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Abstract

Video Question Answering (Video QA) is a critical and challenging task in multimedia comprehension. While deep learning based models are extremely capable of representing and understanding videos, these models heavily rely on massive data, which is expensive to label. In this paper, we introduce a novel task for automatically generating questions given a sequence of video frames and the corresponding subtitles from a clip of video to reduce the huge annotation cost. Learning to ask a question based on a video requires the model to comprehend the rich semantics in the scene and the interplay between the vision and the language. To address this, we propose a novel cross-modal self-attention (CMSA) network to aggregate the diverse features from video frames and subtitles. Excitingly, we demonstrate that our proposed model can improve the (strong) baseline from 0.0738 to 0.1374 in BLEU4 score – more than 0.063 improvement (i.e., 85% relatively). Most of all, We arguably pave a novel path toward solving the challenging Video QA task and provide detailed analysis which ushers the avenues for future investigations.

1. Introduction

Multimedia content collects from daily broadcast news, cameras, online streaming is massively produced and widely available on the web so that it provides the rich information of the entire world in every minute. However, it is difficult to make good use of rich data due to its massive quantities. Video Question Answering (Video QA) systems which answer a natural language question according to a video clip are therefore practical and valuable.

The recent success of deep neural networks has enabled end-to-end training in various video understanding tasks such as action recognition [3, 5, 7, 32], and video captioning [28, 29, 34, 59], and many of the models reach significant performances. The shortcoming of these systems is that they do not communicate with the users. Video QA which takes user-generated natural language questions and comprehend the video is able to seek information for different user needs. However, Video QA remains challenging for requiring the model to understand both user-generated natural language questions and sparse video features. Moreover, deep neural network models with millions of parameters rely on a massive amount of training data, which is expensive to collect.

Several datasets and data mechanisms have been proposed to overcome these obstacles in three ways. (1) Apply text-based question generation on video description. [6, 37, 38] (2) Produce questions template [11]. (3) Manually label the video [14, 16, 26]. The former two approaches neither take into account video frames information nor considering the intersection between the visual and textual semantic features, while the last one requires extremely expensive human efforts. With the supply of the data, modern Video QA systems [18, 30, 31] have made a remarkable progress. However, the expensive cost of data annotation is still a gap for building applications with large-scale multimedia contents.

To address this, we propose a novel and practical task, Video Question Generation (Video QG), to automatically ask a question based on a video clip and reduce the immense labeling cost for training Video QA models. As illustrated in Figure 1 the Video Question Generation system takes an input video clip and generates an answerable question based on the clip. Comparing to the text question generation task where the target questions are highly overlapped with the input passage or the image question generation task where the questions are regardless of the temporal information, the Video QG is arguably more challenging.

To train a Video QG model, it is straightforward to apply an LSTM based Seq2Seq model. However, LSTM based Seq2Seq models usually fail when the length of the encoded sequence is too long which makes the LSTM models difficult to learn long-range dependencies. Moreover, the multimedia information fusion mechanism for LSTM models usually computes the multimodal attention with only...
one embedding space for one modality, restricts the fusion representation ability from learning from multiple semantic subspaces of a single modality and the intersection between different subspaces of different modalities. Therefore, we propose the following novel approaches to cope with the aforementioned problems and analyze the performances of the models:

1. **Semantic-Rich Embedding (SRE)** (cf. section 5.3). SRE incorporates the object-level representation into visual information to directly provide the co-occurrence of the objects to the cue of the relationship and interaction.

2. **Cross-Modal Self-Attention (CMSA) Network** (cf. section 5.4). Our proposed CMSA Network could solve the notorious long-term dependencies issues by applying self-attention mechanism. In addition, we learn multiple semantic subspaces for each modality which allow the model to capture complementary semantic attention in different subspaces so that the CMSA network is capable of generating powerful multimodal representation.

3. **Diversity Metric** (cf. section 7.2). To better measure the quality of generated questions, we propose a diversity metric, Frequent Words Coverage, by calculating the ratio of top-k% of frequent word occurrence. A higher frequent words coverage indicates less diversity in the generated questions. Besides the impressive improvement on BLEU4, ROUGE, CIDEr and METEOR scores of our model, our generated questions are relatively diverse in both scenarios while the baseline model suffers when applying video only, covering 72.26% of words in the questions with only top 0.1% of words in the vocabulary.

We train our system on the TVQA [16] dataset, the only available dataset that is human-labeled and is labeled by having people watch attentively on both visual and textual data of real and untrimmed videos, which is the best test bed for our Video QG model. We apply the video QG in two scenarios, video frames and video frames with subtitles, as these two scenarios are both common in multimedia contents. Our proposed model significantly surpasses the competitive baseline models based on previous works [2, 28] on BLEU4, ROUGE, CIDEr and METEOR scores in both scenarios.

2. Related Work

2.1. Visual Question Answering

VQA can be split into two branches: image question answering and video question answering. Recently, several image question answering datasets have been built, including COCO-QA [24], VQA 1.0 [1], VQA 2.0 [8], CLEVR [12], and Visual7w [40]. Similar to image QA, a number of video qa datasets have been proposed. PororoQA [13] and MarioQA [23] are constructed from the unrealistic video sources. MovieQA [26] dataset is built upon language sources, while MovieFIB [21], VideoQA [33], TGIFQA [10] are based on visual sources. As for the data collection strategy of TVQA [16] dataset, humans are required to focus on both the visual and language sources to label the dataset.

2.2. Question Generation

The question generation tasks can be categorized in terms of the input modality, which are the textual and visual features. Text-based question generation has attracted the natural language community in recent years due to the
huge cost of human labeling. NQG \cite{6} with the seq2seq-based framework is able to generate a question given a text passage. There are also research about image-based question generation. Mostafazadeh et al. \cite{22} aims to generate a natural and engaging question when shown an image. They proposed Gated Recurrent Neural Network and a retrieval based model which leverages the training labels to generate questions. Li et al. \cite{17} introduce question generation as a dual task of question answering. They exploit the inherent complementary relation between question answering and generation to generate questions and answers.

2.3. Video Captioning

The most related task to our work is the video captioning task which is also based on a Seq2Seq framework. Different methods have been proposed to capture the temporal information of videos. Venugopalan et al. \cite{29} applies mean-pooling on video frames. Venugopalan et al. \cite{28}, which is a very competitive video-to-text baseline model, takes advantage of the inherent sequential nature of videos and language, generating captions for videos using an end-to-end sequence-to-sequence model. Yao et al. \cite{34} uses the 3-D convolutional neural network to capture local temporal representation and attention mechanism to model global temporal structure.

Compared with the Video Captioning task which only takes single modality as input, successful Video QG models need to leverage video frames and subtitles to successfully generate diverse and answerable questions and this requirement makes Video QG more difficult than Video Captioning. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to propose the novel task, Video QG, and we tackle this challenging task with our CMSA model.

3. Data Analysis and Task Description

In this section, we begin by reviewing our only available training dataset, TVQA \cite{16} due to the fact that it is the only Video QA dataset whose questions are labeled by considering both textual and visual modalities. We then define our task and explain the input and the output of our model.

3.1. Dataset

Lei et al. \cite{16} proposed the TVQA dataset. TVQA is based on 6 popular TV shows and consists of 152,545 QA pairs from 21,793 clips. Every training data is composed of localized subtitles, frames, questions, and answers which are the ideal training sources for our task. Moreover, different from MovieQA \cite{26}, crowd workers labeled the questions given video frames and subtitles instead of subtitles alone which makes our task more challenging while model is required to understand video information in order to ask the answerable questions.

3.2. Task Definition

In our task setting, we build two scenarios for our task in terms of two different multimedia model input: (1) Only Video Frame and (2) Subtitles + Video Frame.

The subtitles and the video frames are both localized in the video clip. The desired output of the model are the answerable and diverse generated questions given the visual and text information.

4. Baseline Networks

In this section, we introduce a competitive single source baseline network, S2VT \cite{28}, which is the backbone of most of the video captioning models and we build our competitive multimodal baseline network by extending IMGD \cite{2}.

4.1. Single Source Baseline Network: S2VT

We set our single source baseline network as a two layers LSTM encoder and two layers LSTM decoder. The LSTM encoder extracts the features from video frames and passes the features to the LSTM decoder. In decoding stage, we apply Luong Attention \cite{20} to capture contextual representation. The hyperparameters of the single source baseline model are listed in section 5.6.

4.2. Multimodal Baseline Network: IMGD

We apply Images for decoder initialisation (IMGD) \cite{2} as our multimodal baseline network. We pass different modal inputs through individual LSTM encoder to extract features for each modality. We incorporate the last hidden states of the two different LSTM encoders as the initial state of our LSTM decoder. The above fusion mechanism is followed by \cite{2}.

5. Cross-Modal Self-Attention Network

We introduce our proposed novel CMSA networks, mainly composed of a CMSA encoder and an LSTM decoder (cf. Figure 2). The CMSA encoder aims for tackling the long-range dependency issues and the limitation in LSTM-based methods, which mostly take the sequences of a single modality – ignoring the potential interactions from multimodal sequences. Inspired by the recent success of transformer-based machine translation methods \cite{27}, which understand the synonyms by attending the input itself. In a novel setup, our CMSA networks solve the above two problems by the following strategies: (1) We first calculate our designed SRE features to pool the video frames with the high-level semantic information and we capture the video temporal relationship among the long video frames by applying the self-attention mechanism. (2) We derive the multimodal representations by stacking the learned attentive information from the multiple projected subspaces.
5.1. Vanilla Transformer Encoder

In this section, we first introduce the vanilla transformer [27] which inspires our CMSA network.

5.1.1 Scaled Dot-Product Attention

We start the transformer by explaining the scale dot-product attention, which is the main computation of the transformer. Given a query \( q_{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{d} \), where \( t' \) is the time step of a \( T' \) queries sequence, a set of keys \( k_{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{d} \) and a set of values \( v_{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{d} \) from all \( T \) keys and values, we compute the dot products of the query with all keys, divide each by \( \sqrt{d} \), and apply the softmax function to obtain the weights on the values. In practice, we pack \( q_{t'}, k_{t}, \) and \( v_{t} \) into matrices \( Q, K, \) and \( V \) in order to compute the attention scores simultaneously. The attention matrix is computed as:

\[
\text{Attention}(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK}{\sqrt{d}}\right)V
\]

In our experiment, we set \( K, V \) as the two different projected subtitles and \( Q \) is fed with self-attention SRE.

5.1.2 Multi-Head Attention

A single attention matrix computation is called a “head”, and we adopt the multi-head attention in our model. The multi-head attention consists of \( H \) parallel heads which allow the model to jointly learn from different representation subspaces. The multi-head attention output is computed as below:

\[
\text{head}_{j} = \text{Attention}(W_{j}^{Q}Q, W_{j}^{K}K, W_{j}^{V}V)
\]

\[
\text{MultiHead}(Q, K, V) = W^{O}\text{Concat(head}_1, ..., \text{head}_H)
\]

where \( W_{j}^{Q}, W_{j}^{K}, \) and \( W_{j}^{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times d} \) are the head projection matrices.

Corresponding to our experiment, a head computation can be viewed as a fusion between the projected subspaces from each input modality.

5.1.3 Positional Encoding

Every input token in the input sequence is converted to the learned embeddings first. Nonetheless, the self attention module does not provide the temporal information during the computation. Therefore, the learned embedding will add a residual positional encoding to enhance the temporal information in the every time step input. The positional encoding is computed by:

\[
PE_{(pos,2i)} = \sin\left(\frac{pos}{10000^{2i/H}}\right)
\]

\[
PE_{(pos,2i+1)} = \cos\left(\frac{pos}{10000^{2i/H}}\right)
\]

The residual positional encoding is then calculated by the input embedding multiplied by the positional encoding. The detailed math explanation of positional encoding could refer to [27] for further explanation.

5.1.4 Overall Architecture

The entire transformer architecture is composed of a multi-head attention block and a feed-forward block. In our experiment, the feed-forward block is a two-layered MLP. The entire process is described in Figure [3].

5.2. Cross-Modal Self-Attention Encoder

We start introducing our novel CMSA encoder in this section. We solve the long-range dependencies problem by
utilizing the self-attention mechanism and aggregate the fusion subspaces by running multi-head attention of different modalities. Overall, we first compute our proposed attentive semantic rich embedding (attentive SRE) then incorporate the attentive SRE with the subtitles with our novel cross-modal mechanism.

5.3. Semantic Rich Embedding (SRE)

In order to generate attentive SRE. We first map the frame representation to the word space. The mapped frame representation is denoted as \( V_{\text{frame}} \). Then, we learn the SRE feature \( V_{\text{sre}} \) by computing the dot product between the \( V_{\text{frame}} \) and the object-level embedding \( V_{\text{obj}} \). The self-attention SRE can be computed by:

\[
V_{\text{sre}} = V_{\text{obj}} \odot V_{\text{frame}} \tag{6}
\]

\[
V_{\text{AtteSre}} = \text{Attention}(V_{\text{sre}}Q, V_{\text{sre}}K, V_{\text{sre}}V) \tag{7}
\]

\[
= \text{Attention}(W^QV_{\text{sre}}, W^KV_{\text{sre}}, WV^V_{\text{sre}}) \tag{8}
\]

where \( W^Q, W^K, W^V \) are the linear projection matrices as described in (2).

5.4. Cross-Modal Self-Attention (CMSA) Mechanism

We compute the cross-modal attentive value \( V_{\text{cmsa}} \) by:

\[
V_{\text{cmsa}} = \text{Attention}(V_{\text{sub}}^Q, V_{\text{sub}}^K, V_{\text{AtteSre}}^V) \tag{9}
\]

\[
= \text{Attention}(W^QV_{\text{sub}}, W^KV_{\text{sub}}, WV^V_{\text{sre}}) \tag{10}
\]

Every project matrix, \( W^Q, W^K, \) or \( W^V \), indicates a different semantic subspace projection which allows the model to aggregate the fusion from different attention subspaces. We set the subtitle features as the keys and values of our CMSA network and set the attentive semantic rich embedding as the queries.

5.5. LSTM Decoder

We calculate the initial hidden state \( h_0 \) and cell value \( c_0 \) of the LSTM decoder by \( h_0 = HV_{\text{cmsa}}^\text{mean} \) and \( c_0 = CV_{\text{cmsa}}^\text{mean} \), where \( H, C \) are two projection matrices consists of two-layered MLP, and \( V_{\text{fused}}^\text{mean} \) is the mean value of the \( V_{\text{fused}} \). Also, taking advantages of recent development of attention mechanism, we implement Luong attention [20] during decoder generation. We demonstrate the efficacy of our proposed cross-modal self-attention networks in Table [1].

5.6. Implementation Details

We apply our Video QG system to a large-scale Video QA dataset, TVQA [16]. During preprocessing stage, we remove the training data whose number of frames is less than 8. In terms of the reproducibility, we also provide the hyperparameters of our baseline networks and our proposed CMSA networks.

5.6.1 Hyperparameters of the Baseline Networks

We set both the hidden size and layer of the LSTM encoder and the LSTM decoder to 512 and 2. We optimize the loss function with the SGD optimizer and the learning rate is 0.01. The batch size is 32 and the beam size during the inference is 5.

5.6.2 Hyperparameters of the CMSA

We set both the hidden size (d), number of heads (H), and the number of layers of the transformer-like encoder equal to 1024, 8, and 6. The settings of the decoder is the same as the baseline networks. We optimize the model with Adam Optimizer [15] and the learning rate is 3e-3. The batch size and the beam size settings are the same as the baseline networks.
6. Experiments

In this section, we describe the features we utilized in our experiments and the evaluation settings for our results.

6.1. Features

Due to the abundant features in a video clip, we leverage the following features for our novel CMSA network.

6.1.1 Video Frame Features

Frames are extracted 3fps and every frame is passed to the ResNet-101 [9]. We utilize the representation from ResNet Pool 5 layer, which is 2048 dim. Every frame feature is concatenated, denoted as \( V_{\text{frame}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{frame}} \times 2048} \), where \( n_{\text{frame}} \) is the number of frames in a video clip.

6.1.2 Object-Level Features

Inspired by recent works [16, 35], we apply an embedding to each object extracted from the frame. The entire process of extracting object embedding is shown follow: (1) Faster-RCNN [25] is applied to extract the objects in each frame and each object is assigned with an initialized 300 dim embedding which will be updated during the network training. (2) We apply mean pooling on the entire object embeddings of a frame to extract the object representation. The resulting object-level representation is \( V_{\text{obj}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{frame}} \times 300} \), which could provide high-level cue to the video frame features.

6.1.3 Subtitle Features

In order to complement the semantic information of the visual features, we extract the features of every word in each subtitle with a random initialized 300 dim word embedding. The subtitles features can be represented as \( V_{\text{sub}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{sub}} \times 300} \), where \( n_{\text{sub}} \) is the word length of the subtitles in a video clip.

6.2. Settings

In the TVQA dataset, every video clip is labeled with 7 localized segments and each segment consists of a Question-Answer-Subtitles triple pair. We train our Video QG model with the localized segment triple pair. During the evaluation stage, we take a similar evaluation strategy as the image QG task and video captioning task where every input corresponding to 10-20 candidates and the testing score of the input is evaluated as the highest score among the entire candidates. However, only a ground truth question corresponds to each segment. Therefore, we generate a testing question given every localized video segment, and we calculate a score per video clip which is evaluated by the highest score among all the generated questions in a clip since we view the 7 labeled questions as the correct “candidate” questions.

7. Results and Analysis

In this section, we demonstrate our results and analyze our generated questions compared with competitive models based on S2VT and IMGD [28, 2]. To better understand the quality of generated questions, we first examine the correctness with BLEU-4, Rouge, CIDEr and Meteor metrics which are widely applied to text generation tasks such as video captioning or text question generation. Next, we investigate the diversity of the generated questions. Finally, human evaluation with several sampled questions is applied to discover the quality beyond the automatic evaluation results.

7.1. Main Results

Automatic evaluation using coco-caption package [4] is shown in Table 1. Comparing to the strong baseline (First row in each block) model, our proposed method (Last row in each block) obtain an impressive gain in all metrics in the scenario with or without subtitles, indicating that our proposed methods better represent the input video which is sparse and huge. We also compare our model with different input features for video. SRE can further improve the overall performance, especially in the scenario without the subtitles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w/o S CMSA</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td><strong>41.83</strong></td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td>18.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRE + CMSA</td>
<td><strong>13.74</strong></td>
<td>41.48</td>
<td><strong>22.93</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.66</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ S CMSA</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>37.78</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRE + CMSA</td>
<td><strong>13.52</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.80</strong></td>
<td>22.11</td>
<td>18.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Video QG Results on TVQA [16] dataset. S: subtitles, B: BLEU-4, R: ROUGE, C: CIDEr, M: Meteor. We compare our proposed method with a competitive video captioning model based on previous works. [28, 2]. First block: Training without subtitles. Second block: Training with both video and subtitles. SRE: Fusing the video frame feature with detected object level embedding mentioned in section 5. CMSA: our proposed model discussed in section 6. Our proposed method significantly outperforms the strong baseline in both scenario. (cf. section 7.1 for details and section 6 for our experiment settings.)

7.2. Diversity

Diversity is also essential as diverse questions allow the Video QA model to learn various types of user-generated queries. We examine the diversity by calculating the ratio of frequent words coverage of unigram, bigram, noun, and verb extracted with NLTK [19]. The results in Table show that (1) Human labeled questions are more diverse
V
S
Q (GT)
Who is listening to <name5> when she is crying ?
How does <name2> say he likes his men when he
describes his tastes to <name1> ?
Where does <name2> put his arm after he sits
down ?

Q (w/o
Sub)
S2VT: What color is the shirt that <name2>is
wearing when he says 'I do n't' ?
Ours: Where was <name3> when she was
talking to richard ?

S2VT: What color is the shirt <name3>is
wearing when he says 'I do n't' ?
Ours: What does the man in the green hat do
after he walks into the room ?

S2VT: What did <name5> do when he was
talking to <name1> about the case ?
Ours: What did <name1> do when she was
talking to <name4> ?

Ours:
What is <name3> holding when she is laying on the bed ?
What is <name4> holding when she is
laying on the bed ?
What did <name4> do after he said something about a patient ?
What is <name4> holding when she is laying on the bed ?

IMGD: What color is the shirt that <name4> is
wearing when she says 'I do n't' ?
Ours: What does the man in the green hat do
after he walks into the room ?

IMGD: What color is the shirt that <name5> is
wearing when he says 'I do n't' ?
Ours: What did <name4> do after he said
something about a patient ?

Figure 4. Generated Questions. V: Video, S: Subtitles, GT: Ground Truth, QT (w/o Sub): The question generated with video only. Q (w/sub): The question generated with both video and subtitles. Our proposed model generates more diverse and specific question according to the video and subtitles (red) while the S2VT and IMGD generate more general ones. [Best viewed in color]

Figure 5. Generated Unanswerable Questions. First block: Action Error. The action “laying on the bed” does not occur in the clip, making the question unanswerable. Second block: Entity Error. The entity “patient” is not in the dialogue, as the result, the question cannot be answered. cf. 7.4.1

than model generated questions. (2) Our generated questions are more diverse comparing to the S2VT in the video only scenario and comparable in the video + subtitles scenario, indicating that proper attending the video allows the model to focus on specific parts of the video.

7.3. Qualitative Analysis

In the following two subsections, we analyze a set of sampled questions generated by various video QG models in order to better understand the quality and the errors in video QG. We sampled 100 generated questions from the model and analyze the qualities and the errors of them.

The qualitative results are shown in the Figure 4. Our model is able to generate more diverse and specific questions according to the input video and subtitle features. While the S2VT, IMGD tend to repeat the frequent pattern which is valid for most of the video clips, reflecting the previous evaluation results.

7.4. Error Analysis

In this section, we analyze the failure examples in the generated questions as illustrated in Figure 5 which questions are unanswerable and Figure 6 which questions are suboptimal.

7.4.1 Unanswerable Questions

As shown in Figure 5 occasionally, changing a single word in a question may result in the question unanswerable while still gaining high scores in automatic evaluation. In video QG, it is often caused by the incorrect condition such as entity or action errors. This is the result of not representing the multimodal features fed into the decoder well. When the decoder is unable to distinguish the received features, it usually guesses the most common actions and entities and fills them into the questions based on the language model. Furthermore, these questions can still obtain high BLEU scores since they correctly follow the patterns of the questions.
7.4.2 Question Quality

Answerable question does not indicate its quality. We discover two problems that are quite usual in the generated questions (Figure 6): (1) Redundant Relation (First block). Constraining the question with conditions such as temporal relations encourages the Video QA model to learn to pay attention on certain parts. However, some generated questions contain unnecessary relations which do not provide any informative cues. (2) General Question (Second block). These questions are correct but general, more precisely, can be applied to many video clips. These questions contain some most frequent entities and actions in the training data and consequently guessing them is least penalized during training. However, training the Video QA models with them may discourage the models from being robust as the model can simply remember some frequent pattern regardless the input questions.

7.4.3 Other Issues

There are some other issues we found in the samples: (1) Information not provided. Mostly happens in the questions generated with the video only model, or when the model is unable to link the person on the video and the subtitles. These errors can happen when it meets the condition which requires dialog such as “say” or “talk”. (2) Grammar Error. As the patterns of questions are more consistent, the grammar errors are rare in the generated questions. The model seldom outputs the question with repeat words.

8. Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we offer a new perspective and solution to Video QA by proposing a novel task, Video QG which automatically generates the questions given a video clip. We propose a CMSA model to properly represent and understand the input video and capture the informative and specific segments in the video by attending on multimodal sequential features. Our model significantly surpasses the competitive baseline networks, S2VT, IMGD, in terms of quantity and quality. In addition to evaluating with the commonly used metrics, we propose the frequent word coverage to measure the diversity of the generated questions. We dig into the quality beyond the scores by analyzing errors. We hope our work can lead to more thoughts on the creative uses and extensions of Video QG. In the future, we plan to augment Video QA dataset with our improved Video QG model, such as the insufficient Video QA dataset of the languages other than English.
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