label list.
    c. If any video gets no label, randomly sample a label from the multi-label list.
  (2) Assign the other non-selected labels in the multi-label list as partial labels.
  (3) Update weights of model M using the training dataset by masking cross entropy loss values at partial label indices.
Return model M

B.2 Checking for Robustness

We also show some results on a synthetically noised dataset to demonstrate label noise robustness. For these experiments, given a dataset, we change the labels of $x\%$ of examples of a given true label to some other label in the dataset randomly and leave the rest to their original label. We then compare the training results on such a dataset with fine-tuning a 3D-Resnet-18 and an R(2+1)d-D-18 model trained on our dataset.

Finally, to demonstrate robustness against video corruption, we simulated two types of corruption patterns on the UCF101 videos, random corruption and contiguous corruption [3]. We varied the proportion of video corruptions by value notated as $p \in [0, 1]$. For random corruptions, we flip each bit independently with probability $p = 1e - 4$. We replace a random contiguous segment of length $p = 0.75$ times the file length with flipped bits for contiguous corruptions. We find that some videos after applying corruption become unplaybale and are not decoded to frames, which is in accordance with the observations reported by Chang et al. [3].