

Towards Parameter-Efficient Integration of Pre-Trained Language Models In Temporal Video Grounding

Erica K. Shimomoto

kidoshimomoto.e@aist.go.jp

AIST - Japan

Ichiro Kobayashi

koba@is.ocha.ac.jp

Ochanomizu University - Japan

Edison Marrese-Taylor

edison.marrese@aist.go.jp

AIST - Japan

Hideki Nakayama

nakayama@ci.i.u-tokyo.ac.jp

University of Tokyo - Japan

Hiroya Takamura

takamura.hiroya@aist.go.jp

AIST - Japan

Yusuke Miyao

yusuke@is.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp

University of Tokyo - Japan

Abstract

This paper explores the task of Temporal Video Grounding (TVG) where, given an untrimmed video and a query sentence, the goal is to recognize and determine temporal boundaries of action instances in the video described by the provided natural language queries. Recent works solve this task by directly encoding the query using large pre-trained language models (PLM). However, isolating the effects of the improved language representations is difficult, as these works also propose improvements in the visual inputs. Furthermore, these PLMs significantly increase the computational cost of training TVG models. Therefore, this paper studies the effects of PLMs in the TVG task and assesses the applicability of NLP parameter-efficient training alternatives based on adapters. We couple popular PLMs with a selection of existing approaches and test different adapters to reduce the impact of the additional parameters. Our results on three challenging datasets show that TVG models could greatly benefit from PLMs when these are fine-tuned for the task and that adapters are an effective alternative to full fine-tuning, even though they are not tailored for our task. Concretely, adapters helped save on computational cost, allowing PLM integration in larger TVG models and delivering results comparable to the state-of-the-art models. Finally, through benchmarking different types of adapters in TVG, our results shed light on what kind of adapters work best for each studied case.

1. Introduction

Temporal Video Grounding (TVG) is a fundamental task in Computer Vision (CV), where the goal is to have models recognize and determine temporal boundaries of action instances in videos [51, 13, 12] using queries provided in

natural language [9, 19]. Over the past few years, interest in this task has grown substantially, which has led to the release of several models that either use propose-and-rank techniques or directly predict the starting and ending temporal locations [11, 47]. The latter has focused mostly on finding better ways to fuse and compare the representations of the natural language query and the input video, with model sizes increasingly growing in the past few years.

Following trends in other vision-and-language (V&L) tasks, some of the latest models combine vision encoders and pre-trained language models (PLM), which are first pre-trained on large-scale unlabeled data and then fine-tuned on the downstream task at hand. In the Temporal Video Grounding task specifically, we find works that directly encode the natural query using such PLMs [37, 56], which are later fine-tuned with the rest of the architecture, or that try to project both the query and video into the same embedding space using a Transformer [63].

Despite these approaches undoubtedly bringing performance improvements to TVG, we note that it is difficult to isolate the effects of the improved language representations, as these works also propose new video-language matching approaches and/or use different video encoders, which act as confounding factors. Another drawback is their computational cost for training, as parameter counts grow substantially once pre-trained models are incorporated. For example, TMLGA [47] has about 4.7M parameters, which requires roughly 18.8MB of storage¹. If we combine it with a large PLM such as GPT3 [3], we would need an extra 700GB of memory to store all parameters.

To address this problem, several parameter-efficient training methods have been recently proposed for both Natural Language Processing (NLP) [20, 1, 23] and CV models [45, 53, 64]. Among these approaches, adapters [20, 1]

¹ $(4.7 \times 10^6) \times 4 \text{ (bytes)} \times \frac{1}{10^8} \text{ (MB/bytes)} = 18.8 \text{ (MB)}$

and their variations have been particularly effective². In this setting, the idea is to add a small set of parameters to intermediate layers of the PLM, which allows us to attain a performance as high as when fine-tuning but by training only a small set of parameters. Adapters have been successfully combined with vision models for several tasks [53, 24, 64, 68], showing that it is possible to use a few parameters to learn to fuse vision and language representations without losing performance. However, we note that the efforts so far have focused only on image [64] and video [38] classification tasks, or on leveraging pre-trained generative models, for example, by re-casting existing vision-and-language tasks as language generation [53].

Furthermore, while the number of trainable parameters is a major concern, we cannot overlook the amount of data TVG models require to be trained. For example, DORi [48] uses two types of visual features: Temporal features to represent the activities, and spatial features to represent humans and objects in each of these selected frames. Using such features led to significant improvements in performance compared to previous proposal-free TVG models. However, it also significantly increased the memory necessary to load each training sample.

In light of this, in this paper, we study the effects of large PLMs in Temporal Video Grounding and investigate the applicability of NLP adapters for a parameter-efficient integration. We couple popular PLM models with a selection of previous work approaches, allowing us to isolate and understand their effects on performance. Concretely, we analyze ExCL [11], TMLGA [47] and DORi [48], three proposal-free TVG models with different levels of complexity. Moreover, as introducing such large architectures substantially increases the computational cost of existing models, we also test several parameter-efficient training alternatives based on adapters. Unlike previous work on adapters for V&L, our training signal is not a regular classification loss and comes from the visual modality, which keeps us from casting our task as language generation.

We conduct thorough experiments on three challenging datasets for TVG, Charades-STA [9], ActivityNet Captions [26] and YouCookII [70, 69], thus covering videos containing a large variety of daily activities with varying lengths (between 30 and 755 s) and with different query lengths (between 7.2 to 13.48 words on average). Concretely, we seek to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: Does incorporating a PLM improve the performance of existing TVG models?

RQ2: Are adapters an alternative to full finetuning of the PLM parameters within TVG?

RQ3: Is there an adapter that works best for TVG?

²While the term “adapter” is often used to refer to the original bottleneck adapter proposed by Houlisby *et al.* [20], we use the term “adapter” to refer to any efficient fine-tuning method described in this work.

RQ4: What is the impact of different PLMs?

RQ5: How does the combination of existing TVG models with PLM trained with adapters perform against state-of-the-art models?

Our results offer concrete answers to these questions, indicating, for example, that PLMs can deliver significant performance boosts when combined with existing TVG models, sometimes surpassing strong baselines, especially when using adapters. This result ultimately shows that adapters can be an effective alternative to full fine-tuning in our task with minimum impact in terms of parameter count, sometimes performing better than full fine-tuning while training only 10% of the total number of parameters. Ultimately, the parameter-efficient integration of PLMs into TVG models using adapters delivered results comparable to state-of-the-art TVG models.

We believe our results help clarify the role of language encoders in the TVG task, allowing us to quantify to what extent they can improve the grounding capabilities of existing models. Our experiments also highlight the relevance of parameter-efficient training alternatives, which, with the advent of new, deeper Transformer-based models for image and video understanding, are likely to become more relevant in the future.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows: (1) We quantify the impact of pre-trained language models in Temporal Video Grounding models, suggesting that these models can greatly benefit from such integration, especially when these PLMs are fine-tuned for the task, (2) We perform the first work on benchmarking different types of adapters on the task of Temporal Video Grounding, shedding light on what kind of adapters work best for each case, and (3) We offer an empirical demonstration that adapters can reach or surpass the performance of full fine-tuning while updating only about 10% of the parameters in our task.

2. Related Work

Temporal Video Grounding The task of recognizing and determining temporal boundaries of action instances in videos [51, 13, 12] using queries provided in natural language [9, 19]. Work on this task can be divided into two main approaches. On the one hand, we find techniques based on proposal generation, where the idea is to, given a query, output a set of candidate clips which could later be ranked [32, 10]. Further research on this approach has mostly focused on reducing the number of proposals by producing query-guided or query-dependent approaches [5, 6, 58], or on creating maps that can cover diverse video moments with different lengths [65]. Zhang *et al.* [63] adopted a Transformer-based multi-modal model (MSAT) which is pre-trained for this setting. More recently, models have incorporated contrastive losses to improve perfor-

mance further. This is the case of both CPL [67] and MNM [56], which also incorporate Transformer-based components in their pipelines.

The second line of approaches has instead proposed to directly predict the start and end locations using regressions or classifications through the video span [11, 47]. Work on this line of research has focused on improving the performance by modelling label uncertainty [47], adding spatial features [48] or improving the text-to-video matching strategies [36, 61]. For example, CPN [66] adopted an ad-hoc graph-based technique. Other approaches, like [36], have focused on exploiting local and global features for better performance. CPNet [29] recently proposed a pyramid-like approach where the model progressively replenishes the temporal contexts and refines the location of the queried activity by enlarging the temporal receptive fields. Finally, two recent approaches, VSLNet [62] and BCPN [37] have proposed to cast the task as visual question answering.

Parameter-efficient model training As machine learning models continue to grow, updating their parameters efficiently is becoming increasingly important. One key idea in this context has been to only update newly-added parameters [45, 46]. In particular, with the advent of large pre-trained Transformer-based models in Natural Language Processing (NLP) such as BERT [8] and GPT-2 [44], this idea has led to the development of the so-called adapters [20, 1, 40, 50], sub-networks with small parameters that are inserted after every attention and feed-forward layer in a given model. We also find a variety of prompt-based approaches, which add trainable parameters into the model inputs [31, 27, 14]. Alternative techniques, such as sparsely updating a small number of parameters of the model [2, 15, 54], or low-rank factorization for the weights to be updated [34, 22, 21] have also been proposed recently. Finally, [16, 35] have proposed combining some of the above mentioned techniques to propose a unified parameter-efficient training framework. Though we build our study on top of NLP adapters, we deviate from previous work as our approach incorporates the visual modality.

The idea of only updating newly-added parameters has also been proposed in the CV community, with some work predating the advent of large Transformer language models [45, 46]. More recently, we find work combining pre-trained language models with multi-modal inputs. For example, Tsimpoukelli *et al.* [55] trained a vision encoder to represent each image as a sequence of continuous embeddings, such that a frozen language model prompted with this prefix generates the appropriate image caption. Yang *et al.* [59] showed that it is possible to perform zero-shot video question answering by leveraging frozen bidirectional language models. More recently, work by Sung *et al.* [53] cast multiple video-and-language tasks as text generation, and combine NLP adapters with pre-trained encoder-decoders




Figure 1. Illustration of our proposed approach to incorporate pre-trained language encoders and adapters into existing Temporal Video Grounding pipelines. Light orange color refers to trainable parameters, and blue color refers to frozen ones.

such as BART [28] with existing image encoders such as CLIP [43]. The latter has also lately been the target of several studies [24, 64, 68] that extend parameter-efficient techniques for this model.

Though our approach follows a similar trend, combining NLP adapters with multi-modal inputs, we note that their study in the context of video-and-language remains relatively unexplored [38]. Furthermore, in contrast to prior work, which leverages primarily generative models, our interest lies in a grounding task where the training signal comes from the visual modality, which keeps us from casting our task as language generation.

3. Proposed Approach

Consider a video $V \in \mathcal{V}$, represented as a sequence of frames such that $V = \{v_t\}$ with $t = 1, \dots, l$. Each video in \mathcal{V} is annotated with a natural language passage $S \in \mathcal{S}$, where S is a sequence of words $S = \{s_j\}$ with $j = 1, \dots, m$, which describes what is happening at a certain period of time in the video. This interval is formally defined by t_s and t_e , the starting and ending points of the annotations in time, respectively. The goal of the temporal video grounding task is to predict t_s and t_e given the video V and the text query S .

3.1. Temporal Video Grounding Models

For this study, we selected three models from the literature: ExCL [11], TMLGA [47] and DORi [48]. We focused on proposal-free models, which generally offer better performance, and we were careful only to consider works that used word embeddings. ExCL was the first proposal-free model for TVG; TMLGA improved on it by handling video annotation uncertainty, and later DORi incorporated spatial features.




Figure 2. Illustration of the traditional bottleneck adapter proposed by Houslyby *et al.* [20]. The adapter layers are introduced after the multi-head attention and feed-forward layers. Light orange color refers to trainable parameters, and blue color refers to frozen ones.

As shown in Figure 1 (a), these models can be summarized into three main parts: A sentence encoder, a video encoder, and a localization module, which combines information from both modalities and predicts the start and end points of the segment in the video described by the query. While these models heavily explore information from the video input, they make relatively simple use of the textual query, mainly processing pre-trained word embeddings, such as GloVe [39], through a recurrent neural network.

To better understand the role of improved language representations on the performance in the TVG task, we study the effects of PLMs by incorporating them as-is into a selection of existing models from the literature, therefore effectively isolating their impact on the performance across a range of settings. More concretely, we replace the non-contextualized word embeddings with a PLM, as shown in Figure 1 (b). Our modification was guided by considering each TVG model architecture. We tested several ways to incorporate PLMs, such as entirely replacing the text encoder block with the PLM, where most failed to deliver any performance improvement or even a performance comparable with the original models. For example, removing DORI’s text encoder and inputting BERT’s last layer token representation into the localization layer hurt DORI’s performance by almost 2% in mIoU. Therefore, we decided to replace only the word embeddings.

3.2. Adapters

A concern when integrating large PLMs with existing TVG models is the alarming number of parameters added. While some TVG models are pretty small, such as TMLGA with about 4M parameters, recent models are exponentially increasing in size and using larger amounts of training data.

For example, DORI has about 10M parameters, more than double than TMLGA. Combining these models even with reasonably-sized PLMs, such as BERT, increases the number of trainable parameters to over 120M. Also, the more sophisticated visual features are used, the larger the training data becomes. For example, the visual features for TMLGA are about 2.1MB per video in the ActivityNet dataset, while for DORI, they are about 82MB, over 39 times larger.

To alleviate this issue, we also investigate several parameter-efficient training alternatives based on adapters to incorporate these PLMs into the existing model pipelines with reduced computational cost, as shown in Figure 1 (c).

Adapters are sub-networks with a small number of parameters that can be inserted in different locations of a transformer-based language model. Figure 2 illustrates how the traditional bottleneck adapter proposed by Houslyby *et al.* [20] is introduced to a transformer layer in a language model. When training a model to perform a new task, only the parameters in the adapter module are updated, leading to a massive computational cost reduction while achieving comparable performance to full fine-tuning in many downstream tasks, such as textual entailment recognition, sentiment analysis, question answering, among others [20, 16].

For our experiments, we adopt a large selection of adapters following previous work [53], including: Bottleneck adapters such as the ones proposed by Houslyby *et al.* (HOULSBY) [20], Pfeiffer *et al.* (PFEIFFER) [42], and He *et al.* (PARALLEL) [16]; Invertible adapters (INVERSE) [42], Prefix Tuning (PREFIX) [31], Compacter (COMPACTER) [22], and LoRA (LORA) [21].

We note that some of the adapters we consider in our study were designed for specific purposes in NLP, such as the INVERSE adapter, which was proposed to learn language-specific information. Our decision to still include such adapters in our experimental framework is motivated by their relative success in other vision-and-language tasks, as studied by previous work [18, 24, 53]. Moreover, as our training signal comes from the visual modality, our approach differs from existing work in this context. Therefore, we were interested in offering empirical evidence to further understand these adapters’ role in multi-modal scenarios.

4. Experimental Framework

4.1. Datasets

Charades-STA: Built upon the Charades dataset [52], it provides time-based annotations using a pre-defined set of activity classes and general video descriptions. We use the pre-defined train and test sets containing 12,408 and 3,720 moment-query pairs, respectively. Videos are 31 seconds long on average and have a maximum duration of 194 seconds, with 2.4 moments on average, each being 8.2 seconds long on average and described using 7.2 words on average.

ActivityNet Captions: Introduced by Krishna *et al.* [26] and initially constructed for dense video captioning, consists of 20k YouTube videos with an average length of 120 seconds and a maximum duration of 755 seconds. The videos contain 3.65 temporally localized time intervals and sentence descriptions on average, where descriptions have on average 13.48 words. Following previous works, we report the performance on the combined validation sets.

YouCookII: Consists of 2,000 long untrimmed videos from 89 cooking recipes obtained from YouTube by Zhou *et al.* [70, 69]. Each step for cooking these dishes was annotated with temporal boundaries and aligned with the corresponding section of the recipe. The average video length is 316 seconds and a maximum duration of 755 seconds. Regarding relevant moment segments, each video has 7.73 moments on average, with each segment being 19.63 seconds long and described using 8.7 words on average.

4.2. Implementation Details

Temporal Video Grounding Models: Our implementation for TMLGA and DORi is built on top of the original code released by the authors, while we use our own implementation of ExCL. To represent the video input, we follow the original implementations as close as possible. For TMLGA and DORi, we use the I3D features released with the respective papers. These I3D features have size 1024 and are obtained by average-pooling on the last layer, before the classifier head in a I3D network, where the inputs are the raw video frames of dimension 256×256 , at 25fps. Rodriguez *et al.* used the I3D pre-trained model trained on Kinetics for ActivityNet and YouCookII released by [4], and the one pre-trained on Charades for Charades-STA. For our implementation of ExCL, we use the features released by the DORi paper, which follows the same protocol, but extracted at 25 fps instead of the original 5 fps³. Specifically for DORi, we also use the spatial features (i.e., human and object features) released with the paper.

Pre-trained Language Models: We combine our selected models from the literature with three popular pre-trained masked language models, BERT [8], RoBERTa [33] and DeBERTa [17]. We use the implementations provided by the HuggingFace library [57]. Furthermore, we used “bert-base-uncased”, “roberta-base”, and “deberta-base” pre-trained models.

Adapters: We use the adapters’ implementation provided by the adapter-transformers library [41], using the default configurations. In particular, for the Invertible adapters (INVERSE), we only tested the “PfeifferInvConfig”, following the configuration proposed in the original paper [42].

Training: Our experiments were performed on a 40-GB NVIDIA A100 GPU. Models were trained using ADAM

[25] with a step-based learning rate scheduler. When fine-tuning the PLMs, we used a scheduler with linear warmup for the PLM parameters, while keeping the learning rate fixed for the rest of the parameters. For more details on the batch size, learning rate and weight decay, we refer the readers to the supplementary material. Evaluation follows previous work, based on two widely used metrics [9], namely the Recall at various thresholds of the temporal Intersection over Union (tIoU or $R@α$) measuring the percentage of predictions that have tIoU with ground truth larger than certain $α$, and the mean averaged tIoU (mIoU). We use $α$ threshold values of 0.3, 0.5 and 0.7.

5. Results and Discussion

5.1. Effect of adding BERT to existing models

To provide an answer for **RQ1**, we replace the non-contextualized word embeddings in our selected TVG models with BERT, which can be regarded as the current most widely-studied PLM [49, 60, 7, 30]. We compare the original model performance with the performance when fine-tuning the PLM along with the TVG model training (fine-tuning), and when freezing the PLM (*), training only the parameters of the TVG model. To ensure our implementations were correct, we also ran experiments with the original models (ours), achieving performance close to what has been reported in their respective papers.

Table 1 shows the results when combining BERT and adapters with the chosen models for TVG. When introducing BERT to the models, we can see that full model fine-tuning leads to an average improvement of 1.38% and 1.24% in mIoU for ExCL and TMLGA, respectively. This result shows that the chosen TVG models can benefit from using PLMs. However, doing so leads to an addition of over 100M parameters to be tuned, greatly increasing the computational cost to train these models. Such an increase is troublesome as we ran out of memory when trying to fine-tune BERT along with DORi.

One alternative to save on this computational cost is to freeze the PLM when training the TVG model. We can see that this strategy leads to an overall improvement in mIoU of 0.40%, 0.52%, and 0.08% for ExCL, TMLGA, and DORi, respectively, when compared to the original model performance. This improvement is substantially smaller than when fine-tuning the PLM, with cases where using the frozen BERT leads to worse results than when using GloVe, such as with ExCL and DORi on YouCookII. Furthermore, we can see that the models benefited the least from the frozen PLM when tested on the Charades-STA dataset. This result could be related to the fact that the queries in Charades-STA are straightforward, so the word embeddings could already be enough to perform well. Nevertheless, the overall results indicate that fine-tuning is es-

³In practice, this difference in fps is not an issue, as [48] has shown that extraction at 25fps leads to better performance

Table 1. Overview of our results combining BERT and adapters with our selected prior work. Underlined results indicate the best performance within the method and dataset combination, while results in bold indicate the best performance within the dataset.

Method	Params.	Charades-STA				ActivityNet				YouCookII			
		R@0.3	R@0.5	R@0.7	mIoU	R@0.3	R@0.5	R@0.7	mIoU	R@0.3	R@0.5	R@0.7	mIoU
ExCL [†] (orig.)	6.9M	65.10	44.10	22.60	-	-	-	-	-	44.20	28.00	14.60	-
ExCL (ours)	6.9M	62.28	<u>39.74</u>	22.53	42.28	55.49	39.33	23.04	40.32	26.58	15.72	8.19	18.99
+ BERT ✱	6.9M	<u>62.93</u>	38.44	22.23	<u>42.38</u>	57.21	39.66	23.79	41.55	26.63	16.15	8.51	18.87
+ Adapter	7.2M-16.8M	61.59	37.15	21.51	41.06	59.35	41.27	24.86	<u>42.83</u>	<u>28.47</u>	<u>17.75</u>	<u>9.02</u>	19.89
+ Fine-tuning	116M	61.75	38.36	<u>23.44</u>	42.00	<u>59.10</u>	<u>41.83</u>	<u>25.42</u>	42.36	28.18	16.84	<u>9.02</u>	<u>20.08</u>
TMLGA (orig.)	4.7M	67.53	52.02	33.74	48.22	51.28	33.04	19.26	37.78	33.48	20.65	10.94	23.07
TMLGA (ours)	4.7M	69.49	49.97	32.72	48.29	50.84	31.13	17.86	36.90	34.42	21.99	10.94	23.63
+ BERT ✱	4.7M	70.08	49.92	31.42	48.34	52.10	32.57	18.64	37.63	34.77	<u>23.05</u>	<u>12.49</u>	24.42
+ Adapter	5.6M - 14.6M	<u>71.40</u>	<u>52.53</u>	<u>33.82</u>	49.57	<u>53.98</u>	<u>35.20</u>	<u>20.43</u>	<u>38.88</u>	<u>36.08</u>	<u>22.77</u>	<u>12.49</u>	<u>25.19</u>
+ Fine-tuning	114M	71.02	<u>52.53</u>	33.52	<u>49.80</u>	53.59	34.05	19.51	37.92	35.34	21.85	11.63	24.82
DORi (orig.)	10.4M	72.72	59.65	40.56	53.28	57.89	41.49	26.41	42.78	43.36	30.47	18.24	30.46
DORi (ours.)	10.4M	72.26	57.18	40.62	53.01	57.38	40.00	24.84	41.97	43.33	29.15	17.61	30.17
+ BERT ✱	10.4M	71.83	57.15	39.22	52.49	58.86	40.86	25.50	42.97	42.27	29.90	18.38	29.92
+ Adapter	11.6M - 20.3M	72.50	58.63	40.97	53.29	60.81	43.49	27.86	44.55	46.79	32.56	19.87	32.48
+ Fine-tuning	120M		OOM			OOM					OOM		

sential to getting the full potential of the PLM in our task.

5.2. Adapters as an alternative to PLM fine-tuning

Although adapters have shown to be an effective way to deploy PLMs in a parameter-efficient manner in several NLP tasks, to the best of our knowledge, there is currently no evidence to suggest whether or not they could bring similar benefits to the TVG task. Therefore, to answer **RQ2**, we seek to investigate if using adapters can be an effective alternative to full fine-tuning of the PLM models in the task of TVG. We tested the adapters mentioned in Section 3.2 for all three TVG models with BERT. Our best results are shown in Table 1 (Adapter). We refer the readers to the supplementary material for details.

Our results show that using adapters led to an overall improvement in mIoU of 0.70%, 1.71% and 1.72% for ExCL, TMLGA, and DORi, respectively, over the models’ original performance. While the improvement from the adapters for ExCL is smaller than when doing full fine-tuning, adapters led to better performance with TMLGA. More importantly, adapters allowed a significant performance improvement for DORi, as training with adapters requires updating only 16% of the parameters required for full fine-tuning. Furthermore, we can see that in some cases, using adapters leads to better performance than full fine-tuning, such as with ExCL and TMLGA on ActivityNet Captions and ExCL on YouCookII. In summary, these results indicate that despite not being tailored for the task of TVG, the adapters covered in this work can be an efficient alternative to the full fine-tuning of PLM models.

5.3. Choice of adapter for TVG

After confirming the effectiveness of adapters in our setting, we were then naturally interested in studying whether

Table 2. Detailed results combining the TMLGA model with our three pre-trained language encoders and adapters, tested on Charades-STA and ActivityNet Captions. Underlined results indicate the best performance within the model and dataset combination, while the results in bold indicate the best performance within the dataset.

Model	Charades-STA				ActivityNet			
	R@0.3	R@0.5	R@0.7	mIoU	R@0.3	R@0.5	R@0.7	mIoU
TMLGA (orig.)	67.53	52.02	33.74	48.22	51.28	33.04	19.26	37.78
TMLGA (ours)	69.49	49.97	32.72	48.29	50.84	31.13	17.86	36.90
+ BERT ✱	70.08	49.92	31.42	48.34	52.10	32.57	18.64	37.63
+ PFEIFFER	<u>71.64</u>	51.59	33.41	49.50	<u>53.98</u>	<u>35.20</u>	<u>20.43</u>	<u>38.88</u>
+ HOULSBY	70.97	51.69	33.84	49.31	<u>53.98</u>	34.13	19.48	38.57
+ PREFIX	71.40	52.53	33.82	49.57	53.61	34.03	19.89	38.34
+ INVERSE	71.02	<u>52.77</u>	<u>34.49</u>	49.33	52.47	33.76	19.93	37.93
+ COMPACTER	70.27	49.73	31.37	48.31	52.15	33.85	19.62	37.78
+ LoRA	70.94	50.24	32.15	48.81	51.90	32.81	18.77	37.37
+ PARALLEL	70.48	51.64	33.66	49.33	43.50	23.20	11.59	32.29
+ Fine-tuning	71.02	52.53	33.52	<u>49.80</u>	53.59	34.05	19.51	37.92
+ RoBERTa ✱	69.73	51.34	33.49	48.91	52.58	33.8	19.62	37.89
+ PFEIFFER	71.72	53.84	34.78	49.91	<u>54.51</u>	<u>35.27</u>	20.26	38.77
+ HOULSBY	71.08	52.98	34.19	49.28	53.56	34.34	20.16	38.89
+ PREFIX	72.28	52.42	33.98	49.90	53.08	33.19	19.48	38.47
+ INVERSE	71.53	52.69	33.98	49.50	54.36	34.85	<u>20.46</u>	<u>39.35</u>
+ COMPACTER	71.21	51.56	33.17	49.20	52.88	33.16	19.35	38.09
+ LoRA	71.64	51.88	33.17	49.55	53.73	34.00	19.43	38.64
+ PARALLEL	70.99	52.93	34.01	49.19	43.50	23.20	11.59	32.29
+ Fine-tuning	71.61	53.15	33.33	49.77	52.70	33.21	19.69	38.47
+ DeBERTa ✱	70.73	52.53	33.49	49.32	53.04	33.94	20.22	38.72
+ PFEIFFER	71.34	<u>53.49</u>	34.65	<u>49.78</u>	<u>54.37</u>	34.70	20.49	39.30
+ HOULSBY	70.83	52.10	33.74	49.48	53.25	33.93	19.55	38.45
+ INVERSE	<u>71.64</u>	52.58	33.95	49.66	55.09	35.45	20.66	39.71
+ COMPACTER	70.08	51.64	32.98	48.78	53.60	34.21	20.14	38.79
+ LoRA	71.18	52.34	33.31	49.18	53.98	34.53	20.02	39.00
+ PARALLEL*	70.73	53.36	<u>34.76</u>	49.35	43.50	23.20	11.59	32.29
+ Fine-tuning	71.59	53.44	33.44	49.63	53.54	33.78	20.12	38.92

or not there is a specific type of adapter that works best to solve our task. To provide an answer for **RQ3**, we rank the performance of each adapter for each dataset and model, and focus on cases that deliver the best and the worst per-




Figure 3. Best and worst performing adapters with BERT. The y-axis represents the performance in terms of mIoU. The circle and triangles indicate the performance with frozen BERT, while the horizontal ticks show the performance of the models with the corresponding adapter. The * indicates cases where the models could not learn properly with the adapter.

formance, also comparing to our setting with a frozen PLM.

The results of our analysis are summarized in Figure 3. We can see that no single adapter can consistently offer the best performance. However, it is possible to see that the bottleneck adapters, such as the HOULSBY, PFEIFFER, and INVERSE are among the best performing ones.

When controlling our results for each dataset, however, it is possible to see that the PREFIX and the INVERSE adapters worked well on Charades-STA, while the PFEIFFER and HOULSBY adapters worked best for ActivityNet and YouCookII, respectively. We surmise this indicates that the adapter choice is likely more related to the data used to train than to the choice of the model itself. Controlling by model also shows interesting, distinctive patterns. For example, while the PREFIX adapter worked well for TMLGA on Charades-STA and DORi on ActivityNet, it performed poorly with ExCL on ActivityNet and YouCookII.

Another general pattern we could identify is that both the COMPACTER and the PARALLEL adapters did not work well overall, with the latter struggling to deliver good performance in all cases. This regularity of results in delivering bad performance contrasts with our above analysis regarding the best adapters. We think the adapter size (in the number of additional parameters) may play a role in this matter. It is interesting to note that COMPACTER is the adapter with the smallest number of added parameters (0.06M), while the PARALLEL is the second adapter with the largest number of added parameters (7.1M). It might be that the COMPACTER is too small to learn useful information for TVG.

Furthermore, the hyper-parameter search with the PREFIX and the PARALLEL adapters was substantially more challenging than with the other adapters. In particular, when training using the PARALLEL adapter, there were many instances where we faced gradient explosions, as with DORi on Charades-STA, or the model converged to poor performance, as with all three models on YouCookII.

Finally, we believe another factor that may affect performance is the location where each adapter is inserted in the PLM architecture. All of the methods tested in this work

adapt to specific parts of the transformer layer (e.g., attention heads, feed-forward layers, key/value weights, etc.), except for the PARALLEL adapter, which adapts the whole transformer layer. This observation might indicate that adapting specific parts of the transformer layer is more beneficial for our task.

5.4. Impact of different PLMs

After the release of BERT, several pre-trained language encoder variations have been proposed. When tested on extensive NLP benchmarks, some of these models, such as RoBERTa [33], and DeBERTa [17] have proven to be able consistently further improve performance. In this context, we are interested in studying if such performance improvements also translate to better performance in our task in an attempt to provide an answer for RQ4.

Thus, we study the performance of BERT, RoBERTa, and DeBERTa on two datasets, Charades-STA and ActivityNet. We do this using the TMLGA model as a pivot, which we chose because, in our experiments with BERT, it offered a good compromise in terms of performance improvements versus computational cost. Our dataset selection for this study is motivated by Charades-STA and ActivityNet having similar video contents but with queries that differ in complexity, i.e., queries in Charades-STA are much simpler than in ActivityNet. We can verify this difference by observing the vocabulary size (748 vs. 9,744 tokens) and length of the natural queries (7.2 vs. 13.48 words per query) and several metrics to measure the grade level of a piece of text⁴ (third to fourth vs. fifth to sixth grade level).

The results of our study using different PLMs can be seen in Table 2. We did not include results with PREFIX adapters on DeBERTa due to an implementation error on the adapter-transformers library⁵. Furthermore, we also note that in our experiments with the PARALLEL adapter, all the models saturated and reached the same performance on ActivityNet, without learning correctly.

⁴<https://github.com/textstat/textstat>

⁵Version 3.1.0a0 of the adapter-transformers library.

Table 3. Comparison between the best performing TVG model with DeBERTa and current state-of-the-art methods in TVG. Results for all compared methods were taken from their respective papers. The best results for each combination of method type (i.e., proposal-free or proposal-based) and dataset are indicated in bold, while the second best results are underlined.

Method	Charades-STA			ActivityNet		
	R@0.5	R@0.7	mIoU	R@0.5	R@0.7	mIoU
Proposal-free						
DORi (ours)	57.18	40.62	53.01	40.00	24.84	41.97
+ DeBERTa ✱	58.17	40.94	52.73	41.65	25.82	<u>43.64</u>
+ Adapter	58.39	<u>41.61</u>	53.34	45.63	<u>28.74</u>	45.70
VSLNet	54.19	35.22	50.02	43.22	26.16	43.19
CPNet	<u>60.27</u>	38.74	52.00	40.56	21.63	40.65
CPN	59.77	36.67	<u>53.14</u>	<u>45.10</u>	28.10	45.70
BCPN	61.77	43.91	-	44.53	30.11	-
Proposal-based						
MS-2D-TAN	60.08	37.39	-	45.50	28.28	-
MSAT	-	-	-	31.78	-	-
CPL	<u>49.24</u>	22.39	-	55.73	31.37	-
MNM	47.31	<u>27.28</u>	-	<u>48.59</u>	<u>29.26</u>	-

Looking at the results, we can first see that for all three PLMs, using adapters led to an overall performance improvement compared to the frozen PLM. Moreover, we can see that PFEIFFER and the INVERSE adapters seem to provide the best results in both datasets and all PLMs.

Furthermore, while DeBERTa performed the best for ActivityNet, as expected from its performance in NLP downstream tasks, it performed the worst for Charades-STA. We believe this result could be due to the simplicity of the queries in Charades-STA, which might not require all the additional information DeBERTa encodes compared to BERT. It is worth noting that these results were obtained using the first version of DeBERTa, which uses the same type of tokenizer as BERT. We also tested the newer version of DeBERTa, which uses a sentencepiece-based tokenizer and incorporates other model improvements. However, this model performed much worse than the first version on our task showing that using sophisticated tokenizers does not necessarily improve results with simple text queries.

On the other hand, ActivityNet has longer and more complex queries. Our results indicate that in such cases, our task might benefit from using better PLMs. Nevertheless, the best results were achieved when using adapters.

5.5. Comparison against state-of-the-art

We finally tackle **RQ5** and compare our best-performing models against a selection of approaches from previous work. We achieved our best performance for the Charades-STA dataset by using DORi with DeBERTa+PFEIFFER; for the ActivityNet dataset, DORi with DeBERTa+INVERSE. Considering that the models used in this study are proposal-

free, we mainly compare to proposal-free methods, i.e., VSLNet [62], CPN [66], CPNet [29] and BCPN [37]. Nevertheless, we are also interested in observing how our modifications perform against proposal-based methods, such as MS-2D-TAN [65], MSAT [63], CPL [67], and MNM [56]. We note that out of the proposal-free methods, only BCPN uses a PLM (BERT). As for the proposal-based methods, only MS-2D-TAN does not use any form of Transformers in its architecture, while MNM is the only one to use a fine-tuned PLM (DistilBERT). Finally, while MSAT and CPL use Transformers in their architecture to encode visual and textual information, they do not use PLMs.

The performance summary is shown in Table 3. For this analysis, we only consider two alpha bands for the thresholds as most proposal-based models do not report results at the alpha 0.3.

First, we can see that the best-performing methods are proposal-free, with BCPN achieving the best performance in most of the considered metrics. Furthermore, looking at the mean tIoU, we can see that DORi already performs well against the other methods. Replacing the GloVe embeddings with DeBERTa and using adapters for training provides a significant performance boost, delivering results equivalent to state-of-the-art models.

Moreover, it is interesting to see that while proposal-based methods such as CPL and MNM performed well against all methods on ActivityNet, they could not outperform methods without Transformers on the Charades-STA dataset. In contrast, DORi with DeBERTa and adapters achieved a more balanced performance among both datasets, showing a clear advantage against these methods on the Charades-STA dataset.

Therefore, our results show how TVG models can greatly benefit from adequately incorporating PLMs and making use of parameter-efficient techniques, performing well on datasets with different complexity levels in terms of queries, and achieving results comparable to state-of-the-art methods.

6. Conclusions

This paper studied the effects of PLMs in the TVG task and assessed the applicability of NLP parameter-efficient training alternatives based on adapters. We coupled BERT, RoBERTa, and DeBERTa, with a selection of previous work approaches, i.e., ExCL, TMLGA, and DORi, and tested different adapters to reduce the impact of the additional parameters. Our results showed that incorporating PLMs greatly improved the performance of TVG models, especially when doing fine-tuning. Moreover, we verified that adapters are an effective alternative to full fine-tuning, even though they were not tailored for our task. They helped save on computational cost, allowing improvements for larger TVG models, such as DORi, and also delivered results comparable

to state-of-the-art models. Finally, we observed that while PARALLEL adapters seem to struggle to learn in this task, bottleneck adapters such as HOULSBY and PFEIFFER tend to perform well across all tested TVG models and datasets.

References

- [1] Ankur Bapna and Orhan Firat. Simple, Scalable Adaptation for Neural Machine Translation. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 1538–1548, Hong Kong, China, Nov. 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [2] Elad Ben Zaken, Yoav Goldberg, and Shauli Ravfogel. Bit-Fit: Simple Parameter-efficient Fine-tuning for Transformer-based Masked Language-models. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 1–9, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [3] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [4] Joao Carreira and Andrew Zisserman. Quo Vadis, Action Recognition? A New Model and the Kinetics Dataset. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6299–6308, 2017.
- [5] Jingyuan Chen, Xinpeng Chen, Lin Ma, Zequn Jie, and Tat-Seng Chua. Temporally grounding natural sentence in video. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 162–171, Brussels, Belgium, 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [6] Shaoxiang Chen and Yu-Gang Jiang. Semantic proposal for activity localization in videos via sentence query. *AAAI*, 2019.
- [7] Yen-Chun Chen, Linjie Li, Licheng Yu, Ahmed El Kholy, Faisal Ahmed, Zhe Gan, Yu Cheng, and Jingjing Liu. UNITER: UNiversal Image-TExt Representation Learning. In Andrea Vedaldi, Horst Bischof, Thomas Brox, and Jan-Michael Frahm, editors, *Computer Vision – ECCV 2020*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 104–120, Cham, 2020. Springer International Publishing.
- [8] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [9] Jiyang Gao, Chen Sun, Zhenheng Yang, and Ram Nevatia. Tall: Temporal activity localization via language query. In *ICCV*, 2017.
- [10] Runzhou Ge, Jiyang Gao, Kan Chen, and Ram Nevatia. Mac: Mining activity concepts for language-based temporal localization. In *WACV*, 2019.
- [11] Soham Ghosh, Anuva Agarwal, Zarana Parekh, and Alexander Hauptmann. ExCL: Extractive Clip Localization Using Natural Language Descriptions. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [12] Rohit Girdhar, Joao Carreira, Carl Doersch, and Andrew Zisserman. Video Action Transformer Network. In *CVPR*, pages 244–253, 2019.
- [13] Chunhui Gu, Chen Sun, David A. Ross, Carl Vondrick, Caroline Pantofaru, Yeqing Li, Sudheendra Vijayanarasimhan, George Toderici, Susanna Ricco, Rahul Sukthankar, Cordelia Schmid, and Jitendra Malik. AVA: A Video Dataset of Spatio-Temporally Localized Atomic Visual Actions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6047–6056, 2018.
- [14] Yuxian Gu, Xu Han, Zhiyuan Liu, and Minlie Huang. PPT: Pre-trained Prompt Tuning for Few-shot Learning. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8410–8423, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [15] Demi Guo, Alexander Rush, and Yoon Kim. Parameter-Efficient Transfer Learning with Diff Pruning. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4884–4896, Online, Aug. 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [16] Junxian He, Chunting Zhou, Xuezhe Ma, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, and Graham Neubig. Towards a Unified View of Parameter-Efficient Transfer Learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, Feb. 2022.
- [17] Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. DeBERTa: Decoding-Enhanced BERT with Disentangled Attention. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, Feb. 2022.
- [18] Xuehai He, Chunyuan Li, Pengchuan Zhang, Jianwei Yang, and Xin Eric Wang. Parameter-efficient Fine-tuning for Vision Transformers, Mar. 2022.
- [19] Lisa Anne Hendricks, Oliver Wang, Eli Shechtman, Josef Sivic, Trevor Darrell, and Bryan Russell. Localizing moments in video with natural language. In *ICCV*, 2017.
- [20] Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin De Laroussilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. Parameter-Efficient Transfer Learning for NLP. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2790–2799. PMLR, May 2019.
- [21] Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation of Large Language Models. In

- International Conference on Learning Representations*, Mar. 2022.
- [22] Rabeeh Karimi Mahabadi, James Henderson, and Sebastian Ruder. Compacter: Efficient Low-Rank Hypercomplex Adapter Layers. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 1022–1035. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.
- [23] Rabeeh Karimi Mahabadi, Sebastian Ruder, Mostafa Dehghani, and James Henderson. Parameter-efficient Multi-task Fine-tuning for Transformers via Shared Hypernetworks. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 565–576, Online, Aug. 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [24] Konwoo Kim, Michael Laskin, Igor Mordatch, and Deepak Pathak. How to Adapt Your Large-Scale Vision-and-Language Model. Nov. 2021.
- [25] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. In *ICLR (Poster)*, Sept. 2020.
- [26] Ranjay Krishna, Kenji Hata, Frederic Ren, Li Fei-Fei, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Dense-Captioning Events in Videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 706–715, 2017.
- [27] Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. The Power of Scale for Parameter-Efficient Prompt Tuning. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3045–3059, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, Nov. 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [28] Mike Lewis, Yinhan Liu, Naman Goyal, Marjan Ghazvininejad, Abdelrahman Mohamed, Omer Levy, Veselin Stoyanov, and Luke Zettlemoyer. BART: Denoising Sequence-to-Sequence Pre-training for Natural Language Generation, Translation, and Comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7871–7880, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [29] Kun Li, Dan Guo, and Meng Wang. Proposal-Free Video Grounding with Contextual Pyramid Network. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(3):1902–1910, May.
- [30] Xiujun Li, Xi Yin, Chunyuan Li, Pengchuan Zhang, Xiaowei Hu, Lei Zhang, Lijuan Wang, Houdong Hu, Li Dong, Furu Wei, Yejin Choi, and Jianfeng Gao. Oscar: Object-Semantics Aligned Pre-training for Vision-Language Tasks. In Andrea Vedaldi, Horst Bischof, Thomas Brox, and Jan-Michael Frahm, editors, *Computer Vision – ECCV 2020*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 121–137, Cham, 2020. Springer International Publishing.
- [31] Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. Prefix-Tuning: Optimizing Continuous Prompts for Generation. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4582–4597, Online, Aug. 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [32] Meng Liu, Xiang Wang, Liqiang Nie, Xiangnan He, Baoquan Chen, and Tat-Seng Chua. Attentive moment retrieval in videos. In *The 41st International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 15–24. ACM, 2018.
- [33] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. RoBERTa: A Robustly Optimized BERT Pretraining Approach. *arXiv:1907.11692 [cs]*, July 2019.
- [34] Rabeeh Karimi Mahabadi, Sebastian Ruder, Mostafa Dehghani, and James Henderson. Parameter-efficient multi-task fine-tuning for transformers via shared hypernetworks. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 565–576, 2021.
- [35] Yuning Mao, Lambert Mathias, Rui Hou, Amjad Almahairi, Hao Ma, Jiawei Han, Scott Yih, and Madian Khabsa. UniPELT: A Unified Framework for Parameter-Efficient Language Model Tuning. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6253–6264, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [36] Jonghwan Mun, Minsu Cho, and Bohyung Han. Local-Global Video-Text Interactions for Temporal Grounding. In *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 10807–10816, Seattle, WA, USA, June 2020. IEEE.
- [37] Hafiza Sadia Nawaz, Zhensheng Shi, Yanhai Gan, Amanuel Hirpa, Junyu Dong, and Haiyong Zheng. Temporal Moment Localization via Natural Language by Utilizing Video Question Answers as a Special Variant and Bypassing NLP for Corpora. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, pages 1–1, 2022.
- [38] Junting Pan, Ziyi Lin, Xiatian Zhu, Jing Shao, and Hongsheng Li. ST-Adapter: Parameter-Efficient Image-to-Video Transfer Learning for Action Recognition, June 2022.
- [39] Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D Manning. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543, 2014.
- [40] Jonas Pfeiffer, Aishwarya Kamath, Andreas Rücklé, Kyunghyun Cho, and Iryna Gurevych. AdapterFusion: Non-Destructive Task Composition for Transfer Learning. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 487–503, Online, Apr. 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [41] Jonas Pfeiffer, Andreas Rücklé, Clifton Poth, Aishwarya Kamath, Ivan Vulić, Sebastian Ruder, Kyunghyun Cho, and Iryna Gurevych. Adapterhub: A framework for adapting transformers. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 46–54, 2020.
- [42] Jonas Pfeiffer, Ivan Vulić, Iryna Gurevych, and Sebastian Ruder. MAD-X: An Adapter-Based Framework for Multi-

- Task Cross-Lingual Transfer. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 7654–7673, Online, Nov. 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [43] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning Transferable Visual Models From Natural Language Supervision. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, July 2021.
- [44] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. Language Models are Unsupervised Multitask Learners. page 24.
- [45] Sylvestre-Alvise Rebuffi, Hakan Bilen, and Andrea Vedaldi. Learning multiple visual domains with residual adapters. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
- [46] Sylvestre-Alvise Rebuffi, Hakan Bilen, and Andrea Vedaldi. Efficient Parametrization of Multi-Domain Deep Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8119–8127, 2018.
- [47] Cristian Rodriguez, Edison Marrese-Taylor, Fatemeh Sadat Saleh, Hongdong Li, and Stephen Gould. Proposal-free Temporal Moment Localization of a Natural-Language Query in Video using Guided Attention. pages 2464–2473, 2020.
- [48] Cristian Rodriguez-Opazo, Edison Marrese-Taylor, Basura Fernando, Hongdong Li, and Stephen Gould. DORi: Discovering Object Relationships for Moment Localization of a Natural Language Query in a Video. pages 1079–1088, 2021.
- [49] Anna Rogers, Olga Kovaleva, and Anna Rumshisky. A Primer in BERTology: What We Know About How BERT Works. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 8:842–866, 2020.
- [50] Andreas Rücklé, Gregor Geigle, Max Glockner, Tilman Beck, Jonas Pfeiffer, Nils Reimers, and Iryna Gurevych. AdapterDrop: On the Efficiency of Adapters in Transformers. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7930–7946, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, Nov. 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [51] Zheng Shou, Dongang Wang, and Shih-Fu Chang. Temporal action localization in untrimmed videos via multi-stage cnns. In *The IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2016.
- [52] Gunnar A. Sigurdsson, Gül Varol, Xiaolong Wang, Ali Farhadi, Ivan Laptev, and Abhinav Gupta. Hollywood in Homes: Crowdsourcing Data Collection for Activity Understanding. In Bastian Leibe, Jiri Matas, Nicu Sebe, and Max Welling, editors, *Computer Vision – ECCV 2016*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 510–526, Cham, 2016. Springer International Publishing.
- [53] Yi-Lin Sung, Jaemin Cho, and Mohit Bansal. VL-Adapter: Parameter-Efficient Transfer Learning for Vision-and-Language Tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5227–5237, 2022.
- [54] Yi-Lin Sung, Varun Nair, and Colin A Raffel. Training Neural Networks with Fixed Sparse Masks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 24193–24205. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.
- [55] Maria Tsimpoukelli, Jacob L Menick, Serkan Cabi, S. M. Ali Eslami, Oriol Vinyals, and Felix Hill. Multimodal Few-Shot Learning with Frozen Language Models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 200–212. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.
- [56] Zhenzhi Wang, Limin Wang, Tao Wu, Tianhao Li, and Gangshan Wu. Negative Sample Matters: A Renaissance of Metric Learning for Temporal Grounding. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 36(3):2613–2623, June 2022.
- [57] Thomas Wolf, Lysandre Debut, Victor Sanh, Julien Chaumond, Clement Delangue, Anthony Moi, Pierric Cistac, Tim Rault, Rémi Louf, Morgan Funtowicz, et al. Transformers: State-of-the-art natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing: system demonstrations*, pages 38–45, 2020.
- [58] Huijuan Xu, Kun He, L Sigal, S Sclaroff, and K Saenko. Multilevel language and vision integration for text-to-clip retrieval. In *AAAI*, 2019.
- [59] Antoine Yang, Antoine Miech, Josef Sivic, Ivan Laptev, and Cordelia Schmid. Zero-Shot Video Question Answering via Frozen Bidirectional Language Models, June 2022.
- [60] Zekun Yang, Noa Garcia, Chenhui Chu, Mayu Otani, Yuta Nakashima, and Haruo Takemura. BERT representations for Video Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 1556–1565, 2020.
- [61] Runhao Zeng, Haoming Xu, Wenbing Huang, Peihao Chen, Mingkui Tan, and Chuang Gan. Dense Regression Network for Video Grounding. *arXiv:2004.03545 [cs]*, Apr. 2020.
- [62] Hao Zhang, Aixin Sun, Wei Jing, and Joey Tianyi Zhou. Span-based Localizing Network for Natural Language Video Localization. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 6543–6554, Online, July 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [63] Mingxing Zhang, Yang Yang, Xinghan Chen, Yanli Ji, Xing Xu, Jingjing Li, and Heng Tao Shen. Multi-Stage Aggregated Transformer Network for Temporal Language Localization in Videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12669–12678, 2021.
- [64] Renrui Zhang, Rongyao Fang, Wei Zhang, Peng Gao, Kunchang Li, Jifeng Dai, Yu Qiao, and Hongsheng Li. Tip-Adapter: Training-free CLIP-Adapter for Better Vision-Language Modeling, Nov. 2021.
- [65] Songyang Zhang, Houwen Peng, Jianlong Fu, Yijuan Lu, and Jiebo Luo. Multi-Scale 2D Temporal Adjacency Networks for Moment Localization with Natural Language. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, pages 1–1, 2021.
- [66] Yang Zhao, Zhou Zhao, Zhu Zhang, and Zhijie Lin. Cascaded Prediction Network via Segment Tree for Temporal

Video Grounding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4197–4206, 2021.

- [67] Minghang Zheng, Yanjie Huang, Qingchao Chen, Yuxin Peng, and Yang Liu. Weakly Supervised Temporal Sentence Grounding With Gaussian-Based Contrastive Proposal Learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15555–15564, 2022.
- [68] Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Learning to Prompt for Vision-Language Models. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 130(9):2337–2348, Sept. 2022.
- [69] Luowei Zhou, Nathan Louis, and Jason J. Corso. Weakly-Supervised Video Object Grounding from Text by Loss Weighting and Object Interaction. *arXiv:1805.02834 [cs]*, May 2018.
- [70] Luowei Zhou, Chenliang Xu, and Jason J. Corso. Towards Automatic Learning of Procedures From Web Instructional Videos. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Apr. 2018.