

Computer Vision for Primate Behavior Analysis in the Wild

Richard Vogt^{*1}, Timo Lüddecke^{*1}, Jonathan Henrich^{*2}, Sharmita Dey¹, Matthias Nuske³,
 Valentin Hassler¹, Derek Murphy^{4,5}, Julia Fischer^{4,5,6,7}, Julia Ostner^{6,8,9}, Oliver Schülke^{6,8,9},
 Peter M. Kappeler^{6,10,11}, Claudia Fichtel^{6,10}, Alexander Gail^{6,7,12,13}, Stefan Treue^{6,7,12,13},
 Hansjörg Scherberger^{6,7,14,15}, Florentin Wörgötter^{3,6,7}, Alexander S. Ecker^{1,6,7,16}

^{*}equal contribution

¹ Institute of Computer Science and Campus Institute Data Science, University of Göttingen

² Chairs of Statistics and Econometrics, Faculty of Economics, University of Göttingen

³ Department for Computational Neuroscience, Third Physics Institute, University of Göttingen

⁴ Cognitive Ethology Laboratory, German Primate Center, Leibniz Institute for Primate Research, Göttingen

⁵ Department for Primate Cognition, Johann-Friedrich-Blumenbach Institute, University of Göttingen

⁶ Leibniz ScienceCampus, German Primate Center, Leibniz Institute for Primate Research, Göttingen

⁷ Bernstein Center for Computational Neuroscience, University of Göttingen

⁸ Behavioral Ecology Department, University of Göttingen

⁹ Social Evolution in Primates Group, German Primate Center, Leibniz Institute for Primate Research, Göttingen

¹⁰ Behavioral Ecology & Sociobiology Unit, German Primate Center, Leibniz Institute for Primate Research, Göttingen

¹¹ Department of Sociobiology/Anthropology, University of Göttingen

¹² Cognitive Neuroscience Laboratory, German Primate Center, Leibniz Institute for Primate Research, Göttingen

¹³ Georg-Elias-Müller-Institute of Psychology, University of Göttingen

¹⁴ Faculty of Biology and Psychology, University of Göttingen

¹⁵ Neurobiology Laboratory, German Primate Center, Leibniz Institute for Primate Research, Göttingen

¹⁶ Max Planck Institute for Dynamics and Self-Organization, Göttingen

Abstract

Advances in computer vision as well as increasingly widespread video-based behavioral monitoring have great potential for transforming how we study animal cognition and behavior. However, there is still a fairly large gap between the exciting prospects and what can actually be achieved in practice today, especially in videos from the wild. With this perspective paper, we want to contribute towards closing this gap, by guiding behavioral scientists in what can be expected from current methods and steering computer vision researchers towards problems that are relevant to advance research in animal behavior. We start with a survey of the state-of-the-art methods for computer vision problems that are directly relevant to the video-based study of animal behavior, including object detection, multi-individual tracking, (inter)action recognition and individual identification. We then review methods for effort-efficient learning, which is one of the biggest challenges from a practical perspective. Finally, we close with an outlook into the future of the emerging field of computer vision for animal behavior, where we argue that the field should move fast beyond the common frame-by-frame processing and treat video as a first-class citizen.

1 Introduction

Monitoring the behavior of animals is an important research task in multiple scientific disciplines ranging from behavioral ecology to neuroscience. While behavior is a wide-ranging term, including swarm behavior or movement patterns [1], and often studied in laboratories, we want to focus here on individualized actions and interactions recorded in images or videos in free-ranging animals, often in the wild. Traditionally, the collection of behavioral data has been time-consuming, laborious, or invasive, as it has relied on human observation and manual documentation or equipping animals with biologgers or tracking devices [2]. In the last decade, the situation has changed as powerful computer vision methods have emerged that have enabled researchers to automate many image recognition tasks. These developments have put fully automated behavioral tracking and analysis of animal behavior on the horizon. Automated annotations using computer vision complement the work of human observers and fundamentally change how data on animal behavior are collected, with important consequences for researchers: Unprecedented amounts of data can be processed and analyzed, something

that was infeasible to be done manually; potential biases introduced by researchers who know the research hypothesis could be circumvented; even for smaller quantities of videos researchers can focus on analyzing and interpreting rather than spending weeks or months on manual scoring of videos.

One of the areas where computer vision methods have already been adopted at scale is monitoring animal behavior in laboratory settings [3, 4, 5, 6]. Open-source pose estimation frameworks such as DeepLabCut [7], SLEAP [8] and others [9, 10] have been adopted by a large user community in neuroscience and beyond, and have facilitated an ongoing paradigm shift towards more unrestrained and natural behavior in neuroscience [11]. These tools work remarkably well in a laboratory setting, where the visual complexity of the scene is manageable. However, the situation is more challenging in more natural outdoor environments or in the wild, where complex visual scenes, changing lighting conditions, non-stationary cameras, occlusion and clutter due to large numbers of animals pose significant challenges to the computer vision machinery [12]. Moreover, the behaviors that behavioral ecologists are interested in are often complex, not easily deduced from an animal’s pose on a single video frame and often concern interactions between two or more individuals, or between individuals and objects in their environment. The following examples from our own ongoing research work illustrate representative types of problems in which computer vision methods can assist behavioral ecologists: First, the identification of individual monkeys from a collection of camera trap images. The co-occurrences of monkeys reveal insights into the social networks of the group of monkeys. Second, tracking of multiple monkeys throughout a set of hand-recorded videos and identification of their actions, e. g. resting, grooming, sleeping. Third, the automated analysis of social learning by identifying interactions between individuals who perform certain tasks and observe each other.

Even though there are some first successful examples of how to use computer vision techniques to detect, track and identify individual monkeys in the wild [13, 12, 14], they do not have the same maturity and general usability as models developed for laboratory settings. Similarly, the automated recognition of actions and interactions with high accuracy from video recordings in natural environments using computer vision methods is still a challenging and unsolved problem. Yet, these settings are what we are particularly interested in. Making use of currently existing computer vision methods will bring us closer to solving these problems, but it will likely require further advances in machine learning and computer vision. Therefore, our aim with this perspective is not only to highlight and discuss current developments in computer vision but also to sketch a path towards future developments.

We identify four key tasks on the path towards automated behavior analysis from images and videos. These tasks can be unified to obtain a holistic characterization of animal behavior (Fig. 1).

- *Animal detection*: To understand the behavior of individual animals, these animals must first be located in images.
- *Multi-animal tracking*: For videos, detections of the same individual across multiple frames must be associated with each other to track an individual over time.
- *Individual identification*: Many research questions require identifying individuals based on face, body or other features which help to distinguish them.
- *Action understanding*: Classifying behaviors based on observable patterns of actions is the core of behavioral analysis. Tasks of interest include the assignment of actions or behaviors to individuals and temporal intervals, as well as the detection of interactions between individuals or between individuals and objects.

Although there are many methods to accomplish these four tasks using computer vision methods, they often require large amounts of labeled data, which limits their practical use. Therefore, another important question is how to solve the tasks in the face of limited time and resources. We review current ideas around how to work with completely or partially unlabeled data, labels that are faster to annotate, and how to find the best samples for annotation to improve the model optimally given a certain labeling budget. Based on our analysis of the state of the art in the key tasks and effort-efficient methods, we highlight promising future directions for computer vision in animal behavior and identify potentially high-impact developments.

With this paper, we aim to review and structure the field of computer vision for animal behavior researchers with a technical interest. While we write primarily from the perspective of scientists interested in primate behavior in natural environments, many of the discussed principles are also applicable to other taxonomic groups and settings. The paper is directed at both AI researchers and empirical scientists, aiming to make significant contributions in two ways: (1) provide guidance to the deep learning community on critical open problems with practical applications and (2) show biologists and ecologists a path towards transforming their research by AI.




Figure 1: Structure of behavior analysis tasks: Starting from a video taken in the wild, the goal is to obtain a structured representation of actions and interactions between the depicted animals while keeping track of their identities. The behavior analysis output on the right shows the behavior of two individuals (blue and violet) over time.

We review machine learning methods for the key tasks of behavioral analysis (Section 2) and effort-efficient learning (Section 3) in a way that is accessible to researchers from both fields. A more detailed technical review of these methods can be found in Appendix B and C, while Appendix A introduces some computer vision foundations. Our outlook on promising research directions is provided in Section 4.

2 Methods for primate behavior analysis

In this section, we introduce the computer vision tasks that we expect to be crucial for a holistic analysis of individualized primate behavior: animal detection (2.1), multi-animal tracking (2.2), individual identification (2.3) and action understanding (2.4). For each of these tasks, we describe the expected inputs and outputs and illustrate the key methods. While some methods operate on static images, others require video input. In Appendix B, we review all the mentioned methods in more technical detail.

Since the goal is to analyze the behavior of individuals, all tasks introduced in this section require a certain way of representing the presence and position of *object instances* (in our case: individual animals) appearing in an image or video frame. Possible instance representations are bounding boxes, instance segmentation masks and keypoints.

Bounding boxes represent instances by the smallest possible rectangular box that encompasses all visible parts of an animal in an image. Most commonly, axis-aligned bounding boxes are used where the sides of the box are parallel to the image axes. Depending on the actual shape of the animal, axis-aligned bounding boxes can also contain a lot of background but come with the advantage of being fast to annotate. There are variations of this representation, such as amodal bounding boxes, which encompass even the parts of the individual that are not visible (e.g. because they are occluded). *Instance segmentation masks* indicate for each pixel of the image to which individual it belongs or whether it is part of the background. Labels for instance segmentation can be very time-consuming to acquire, although recent methods show great potential to reduce this time [15]. A *keypoint* representation allows a more precise determination of the animal’s posture. For each instance, a canonical set of relevant keypoints, such as nose, left hand or right knee is defined. The annotation effort depends on the number of keypoints used, but is usually higher than for bounding boxes. While many popular toolkits for animal behavior analysis are centered around keypoints [7, 16, 8], we argue later (see discussion in Section 4) that bounding boxes are a more suitable intermediate representation for building flexible, generalizable architectures. We will also see that most of the work on tracking and action understanding is based on bounding boxes, which is why the following sections are mostly focused on such methods.

2.1 Animal detection

Given a single image, a natural goal for animal behavior researchers using computer vision is to detect all animals of interest in the image. Having discussed different ways of representing the presence and position of individual animals, this section deals with methods to automatically detect them. We focus on detection methods that represent individuals as bounding boxes which are called *object detection* methods. Training an object detector usually requires images with ground truth labels of bounding boxes. A key challenge for object

detection methods is that the number of objects can vary from image to image, as we do not know apriori how many animals there are in an image. Therefore, neural networks, which commonly have a fixed number of parameters, must be equipped with a mechanism to generate a variable number of output bounding boxes. This is typically done by predicting a large number of bounding boxes together with a confidence score, while only bounding boxes with a sufficiently high confidence are kept. In the following, we explain the basic principles of popular object detection methods.

Object detection methods can be categorized into *single-stage* and *two-stage* methods. In two-stage methods, detection is separated into two steps: Region proposal, where a large number of potential object regions are identified, and classification, where the regions are rated according to their plausibility of containing an object and classified into object categories. This paradigm is employed by the well-known R-CNN family [17, 18, 19, 20]. Two-stage methods perform very well but are generally fairly complex pipelines. In single-stage methods, bounding box coordinates and confidence scores are predicted without in-between steps. Compared to two-stage methods, single-stage methods are (1) faster (which is important for real-time applications), (2) conceptually simpler, and (3) can be naturally trained in an end-to-end way. Notable examples are Single-Shot Detector (SSD) [21], the YOLO-series [22, 23, 24] and heatmap-based detectors [25, 26, 27, 28], where bounding boxes are predicted with the help of heatmaps for pre-defined object parts, such as corners or centers. The methods described so far are all based on Convolutional Neural Networks. More recently, single-stage object detection methods based on the transformer network architecture [29] have gained popularity. In this paradigm, objects are represented by so-called object queries, i.e. numerical vectors, that extract information from the input image through a transformer network. These object queries are then transformed into bounding boxes and confidence scores to arrive at object detections. Notable examples following this paradigm include the detection transformer (DETR) [30] and its follow-up works [31, 32, 33, 34].

2.2 Multi-animal tracking

So far, we have discussed how object detection allows us to locate and classify objects of interest in still images. However, researchers studying animal behavior frequently record video footage of behavior. In this case, they need a model that will not only find all animals in a given video frame but also keep track of them over time. This tracking is crucial for observing long-term behavioral patterns and the assignment of instances and entire sequences of actions to the same animal over time.

The input for a tracking model is always a video, typically broken down into single frames in a temporal sequence. The output is a list of detections (most commonly bounding boxes) and track IDs that link the detected instances across video frames. A good tracking algorithm will be able to follow an individual through the sequence and assign the same identity to each detection of that individual. When the detections are represented as bounding boxes, this method is referred to as Multiple Object Tracking (MOT). Although tracking algorithms based on other instance representations exist (e.g. Video Instance Segmentation or keypoint-based tracking), they often solve MOT as a first step or have to solve it implicitly. For this reason and because MOT is the most widely studied and best-understood paradigm, we will focus on it here.

The tracking procedure has so far usually been partitioned into two phases [35]: detection and association. In the detection phase, the primary aim is to identify and locate objects of interest within frames, as described above. The association phase links the detected objects across frames to produce trajectories over time for each object. This is accomplished through the detected locations and the extraction of descriptive features, such as motion and appearance, from the detected objects. The motion features estimate the position of an object in future frames, while the appearance features represent its visual characteristics. After feature extraction, an affinity cost is calculated. The affinity cost measures the pairwise similarity between the detected objects across frames based on their location, motion and appearance. It is then used to link the detected objects across successive frames to generate object trajectories over time. Existing MOT methods can be categorized into two groups: (1) The classical *tracking-by-detection* approach described above, where the detection and association phase are independent of each other, and (2) more recent *tracking-by-query* methods with interdependent detection and association phases.

A prime example of the classical tracking-by-detection framework is the Simple Online Real-time Tracker (SORT) model [36]. In the SORT model, the detections of each frame are collected independently of each other. The spatial shift between detections of successive frames is then used to extract motion features, which are used to calculate the expected location of objects on the next frame. Detections are then linked across frames based on the overlap between the expected location of objects and the actual detections. Follow-up works improved the SORT model, for example by additionally including appearance features [37, 38, 39] or employing more elaborate association strategies [37, 40].

More recently, frameworks have emerged that follow the tracking-by-query paradigm where the detection and association phases are interlinked, rather than independent. In this setup, the results of the association phase, such as motion or appearance features, help improve the results of the detection phase, and vice versa. The most prominent example of this paradigm is the multiple-object tracking with transformer (MOTR) model [41] and its follow-up works [42, 43, 44]. MOTR uses the DETR detection framework described above and introduces the concept of track queries in addition to object queries. While object queries are used to detect newly emerging objects, as is done in DETR, track queries represent tracked objects in terms of their motion and appearance features and are used to produce tracks of objects. Object and track queries interact with each other through the transformer design which enables information exchange between detection and association.

2.3 Individual identification

Individual identification is an essential step for most studies on animal behavior and ecology, for example, in studies of sociality [45, 6] or for population estimation [46]. It describes the task of distinguishing between individuals in an animal group by consistently assigning unique identity labels across different images or videos. The label is typically a pre-assigned identity, e.g. a name or ID code. Individual identification is different from multi-object tracking, where individuals are assigned a new label for each video/scene in which they appear.

There are two main approaches to individual identification: *closed set* and *open set* identification [47]. In closed set identification, all individuals are known beforehand and need only be recognized again in new images, while in open set identification previously unseen individuals (e.g. from unhabituated groups) can appear in the data and must be distinguished from known individuals. Closed set identification is a classification task and has been traditionally tackled with standard methods like convolutional neural networks (CNNs) with a classification layer that are applied on images of the full body [48, 49, 9] or face [50] of the animals. Alternatively, Bain et al. [51] classify which animals are present in a frame without localizing them. In contrast to these classical approaches, more recently there has been evidence that deep metric learning for the identification of animals outperforms classification approaches [47]. In deep metric learning, the goal is to learn features that can be used to distinguish individuals from each other. Commonly used approaches for learning discriminative features are triplet loss [52] and contrastive learning methods [53, 54]. One advantage of deep metric learning is that unknown individuals can be identified based on feature distance. More precisely, when the calculated feature of a newly detected individual is highly dissimilar to the features associated with known individuals, this individual can be classified as unknown. Therefore, deep metric learning is a promising avenue to tackle the challenging task of open set individual identification. For an exhaustive overview of current open set methods, we refer to the review of Sun et al. [55].

2.4 Action understanding

The animal localization methods discussed in the previous sections (detection and tracking) are crucial prerequisites. Now we focus on methods for action understanding. These methods differ mainly in whether and how they localize actions in space and time (Fig. 2). For video inputs, they can be divided into four main categories: (1) *action recognition* (also known as action classification), (2) *temporal action detection* (also known as temporal action localization), (3) *spatio-temporal action detection* (also known as spatio-temporal action localization) and (4) *dynamic scene graph generation*. To exemplify what these four methods do, suppose that there is a video of a monkey feeding from a bowl. An *action recognition* method would assign the label “feeding” to the entire video. A more precise output can be obtained using a *temporal action detection* method which would identify the temporal interval during which the monkey is feeding. Both of these methods generate video-level output that does not refer to individual animals. Therefore, these methods usually do not make use of animal localization. In contrast, a *spatio-temporal action detection* method would localize the monkey using bounding boxes on individual video frames (frame-based approach) or a track (track-based approach). The action “feeding” would then be assigned to the respective bounding boxes (frame-based approach) or sub-tracks (track-based approach) where the monkey feeds. Similarly, a *dynamic scene graph generation* method would localize the monkey and the bowl by means of bounding boxes (frame-based approach) or tracks (track-based approach). The action “feeding” would then be assigned to the respective bounding boxes (frame-based approach) or sub-tracks (track-based approach) in the form of a relationship triplet (monkey–feeding from–bowl). It should be noted that frame-based approaches still leverage temporal information for the prediction. However, predictions are made separately for each frame, which is why it is not possible to directly infer whether two actions on different frames belonging to the same animal represent the same action instance or whether the action has been




Figure 2: Categories of action and interaction recognition tasks based on input and output temporal format as well as spatial granularity.

interrupted in between. To achieve this, a tracking method would have to be applied additionally. Figure 2 categorizes the action understanding methods with regard to their input and output type.

Advances in action understanding methods have been largely driven by the development of more and more powerful general video processing backbones. While early backbones primarily relied on 3D convolutions [56, 57, 58], there has been a shift towards transformer networks [59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67], enabling the exchange of information across spatially and temporally distant regions of the input video. State-of-the-art action understanding results can often be achieved by simply employing a powerful video backbone with a classifier network on the entire video clip (action recognition) or a spatially cropped version (spatio-temporal action detection). The region for spatial cropping is usually determined by employing a separate detector for actors. Explicitly modeling motion [68, 69] or action-related components [70, 71, 72], such as actors and objects involved, for action recognition and spatio-temporal action detection has also been attempted, but often performs worse than simply using strong general video processing backbone without any bells and whistles. Temporal action detection methods are conceptually similar to object detection methods, with the difference being that temporal instead of spatial boundaries are predicted. Just as in object detection, there is a trend towards single-stage methods that process the input using some form of video backbone and directly predict action boundaries and confidence scores without any in-between proposal generation step [73, 74, 75, 76].

The methods described so far assign actions either to entire videos, subsequences of videos or detected individuals, but researchers are often interested in interactions between two individuals or individuals and specific objects. Such interactions can be described by a *scene graph*, where edges express interactions between entities (objects/individuals). Comparably little research has been devoted to the challenging field of dynamic scene graph generation. In principle, existing methods [77, 78, 79, 80] involve the following steps: First, features are extracted for entities (e.g. monkey and bowl) and relations (e.g. feeding). The entity features are usually obtained from image or video backbones, while relations are, for example, represented by the relative motion of the involved entities. In a second step, the extracted features are further processed using some form of spatio-temporal reasoning. Finally, the features are used to separately predict the entity and relation classes.

3 Methods for effort-efficient learning

The methods presented in the previous section have been developed using (usually) large, diverse image or video datasets with high-quality annotations. Thus, while there has been a lot of progress and many strong methods exist in principle, they cannot be easily applied to situations where no or only a few labels exist – as is the case in animal behavior. Annotating images or videos with bounding boxes, keypoints, segmentation masks or interactions takes a considerable amount of time and often labeling budgets are limited. We therefore now turn to effort efficiency: Researchers would like to maximize model performance while minimizing manual annotation costs. Which techniques can we use to make the most of available labels or even of unlabeled data? Figure 3 provides a schematic overview of some of the most promising effort-efficient learning techniques. Note




Figure 3: Schematic overview of effort-efficient learning techniques.

that the boundaries between these categories are fluent and some methods do not strictly fall into only a single category, but are hybrid approaches. It helps, however, to look at the approaches in isolation as they deal with different types of input data and model architectures. Below we provide a high-level overview of these methods. In Appendix C we review the currently used methodologies for effort-efficient learning in more technical detail.

The most traditional effort-efficient learning method is *transfer learning*. The idea is to transfer knowledge gained from one task to enhance the performance on a related task. Traditionally, a model trained on an annotated dataset with a wide range of objects, such as ImageNet [81] or MS-COCO [82], is fine-tuned with data from the task of interest. Since knowledge contained in the original model can be leveraged, this allows for training good models even when only a small number of labels is available.

Self-supervised learning models learn meaningful representations from large, unlabeled datasets. One of the most popular approaches is masked autoencoders [83], where parts of the image are masked out and the model has to learn to restore the image. Another line of self-supervised models is contrastive methods [84, 85], where two similar versions of an input image are created (e.g. by random cropping, flipping, color changes) and the model has to learn that they show the same image while differentiating it from other images. Both ideas require the model to learn a general understanding of what the image shows. After self-supervised pre-training on a large unlabeled dataset, the models are adapted to the target task using transfer learning with a small labeled dataset. This can yield better results than supervised pre-training [83].

Weakly supervised learning is used in scenarios where perfect annotations are not available. Models are trained using incomplete, inaccurate or cheaper labels. Especially the latter is relevant for our animal behavior models, as we can train a model without having to go through the full annotation effort. Annotations of image-level labels, bounding boxes, keypoints and instance segmentations are increasingly more fine-grained and expensive. For example, for individual identification, we need bounding box labels, but drawing bounding boxes is more time-consuming than creating more coarse-grained image-level labels (e.g. simply stating which individuals are present in the image). Weakly supervised methods aim to find ways to train a fine-grained model with coarse-grained labels, thus minimizing annotation time.

Semi-supervised learning is a strategy that utilizes both labeled and unlabeled data for model training. A basic strategy is to train a first model using the labeled data and use this to create pseudo labels on the unlabeled data, with which a better model can be trained. In the popular architectures MixMatch [86] and FixMatch [87], the pseudo labeling strategy is combined with consistency-based methods, where the model learns to consistently recognize an image as the same, even if it is flipped, cropped, has color changes or other augmentations applied to it.

Active learning is explored as a strategic approach to selecting which unlabeled samples are most beneficial

to annotate to improve the model. For instance, when annotating videos, randomly sampling frames could result in many frames without interesting individuals or actions, repeated samples of the same individual, too simple or too complicated frames. Active learning has so far mostly been studied in the area of image classification, and recently in object detection. Two main strategies are used: Uncertainty-based methods look for samples where the current model shows low confidence [88]; diversity-based methods select samples for annotation such that the entire dataset is well represented [89]. Active learning is part of an emerging larger field called data-centric learning, motivated by studies that show that better data are often more valuable than better models [90].

Another approach how to avoid manual annotation is to generate *synthetic training data*. This usually involves data produced using 3D renderers, where labeled samples can be generated at no cost once a simulation model has been created (e.g. Kubric [91]). Depending on the quality of the simulated data, it might be necessary to explicitly adapt to real-world data, for example using transfer learning. In some cases, directly using the model trained on synthetic images on natural images has proven to be successful. This involves optical flow [92] and point tracking [93, 94].

Another paradigm that has become popular recently is *cross-modal learning*, where observations from a second modality serve as supervisory signals. For instance, the language-vision model CLIP [95] uses the text accompanying images on websites as “labels” for the images. Similar approaches could also be applied to animal behavior. For example, in addition to video data, researchers could collect audio recordings, thermal images, accelerometer data, GPS information, weather data and more, and use the data from these extra modalities as labels for video data in a cross-modal learning setting. Incorporating audio information into a machine vision model can lead to good performance on tasks relevant to researchers interested in animal behavior, as demonstrated by Bain and colleagues [13] who used such an approach to identify actions performed by wild chimpanzees.

Finally, annotation efficiency can be improved by using collaborative efforts between humans and already existing models. Integration of deep learning models into annotation workflows and the design of user-friendly tools are means to enhance the efficiency of collaborative annotation processes.

4 Avenues for Future Research

We have seen that quantifying behavior from video recordings is a multi-faceted problem that requires different computer vision approaches depending on the specific information we seek to extract from a video and/or the scientific question we wish to answer (identity, action, etc.). While the computer vision community has developed approaches to tackle all of these problems, not all of them have received the same degree of attention. For instance, the computer vision community has focused much more on images than on video data, mostly for reasons of computational complexity and memory. Research in computer vision is driven strongly by the availability of benchmarks and (annotated) datasets. The focus has often been on developing architectures that work well in certain domains (e.g. pedestrian tracking) given the constraints of the size and types of datasets available. Comparably less effort has gone into researching how to obtain the necessary labels in the most efficient way, how to reuse labels across tasks and domains, and how to design architectures that facilitate such reuse. In this final section, we want to highlight what we consider to be the most important open questions in computer vision for animal behavior (Fig. 4).

Video as a first-class citizen. Actions and interactions – the primary quantity of interest in behavioral science – are inherently spatio-temporal. We argue that, for this reason, video should be treated as a first-class citizen. A lot of progress in computer vision has been achieved in the area of image recognition (e.g. image classification, object detection, image segmentation). As a result, even video processing is often done by first performing frame-level image recognition and then merging/tracking results over time. As a prime example of this paradigm, take the tracking-by-detection approach with independent detection and association phases: image-based object detectors have been optimized for years and large, high-quality annotated datasets exist, but datasets with densely annotated object tracks in video are rare and comparably small. As a result, tracking approaches, which are based on state-of-the-art detectors, outperform methods directly trained on object tracks on typical pedestrian-tracking datasets. However, these image-based approaches likely lead to locally, rather than globally optimal solutions, especially when it comes to classifying animal behavior. That is, frame-based recognition cannot deal as well with low-level image corruptions like motion blur or poor lighting conditions, has fundamental difficulties with reasoning about appearance changes caused by non-rigid body movements and is more error-prone when it comes to occlusion of similarly looking individuals. All of these issues are




Figure 4: Selection of important developments in computer vision and their impact on behavioral analysis.

in principle also present in tasks involving tracking humans moving through a space, but are far more pronounced when using videos of animals, because animals look more similar, move faster and more nonlinearly. The community has recently started to recognize and tackle these challenges. For instance, the DanceTrack benchmark [96] brought into focus the challenges of dealing with similar-looking individuals, complex motion and occlusion. From our perspective, a significant proportion of these difficulties could be alleviated by shifting from image-level to video-level methods. Recent query-based models where detections are obtained by also taking into account past information of already-tracked objects are a step in the right direction. However, these approaches still process the video in a frame-by-frame manner, thus preventing the learning of video-level features. Realizing a shift towards methods that consider videos in an integrated way requires the computer vision community to acknowledge the need to make this transition.

Tracking individuals in a video is an important aspect of using computer vision in the study of animal behavior, but not an end in and of itself – it is only an intermediate step. When studying the behavior of a group of non-human primates, localizing actions and interactions in space and time, as well as identifying which individuals are involved, are key goals for researchers. Formally speaking, we want to infer a scene graph, where nodes represent individuals (in space and time) and edges represent their actions and interactions. Thus, what is ultimately needed is a framework that combines ideas from several fields into a strong spatio-temporal backbone, ideally trained self- or semi-supervised with modular heads that output tracks for individuals, identifications, pixel-level segmentation and/or keypoint tracks, spatio-temporally localized actions and interactions, or subsets/combinations of those. As of now, detection, tracking and action understanding tasks are usually treated separately from each other. While action understanding methods are largely based on video-level processing, the same does not hold for tracking methods, which prevents the convergence of two research areas that should be considered jointly. While there are still some issues related to memory limitations and long-term modeling capabilities of video-processing models, there are already some promising recent works that aim to provide models for joint tracking and action understanding [97, 98]. Comprehensive benchmarks for behavioral analysis are needed to drive model development in a more unified direction.

Intermediate representations. Pose estimation has become a popular first step and intermediate representation in video-based analysis of animal behavior – in particular in lab-based settings, e. g. in neuroscience. Pose estimation as a first step has been facilitated by impressive open-source frameworks such as DeepLabCut [7], SLEAP [8] and DeepPoseKit [99], which provide excellent tools for data annotation, are well-documented, relatively easy to use for non-experts and work remarkably well in lab settings or when overfit to individual video sequences. Other works built upon these frameworks by providing behavioral analysis tools for laboratory settings that are based on features derived from tracked keypoints [100, 4].

Keypoints clearly contain useful information for some downstream tasks, such as action understanding, but

they do not lend themselves as naturally to other important problems such as identification, tracking or classifying certain actions. For example, the action “monkey feeding” can be more unambiguously detected using visual information (e.g. food in the hand). Thus, while being helpful sometimes, the extraction of visual information from an image or video does not necessitate keypoints. We therefore argue that there are several reasons for preferring bounding boxes as the intermediate representations around which to build generalizable architectures: First, bounding boxes are faster and easier to obtain compared to other instance representations. Second, as deep learning models become more and more powerful, we expect them to be able to extract the relevant features for tasks such as action understanding directly from the input image or video, without the need for complex instance representations. If more fine-grained instance representations are needed, they can be easily added as a second step when the instances are already detected and localized. Third, state-of-the-art action understanding methods already rely predominantly on bounding boxes as instance representations. This observation mirrors a general trend: Over the history of deep learning, models using intermediate representations have disappeared and been replaced with models that are trained “end-to-end” directly on the task of interest (e. g. action understanding). Until 2012, image recognition classifiers were trained on manually-defined visual representations (Bag-of-visual words [101], histogram of oriented gradients [102]). The seminal AlexNet [103] has shown that end-to-end training directly on the image classification task outperforms using handcrafted intermediate representations. We expect this transition to also happen in animal behavior analysis, which currently relies heavily on some form of intermediate representation. A key question will be if labeled data is necessary as a driver or if features can also be learned in an unsupervised way – our next topic.

Effort-efficient learning everywhere. Progress in image recognition was initially driven by end-to-end training on large collections of labeled data such as ImageNet [81] and MS-COCO [82], but the image characteristics of such commonly used datasets differ quite a bit from those encountered when studying animal behavior in the wild, limiting the power of transfer learning from such datasets. Collecting and annotating large-scale “in-domain” datasets (i. e. with relevant species in the appropriate environments and contexts) is costly. Hence, such datasets might not be available any time soon for many relevant animal behavior tasks. However, recent years have brought a lot of progress in training models without the need for manual data annotation, as discussed in Section 3. In our view, a particularly promising research direction in the context of animal behavior is self-supervised learning in combination with transfer learning.

Self-supervised learning is promising because large collections of video footage of animal behavior are increasingly available as researchers employ video recordings for behavioral observations or set up camera traps in the wild. Such datasets could be used to pre-train a backbone in-domain. However, it remains to be investigated which pre-training objectives yield features that are useful for the downstream task: it is not at all clear whether self-supervised learning approaches developed on ImageNet or YouTube videos will generalize to the problems posed by analyzing animal behavior. For instance, the self-supervised paradigms developed using data from ImageNet do not readily generalize to other image domains, because ImageNet images are mostly focused on a single salient object and work by applying label-preserving transformations to these images. Such approaches may not easily generalize to settings where there are many similar-looking individuals close together. Current video-based self-supervised learning strategies are largely inspired by their counterparts in the image domain. The most successful models rely on masked feature modeling [104, 105, 106] and video-language contrastive learning [107]. Putting animal behavior recognition on the agenda for evaluating self-supervised video representation learning could inspire new basic research in computer vision by making limitations of current approaches measurable and incentivizing the development of new methods to address these limitations. The animal behavior community could facilitate such efforts by publishing datasets and establishing benchmarks.

One of the biggest levers to enable progress in application domains such as animal behavior (but also more broadly) is to shift focus from developing architectures for existing tasks and datasets towards the *process* of iteratively annotating (the right) data and training models until the accuracy requirements of the problem at hand are met. In other words: Given that we want to identify certain aspects of animal behavior (e. g. identities of individuals and grooming interactions), which parts (frames, snippets) of the dataset should we annotate, how (boxes, tracks, keypoints, actions spatially and/or temporally localized?) and in what order to achieve satisfactory performance with as little effort as possible? In machine learning, the question of which samples to annotate is formalized as active learning. In computer vision, active learning is mostly studied in the context of image classification, more recently also in object detection [108] and segmentation (e. g. SAM [15]). Extending research on active learning more towards spatio-temporal tasks such as action and interaction recognition would be extremely helpful. To some extent, this is going to be a matter of adapting established principles of active learning to these more complex tasks and developing the right tools. However, there is also a deeper scientific



Prompt:
"Describe the following image."

GPT4-V:
The image features two monkeys perched on a tree branch. The foreground monkey has distinct pale pinkish facial features, with a calm and direct gaze toward the camera. Its body appears to be creamy beige, and it is holding onto the branch with its limbs while embracing a smaller monkey.
The smaller monkey, likely a juvenile, clings onto the back of the larger monkey with its head turned away from the camera, suggesting a moment of bonding or transportation. Their fur appears to be a similar shade of beige or light brown.
The surrounding environment is lush and green, indicative of a dense, leafy forest habitat which is natural for these monkeys. Sunlight filters through the canopy above, casting soft light upon the scene. The branches and leaves around them provide a sense of depth and a rich, textured backdrop, enhancing the naturalistic setting of the photograph.

Prompt:
"Describe the following image. Focus on the animals, their state, actions and interactions as well as objects in the scene. Generate a structured output by listing all animals and objects. For action and interaction, provide of tuples (<obj1>, <obj2>, <interaction>) or (<obj1>, <action>)."

GPT4-V:
Animals:
- Monkey 1: Appears to be an adult with light fur and a pinkish face, sitting on a branch.
- Monkey 2: Appears to be young, positioned behind Monkey 1 with its head not visible.
Objects:
- Branch: Sturdy branch upon which the monkeys are sitting.
- Foliage: Green leaves and branches surrounding the monkeys.
Actions and Interactions:
- (Monkey 1, Branch, Sitting)
- (Monkey 2, Behind Monkey 1, Clinging)
- (Monkey 1, Looking), direction: towards the camera/viewer.
- (Monkey 2, Monkey 1, interaction), specific nature: unclear due to positioning, possibly grooming or clinging for security.

Figure 5: Multi-modal large language models (here GPT4-V) can be used to understand challenging scenes. It succeeds in recognizing the general setting (monkeys sitting on a branch) but fails to detect details (the baby monkey, spatial relation, interaction). While current models are not capable of a fully automated analysis they might serve as a tool for pseudo labeling. More examples can be found in Appendix D.

question that has not received too much attention thus far: Action and interaction recognition is inherently a multi-task problem. Individuals need to be detected and tracked, then actions and interactions associated with them. Some of these tasks inform each other. For instance, it is well known that adding segmentation labels helps object detection (Mask R-CNN [109]), but it is less clear whether investing the same amount of labeling time in additional bounding boxes would not improve a detector more. Similarly, some research has investigated how representations learned by one task generalize to another (Taskonomy [110]), but with a focus on purely spatial tasks, most of which are not directly relevant to the study of animal behavior. How much annotation effort should be put into each of the relevant tasks, and what are good strategies for identifying the limiting factors that provide the most leverage to improvement at any given point in time? This problem could be phrased as multi-task active learning, and we are not aware of any research in this direction.

Foundation models. ChatGPT has popularized the idea of foundation models [111], very large models that address several tasks at once. While the first versions operated exclusively on text, now image processing capability is available. This raises the question to which degree behavior analysis tasks will be solved in the future by such general-purpose models (Fig. 5). While early experiments [112] suggest remarkable image understanding capabilities, we believe behavioral analysis will not be conducted by these models in the near future for multiple reasons: (a) behavior requires video understanding and spatio-temporal reasoning and (b) the data domain is very different from the typical internet videos. (c) Most importantly, tasks like individual identification, or specifying a target ethogram will necessarily require tuning the model as the required information to master these tasks is not accessible to the model. Nonetheless, foundation models can already now enhance behavioral understanding: Even closed-source models such as OpenAI’s GPT4-V can be leveraged to generate pseudo labels on images. From openly-available models such as SegmentAnything or CLIP, it is also possible to extract the knowledge through distillation [113].

5 Conclusion

We gave a comprehensive overview of the current state-of-the-art computer vision techniques that we consider crucial for the analysis of individualized animal behavior in natural settings, with the four key tasks being object detection, multi-individual tracking, individual identification and action understanding. Additionally, we reviewed methods for effort-efficient learning, highlighting their practical significance given the extensive annotation requirements of computer vision models. We expect recent generic computer vision technologies, from multi-object tracking to action recognition, to surpass the performance of abundantly used specialized image- or keypoint-based methods for automated animal behavior analysis in the wild.

At the same time, there are still several computer vision problems highly relevant to practical behavioral researchers, which should – in our opinion – receive more attention from the community. Extending effort-efficient methods such as active learning from images to video has great potential for primate behavior analysis. Furthermore, unifying tasks such as tracking, individual identification and action understanding instead of treating them separately would enable a comprehensive characterization of how individual animals in a group move

and what (inter)actions they engage in. The creation of such joint models is also desirable in terms of the convergence of different research directions towards holistic video processing. Ultimately, collaboration between behavioral scientists and computer vision researchers will play a vital role in finding the right path towards developing methodologies that are both powerful and practically applicable.

Acknowledgements

This publication was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project-ID 454648639 – SFB 1528 – Cognition of Interaction and with NextGenerationEU funds from the European Union by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research under the funding code 16DKWN038. The responsibility for the content of this publication lies with the authors.

References

- [1] Iain D Couzin and Conor Heins. “Emerging technologies for behavioral research in changing environments”. In: *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 38.4 (2023), pp. 346–354.
- [2] Melissa Bateson and Paul Martin. *Measuring behaviour: an introductory guide*. Cambridge university press, 2021.
- [3] Vassilis M Papadakis et al. “A computer-vision system and methodology for the analysis of fish behavior”. In: *Aquacultural engineering* 46 (2012), pp. 53–59.
- [4] Cristina Segalin et al. “The Mouse Action Recognition System (MARS) software pipeline for automated analysis of social behaviors in mice”. In: *Elife* 10 (2021), e63720.
- [5] Kevin Luxem et al. “Open-source tools for behavioral video analysis: Setup, methods, and best practices”. In: *Elife* 12 (2023), e79305.
- [6] Daniel P Schofield et al. “Automated face recognition using deep neural networks produces robust primate social networks and sociality measures”. In: *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 14.8 (2023), pp. 1937–1951.
- [7] Alexander Mathis et al. “DeepLabCut: markerless pose estimation of user-defined body parts with deep learning”. In: *Nature neuroscience* 21.9 (2018), pp. 1281–1289.
- [8] Talmo D Pereira et al. “SLEAP: A deep learning system for multi-animal pose tracking”. In: *Nature methods* 19.4 (2022), pp. 486–495.
- [9] Tristan Walter and Iain D Couzin. “TRex, a fast multi-animal tracking system with markerless identification, and 2D estimation of posture and visual fields”. In: *eLife* 10 (Feb. 2021). Ed. by David Lentink, Christian Rutz, and Sergi Pujades, e64000. ISSN: 2050-084X. URL: <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.64000>.
- [10] Jacob M. Graving et al. “DeepPoseKit, a software toolkit for fast and robust animal pose estimation using deep learning”. In: *eLife* 8 (2019).
- [11] Gianna A Jordan et al. “Automated system for training and assessing reaching and grasping behaviors in rodents”. In: *Journal of Neuroscience Methods* 401 (2024), p. 109990.
- [12] Charlotte Wiltshire et al. “DeepWild: Application of the pose estimation tool DeepLabCut for behaviour tracking in wild chimpanzees and bonobos”. In: *Journal of Animal Ecology* (2023).
- [13] Max Bain et al. “Automated audiovisual behavior recognition in wild primates”. In: *Science Advances* 7.46 (2021), eabi4883.
- [14] Markus Marks et al. “Deep-learning-based identification, tracking, pose estimation and behaviour classification of interacting primates and mice in complex environments”. In: *Nature Machine Intelligence* 4.4 (2022), pp. 331–340.
- [15] Alexander Kirillov et al. “Segment anything”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision (ICCV)* (2023).
- [16] Riza Alp Güler, Natalia Neverova, and Iasonas Kokkinos. “DensePose: Dense Human Pose Estimation in the Wild”. In: *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition* (2018), pp. 7297–7306.
- [17] Ross B. Girshick et al. “Rich Feature Hierarchies for Accurate Object Detection and Semantic Segmentation”. In: *2014 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition* (2013), pp. 580–587.
- [18] Shaoqing Ren et al. “Faster R-CNN: Towards Real-Time Object Detection with Region Proposal Networks”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 39 (2015), pp. 1137–1149.
- [19] Kaiming He et al. “Mask R-CNN”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 42 (2017), pp. 386–397.
- [20] Jifeng Dai et al. “R-FCN: Object Detection via Region-based Fully Convolutional Networks”. In: *ArXiv abs/1605.06409* (2016).
- [21] Wei Liu et al. “Ssd: Single shot multibox detector”. In: *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part I 14*. Springer, 2016, pp. 21–37.

- [22] Joseph Redmon and Ali Farhadi. “YOLO9000: Better, Faster, Stronger”. In: *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* (2016), pp. 6517–6525.
- [23] Joseph Redmon and Ali Farhadi. “YOLOv3: An Incremental Improvement”. In: *ArXiv abs/1804.02767* (2018).
- [24] Zheng Ge et al. “YOLOX: Exceeding YOLO Series in 2021”. In: *ArXiv abs/2107.08430* (2021).
- [25] Hei Law and Jia Deng. “CornerNet: Detecting Objects as Paired Keypoints”. In: *International Journal of Computer Vision* 128 (2018), pp. 642–656.
- [26] Kaiwen Duan et al. “CenterNet: Keypoint Triplets for Object Detection”. In: *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)* (2019), pp. 6568–6577.
- [27] Xingyi Zhou, Dequan Wang, and Philipp Krähenbühl. “Objects as Points”. In: *ArXiv abs/1904.07850* (2019).
- [28] Zhi Tian et al. “Fcos: Fully convolutional one-stage object detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 2019, pp. 9627–9636.
- [29] Ashish Vaswani et al. “Attention is All you Need”. In: *Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2017.
- [30] Nicolas Carion et al. “End-to-End Object Detection with Transformers”. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV) abs/2005.12872* (2020).
- [31] Xizhou Zhu et al. “Deformable DETR: Deformable Transformers for End-to-End Object Detection”. In: *ArXiv abs/2010.04159* (2020).
- [32] Feng Li et al. “DN-DETR: Accelerate DETR Training by Introducing Query DeNoising”. In: *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* (2022), pp. 13609–13617.
- [33] Shilong Liu et al. “DAB-DETR: Dynamic Anchor Boxes are Better Queries for DETR”. In: *ArXiv abs/2201.12329* (2022).
- [34] Hao Zhang et al. “DINO: DETR with Improved DeNoising Anchor Boxes for End-to-End Object Detection”. In: *ArXiv abs/2203.03605* (2022).
- [35] Gioele Ciaparrone et al. “Deep Learning in Video Multi-Object Tracking: A Survey”. In: *Neurocomputing* (2020), pp. 61–88.
- [36] Alex Bewley et al. “Simple online and realtime tracking”. In: *2016 IEEE international conference on image processing (ICIP)*. IEEE. 2016, pp. 3464–3468.
- [37] Yifu Zhang et al. “Bytetrack: Multi-object tracking by associating every detection box”. In: *Computer Vision—ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XXII*. Springer. 2022, pp. 1–21.
- [38] Jinkun Cao et al. “Observation-centric sort: Rethinking sort for robust multi-object tracking”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.14360* (2022).
- [39] Gerard Maggolino et al. “Deep OC-SORT: Multi-Pedestrian Tracking by Adaptive Re-Identification”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.11813* (2023).
- [40] Nir Aharon, Roy Orfaig, and Ben-Zion Bobrovsky. “BoT-SORT: Robust associations multi-pedestrian tracking”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.14651* (2022).
- [41] Fangao Zeng et al. “Motr: End-to-end multiple-object tracking with transformer”. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer. 2022, pp. 659–675.
- [42] Yuang Zhang, Tiancai Wang, and Xiangyu Zhang. “MOTRv2: Bootstrapping End-to-End Multi-Object Tracking by Pretrained Object Detectors”. In: *ArXiv abs/2211.09791* (2022).
- [43] En Yu et al. “MOTRv3: Release-Fetch Supervision for End-to-End Multi-Object Tracking”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14298* (2023).
- [44] Feng Yan et al. “Bridging the Gap Between End-to-end and Non-End-to-end Multi-Object Tracking”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12724* (2023).
- [45] Sandra Frey et al. “Investigating animal activity patterns and temporal niche partitioning using camera-trap data: challenges and opportunities”. In: *Remote Sensing in Ecology and Conservation* 3.3 (), pp. 123–132.

- [46] J. Andrew Royle. “Hierarchical Spatial Capture–Recapture Models for Estimating Density from Trapping Arrays”. In: *Camera Traps in Animal Ecology: Methods and Analyses*. Ed. by Allan F. O’Connell, James D. Nichols, and K. Ullas Karanth. Tokyo: Springer Japan, 2011, pp. 163–190. ISBN: 978-4-431-99495-4.
- [47] Maxime Vidal et al. “Perspectives on individual animal identification from biology and computer vision”. In: *Integrative and comparative biology* 61.3 (2021), pp. 900–916.
- [48] André C. Ferreira et al. “Deep learning-based methods for individual recognition in small birds”. In: *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 11.9 (), pp. 1072–1085.
- [49] Francisco Romero-Ferrero et al. “Idtracker. ai: tracking all individuals in small or large collectives of unmarked animals”. In: *Nature methods* 16.2 (2019), pp. 179–182.
- [50] Debayan Deb et al. “Face Recognition: Primates in the Wild”. In: *2018 IEEE 9th International Conference on Biometrics Theory, Applications and Systems (BTAS)*. 2018, pp. 1–10.
- [51] Max Bain et al. “Count, Crop and Recognise: Fine-Grained Recognition in the Wild”. In: *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision Workshop (ICCVW)* (2019), pp. 236–246.
- [52] Florian Schroff, Dmitry Kalenichenko, and James Philbin. “Facenet: A unified embedding for face recognition and clustering”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2015, pp. 815–823.
- [53] Yuto Kodama et al. “Open-set recognition with supervised contrastive learning”. In: *2021 17th International Conference on Machine Vision and Applications (MVA)*. IEEE. 2021, pp. 1–5.
- [54] Jongjin Park et al. “Opencos: Contrastive semi-supervised learning for handling open-set unlabeled data”. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer. 2022, pp. 134–149.
- [55] Jiayin Sun and Qiulei Dong. “A Survey on Open-Set Image Recognition”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15571* (2023).
- [56] Zhaofan Qiu, Ting Yao, and Tao Mei. “Learning spatio-temporal representation with pseudo-3d residual networks”. In: *proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*. 2017, pp. 5533–5541.
- [57] Youngwan Lee et al. “Diverse temporal aggregation and depthwise spatiotemporal factorization for efficient video classification”. In: *IEEE Access* 9 (2021), pp. 163054–163064.
- [58] Christoph Feichtenhofer et al. “Slowfast networks for video recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 2019, pp. 6202–6211.
- [59] Anurag Arnab et al. “Vivit: A video vision transformer”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 2021, pp. 6836–6846.
- [60] Gedas Bertasius, Heng Wang, and Lorenzo Torresani. “Is space-time attention all you need for video understanding?” In: *ICML*. Vol. 2. 3. 2021, p. 4.
- [61] Shen Yan et al. “Multiview transformers for video recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 3333–3343.
- [62] AJ Piergiovanni, Weicheng Kuo, and Anelia Angelova. “Rethinking video vits: Sparse video tubes for joint image and video learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2023, pp. 2214–2224.
- [63] Haoqi Fan et al. “Multiscale vision transformers”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 2021, pp. 6824–6835.
- [64] Chaitanya Ryali et al. “Hiera: A Hierarchical Vision Transformer without the Bells-and-Whistles”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)* (2023).
- [65] Chao-Yuan Wu et al. “Memvit: Memory-augmented multiscale vision transformer for efficient long-term video recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 13587–13597.
- [66] Kunchang Li et al. “Uniformer: Unified transformer for efficient spatiotemporal representation learning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.04676* (2022).
- [67] Kunchang Li et al. “UniFormerV2: Spatiotemporal Learning by Arming Image ViTs with Video UniFormer”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09552* (2022).

- [68] Mandela Patrick et al. “Keeping your eye on the ball: Trajectory attention in video transformers”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021), pp. 12493–12506.
- [69] Fuchen Long et al. “Stand-alone inter-frame attention in video models”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 3192–3201.
- [70] Joanna Materzynska et al. “Something-else: Compositional action recognition with spatial-temporal interaction networks”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2020, pp. 1049–1059.
- [71] Yuan Tian et al. “Ean: event adaptive network for enhanced action recognition”. In: *International Journal of Computer Vision* 130.10 (2022), pp. 2453–2471.
- [72] Gueter Josmy Faure, Min-Hung Chen, and Shang-Hong Lai. “Holistic Interaction Transformer Network for Action Detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 2023, pp. 3340–3350.
- [73] Feng Cheng and Gedas Bertasius. “TallFormer: Temporal Action Localization with a Long-Memory Transformer”. In: *Computer Vision–ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XXXIV*. Springer. 2022, pp. 503–521.
- [74] Chen-Lin Zhang, Jianxin Wu, and Yin Li. “Actionformer: Localizing moments of actions with transformers”. In: *Computer Vision–ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part IV*. Springer. 2022, pp. 492–510.
- [75] Tuan N Tang, Kwonyoung Kim, and Kwanghoon Sohn. “TemporalMaxer: Maximize Temporal Context with only Max Pooling for Temporal Action Localization”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.09055* (2023).
- [76] Dingfeng Shi et al. “TriDet: Temporal Action Detection with Relative Boundary Modeling”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07347* (2023).
- [77] Jingyi Wang et al. “Cross-Modality Time-Variant Relation Learning for Generating Dynamic Scene Graphs”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08522* (2023).
- [78] Shengyu Feng et al. “Exploiting long-term dependencies for generating dynamic scene graphs”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 2023, pp. 5130–5139.
- [79] Kaifeng Gao et al. “Classification-then-grounding: Reformulating video scene graphs as temporal bipartite graphs”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 19497–19506.
- [80] Meng Wei et al. “In Defense of Clip-based Video Relation Detection”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08984* (2023).
- [81] Olga Russakovsky et al. “ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge”. In: *International Journal of Computer Vision* 115 (2014), pp. 211–252.
- [82] Tsung-Yi Lin et al. “Microsoft COCO: Common Objects in Context”. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision*. 2014.
- [83] Kaiming He et al. “Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2022, pp. 16000–16009.
- [84] Ting Chen et al. “A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations”. In: *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR. 2020, pp. 1597–1607.
- [85] Xinlei Chen and Kaiming He. “Exploring simple siamese representation learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2021, pp. 15750–15758.
- [86] David Berthelot et al. “Mixmatch: A holistic approach to semi-supervised learning”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).
- [87] Kihyuk Sohn et al. “Fixmatch: Simplifying semi-supervised learning with consistency and confidence”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), pp. 596–608.
- [88] Donggeun Yoo and In So Kweon. “Learning loss for active learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2019, pp. 93–102.
- [89] Ozan Sener and Silvio Savarese. “Active learning for convolutional neural networks: A core-set approach”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.00489* (2017).

- [90] Daochen Zha et al. “Data-centric ai: Perspectives and challenges”. In: *Proceedings of the 2023 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM)*. SIAM. 2023, pp. 945–948.
- [91] Klaus Greff et al. “Kubric: A scalable dataset generator”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 3749–3761.
- [92] Alexey Dosovitskiy et al. “FlowNet: Learning Optical Flow with Convolutional Networks”. In: *2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)* (2015), pp. 2758–2766.
- [93] Nikita Karaev et al. “CoTracker: It is Better to Track Together”. In: *arXiv:2307.07635* (2023).
- [94] Carl Doersch et al. “TAPIR: Tracking Any Point with per-frame Initialization and temporal Refinement”. In: *ICCV* (2023).
- [95] Alec Radford et al. “Learning Transferable Visual Models From Natural Language Supervision”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. 2021.
- [96] Peize Sun et al. “Dancetrack: Multi-object tracking in uniform appearance and diverse motion”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 20993–21002.
- [97] Jiaojiao Zhao et al. “Tuber: Tubelet transformer for video action detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 13598–13607.
- [98] Alexey Gritsenko et al. “End-to-End Spatio-Temporal Action Localisation with Video Transformers”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12160* (2023).
- [99] Jacob M Graving et al. “DeepPoseKit, a software toolkit for fast and robust animal pose estimation using deep learning”. In: *Elife* 8 (2019), e47994.
- [100] Simon RO Nilsson et al. “Simple Behavioral Analysis (SimBA)—an open source toolkit for computer classification of complex social behaviors in experimental animals”. In: *BioRxiv* (2020), pp. 2020–04.
- [101] Gabriella Csurka et al. “Visual categorization with bags of keypoints”. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision*. 2002.
- [102] Navneet Dalal and Bill Triggs. “Histograms of oriented gradients for human detection”. In: *2005 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR’05)* 1 (2005), 886–893 vol. 1.
- [103] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. “Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 25 (2012).
- [104] Rui Wang et al. “Masked video distillation: Rethinking masked feature modeling for self-supervised video representation learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2023, pp. 6312–6322.
- [105] Zhan Tong et al. “Videomae: Masked autoencoders are data-efficient learners for self-supervised video pre-training”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), pp. 10078–10093.
- [106] Limin Wang et al. “Videomae v2: Scaling video masked autoencoders with dual masking”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2023, pp. 14549–14560.
- [107] Yi Wang et al. “InternVideo: General Video Foundation Models via Generative and Discriminative Learning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.03191* (2022).
- [108] Ismail Elezi et al. “Not all labels are equal: Rationalizing the labeling costs for training object detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 14492–14501.
- [109] Kaiming He et al. “Mask r-cnn”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 2017, pp. 2961–2969.
- [110] Amir R Zamir et al. “Taskonomy: Disentangling task transfer learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2018, pp. 3712–3722.
- [111] Rishi Bommasani et al. “On the opportunities and risks of foundation models”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258* (2021).
- [112] Zhengyuan Yang et al. “The dawn of llms: Preliminary explorations with gpt-4v (ision)”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17421* 9.1 (2023).

- [113] Geoffrey E. Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeffrey Dean. “Distilling the Knowledge in a Neural Network”.
In: *ArXiv* abs/1503.02531 (2015).




Figure 6: Before fine-tuning for a specific task, often neural networks are initialized using ImageNet classification weights.

A Foundations

A.1 Neural Networks

Neural networks are machine learning models whose parameters (weights) can be efficiently learned from data using the backpropagation algorithm [1]. Deep neural networks are composed of multiple layers, i.e. blocks of the conceptually same but differently parameterized operation. For instance, a fully-connected layer transforms an input vector by matrix multiplication. The transformed vector can then be used as input to another fully-connected layer.

A.2 Backbones

In modern neural-network-based computer vision, it is common to use a backbone model to obtain general image features, which can be applied to several tasks. Backbones incorporate best practices for the design of the neural network architecture such that this does not have to be reinvented for every task. Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) such as ResNets [2] are commonly used as backbones for image tasks. The idea here is to apply the same set of learnable filters at a grid of locations of an image in each layer. Since the same operation is repeated at different locations and the number of parameters is independent of the image size, CNNs are parameter-efficient models that can learn from small datasets. The feature pyramid network [3] is a CNN that can deal with image content at different size scales. Driven by the success in language modeling, transformer models were recently successfully applied on images [4]. The input image is divided into a grid of patches (commonly of size 8 to 16 pixels). Each patch is mapped to a token using a linear projection and encoded using a positional embedding. Then, a transformer encoder [5] is used to process the image. To extract a single feature vector for whole-image classification, a CLS token can be added to the input (in addition to the patches) or all tokens can be pooled.

The choice of backbone strongly influences training and inference time, as the number of parameters and compute operations can vary substantially. Backbones with a large number of parameters tend to achieve better performance across downstream tasks but require more time to train and to make predictions at test time. Such backbones might also not fit onto embedded devices to be used in the field (e. g. a Raspberry Pi 4) or might not permit higher frame rates to study motion in real-time.

A.3 Pre-training and Transfer Learning

Pre-training (Fig. 6) describes the process of training a model on an external, often large, dataset, which allows the model to learn generic image or video features that represent the visual content of the input. During transfer learning, this pre-trained model is fine-tuned on a, typically smaller, dataset that is available for the task of interest. For example, an object detection model that has been trained on a large dataset that consists of humans can be used for fine-tuning on a smaller object detection dataset that consists of primates. We provide more detail on transfer learning and different pre-training techniques in Appendix C.1.

A.4 Task Heads

Starting from a pre-trained backbone, the desired task can be trained as a task head on top of it. For example, if our target task is individual identification, we can add an “identification” head to the backbone. Multiple task

heads may be added to the same backbone (e.g. identification, localisation, action classification). Since we expect the backbone to have learned good features before, the target task does not need a very large number of parameters. If the downstream dataset is small and the pre-trained backbone has many learnable parameters, fine-tuning the entire model can lead to overfitting. This means that the model performs well on the training set, but loses its ability to generalize to unseen data. Therefore, it can be helpful to freeze most layers and only train a small part of the model, such as the task heads.

B Methods for Primate Behavior Analysis

B.1 Animal detection

The goal of detection is to take an image and predict a set of bounding boxes that indicate the locations of animals in the image. Often the bounding box locations are accompanied by object class predictions and confidence scores.

Anchor-based One approach for object detection is to define a large set of candidate regions, called anchors, a priori and allow the model to determine which of these candidate regions matches an object. This means the task of determining the presence of an object is reduced to predicting a confidence score that indicates if each candidate region contains an object or not. However, since the number of all possible object regions is very high, it is computationally infeasible to make a prediction for all of them. Many anchor-based detection methods solve this problem using a sliding-window approach [6, 7, 8]: They pre-define a small number of anchor-boxes (usually not more than 10) by their width and height to cover objects of different scales. Then, the image is divided into a grid and for each grid location and anchor box, it is evaluated whether there is a matching object or not. For computational efficiency, the grid does not cover every pixel. To compensate for the inaccuracies introduced by considering only a fixed set of anchor boxes and grid locations, an offset is predicted in addition to the confidence score to refine the location as well as the width and height of the detected objects. To obtain a set of problem-specific anchor-box widths and heights, their distribution in the training dataset can be used, e. g. a pedestrian dataset will result in primarily elongated anchors. A disadvantage of anchor-based approaches is that the model’s performance might decline if the bounding boxes in the target dataset look different from the training distribution. Notable examples of single- and two-stage methods employing anchors are the R-CNN [6, 9] and YOLO family [10, 8].

Heatmap-based Heatmap-based detection is an object detection paradigm that does not require anchor boxes. Here, a heatmap (a one-channel feature map) is generated over the entire image indicating the predicted locations of the corners or center of each object. The predicted values of this heatmap should be high at specified object locations, such as the object center or object corners, and zero everywhere else.

In CornerNet [11], top-left and bottom-right pairs of keypoints indicating bounding box locations are predicted as two sets of heatmaps (one per category, such as monkey or human, to enable multi-class detection). To resolve the ambiguous correspondence between pairs of keypoints when multiple objects of the same class are present, an additional pixel-wise embedding is trained to be similar at locations of corresponding points. CenterNet (by Duan et al. [12]) extends this approach by predicting the center point of the object in addition to the two corner keypoints.

Another method also called CenterNet (by Zhou et al. [13]) predicts the centerpoint of each object as a heatmap (one per category) and generates bounding box width and height in a different prediction head. The center heatmap indicates at which position the width and height information should be read out. The Fully-Convolutional One-Stage Object Detector (FCOS [14]) employs a similar approach to the heatmap-based approaches but uses all pixels that pertain to an object to estimate the location and size of its bounding box instead of just considering the center or corners.

Detection transformer: DETR The output of many of the previous detection methods cannot be directly used but needs to be further processed to avoid predicting the same bounding box multiple times at nearby locations. This heuristic filtering of redundant bounding boxes is a non-differentiable operation and, depending on where in the framework it is employed, it might prevent the network from being trainable in an end-to-end manner [6]. This complicates the training procedure and can have a negative impact on overall detection performance [15]. The detection transformer (DETR) [16] introduces the concept of object queries, which can be used

to make unique object predictions without the need for heuristic filtering or other hand-crafted components, such as anchors. Each object query is a predefined or learned numerical vector. At its core, DETR relies on a transformer that decodes these object queries into bounding boxes using image features (specifically, a high-level feature map) from a CNN backbone. Since information exchange between object queries is possible through self-attention, duplicate matches to ground truth objects can be prevented by penalizing them in the training objective.

In practice, DETR has slow convergence (i.e. requires many training iterations) and high computational demands due to the quadratic complexity of the transformer. Subsequent works aimed to tackle these issues [17, 18, 19]. For example, in Deformable-DETR [17] each object query learns to attend to a small number of locations that are relevant for object detection, which reduces computational complexity and leads to faster convergence. Various improvements of DETR have been combined, resulting in the DINO detector¹ [20], which is currently the state of the art in object detection.

Practical Detector Training Considerations Besides the model’s architecture, i.e. backbone and detection method, the training algorithm, training data and loss function are crucial factors for detection performance. Over the years, multiple techniques have been developed. For example, one common problem of object detection datasets is class imbalance, i.e., some object classes occur much more frequently than others. This imbalance incentivizes a model to improve on frequent rather than rare classes during training. Focal loss [21] adds a factor to each class term in the loss function, such that classes that are not yet classified that well receive more weight. Augmentations, i.e. random modifications to the images and labels, increase the variability of the training data and have emerged as a crucial component in object detection. Classic augmentations include random cropping and change of contrast. More recently, mosaic augmentation and mixup proved successful in the context of object detection [22]. Another recent advancement is SiMoTA [22], an algorithm that seeks to optimize which predictions are considered positive and negative during training. Using this advanced label assignment strategy has a positive impact on both training time and model performance.

Datasets and Benchmarks The standard benchmark for evaluating an object detection model is the Common Objects in Context (COCO) dataset [23]. Since virtually all published detection methods provide metrics for their performance on COCO, it is a useful benchmark to help researchers select the right model in terms of accuracy and computational efficiency. However, model performance on COCO might not be directly comparable to performance on tasks involving the detection and individual identification of animals, as COCO contains a diverse set of 80 classes, and is more suited for broader classification problems (e.g. classifying an object as a dog or a bicycle, rather than distinguishing between similarly looking individuals of the same class, as required for primate detection tasks). Further popular object detection benchmarks are Object365 [24] and LVIS [25].

Published, annotated datasets of images of primates are available, although these are much smaller than the more commonly used datasets, such as COCO, and are often focused on keypoints. The MacaquePose dataset [26] consists of over 13,000 images of (several species of) macaques with labeled keypoints and masks. Masks can be converted to bounding boxes based on their maximum extension. OpenApePose [27] offers over 70,000 images of six ape species with annotated poses. The AP-10K [28] and APT-36K [29] datasets contain keypoint annotations for several primate species, as well as species from other orders. The Objects365 [24] and LVIS [25] datasets include “monkey” as an object class, although in both cases, this class includes a wide variety of taxonomic groups, for example platyrrhini, catarrhini (both cercopithecoids and non-human apes), and prosimians, as well as artificial objects, such as toys, that resemble primates.

B.2 Multi-animal tracking

Tracking-by-detection Most work in the tracking-by-detection paradigm is based on the seminal SORT model [30]. In this model, detections of each frame are collected independently of each other using Faster R-CNN [6]. The spatial shift between detections of successive frames is then used to extract motion features. Next, the Kalman filter algorithm [31] is applied which uses these motion features and the previous location of an object to determine the predicted bounding box on the next frame. The overlap between the predicted and detected bounding boxes is used to compute the affinity cost for all possible pairings. Finally, the model associates the detections across frames by minimizing the affinity cost using Hungarian matching [32]. This association process is continued for each frame of the video to obtain tracks.

¹this should not be confused with self-supervised learning method DINO

Within the SORT framework, a number of models have emerged, each tweaking different components of the model to achieve superior results. Most models now implement more powerful backbones, such as Darknet [33, 34], to facilitate superior feature extraction. To improve association, models often incorporate appearance characteristics of detections [33, 34, 35]. Kalman filters have also seen improvements [34, 36, 35], and adaptive thresholds for pairing detections have been established [33, 37]. Some models account for camera motion [37] and have made modifications to the overlap computation for two bounding boxes [38, 39]. In other works, affinity costs are computed indirectly by a graph neural network based on all detections over multiple consecutive frames [40, 41].

Tracking-by-query Apart from the classical tracking-by-detection framework, there are also methods with information exchange between the detection and association phase. This information exchange has been facilitated by the advent of transformer structures in computer vision. Specifically with the introduction of DETR [16] in object detection, the number of models implementing this tracking approach has seen a significant increase [42, 43, 44, 45]. When using the DETR architecture (see Section 2.1) for tracking, the resulting embeddings from the transformer decoder are not only mapped onto bounding boxes or masks. Rather, they are also reused as additional track queries, which guide the detection and association process in the following frame. This way, motion and appearance information from previous frames is taken into account for both detection and association. Significant progress in this area has been made with MOTRv2 [46], which uses external detections from the YOLOX detection model [22], that are associated and potentially refined using track queries. Additionally, an improved variant of DETR [19] contributes to enhanced processing. Most recent works even eliminated the need for an external object detector in this architecture by employing a specialized training strategy that reconciles the detection and association objective [47, 48].

Datasets and Benchmarks Since most tracking projects are interested in tracking humans, they are typically evaluated on human multi-object tracking benchmarks, such as MOT17 [49], a dataset of annotated videos of pedestrians walking through the streets, or DanceTrack [50], which contains annotated videos that show dancers and, therefore, humans engaged in more complex, non-linear motion patterns than in MOT17. Furthermore, the dancers in a video tend to be similarly clothed, which makes the tracking task even harder. Models performing well on DanceTrack may be good candidates for animal tracking tasks because in this domain we also expect similar appearances and highly non-linear motion patterns. Recently, the first dataset solely devoted to tracking groups of animals was introduced (AnimalTrack, [51]). However, primate videos are not included in this dataset.

B.3 Individual identification

Unlike core computer vision tasks like detection and tracking, there are fewer animal identification benchmarks and methods. Training a classification or metric-based model for individual identification requires annotated images or videos of animals alone or in a group. Annotation involves the localization of an animal in a frame, e.g. by drawing a bounding box, and then assigning an identity to it. Previous studies have demonstrated promising identification results with annotated training sets containing merely tens to hundreds of examples [52, 53, 54], while other works have used thousands of training examples per individual [55, 56]. The exact number of required annotated examples depends on the complexity of the task and the desired model accuracy. When applying identification models to unseen data, it can be challenging to recognize individuals in single frames, due to occlusion or non-standard poses. Therefore, researchers often utilize camera traps which produce bursts of several images taken in quick succession when they detect motion [57]. When several images from a sequence are available, the model predictions can be aggregated, which can lead to improved performance compared to when model predictions are based on single images [58]. This aggregation technique can be combined with multi-object tracking methods, so that the model only has to be very certain on a few frames to propagate the identification result to all other frames of the video.

Datasets and Benchmarks Most scientists interested in identification tasks work with their own datasets, as their use cases tend to differ strongly with respect to animal species, research question, camera type, backgrounds of the recordings and lighting. Primate-related benchmarks include a face-based identification dataset of lemurs [52] and a dataset containing, among other animals, chimpanzees and gorillas with tracking and identification labels [59], the recently released ChimpACT [60] contains longitudinal data of a group of chimpanzees in a zoo. Additionally, benchmarks on person and other species re-identification can inspire methods for non-human primate applications [61, 62, 63].

B.4 Action understanding

Action recognition Action recognition models classify what action a video sequence contains. Early action recognition methods primarily rely on 3D-convolutions on RGB inputs [64, 65, 66]. For example, SlowFast [66] convolves over low and high frame rate input to capture high-level semantics and fine motions. The main drawback of convolutional networks is their limited receptive field which is of particular disadvantage in video-understanding tasks that often require long-range temporal reasoning. Therefore, there has been a shift towards transformer networks which benefit from stronger temporal modeling capabilities. The pioneering works in this area [67, 68] closely follow the design of Vision Transformer [4]. To tackle the additional computational cost imposed by the time dimension, the authors proposed several methods to minimize the memory load, such as tube embedding, frame subsampling and various attention factorizations. Subsequent efforts extended these transformer models by including feature pyramids [69, 70, 71], by enhancing their long-term modeling capabilities [72] or by improving efficiency [73, 74]. Some works also combined the merits of convolution and transformer models by modeling local and global features in shallow and deep layers respectively [75, 76].

Another line of research approaches action recognition by modeling motion-related features. Early works incorporated optical flow features in convolutional architectures [77, 78, 79] while more recently there have been attempts to design neural network modules to compute motion features [80, 81]. Furthermore, there are also methods which use motion information to guide feature extraction [82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89]. For example, efforts have been made to aggregate features along motion trajectories [82, 83, 84], which accounts for the fact that the same object may appear in different locations in different frames across time due to the movement of the object. Another strand of literature models interactions between objects [90, 91, 92, 93]. For example, the action “feeding from bowl” can benefit from explicitly modeling the interaction between the feeding individual and the bowl. While early approaches rely on external object detectors [90, 92], more recent frameworks leverage attention to model interactions implicitly [93]. Although the modeling of motion and action-related features provides suitable inductive biases for action recognition, performance often falls short compared to the more generic transformer-based video backbones. This is especially true if these backbones are pre-trained with state-of-the-art self-supervised methods [94, 95]. Nevertheless, the exploration of inductive biases for video-understanding tasks remains an important research topic since they can be helpful in ensuring a decent model performance in the face of limited training data. In contrast, generic video backbones usually require huge amounts of labeled data when being trained from scratch.

Just as for animal localization methods, benchmarks for action recognition typically focus on datasets of videos of humans [96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102]. These benchmarks consist of short videos (a couple of seconds) that are labeled with one or more action labels. However, recently an animal action recognition benchmark has been published that contains video-level action labels for a diverse set of animal species [103]. The dataset does not include primate videos.

Temporal action detection Temporal action detection methods assign action labels to temporal intervals in a video. They can be divided into single- and two-stage methods, analogous to detection methods. Two-stage methods first generate temporal proposals which are subsequently classified and potentially refined. Single-stage methods directly produce predictions without the in-between proposal generation step.

Early proposal generation methods are based on anchors, i.e. multiscale temporal intervals centered at various temporal locations [104, 105]. For example, [104] obtain proposals by classifying anchors as containing or not containing an action based on the features associated to the anchor. Since anchors might be too restrictive to capture the large temporal variety in ground truth action instances, subsequent works developed anchor-free proposal generation methods. In their pioneering work, [106] predict starting, ending and action probabilities at individual temporal locations and arrive at proposals by grouping according to these scores. Empirically, grouping based on low-level predictions can be unreliable, for example due to scene switches. This issue can be counteracted by enhancing the temporal context modeling capabilities or employing regularization techniques, which has been pursued in subsequent works [107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112]. For example, [111] employ a graph-convolutional network and a transformer to model local and global relationships between video snippets, respectively. [112] regularize proposals by enforcing consistency between and within starting, actionness and ending phases. Methods that take proposals as input either operate directly on proposal-level features [113] or further enhance them by proposal-context modeling [114, 115, 116] to produce the final predictions.

Early single-stage methods were also based on anchors [117, 118]. For example, the first work to propose single-stage processing [117] directly regressed action boundaries and class confidence from anchors similar to SSD for object detection [7]. More recently, anchor-free methods have demonstrated superior performance [119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126]. In this line of research, attention-based methods that operate on

snippet-level features computed by pre-trained 3D-convolutional networks are a popular approach. For example, ActionFormer [124] successively employs transformer and subsampling blocks to snippet-level features to create a feature pyramid, which facilitates the detection of actions at different temporal scales. The resulting tokens are used to regress the relative offset to the action boundaries and class confidences. Recently, transformers have been criticized for their inability to attend to crucial frames among frames with similar appearance [125]. More recent approaches have therefore replaced attention with simpler temporal context modeling techniques while achieving state-of-the-art results [125, 126]. For example, TemporalMaxer [125] follows the same design as ActionFormer but replaces the transformer layers with simple max-pooling operations. Remarkably, these approaches even achieve state-of-the-art performance in dense prediction tasks where there are multiple overlapping actions, outperforming methods specifically developed for these tasks [127, 128, 129, 130, 131].

There are various benchmarks for regular [132, 133] and dense [134, 135, 96, 97] temporal action detection. As usual, the actors involved are typically humans and we are not aware of any animal-related benchmarks.

Spatio-temporal action detection Existing spatio-temporal action detection methods can be divided into two categories. First, there are track-based methods that identify tracks of actors in a video and assign action labels to sub-tracks. Second, there are frame-based methods that leverage spatio-temporal information to assign one or more actions to detections in individual video frames.

Early methods for track-based spatio-temporal action detection usually employed 2D-convolutions on frame-level RGB inputs and optical flow features to obtain action localizations, which are then linked via tracking algorithms [136, 137, 138]. Subsequent works improved upon this approach by leveraging temporal information [139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144]. This is done by directly predicting action tracks on short video segments and subsequently linking them based on overlap to obtain video-level action tracks. For example, this paradigm was adopted by STAR [144], which uses a set of spatio-temporal queries to decode action tracks from segment-level video features. Notably, the method can be supervised with action tracks sparsely annotated on individual keyframes, which are easier to obtain than exhaustive annotations. Another recent work [145] represents detections in individual frames by their appearance and estimated 3D pose features. All detections in a video segment are then input to a standard transformer architecture to predict framewise action classes which are linked with a 3D tracking algorithm.

In contrast to track-based methods, frame-based spatio-temporal action detection aims to detect actions on individual keyframes. A separate tracking algorithm is needed to link these detections into action tracks. The standard frame-based approach [146] can be divided into three steps. First, a pre-trained object detector like faster R-CNN [147] is used to obtain bounding boxes of actors in a frame. Then, each bounding box is symmetrically extended along the temporal dimension to obtain a 3D region of interest, which is used for feature extraction from a video backbone. Lastly, the extracted features are used for multi-class action classification. This procedure has been employed in combination with various video backbones [66, 148, 4, 70, 72] and self-supervised pre-training [94, 95].

However, there have also been efforts to develop more sophisticated modeling frameworks for frame-based spatio-temporal action detection. Early approaches focused on modeling actor-context [149, 150] or long-term temporal [151] relations. To illustrate why it is useful to model these two types of relations, consider an individual that is feeding. In this case, contextual cues, such as the proximity of a feeding bowl, or temporal information, such as the individual taking the food a couple of seconds before, are indicative of the performed action. Subsequent research acknowledged that both context and temporal relations must be modeled simultaneously to make further progress [152, 153]. For example, [153] construct a spatio-temporal graph with actor and context detections from successive video snippets and employ attention-based message passing. The enriched actor-features are then used for action-classification. Other works include more intricate relationships in their models, while employing a memory module for temporal reasoning. For example, ACAR-Net [154] includes higher-order interactions between actors and contextual objects and HIT [155] uses both RGB and pose features to model hand, object and person interactions. Notably, all of these more sophisticated modeling attempts perform worse than the standard three-step frame-based approach with transformer-based backbones and self-supervised pre-training.

Benchmarks for track-based spatio-temporal action detection, include the J-HMDB-21 [156], UCF101-24 [99], MultiSports [157] and AVA datasets [146, 158]. However, the AVA dataset only contains sparsely annotated action tracks at one frame per second and, therefore, has been primarily used for the evaluation of frame-based approaches. We are not aware of any animal related benchmarks.

Dynamic scene graph generation Methods for dynamic scene graph generation (DSGG) localize animals and objects and predict relationship triplets of the form entity–relation–entity, where entities can be animals or objects. There are two paradigms for DSGG: In track-based methods, entities are tracked over time and relations are predicted for sub-tracks of two entities. In frame-based methods, relations are only predicted for individual frames of a video. It should be noted that there is also an extensive literature on interaction detection and scene graph generation methods for still images, however, since most relations and actions can be more easily identified when temporal information is available, we focus on video-based methods in this work and refer to recent survey papers for an overview of image-based approaches [159, 160].

Irrespective of the paradigm, all DSGG methods roughly follow the same procedure: First, features are extracted for entities and relations. The entity features are usually obtained from image- or video-backbones, while relations are often represented by the class labels, union features (i.e. features of both involved entities) and relative motion of subjects and objects. In a second step, the extracted features are further processed using some form of spatio-temporal reasoning. Finally, the features are used to separately predict the entity and relation classes. A joint prediction of the relationship-triplet is avoided because the number of possible classes would be intractable.

Early track-based methods divide the input video into short, overlapping segments and generate scene graphs for each segment separately [161, 162, 163]. Video-level scene graphs are then obtained by merging segment-level relationship-triplets if the corresponding tracks have a sufficient overlap and the predicted relation is the same. Many subsequent works generally maintained this paradigm, while trying to improve on individual aspects [164, 165, 166, 167]. For example, [165] realized that the proposed merging algorithm is not robust to segment-level errors. Therefore, they proposed to preserve multiple relationship-triplet hypotheses at each merging step and discard unlikely ones when sufficient information is available. However, the problem remains that scene graphs are generated separately for each segment without using the information from other segments, which prevents the learning of inter-segment dependencies. For example, there is often a natural sequence of relations (e. g. person–take–cup followed by person–look at–cup). This problem has been addressed by [168] who used two separate graph-convolution-based modules for segment-level inter-entity modeling and video-level inter-relation modeling to achieve state-of-the-art results for track-based DSGG. In addition to this work, there have also been efforts to discard the segment-level paradigm altogether [169, 170, 171, 172]. For example, [172] perform tracking on the complete input video and obtain sub-tracks using a sliding window approach with multiple kernel sizes. Then, a pair proposal module is used to identify pairs of sub-tracks that relate to each other. In the last step, the entity and relation classes of the identified pairs are predicted. Although methods that operate on complete videos facilitate global processing, they have problems of their own. For example, the creation of long tracks is prone to errors, which can have a negative impact on DSGG performance. In addition, the features of long tracks must be heavily compressed to be processable, resulting in a loss of information.

Frame-based methods are dominated by transformer models. In early approaches, the dependency between all relation or entity features of neighboring frames is modeled [173, 153, 174]. For example, [174] use two separate but identical transformer architectures for intra- and inter-frame relation-modeling. Although this approach is refreshingly simple, it suffers from memory issues since the temporal reasoning is done in a fully-connected way. Methods along this line are therefore restricted to operating on a small number of frames. In contrast, more recent methods rely on some form of tracking to perform temporal modeling for each subject-object pair separately [175, 176, 177], thus allowing for the consideration of a broader temporal context.

Benchmarks for track-based DSGG include the VidVRD [163] and the VidOR [178] datasets, while for frame-based DSGG there is the Action Genome dataset [179]. All of these benchmark datasets consist of videos containing various human-centered relations. These relations include actions, but also spatial arrangements. We are not aware of any animal related benchmarks.

C Methods for effort-efficient learning

C.1 Transfer Learning

Transfer learning involves leveraging knowledge gained from one task to improve learning and performance on a related, but different, task. By reusing previously acquired features or models, transfer learning addresses data scarcity and accelerates model training. This approach is particularly valuable in scenarios where labeled data for the target task is limited or expensive to obtain.

Traditionally, models were pre-trained through supervised learning on source tasks with labeled data [180, 181, 182, 183], transferring knowledge to target tasks with limited labeled data. In the realm of computer

vision, a prevalent transfer learning approach involves pre-training on an extensive and diverse dataset such as ImageNet [184], MS-COCO [23], or Open Images Dataset [185], followed by fine-tuning on a narrower target dataset. However, recent advancements have introduced the use of unlabeled data as a pivotal paradigm for pre-training in transfer learning [186, 187, 188, 189]. These methods allow models to be pre-trained on large amounts of unlabeled data by predicting or reconstructing certain data aspects, eliminating the need for explicit labels. A more elaborate discussion of these self-supervised learning methods is presented in Appendix C.2.

Modern successors of transfer learning have reached zero-shot transfer capabilities, which means that no examples are required to fine-tune the model to the target task. Instead, the diversely-pretrained foundation model is able to adapt to a target task directly. Language-vision models like CLIP [182], EVA [190], Florence [191] and Flamingo [192] are big models which are trained on large-scale datasets, usually involving text and associated images obtained from the internet. These models have a good general understanding of many object classes and often achieve a zero-shot performance that is on par or better than smaller models trained specifically for this task. An advantage of these models is their strong ability to use information encoded in natural language, so that complex questions about an image or video could be formulated as a text, lowering the technical requirements on the user side for working with such a system.

C.2 Self-supervised learning

The objective of self-supervised learning is to derive labels directly from the data, enabling the model to learn meaningful representations from large, unlabeled datasets. These representations serve as valuable resources for training general-purpose models that can be applied to a wide range of downstream tasks. Therefore, self-supervised learning techniques produce models which can be used as foundations for transfer learning. In the following paragraphs, we delve into several state-of-the-art approaches in self-supervised learning, which can be broadly classified into three categories: pretext task learning, joint embedding architectures, and generative approaches.

Pretext task learning trains models on tasks like predicting image patch positions [193] or image rotations [194] to learn data features without labels. These tasks promote understanding of object features and spatial relationships but pose challenges in task design and potential over-specialization that may impair future performance on tasks such as classification or regression.

In *joint embedding architectures*, representations are learned by minimizing the deviation between similar samples and maximizing the deviation between dissimilar samples provided as training data. Typically, a contrastive loss is optimized between augmented pairs of similar and dissimilar samples. The SimCLR [186] framework is a popular contrastive learning framework that led to the development of many succeeding contrastive learning approaches based on a similar idea. The main idea of the framework is to maximize similarity between different versions of similar samples (created through augmentation techniques like cropping and rotating), while minimizing the similarity between the dissimilar sample pairs. However, this contrastive self-supervised learning method requires a large number of dissimilar examples for training to prevent collapse of the representation into trivial solutions, where all inputs map to the same output, and it requires substantial batch sizes for optimal performance. Recent studies, including SimSiam [187], BYOL [195], Barlow Twins [188] and DINO [196] have made significant advancements in the field of self-supervised learning by eliminating the need for dissimilar or negative samples. These methods employ various techniques, such as momentum encoder and cross-batch memory banks, to learn representations without explicitly utilizing negative pairs. VicReg [197] addresses the issue of collapsing by introducing a regularization term that focuses on the variance of the embeddings. Notably, these techniques have exhibited competitive performance when compared to SimCLR across diverse benchmark datasets.

A noteworthy *generative method*, known as Masked Autoencoders (MAE) [198], has shown immense promise in the realm of self-supervised learning. The fundamental concept underlying MAE involves masking random patches within an input image and subsequently reconstructing the missing pixels. Building upon the success of this approach in image-based downstream tasks, researchers have extended this idea to video-based pre-training [95, 199]. A combination of masked image modeling and contrastive learning is found in iBOT [200] and CMAE [201].

C.3 Weakly supervised learning

Perfect annotations are beneficial for model training, but not always available. In general, imperfections can have several origins, for example, bad annotation quality, partly wrong annotations, or labels that were produced for a similar but not exactly the desired task among others. The goal of weakly supervised learning is to find

an effective way to extract information from such imperfect data to solve the desired task. Weakly supervised learning has been used in a wide array of computer vision tasks, including object localization [202], image classification [203], pose estimation [204], action localization [205] and scene understanding [206].

Given the extensive annotation effort necessary in the context individualized behavioral analysis, the most important application of weakly supervised learning involves the use of coarse-grained labels for a target task with a finer granularity. For example, the goal might be to train a model for object localization using only information about how many individuals are present in an image. Current methods used for coarse-to-fine-grained weakly supervised learning are mostly based on one of two paradigms: Multiple Instance Learning (MIL) and Class Activation Maps (CAM).

In *MIL-based* approaches [207, 208] several images (or frames of a video) $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ are combined into bags. Labels must only be provided at the bag level, i.e. when any of the images contain the labeled object, the complete respective bag receives this label. For example, the label “dog” would be given to the bag if the bag contains at least one image with a dog. The models have to find out which subset of images and which image regions are responsible for predicting the given label by comparing positive to negative bags. *CAM-based* approaches [209, 210, 211] use image-level labels to train a CNN. Afterwards, the last convolutional layers can be used to see which areas of the image are most responsible for the correct prediction and can be used to locate the object of interest. There are additional ideas that help to improve performance further. For example, some models add additional steps to prevent the model from only detecting the most discriminative region [212, 207]. Instead of creating the class activation maps from the last feature map, other methods get improved results from adding features from earlier layers [213].

C.4 Semi-supervised learning

Semi-supervised learning involves using both labeled and unlabeled data to train a model. This is useful in scenarios where labeled data is scarce or expensive to obtain, but unlabeled data is readily available. The labeled data are used to train a model to recognize a relationship between the model inputs (e.g. images of a monkey) and labels (e.g. action displayed on an image), while the larger set of unlabeled data (e.g. further images showing actions) is used to generalize the learned features. Compared to only using labeled data, a more powerful and robust model can be obtained. A comprehensive review of semi-supervised learning techniques is provided by Yang et al. [214]. Trivially, semi-supervised learning can be implemented by using self-supervised methods like contrastive learning (see Appendix C.2) followed by supervised fine-tuning. Further semi-supervised approaches that we consider especially relevant for the use of computer vision in the field of primate video analyses can be categorized as pseudo labeling and consistency-based.

Pseudo labeling follows the basic idea that, at first, only the labeled data are used to train a model (the “teacher” model). After applying the model to the unlabeled data, the most confident predictions are used as pseudo labels, and a new model (the “student” model) is trained with the labeled data and the part of the unlabeled data for which confident pseudo labels were created [215]. For example, Chen et al. [216] integrates this student-teacher approach in a three-step pipeline to make optimal use of the available unlabeled data. The steps are (1) self-supervised pre-training using unlabeled data, (2) fine-tuning with the labeled data and (3) using pseudo labels generated by the fine-tuned model to train a more robust student model. *Consistency-based* methods aim to make a model invariant to input perturbations that do not change the semantic content. For example, Rasmus et al. [217] combined a supervised training objective with a reconstruction task where noise is added in various layers of the neural network to obtain a more robust model.

Many popular semi-supervised methods are hybrid. These methods typically generate pseudo labels by feeding the original (e.g. Mean Teacher [218]) or weakly augmented (e.g. MixMatch [219] and FixMatch[220]) images to a teacher model. During training of the student model, consistency is enforced by adding (stronger) data augmentations to the input. FlexMatch [221] further develops FixMatch by adding curriculum pseudo labeling. Instead of defining a fixed confidence threshold for which pseudo labels should be taken into account during training, the threshold is determined adaptively based on the current learning status of the model. In recent years, pseudo labeling and consistency based methods have improved substantially in several computer vision tasks by using Vision Transformers [4] as student and teacher models [222, 223].

Other semi-supervised approaches use generative models, either with Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) [224] or Variational Autoencoders [225, 226]. The basic idea is to use the generative power of the model to create additional data samples which can help to improve the model performance. The unlabeled data are used to help the generator to create samples that are similar to real data points.

C.5 Active learning

In situations where researchers have large amounts of unlabeled data and a limited labeling budget, active learning can help the researcher to choose, in an automated fashion, which samples should be annotated and added to the training set to optimally improve the model. The basic idea behind active learning is to strategically choose data points that are likely to provide the most valuable information for improving the model’s accuracy or reducing its uncertainty. Often, active learning happens in an iterative manner, where model training and new sample selection alternate. However, it already shows benefits during the first iteration, as well-selected samples for labeling can yield substantial improvement over random samples [227]. Several active learning strategies have been proposed and reviewed for classification [227], and object detection [228, 229]. However, recently, first applications in other computer vision fields have emerged, such as active learning for tracking [230], action recognition [231] and scene graph generation [232]. Here, we structure currently existing methods into three main branches: classical query-by-committee-based, uncertainty-based, diversity-based.

A classical approach is *query-by-committee* [233, 234, 235], which involves maintaining a committee of several models and selecting unlabeled data points that have high disagreement among the models. *Uncertainty-based* strategies use a single model and rely on the idea that samples on which the model performs poorly should be labeled and added to the pool of training data. In classification tasks, this can be based on the overall entropy of the predicted labels or the difference between the two most confident predicted labels. One of the currently best performing uncertainty-based methods is Loss Prediction Loss (LPL) [236] which involves attaching a small parametric module, called the “loss prediction module” to the target network. It learns to predict target losses of unlabeled inputs and helps to identify data points that are likely to result in incorrect predictions by the target model. *Diversity-based* (or representation-based) strategies follow the idea that, by having representative samples from the whole dataset in the pool of labeled data, one has the best chance to have a well-performing model on unseen data. They are often based on clustering techniques, such as KMeans [237]. CoreSet [238] finds data samples in a manner that the selected subset of samples is representative for the remaining dataset. Different strategies are recommended depending on the size of the labeling budget [239]. Hybrid methods combine the previous ideas in various ways. For example, many hybrid methods are based on two-step optimization, where the uncertainty- and diversity-based criteria are taken into account and optimized in an alternating manner [240, 241].

C.6 Human-machine collaborative annotations

Finally, labeling effort can be reduced by selecting the most appropriate tools for annotation. More and more annotation tools include existing deep learning models into their annotation workflows to accelerate the process and reduce manual human labor. In contrast to active learning, where a model recommends which data samples would be most beneficial for labeling, or semi-supervised learning, where pseudo labels are suggested, here we present some ideas on how annotation tools themselves can support human annotators by incorporating models in an interactive manner.

Effort-efficiency in this context can be achieved through smart strategies such as having the annotation tool provide initial annotation guesses (e. g. through model outputs [242]), heuristics [243], gamification [244] of user input [245] or linearly interpolating between two annotated frames in a video [246]. Effective and user-friendly design of annotation tools can already contribute to improvements. One promising method is Segment Anything (SAM) [247], which automatically, or with minimal user input such as clicking on an object in an image, generates segmentation masks of objects and has shown good results on a broad range of images and object classes, significantly reducing manual annotation efforts. The labeling software CVAT [246] includes the option to segment objects with SAM, dramatically reducing labeling time for instance masks compared to traditional methods, as animal outlines can be obtained by a single click rather than manual delineation.

D GPT4-V Image Descriptions

We conducted a small study (Fig. 7) to assess the current capabilities of GPT4-V, arguably the strongest multi-modal large language available, for images taken in the field. While some parts of the descriptions are remarkably good, there are often mistakes in details or in the number of animals present. Hence we conclude that, at the current state, such models are insufficient as a standalone tool for primate behavior analysis.

"Describe the following image."



Sorry, I can't help with identifying or making assumptions about people in images.

"Describe the following image. Focus on the animals, their state, actions and interactions as well as objects in the scene. Generate a structured output by listing all animals and objects. For action and interaction, provide of tuples (<obj1>, <obj2>, <interaction>) or (<obj1>, <action>)."

Animals:
 - Baboon 1: Visible on the left side of the image, partially obscured by foliage.
 - Baboon 2: Visible towards the center/right of the image in the background, also partially obscured by foliage.

Objects:
 - Trees: Several trees of various sizes are spread throughout the image.
 - Foliage: There is undergrowth and multiple bushes in the scene.
 - Ground: The ground is mostly sandy with fallen leaves and patches of grass.

Actions and Interactions:
 - (Baboon 1, Baboon 2, Interaction): Both baboons appear to be engaged in an activity or moving around, potentially interacting with each other or the environment, but specific actions are not clear due to the distance and foliage.
 - (Baboons, Foliage, Moving Through): Baboons seem to be moving through the foliage, interacting with the environment as they navigate it.
 - (Baboons, Ground, Walking): Baboons are in contact with the ground, possibly walking or searching for food.



The image shows two medium-sized mammals in a forest setting with a dense cover of dry leaves on the ground and various trees and shrubs around. The creatures have thick tails arched upwards, brownish fur, and seem to be engaged in some type of activity on the forest floor. One of the animals is facing away from the camera, its tail a prominent feature in the photo as it stands in an upright position. The other animal is facing towards the right side of the frame and appears to be eating or interacting with a bright orange object, possibly a fruit or some food item. The natural environment suggests they might be in their natural habitat, and the overall scene looks tranquil and undisturbed.

Animals:
 - Two lemurs (possibly ring-tailed lemurs, based on the tail appearance)

Objects:
 - Foliage (various green plants and trees)
 - Ground covered with dry leaves
 - An unidentifiable object being eaten by one of the lemurs

Actions and Interactions:
 - (Lemur 1, Object being eaten, Eating)
 - (Lemur 2, Ground, Standing/Crouching)

There is no direct interaction between the two lemurs observable from this still image; they seem to be engaged in separate activities. Lemur 1 is eating, while Lemur 2 appears to be standing or crouching on the ground without engaging with Lemur 1 or the food.



The image shows a natural, forested setting with a group of baboons. One baboon is prominently seen grooming another, a behavior common among primates for social bonding and hygiene. In the background, there are more baboons in various postures: one on all fours, potentially foraging, and another sitting by the base of a tree with exposed roots that create small cave-like structures, possibly used by the baboons as shelter or resting spots. The forest floor is littered with dry leaves, and the environment suggests it might be a dry woodland or savanna habitat. The sunlight filtering through the trees suggests daytime.

Animals:
 - Baboon 1: Sitting on the ground, appears to be engaging in social grooming with Baboon 2.
 - Baboon 2: Sitting on ground, participating in social grooming with Baboon 1.
 - Baboon 3: Standing on four legs, facing away from the camera, located on the right side of the image.
 - Baboon 4: Sitting within a hole in the tree or earth structure, mostly obscured by shadows.
 - Baboon 5: Sitting on the ground, facing left in the image, somewhat away from other baboons.
 - Baboon 6: In the background, appears to be either sitting or crouching, towards the right side.

Objects:
 - Tree/earth structure: Center of the image, a noticeable feature with at least one baboon occupying a hole.
 - Fallen tree branches: Throughout the image, particularly one crossing in front of Baboon 1 and Baboon 2.
 - Forest ground: Covered with leaves and soil, where the baboons are sitting and standing.

Actions and Interactions:
 - (Baboon 1, Baboon 2, Grooming): Baboon 1 appears to be grooming Baboon 2.
 - (Baboon 4, Tree/earth structure hole, Occupying): Baboon 4 is sitting inside a hole in the tree or earth structure.
 - (Baboon 3, Walking/standing): Baboon 3 is standing on four legs, possibly in motion or pausing.
 - (Baboons 5 and 6, Sitting/resting): Both of these baboons seem to be sitting or crouching peacefully.



This image features a group of monkeys in a natural forest setting. They appear to be macaques, which are commonly found in various regions across Asia and often adapt to different environments. These monkeys are situated on the limbs of a fallen tree, providing a clear demonstration of their agility and sociable nature. One monkey can be seen hanging from a branch by its tail and limbs, showcasing their typical playfulness and acrobatic abilities. Another is perched attentively on the branch, while a few others are engaged in social interactions or in mid-motion, possibly climbing or leaping. The foliage surrounding them is dense, indicative of a lush forest habitat. The overall scene captures the lively dynamics of these primates in their natural habitat.

Animals:
 1. Monkey A - hanging upside down from the tree branch
 2. Monkey B - positioned on the branch, appears to be grooming or touching Monkey C
 3. Monkey C - sitting on the branch
 4. Monkey D - sitting on the branch with a direct gaze at the camera or forward
 5. Monkey E - sitting further back on the branch

Objects:
 1. Tree Branch - the main branch that the monkeys are on
 2. Surrounding Trees - background foliage and trees in the forest

Actions and Interactions:
 1. (Monkey A, Tree Branch, hanging)
 2. (Monkey B, Monkey C, grooming/touching)
 3. (Monkey D, Camera/forward, gazing)
 4. (Monkeys, Tree Branch, sitting)
 5. (Monkeys, Environment, existing within)

The image captures monkeys engaging in typical arboreal behaviors such as hanging, sitting on tree branches, and grooming. The forest environment around them provides a natural habitat setting.



This image shows a group of four brown furry animals, possibly mongooses or lemurs, in a forested area with leaf litter on the ground. They are surrounding two small wooden structures, which could be feeding stations or traps meant for wildlife monitoring. The animals appear to be interacting with or investigating these structures. The setting looks to be a natural habitat for these creatures, possibly in a tropical or subtropical forest. The photo is taken during daytime with ample natural light.

In the image, we see a group of brown animals, which appear to be mongoose species, in a natural forest floor setting with leaf litter. They are interacting with wooden boxes that may have been placed by humans, possibly as feeding stations or traps.

List of Animals:
 - Multiple Mongooses

List of Objects:
 - Two wooden boxes

Actions and Interactions:
 - (Mongooses, Wooden boxes, Interacting) - It appears some mongooses are investigating or interacting with the wooden boxes.
 - (Mongooses, Ground, Walking/Moving) - There are mongooses that appear to be walking or moving on the ground.

Without further context, it's difficult to determine the exact nature of the interaction or the purpose of the wooden boxes, but the animals seem to be engaged with or curious about them.

Figure 7: GPT4-V output when asked to describe images from in-the-wild recordings.

Appendix References

- [1] David E Rumelhart, Geoffrey E Hinton, and Ronald J Williams. “Learning representations by back-propagating errors”. In: *nature* 323.6088 (1986), pp. 533–536.
- [2] Kaiming He et al. “Deep residual learning for image recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [3] Tsung-Yi Lin et al. “Feature Pyramid Networks for Object Detection”. In: *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* (2016), pp. 936–944.
- [4] Alexey Dosovitskiy et al. “An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale”. In: *ICLR* (2021).
- [5] Ashish Vaswani et al. “Attention is All you Need”. In: *Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2017.
- [6] Shaoqing Ren et al. “Faster R-CNN: Towards Real-Time Object Detection with Region Proposal Networks”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 39 (2015), pp. 1137–1149.
- [7] Wei Liu et al. “Ssd: Single shot multibox detector”. In: *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part I 14*. Springer. 2016, pp. 21–37.
- [8] Joseph Redmon and Ali Farhadi. “YOLOv3: An Incremental Improvement”. In: *ArXiv abs/1804.02767* (2018).
- [9] Kaiming He et al. “Mask R-CNN”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 42 (2017), pp. 386–397.
- [10] Joseph Redmon and Ali Farhadi. “YOLO9000: Better, Faster, Stronger”. In: *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* (2016), pp. 6517–6525.
- [11] Hei Law and Jia Deng. “CornerNet: Detecting Objects as Paired Keypoints”. In: *International Journal of Computer Vision* 128 (2018), pp. 642–656.
- [12] Kaiwen Duan et al. “CenterNet: Keypoint Triplets for Object Detection”. In: *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)* (2019), pp. 6568–6577.
- [13] Xingyi Zhou, Dequan Wang, and Philipp Krähenbühl. “Objects as Points”. In: *ArXiv abs/1904.07850* (2019).
- [14] Zhi Tian et al. “Fcos: Fully convolutional one-stage object detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 2019, pp. 9627–9636.
- [15] Peize Sun et al. “What makes for end-to-end object detection?” In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2021, pp. 9934–9944.
- [16] Nicolas Carion et al. “End-to-End Object Detection with Transformers”. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV) abs/2005.12872* (2020).
- [17] Xizhou Zhu et al. “Deformable DETR: Deformable Transformers for End-to-End Object Detection”. In: *ArXiv abs/2010.04159* (2020).
- [18] Feng Li et al. “DN-DETR: Accelerate DETR Training by Introducing Query DeNoising”. In: *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* (2022), pp. 13609–13617.
- [19] Shilong Liu et al. “DAB-DETR: Dynamic Anchor Boxes are Better Queries for DETR”. In: *ArXiv abs/2201.12329* (2022).
- [20] Hao Zhang et al. “DINO: DETR with Improved DeNoising Anchor Boxes for End-to-End Object Detection”. In: *ArXiv abs/2203.03605* (2022).
- [21] Tsung-Yi Lin et al. “Focal Loss for Dense Object Detection”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 42 (2017), pp. 318–327.
- [22] Zheng Ge et al. “YOLOX: Exceeding YOLO Series in 2021”. In: *ArXiv abs/2107.08430* (2021).
- [23] Tsung-Yi Lin et al. “Microsoft COCO: Common Objects in Context”. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision*. 2014.
- [24] Shuai Shao et al. “Objects365: A Large-Scale, High-Quality Dataset for Object Detection”. In: *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)* (2019), pp. 8429–8438.

- [25] Agrim Gupta, Piotr Dollár, and Ross B. Girshick. “LVIS: A Dataset for Large Vocabulary Instance Segmentation”. In: *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* (2019), pp. 5351–5359.
- [26] Rollyn T. Labuguen et al. “MacaquePose: A Novel “In the Wild” Macaque Monkey Pose Dataset for Markerless Motion Capture”. In: *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience* 14 (2020).
- [27] Nisarg P. Desai et al. “OpenApePose: a database of annotated ape photographs for pose estimation”. In: *ArXiv abs/2212.00741* (2022).
- [28] Hang Yu et al. “AP-10K: A Benchmark for Animal Pose Estimation in the Wild”. In: *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*. 2021.
- [29] Yuxiang Yang et al. “APT-36K: A Large-scale Benchmark for Animal Pose Estimation and Tracking”. In: *Thirty-sixth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*. 2022.
- [30] Alex Bewley et al. “Simple online and realtime tracking”. In: *2016 IEEE international conference on image processing (ICIP)*. IEEE. 2016, pp. 3464–3468.
- [31] Rudolph Emil Kalman. “A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems”. In: *Journal of Basic Engineering* 82 (1960), pp. 35–45.
- [32] Harold W Kuhn. “The Hungarian method for the assignment problem”. In: *Nav. res. logist. q.* 2.1-2 (1955), pp. 83–97.
- [33] Yifu Zhang et al. “Bytetrack: Multi-object tracking by associating every detection box”. In: *Computer Vision—ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XXII*. Springer. 2022, pp. 1–21.
- [34] Jinkun Cao et al. “Observation-centric sort: Rethinking sort for robust multi-object tracking”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.14360* (2022).
- [35] Gerard Maggolino et al. “Deep OC-SORT: Multi-Pedestrian Tracking by Adaptive Re-Identification”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.11813* (2023).
- [36] Yunhao Du et al. “Strongsort: Make deepsort great again”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* (2023).
- [37] Nir Aharon, Roy Orfaig, and Ben-Zion Bobrovsky. “BoT-SORT: Robust associations multi-pedestrian tracking”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.14651* (2022).
- [38] Fan Yang et al. “Hard to Track Objects with Irregular Motions and Similar Appearances? Make It Easier by Buffering the Matching Space”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 2023, pp. 4799–4808.
- [39] Feng Yan et al. “Multiple Object Tracking Challenge Technical Report for Team MT_IoT”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.03586* (2022).
- [40] Guillem Brasó and Laura Leal-Taixé. “Learning a neural solver for multiple object tracking”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2020, pp. 6247–6257.
- [41] Orcun Cetintas, Guillem Brasó, and Laura Leal-Taixé. “Unifying Short and Long-Term Tracking with Graph Hierarchies”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.03038* (2022).
- [42] Fangao Zeng et al. “Motr: End-to-end multiple-object tracking with transformer”. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer. 2022, pp. 659–675.
- [43] Tim Meinhardt et al. “TrackFormer: Multi-Object Tracking with Transformers”. In: *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* (2021), pp. 8834–8844.
- [44] Zitong Zhan, Daniel McKee, and Svetlana Lazebnik. “Robust Online Video Instance Segmentation with Track Queries”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09108* (2022).
- [45] Peize Sun et al. “Transtrack: Multiple object tracking with transformer”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.15460* (2020).
- [46] Yuang Zhang, Tiancai Wang, and Xiangyu Zhang. “MOTRv2: Bootstrapping End-to-End Multi-Object Tracking by Pretrained Object Detectors”. In: *ArXiv abs/2211.09791* (2022).
- [47] En Yu et al. “MOTRv3: Release-Fetch Supervision for End-to-End Multi-Object Tracking”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14298* (2023).

- [48] Feng Yan et al. “Bridging the Gap Between End-to-end and Non-End-to-end Multi-Object Tracking”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12724* (2023).
- [49] Anton Milan et al. “MOT16: A benchmark for multi-object tracking”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.00831* (2016).
- [50] Peize Sun et al. “Dancetrack: Multi-object tracking in uniform appearance and diverse motion”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 20993–21002.
- [51] Libo Zhang et al. “AnimalTrack: A Benchmark for Multi-Animal Tracking in the Wild”. In: *International Journal of Computer Vision* 131.2 (2023), pp. 496–513.
- [52] Debayan Deb et al. “Face Recognition: Primates in the Wild”. In: *2018 IEEE 9th International Conference on Biometrics Theory, Applications and Systems (BTAS)*. 2018, pp. 1–10.
- [53] Matthias Körschens, Björn Barz, and Joachim Denzler. “Towards automatic identification of elephants in the wild”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.04418* (2018).
- [54] Olga Moskvayak et al. “Robust re-identification of manta rays from natural markings by learning pose invariant embeddings”. In: *2021 Digital Image Computing: Techniques and Applications (DICTA)*. IEEE. 2021, pp. 1–8.
- [55] André C. Ferreira et al. “Deep learning-based methods for individual recognition in small birds”. In: *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 11.9 (), pp. 1072–1085.
- [56] Francisco Romero-Ferrero et al. “Idtracker. ai: tracking all individuals in small or large collectives of unmarked animals”. In: *Nature methods* 16.2 (2019), pp. 179–182.
- [57] Stefan Schneider et al. “Past, present and future approaches using computer vision for animal re-identification from camera trap data”. In: *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 10.4 (), pp. 461–470.
- [58] Matthias Körschens, Björn Barz, and Joachim Denzler. “Towards Automatic Identification of Elephants in the Wild”. In: *ArXiv abs/1812.04418* (2018).
- [59] Ludmila I Kuncheva et al. “A benchmark database for animal re-identification and tracking”. In: *2022 IEEE 5th International Conference on Image Processing Applications and Systems (IPAS)*. IEEE. 2022, pp. 1–6.
- [60] Xiaoxuan Ma et al. “ChimpACT: A Longitudinal Dataset for Understanding Chimpanzee Behaviors”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16447* (2023).
- [61] Liang Zheng et al. “Mars: A video benchmark for large-scale person re-identification”. In: *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part VI 14*. Springer. 2016, pp. 868–884.
- [62] Liang Zheng et al. “Scalable person re-identification: A benchmark”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 2015, pp. 1116–1124.
- [63] Shuyuan Li et al. “ATRW: a benchmark for Amur tiger re-identification in the wild”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.05586* (2019).
- [64] Zhaofan Qiu, Ting Yao, and Tao Mei. “Learning spatio-temporal representation with pseudo-3d residual networks”. In: *proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*. 2017, pp. 5533–5541.
- [65] Youngwan Lee et al. “Diverse temporal aggregation and depthwise spatiotemporal factorization for efficient video classification”. In: *IEEE Access* 9 (2021), pp. 163054–163064.
- [66] Christoph Feichtenhofer et al. “Slowfast networks for video recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 2019, pp. 6202–6211.
- [67] Anurag Arnab et al. “Vivit: A video vision transformer”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 2021, pp. 6836–6846.
- [68] Gedas Bertasius, Heng Wang, and Lorenzo Torresani. “Is space-time attention all you need for video understanding?” In: *ICML*. Vol. 2. 3. 2021, p. 4.
- [69] Shen Yan et al. “Multiview transformers for video recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 3333–3343.

- [70] Haoqi Fan et al. “Multiscale vision transformers”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 2021, pp. 6824–6835.
- [71] Chaitanya Ryali et al. “Hiera: A Hierarchical Vision Transformer without the Bells-and-Whistles”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)* (2023).
- [72] Chao-Yuan Wu et al. “Memvit: Memory-augmented multiscale vision transformer for efficient long-term video recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 13587–13597.
- [73] Adrian Bulat et al. “Space-time mixing attention for video transformer”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), pp. 19594–19607.
- [74] Wangmeng Xiang et al. “Spatiotemporal Self-attention Modeling with Temporal Patch Shift for Action Recognition”. In: *Computer Vision–ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part III*. Springer. 2022, pp. 627–644.
- [75] Kunchang Li et al. “Uniformer: Unified transformer for efficient spatiotemporal representation learning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.04676* (2022).
- [76] Kunchang Li et al. “UniFormerV2: Spatiotemporal Learning by Arming Image ViTs with Video UniFormer”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09552* (2022).
- [77] Du Tran et al. “Learning spatiotemporal features with 3d convolutional networks”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 2015, pp. 4489–4497.
- [78] 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*. 2017, pp. 6299–6308.
- [79] Saining Xie et al. “Rethinking spatiotemporal feature learning: Speed-accuracy trade-offs in video classification”. In: *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*. 2018, pp. 305–321.
- [80] Can Zhang et al. “Pan: Towards fast action recognition via learning persistence of appearance”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.03462* (2020).
- [81] Heeseung Kwon et al. “Motionsqueeze: Neural motion feature learning for video understanding”. In: *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XVI 16*. Springer. 2020, pp. 345–362.
- [82] Yue Zhao, Yuanjun Xiong, and Dahua Lin. “Trajectory convolution for action recognition”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 31 (2018).
- [83] Mandela Patrick et al. “Keeping your eye on the ball: Trajectory attention in video transformers”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021), pp. 12493–12506.
- [84] Fuchen Long et al. “Stand-alone inter-frame attention in video models”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 3192–3201.
- [85] Limin Wang et al. “Tdn: Temporal difference networks for efficient action recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2021, pp. 1895–1904.
- [86] Heeseung Kwon et al. “Learning self-similarity in space and time as generalized motion for video action recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 2021, pp. 13065–13075.
- [87] Ceyuan Yang et al. “Temporal pyramid network for action recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2020, pp. 591–600.
- [88] Yuanzhong Liu, Junsong Yuan, and Zhigang Tu. “Motion-driven visual tempo learning for video-based action recognition”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 31 (2022), pp. 4104–4116.
- [89] Guoxi Huang and Adrian G Bors. “Busy-quiet video disentangling for video classification”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 2022, pp. 1341–1350.
- [90] Xiaolong Wang and Abhinav Gupta. “Videos as space-time region graphs”. In: *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*. 2018, pp. 399–417.

- [91] Bolei Zhou et al. “Temporal relational reasoning in videos”. In: *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*. 2018, pp. 803–818.
- [92] Joanna Materzynska et al. “Something-else: Compositional action recognition with spatial-temporal interaction networks”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2020, pp. 1049–1059.
- [93] Yuan Tian et al. “Ean: event adaptive network for enhanced action recognition”. In: *International Journal of Computer Vision* 130.10 (2022), pp. 2453–2471.
- [94] Yi Wang et al. “InternVideo: General Video Foundation Models via Generative and Discriminative Learning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.03191* (2022).
- [95] Zhan Tong et al. “Videomae: Masked autoencoders are data-efficient learners for self-supervised video pre-training”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), pp. 10078–10093.
- [96] Gunnar A Sigurdsson et al. “Hollywood in homes: Crowdsourcing data collection for activity understanding”. In: *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part I 14*. Springer. 2016, pp. 510–526.
- [97] Dima Damen et al. “Rescaling egocentric vision”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.13256* (2020).
- [98] Will Kay et al. “The kinetics human action video dataset”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.06950* (2017).
- [99] Khurram Soomro, Amir Roshan Zamir, and Mubarak Shah. “UCF101: A dataset of 101 human actions classes from videos in the wild”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.0402* (2012).
- [100] Hildegard Kuehne et al. “HMDB: a large video database for human motion recognition”. In: *2011 International conference on computer vision*. IEEE. 2011, pp. 2556–2563.
- [101] Raghav Goyal et al. “The” something something” video database for learning and evaluating visual common sense”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 2017, pp. 5842–5850.
- [102] Mathew Monfort et al. “Moments in time dataset: one million videos for event understanding”. In: *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 42.2 (2019), pp. 502–508.
- [103] Xun Long Ng et al. “Animal kingdom: A large and diverse dataset for animal behavior understanding”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 19023–19034.
- [104] Zheng Shou, Dongang Wang, and Shih-Fu Chang. “Temporal action localization in untrimmed videos via multi-stage cnns”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2016, pp. 1049–1058.
- [105] Huijuan Xu, Abir Das, and Kate Saenko. “R-c3d: Region convolutional 3d network for temporal activity detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 2017, pp. 5783–5792.
- [106] Tianwei Lin et al. “BSN: Boundary Sensitive Network for Temporal Action Proposal Generation”. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision*. 2018.
- [107] Haisheng Su et al. “BSN++: Complementary Boundary Regressor with Scale-Balanced Relation Modeling for Temporal Action Proposal Generation”. In: *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. 2020.
- [108] Tianwei Lin et al. “BMN: Boundary-Matching Network for Temporal Action Proposal Generation”. In: *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)* (2019), pp. 3888–3897.
- [109] Chuming Lin et al. “Fast Learning of Temporal Action Proposal via Dense Boundary Generator”. In: *ArXiv abs/1911.04127* (2019).
- [110] Qing-Huang Song et al. “Faster Learning of Temporal Action Proposal via Sparse Multilevel Boundary Generator”. In: *ArXiv abs/2303.03166* (2023).
- [111] Shuning Chang et al. “Augmented Transformer with Adaptive Graph for Temporal Action Proposal Generation”. In: *Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Human-Centric Multimedia Analysis* (2021).
- [112] Peisen Zhao et al. “Bottom-Up Temporal Action Localization with Mutual Regularization”. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision*. 2020.

- [113] Limin Wang et al. “UntrimmedNets for Weakly Supervised Action Recognition and Detection”. In: *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* (2017), pp. 6402–6411.
- [114] Zheng Shou et al. “CDC: Convolutional-De-Convolutional Networks for Precise Temporal Action Localization in Untrimmed Videos”. In: *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* (2017), pp. 1417–1426.
- [115] Runhao Zeng et al. “Graph Convolutional Networks for Temporal Action Localization”. In: *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)* (2019), pp. 7093–7102.
- [116] Zixin Zhu et al. “Enriching Local and Global Contexts for Temporal Action Localization”. In: *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)* (2021), pp. 13496–13505.
- [117] Tianwei Lin, Xu Zhao, and Zheng Shou. “Single shot temporal action detection”. In: *Proceedings of the 25th ACM international conference on Multimedia*. 2017, pp. 988–996.
- [118] Qinying Liu and Zilei Wang. “Progressive boundary refinement network for temporal action detection”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*. Vol. 34. 07. 2020, pp. 11612–11619.
- [119] Fuchen Long et al. “Gaussian temporal awareness networks for action localization”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2019, pp. 344–353.
- [120] Chuming Lin et al. “Learning salient boundary feature for anchor-free temporal action localization”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2021, pp. 3320–3329.
- [121] Xiaolong Liu et al. “End-to-end temporal action detection with transformer”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 31 (2022), pp. 5427–5441.
- [122] Yilong He et al. “GLFormer: Global and Local Context Aggregation Network for Temporal Action Detection”. In: *Applied Sciences* 12.17 (2022), p. 8557.
- [123] Feng Cheng and Gedas Bertasius. “TallFormer: Temporal Action Localization with a Long-Memory Transformer”. In: *Computer Vision–ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XXXIV*. Springer. 2022, pp. 503–521.
- [124] Chen-Lin Zhang, Jianxin Wu, and Yin Li. “Actionformer: Localizing moments of actions with transformers”. In: *Computer Vision–ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part IV*. Springer. 2022, pp. 492–510.
- [125] Tuan N Tang, Kwonyoung Kim, and Kwanghoon Sohn. “TemporalMaxer: Maximize Temporal Context with only Max Pooling for Temporal Action Localization”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.09055* (2023).
- [126] Dingfeng Shi et al. “TriDet: Temporal Action Detection with Relative Boundary Modeling”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07347* (2023).
- [127] Rui Dai, Srijan Das, and Francois Bremond. “CTRNet: Class-Temporal Relational Network for Action Detection”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.13473* (2021).
- [128] Rui Dai et al. “Pdan: Pyramid dilated attention network for action detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 2021, pp. 2970–2979.
- [129] Praveen Tirupattur et al. “Modeling multi-label action dependencies for temporal action localization”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2021, pp. 1460–1470.
- [130] Rui Dai et al. “MS-TCT: multi-scale temporal convtransformer for action detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 20041–20051.
- [131] Jing Tan et al. “PointTAD: Multi-Label Temporal Action Detection with Learnable Query Points”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), pp. 15268–15280.
- [132] Haroon Idrees et al. “The thumos challenge on action recognition for videos “in the wild””. In: *Computer Vision and Image Understanding* 155 (2017), pp. 1–23.
- [133] Fabian Caba Heilbron et al. “ActivityNet: A large-scale video benchmark for human activity understanding”. In: *2015 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition (CVPR)*. IEEE. 2015, pp. 961–970.
- [134] Serena Yeung et al. “Every moment counts: Dense detailed labeling of actions in complex videos”. In: *International Journal of Computer Vision* 126 (2018), pp. 375–389.

- [135] Rui Dai et al. “Toyota smarthome untrimmed: Real-world untrimmed videos for activity detection”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 45.2 (2022), pp. 2533–2550.
- [136] Philippe Weinzaepfel, Zaid Harchaoui, and Cordelia Schmid. “Learning to track for spatio-temporal action localization”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 2015, pp. 3164–3172.
- [137] Georgia Gkioxari and Jitendra Malik. “Finding action tubes”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2015, pp. 759–768.
- [138] Suman Saha et al. “Deep learning for detecting multiple space-time action tubes in videos”. In: *British Machine Vision Conference (BMVC)* (2016).
- [139] Vicky Kalogeiton et al. “Action tubelet detector for spatio-temporal action localization”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*. 2017, pp. 4405–4413.
- [140] Xitong Yang et al. “Step: Spatio-temporal progressive learning for video action detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2019, pp. 264–272.
- [141] Yixuan Li et al. “Actions as moving points”. In: *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XVI 16*. Springer. 2020, pp. 68–84.
- [142] Jiaojiao Zhao et al. “Tuber: Tubelet transformer for video action detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 13598–13607.
- [143] Gurkirt Singh et al. “Spatio-Temporal Action Detection Under Large Motion”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 2023, pp. 6009–6018.
- [144] Alexey Gritsenko et al. “End-to-End Spatio-Temporal Action Localisation with Video Transformers”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12160* (2023).
- [145] Jathushan Rajasegaran et al. “On the Benefits of 3D Pose and Tracking for Human Action Recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2023, pp. 640–649.
- [146] Chunhui Gu et al. “Ava: A video dataset of spatio-temporally localized atomic visual actions”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2018, pp. 6047–6056.
- [147] Huaizu Jiang and Erik Learned-Miller. “Face detection with the faster R-CNN”. In: *2017 12th IEEE international conference on automatic face & gesture recognition (FG 2017)*. IEEE. 2017, pp. 650–657.
- [148] Christoph Feichtenhofer. “X3d: Expanding architectures for efficient video recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2020, pp. 203–213.
- [149] Chen Sun et al. “Actor-centric relation network”. In: *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*. 2018, pp. 318–334.
- [150] Rohit Girdhar et al. “Video action transformer network”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2019, pp. 244–253.
- [151] Chao-Yuan Wu et al. “Long-term feature banks for detailed video understanding”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2019, pp. 284–293.
- [152] Jiajun Tang et al. “Asynchronous interaction aggregation for action detection”. In: *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XV 16*. Springer. 2020, pp. 71–87.
- [153] Anurag Arnab, Chen Sun, and Cordelia Schmid. “Unified graph structured models for video understanding”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 2021, pp. 8117–8126.
- [154] Junting Pan et al. “Actor-context-actor relation network for spatio-temporal action localization”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2021, pp. 464–474.
- [155] Gueter Josmy Faure, Min-Hung Chen, and Shang-Hong Lai. “Holistic Interaction Transformer Network for Action Detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 2023, pp. 3340–3350.

- [156] Hueihan Jhuang et al. “Towards understanding action recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 2013, pp. 3192–3199.
- [157] Yixuan Li et al. “Multisports: A multi-person video dataset of spatio-temporally localized sports actions”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 2021, pp. 13536–13545.
- [158] Ang Li et al. “The ava-kinetics localized human actions video dataset”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00214* (2020).
- [159] Maya Antoun and Daniel Asmar. “Human object interaction detection: Design and survey”. In: *Image and Vision Computing* (2022), p. 104617.
- [160] Guangming Zhu et al. “Scene graph generation: A comprehensive survey”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.00443* (2022).
- [161] Xufeng Qian et al. “Video relation detection with spatio-temporal graph”. In: *Proceedings of the 27th ACM international conference on multimedia*. 2019, pp. 84–93.
- [162] Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai et al. “Video relationship reasoning using gated spatio-temporal energy graph”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2019, pp. 10424–10433.
- [163] Xindi Shang et al. “Video visual relation detection”. In: *Proceedings of the 25th ACM international conference on Multimedia*. 2017, pp. 1300–1308.
- [164] Xu Sun et al. “Video visual relation detection via multi-modal feature fusion”. In: *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. 2019, pp. 2657–2661.
- [165] Zixuan Su et al. “Video relation detection via multiple hypothesis association”. In: *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. 2020, pp. 3127–3135.
- [166] Yicong Li et al. “Interventional video relation detection”. In: *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. 2021, pp. 4091–4099.
- [167] Xindi Shang et al. “Video visual relation detection via iterative inference”. In: *Proceedings of the 29th ACM international conference on Multimedia*. 2021, pp. 3654–3663.
- [168] Meng Wei et al. “In Defense of Clip-based Video Relation Detection”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08984* (2023).
- [169] Chenchen Liu et al. “Beyond short-term snippet: Video relation detection with spatio-temporal global context”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2020, pp. 10840–10849.
- [170] Kaifeng Gao et al. “Classification-then-grounding: Reformulating video scene graphs as temporal bipartite graphs”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 19497–19506.
- [171] Shuo Chen et al. “Social fabric: Tubelet compositions for video relation detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 2021, pp. 13485–13494.
- [172] Kaifeng Gao et al. “Video relation detection via tracklet based visual transformer”. In: *Proceedings of the 29th ACM international conference on multimedia*. 2021, pp. 4833–4837.
- [173] Jingwei Ji, Rishi Desai, and Juan Carlos Nibbles. “Detecting human-object relationships in videos”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 2021, pp. 8106–8116.
- [174] Yuren Cong et al. “Spatial-temporal transformer for dynamic scene graph generation”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 2021, pp. 16372–16382.
- [175] Jingyi Wang et al. “Cross-Modality Time-Variant Relation Learning for Generating Dynamic Scene Graphs”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08522* (2023).
- [176] Yiming Li, Xiaoshan Yang, and Changsheng Xu. “Dynamic scene graph generation via anticipatory pre-training”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 13874–13883.
- [177] Shengyu Feng et al. “Exploiting long-term dependencies for generating dynamic scene graphs”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 2023, pp. 5130–5139.

- [178] Xindi Shang et al. “Annotating objects and relations in user-generated videos”. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 on International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval*. 2019, pp. 279–287.
- [179] Jingwei Ji et al. “Action genome: Actions as compositions of spatio-temporal scene graphs”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2020, pp. 10236–10247.
- [180] Ali Sharif Razavian et al. “CNN features off-the-shelf: an astounding baseline for recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*. 2014, pp. 806–813.
- [181] Jonti Talukdar et al. “Transfer learning for object detection using state-of-the-art deep neural networks”. In: *2018 5th international conference on signal processing and integrated networks (SPIN)*. IEEE. 2018, pp. 78–83.
- [182] Alec Radford et al. “Learning Transferable Visual Models From Natural Language Supervision”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. 2021.
- [183] Shaokai Ye et al. “SuperAnimal models pretrained for plug-and-play analysis of animal behavior”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.07436* (2022).
- [184] Olga Russakovsky et al. “ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge”. In: *International Journal of Computer Vision* 115 (2014), pp. 211–252.
- [185] Alina Kuznetsova et al. “The open images dataset v4: Unified image classification, object detection, and visual relationship detection at scale”. In: *International Journal of Computer Vision* 128.7 (2020), pp. 1956–1981.
- [186] Ting Chen et al. “A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations”. In: *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR. 2020, pp. 1597–1607.
- [187] Xinlei Chen and Kaiming He. “Exploring simple siamese representation learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2021, pp. 15750–15758.
- [188] Jure Zbontar et al. “Barlow twins: Self-supervised learning via redundancy reduction”. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR. 2021, pp. 12310–12320.
- [189] Maxime Oquab et al. “DINOv2: Learning Robust Visual Features without Supervision”. In: *ArXiv abs/2304.07193* (2023).
- [190] Yuxin Fang et al. “Eva: Exploring the limits of masked visual representation learning at scale”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2023, pp. 19358–19369.
- [191] Lu Yuan et al. “Florence: A new foundation model for computer vision”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.11432* (2021).
- [192] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac et al. “Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), pp. 23716–23736.
- [193] Carl Doersch, Abhinav Gupta, and Alexei A Efros. “Unsupervised visual representation learning by context prediction”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 2015, pp. 1422–1430.
- [194] Spyros Gidaris, Praveer Singh, and Nikos Komodakis. “Unsupervised representation learning by predicting image rotations”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.07728* (2018).
- [195] Jean-Bastien Grill et al. “Bootstrap your own latent—a new approach to self-supervised learning”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), pp. 21271–21284.
- [196] Mathilde Caron et al. “Emerging properties in self-supervised vision transformers”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 2021, pp. 9650–9660.
- [197] Adrien Bardes, Jean Ponce, and Yann LeCun. “Vicreg: Variance-invariance-covariance regularization for self-supervised learning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.04906* (2021).
- [198] Kaiming He et al. “Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2022, pp. 16000–16009.
- [199] Limin Wang et al. “Videomae v2: Scaling video masked autoencoders with dual masking”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2023, pp. 14549–14560.

- [200] Jinghao Zhou et al. “ibot: Image bert pre-training with online tokenizer”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.07832* (2021).
- [201] Zhicheng Huang et al. “Contrastive masked autoencoders are stronger vision learners”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* (2023).
- [202] Feifei Shao et al. “Deep learning for weakly-supervised object detection and localization: A survey”. In: *Neurocomputing* 496 (2022), pp. 192–207.
- [203] Dhruv Mahajan et al. “Exploring the limits of weakly supervised pretraining”. In: *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*. 2018, pp. 181–196.
- [204] Xingyi Zhou et al. “Towards 3d human pose estimation in the wild: a weakly-supervised approach”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 2017, pp. 398–407.
- [205] Pilhyeon Lee, Youngjung Uh, and Hyeran Byun. “Background suppression network for weakly-supervised temporal action localization”. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*. Vol. 34. 07. 2020, pp. 11320–11327.
- [206] Jing Shi et al. “A simple baseline for weakly-supervised scene graph generation”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 2021, pp. 16393–16402.
- [207] Zhongzheng Ren et al. “Instance-aware, context-focused, and memory-efficient weakly supervised object detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2020, pp. 10598–10607.
- [208] Fang Wan et al. “C-mil: Continuation multiple instance learning for weakly supervised object detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2019, pp. 2199–2208.
- [209] Bolei Zhou et al. “Learning deep features for discriminative localization”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2016, pp. 2921–2929.
- [210] Soufiane Belharbi et al. “F-cam: Full resolution class activation maps via guided parametric upscaling”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 2022, pp. 3490–3499.
- [211] Shakeeb Murtaza et al. “Discriminative sampling of proposals in self-supervised transformers for weakly supervised object localization”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 2023, pp. 155–165.
- [212] Yan Gao et al. “C-midn: Coupled multiple instance detection network with segmentation guidance for weakly supervised object detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 2019, pp. 9834–9843.
- [213] Jun Wei et al. “Shallow feature matters for weakly supervised object localization”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2021, pp. 5993–6001.
- [214] Xiangli Yang et al. “A survey on deep semi-supervised learning”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* (2022).
- [215] Dong-Hyun Lee et al. “Pseudo-label: The simple and efficient semi-supervised learning method for deep neural networks”. In: *Workshop on challenges in representation learning, ICML*. Vol. 3. 2. Atlanta. 2013, p. 896.
- [216] Ting Chen et al. “Big self-supervised models are strong semi-supervised learners”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), pp. 22243–22255.
- [217] Antti Rasmus et al. “Semi-supervised learning with ladder networks”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 28 (2015).
- [218] Antti Tarvainen and Harri Valpola. “Mean teachers are better role models: Weight-averaged consistency targets improve semi-supervised deep learning results”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [219] David Berthelot et al. “Mixmatch: A holistic approach to semi-supervised learning”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).
- [220] Kihyuk Sohn et al. “Fixmatch: Simplifying semi-supervised learning with consistency and confidence”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), pp. 596–608.

- [221] Bowen Zhang et al. “Flexmatch: Boosting semi-supervised learning with curriculum pseudo labeling”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), pp. 18408–18419.
- [222] Zhaowei Cai et al. “Semi-supervised vision transformers at scale”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), pp. 25697–25710.
- [223] Zhen Xing et al. “Svformer: Semi-supervised video transformer for action recognition”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2023, pp. 18816–18826.
- [224] Zihang Dai et al. “Good semi-supervised learning that requires a bad gan”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [225] Durk P Kingma et al. “Semi-supervised learning with deep generative models”. In: *Advances in neural information processing systems* 27 (2014).
- [226] M Ehsan Abbasnejad, Anthony Dick, and Anton van den Hengel. “Infinite variational autoencoder for semi-supervised learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2017, pp. 5888–5897.
- [227] Xueying Zhan et al. “A comparative survey of deep active learning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13450* (2022).
- [228] Zhanpeng Feng et al. “ALBench: a framework for evaluating active learning in object detection”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.13339* (2022).
- [229] Ismail Elezi et al. “Not all labels are equal: Rationalizing the labeling costs for training object detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 14492–14501.
- [230] Di Yuan et al. “Active learning for deep visual tracking”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* (2023).
- [231] Aayush J Rana and Yogesh S Rawat. “Hybrid Active Learning via Deep Clustering for Video Action Detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2023, pp. 18867–18877.
- [232] Shuzhou Sun et al. “Evidential Uncertainty and Diversity Guided Active Learning for Scene Graph Generation”. In: *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*. 2022.
- [233] Ido Dagan and Sean P Engelson. “Committee-based sampling for training probabilistic classifiers”. In: *Machine Learning Proceedings 1995*. Elsevier, 1995, pp. 150–157.
- [234] Ray Liere and Prasad Tadepalli. “Active learning with committees for text categorization”. In: *AAAI/IAAI*. Citeseer. 1997, pp. 591–596.
- [235] William H Beluch et al. “The power of ensembles for active learning in image classification”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2018, pp. 9368–9377.
- [236] Donggeun Yoo and In So Kweon. “Learning loss for active learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2019, pp. 93–102.
- [237] Stuart Lloyd. “Least squares quantization in PCM”. In: *IEEE transactions on information theory* 28.2 (1982), pp. 129–137.
- [238] Ozan Sener and Silvio Savarese. “Active learning for convolutional neural networks: A core-set approach”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.00489* (2017).
- [239] Guy Hacohen, Avihu Dekel, and Daphna Weinshall. “Active learning on a budget: Opposite strategies suit high and low budgets”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.02794* (2022).
- [240] Lin Yang et al. “Suggestive annotation: A deep active learning framework for biomedical image segmentation”. In: *Medical Image Computing and Computer Assisted Intervention- MICCAI 2017: 20th International Conference, Quebec City, QC, Canada, September 11-13, 2017, Proceedings, Part III* 20. Springer. 2017, pp. 399–407.
- [241] Changjian Shui et al. “Deep active learning: Unified and principled method for query and training”. In: *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. PMLR. 2020, pp. 1308–1318.
- [242] Mykhaylo Andriluka, Jasper RR Uijlings, and Vittorio Ferrari. “Fluid annotation: a human-machine collaboration interface for full image annotation”. In: *Proceedings of the 26th ACM international conference on Multimedia*. 2018, pp. 1957–1966.

- [243] Manuel Haussmann, Fred A Hamprecht, and Melih Kandemir. “Deep active learning with adaptive acquisition”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.11471* (2019).
- [244] Nicolai Spicher, Tim Wesemeyer, and Thomas M Deserno. “Crowdsourcing image segmentation for deep learning: integrated platform for citizen science, paid microtask, and gamification”. In: *Biomedical Engineering/Biomedizinische Technik* 0 (2023).
- [245] Olga Russakovsky, Li-Jia Li, and Li Fei-Fei. “Best of both worlds: human-machine collaboration for object annotation”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2015, pp. 2121–2131.
- [246] Boris Sekachev et al. *opencv/cvat: v1.1.0*. Version v1.1.0. Aug. 2020.
- [247] Alexander Kirillov et al. “Segment anything”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision (ICCV)* (2023).