# Unsupervised Video Summarization via Reinforcement Learning and a Trained Evaluator

Mehryar Abbasi, Student Member, IEEE, Hadi Hadizadeh, Parvaneh Saeedi, Member, IEEE,

Abstract—This paper presents a novel approach for unsupervised video summarization using reinforcement learning. It aims to address the existing limitations of current unsupervised methods, including unstable training of adversarial generatordiscriminator architectures and reliance on hand-crafted reward functions for quality evaluation. The proposed method is based on the concept that a concise and informative summary should result in a reconstructed video that closely resembles the original. The summarizer model assigns an importance score to each frame and generates a video summary. In the proposed scheme, reinforcement learning, coupled with a unique reward generation pipeline, is employed to train the summarizer model. The reward generation pipeline trains the summarizer to create summaries that lead to improved reconstructions. It comprises a generator model capable of reconstructing masked frames from a partially masked video, along with a reward mechanism that compares the reconstructed video from the summary against the original. The video generator is trained in a self-supervised manner to reconstruct randomly masked frames, enhancing its ability to generate accurate summaries. This training pipeline results in a summarizer model that better mimics human-generated video summaries compared to methods relying on hand-crafted rewards. The training process consists of two stable and isolated training steps, unlike adversarial architectures. Experimental results demonstrate promising performance, with F-scores of 62.3 and 54.5 on TVSum and SumMe datasets, respectively. Additionally, the inference stage is 300 times faster than our previously reported state-of-the-art method.

*Index Terms*—Unsupervised Video summarization, selfsupervised learning, Reinforcement Learning, Transformers, TV-Sum, SumMe.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

**W** IDEO summarization provides a condensed representation of video content and enables users to grasp its core essence swiftly. With the surge of video data, the demand for more efficient methods for indexing, searching, and managing extensive video databases becomes increasingly urgent [1, 2]. Video summarization provides condensed content in surveillance systems, online learning platforms, and social media [3]. It aids in identifying events in traffic monitoring systems [4], serves as a resource in healthcare and education [5, 6], and assists us in navigating through the immense volume of video data [7].

There are two ways to summarize videos: by selecting important frames (video skimming) or by making a sequence of short video clips (video storyboarding) [8]. A common guideline for this process is that the summary length should not exceed 15% of the input video length [9], ensuring that it captures the most critical aspects while remaining concise and easy to watch. In recent years, deep learning-based methods for automated video summarization have gained popularity [9].

However, many of these methods rely on human-generated labels to train their models [10-12], leading to challenges with scarcity, subjectivity, and bias in human annotations. As a result, there has been a focus on developing unsupervised video summarization methods [13–27]. Unsupervised methods don't require human annotations. Instead, they use heuristic criteria like diversity, coverage, and/or representativeness to select the summary frames. However, these methods often fail to capture the semantic relevance and coherence of the summary and may produce redundant or noisy frames. Some of the existing works use complex or unstable architectures (e.g., RNNs, LSTMs, GANs) and training procedures (e.g. adversarial learning) [13, 20–27]. Other methods employ training criteria, reward, and loss functions that do not strongly correlate with the way a human would generate a video summary, thereby limiting their performance metrics [14–18].

1

This paper is an extension of our recent preliminary work [19], which presented a new iterative method for frame scoring and video summarization. In the proposed method, called RS-SUM, a generator model was trained in a selfsupervised manner to reconstruct masked frames of a video input. In the inference stage, frames were randomly masked iteratively and the total reconstruction score was assigned to non-masked frames as their representativeness frame score. In the work presented here, the generator forms the backbone of our learned reward function, used to train the summarizer via reinforcement learning. The video summarizer must take in a video, produce a score for each frame, and create a video summary using the assigned scores. During training, the scores generated by the summarizer are used as probability scores. Frames are then randomly chosen to be either masked or left unmasked, resulting in a partially masked video. The probability of a frame being masked is inversely proportional to its score. This partially masked video is then passed to the generator, which reconstructs the masked frames. The reconstruction loss is computed by comparing the input video and its reconstructed version. This loss is transformed into a reward coefficient which adjusts the summarizer, to assign higher scores to frames that contribute to a superior reconstruction.

The following are what differentiates this work from the previous works [13–27]:

- We present a single-pass summarizer model, which generates a video summary from a video input, a process that is significantly faster (300 times) than RS-SUM [19].
- We present a novel dynamic window masking algorithm used in the training stage of the generator. It enhances the downstream video summarization task, offering better results over a fixed window masking method that is used

2

# in RS-SUM [19].

- We introduce a novel approach for generating reward coefficients during the reinforcement learning stage, resulting in superior performance compared to all previous state-of-the-art methods that relied on reward-based reinforcement learning [14–18], by being better at mimicking the way a human generates and evaluates a video summary.
- Our method employs two distinct and independent training stages, offering greater stability and consistency compared to previous state-of-the-art approaches that relied on complex training strategies and adversarial learning methods [13, 20–27]. Ultimately, this results in the generation of more accurate video summaries.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II reviews the related work on unsupervised video summarization. Section III describes the proposed method in detail. Section IV presents the experimental results and analysis. Section V concludes the presented work.

#### **II. RELATED WORKS**

Most unsupervised video summarization algorithms adhere to the principle that a video summary should enable a viewer to understand the original content of the video with less effort, time, and resources [13, 20-27]. These algorithms employ Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN) to generate a summary that encapsulates the essence of the video. Unsupervised video summarization algorithms based on GAN typically utilize three units: a summarizer, a generator, and a discriminator. The summarizer generates the summary from the input video by assigning importance scores to the frames and selecting only the high-scoring frames to form a video snippet. The generator creates two new video representations from the video summary and the original input video. These new representations are expected to be similar in content and style. The discriminator evaluates the generator's outputs and attempts to identify which one was based on the summary.

The use of an adversarial learning process to train a keyframe selector based on Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) was pioneered by [13]. Subsequent works have focused on improving that method through various modifications such as creating a more robust discriminator to retain as much information as possible in a video's summary [21], modifying the loss functions and optimization steps [20], and adding a video decomposition stage, which breaks each video into smaller and non-overlapping chunks of consecutive frames with uniformly sampled strides before feeding them to the summarizer network [22]. Further improvements were made by adding a frame score refinement stage to the summarizer's output [23, 24]. This included the use of an attention module that progressively edits each frame's score based on current and previous frames [24], and the addition of an Actor-Critic model that adjusted the frames' scores in a non-sequential order based on past and future frames and previously made adjustments [23].

The advantage of using GAN for unsupervised video summarization is in its ability to generate more diverse, realistic summaries that match the input video content and style. However, there are also some drawbacks. One is the complexity of the training procedure as it involves multiple models with different objectives and losses [24]. Balancing and coordinating the training of these models to ensure their convergence and stability are challenging [28]. Other issues such as mode collapse, vanishing gradients, or oscillation could cause training instabilities [14, 29]. Also, another drawback is that GAN may not capture some important aspects of video summarization, such as temporal coherence [24]. Therefore, some approaches have used reinforcement learning with custom reward functions to overcome the above mentioned issues [14-17]. A custom reward function measures specific properties required in an optimal video summary, such as diversity, representativeness, smoothness, and sparsity. A two-part reward function called Diversity-Representativeness was suggested in [14] that measured diversity by examining differences between frames of the summarized video and representativeness by comparing the selected frames to the entire video. The aim was to train a model that created a summary of diverse and representative frames from different parts of the video. The use of Diversity-Representativeness became so prominent that it was even added to the optimization process of the summarizer in the GAN-based methods [16]. Alternatively, the use of graph neural networks was proposed as another way to avoid adversarial training [30]. This method built a graph representation of the input video and used the node feature magnitude to generate hard assignments for the summary selection.

Many video summarization methods mentioned above use LSTM-based models and therefore could have problems such as vanishing and exploding gradients [31]. To address these challenges, some unsupervised video summarization methods have incorporated self-attention modules or transformer encoders [32] into their LSTM-based models [25–27, 32]. Others have exclusively utilized transformer encoders [17, 18]. These strategies primarily concentrate on substituting LSTM-based models with self-attention encoders. Despite these modifications, these methods continue to employ reward-based training, utilizing traditional rewards such as representativeness/diversity and length regularization cost [14, 20].

Our training pipeline shares similarities with the reinforcement learning approach outlined in [14]. However, a crucial distinction lies in the utilization of a learned reward function instead of handcrafted ones. The core of the proposed learned reward function is a model that is trained during a self-supervised learning stage. This stage employs a novel dynamic window masking algorithm, which signifies our selfsupervised learning stage from the one in [19]. Additional explanation regarding our methodology is presented in the following section.

# III. APPROACH

Here, we introduce a novel method for generating and assessing video summaries using reinforcement learning that includes a learned reward function. Our method involves two models: a video generator and a video summarizer.

The input to the generator model is a masked video, in which some of the frames are masked (missing). The generator



Fig. 1. System flowchart: A) Input video is embedded, frames are shot labeled, and the sequence is broken down into segments. B) Segments are randomly masked based on the shot labels for self-supervised generator training. C) The trained generator is used to train the summarizer via reinforcement learning. D) The summarizer assigns scores to the embedding sub-sequences, which are combined to create a frame score sequence for the generated video summary.

model takes this video summary as input and generates a reconstructed video. It learns to fill in for the missing frames by minimizing a reconstruction loss function that measures the similarity between the original and reconstructed frames.

The video summarizer model takes a video as input and generates importance scores for each frame. It then creates a video summary using frames' importance scores. To train the video summarizer, a video summary is first created by selecting the frames with the highest scores. Next, the summary video is passed to the generator for reconstruction. Finally, the reconstruction loss between the input video and its reconstruction is used to update the video summarizer. The video summarizer model learns to assign higher scores to frames that better represent the input video and contribute to a lower reconstruction loss. It is trained using reinforcement learning [33], where the reward is the sigmoid of the negative reconstruction loss.

The video summarizer model is built within an encoderdecomposition-summarizer-aggregation framework. In the following subsections, we describe each component of this framework and the training procedure.

- Section III-A describes the encoding and decomposition steps, wherein the frames of the input video are converted into embeddings and the video is broken down into a smaller set of segments.
- Section III-B outlines the architecture of the video generator and describes its training method.
- Section III-C details the architecture of the summarizer and its training process.
- Section III-D delineates the steps of the inference stage and the video summary generation pipeline.

In the rest of this paper, bold uppercase symbols like I

TABLE I GLOSSARY OF VARIABLE SYMBOLS (WITH THEIR TYPES, AND DEFINITIONS) USED IN THIS PAPER.

Symbol	Describtion			
	Sequences			
$egin{array}{c} F \ E \ S_{j/k} \ M_j \ \hat{S}_j \ P_j \ O \ U \ A \end{array}$	Input video (frame sequence) Frame embeddings sequence <i>j</i> -th or <i>k</i> -th frame embedding sub-sequence Partially masked or summary sub-sequence Reconstructed <i>j</i> -th frame embedding sub-sequence <i>j</i> -th frame score sub-sequence (sequence of numbers) Final frame score sequence (sequence of numbers) User summary (binary sequence) Automated summary (binary sequence)			
	Vectors			
$\hat{m{e}}_{t/j}$ $m{e}_{t/j}$ $m{m}$ $m{h}_t$ $m{w}_{sc}$	Reconstructed embedding of $t$ -th or $j$ -th frame Embedding of $t$ -th or $j$ -th frame Masked token embedding t-th hidden state embedding Trainable weights of the scoring layer			
Numbers				
$\begin{array}{c} T\\ L\\ J\\ \Delta\\ d\\ D_R\\ M_R\\ p_t\\ a_t\\ N\\ \mathcal{L}_{CE}\\ \mathcal{L}_{L1}\\ \mathcal{L}_{rec}\\ \mathcal{R}_s\\ b\\ \mathcal{L}_{reg}\\ \delta\\ \beta\\ l \end{array}$	A video's total number of frames Length of sub-sequences. Total number of sub-sequences Sub-sequence starting point random shift Frame embedding dimension size Dynamic window size ratio Total masking ratio t-th frame importance score t-th frame selection action Total number of episodes Cosine similarity loss L1 loss Reconstruction loss Reward value Moving average of past rewards Regularization loss Regularization factor Regularization coefficient Number of transformer encoder layers			
$egin{array}{c} h \ P \ R \ F \end{array}$	Number of self-attention heads Precision Recall F-score			

stand for sequences, while bold lowercase elements such as *e* indicate vectors. Italic lowercase or uppercase letters represent numbers. For a glossary of all variable symbols, their types, and definitions, please refer to Table I.

#### A. Encoding and video segmentation

Fig. 1.A illustrates the workings of the encoder and decomposition stage. Consider a video comprising T frames denoted as F. The encoder, implemented as a Convolutional Neural Network (CNN), transforms the input video (frame sequence) F into the frame embeddings sequence  $E = \{e_t\}_{t=1}^{T}$ , where each  $e_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is the embedding representation of the t-th frame. We employ GoogleNet [34] as the CNN model where the frame embeddings are the output of its penultimate layer. We opt for GoogleNet [34] to maintain consistency with most prior works [13, 18, 20–27] and to emphasize the impact of our algorithm on the results rather than the choice of the encoder. However, any arbitrary CNN such as [35] can be utilized in our proposed framework without loss of generality, as we do not make any specific assumption regarding the chosen feature encoder.

After obtaining the frame embeddings, we utilize Kernel Temporal Segmentation (KTS) [36], a method that divides a video into segments with minimized internal variance, to extract shot boundaries within a video. Shots, in the context of video representation, represent continuous sequences of similar frames. In Fig. 1.A, some exemplar shots are shown, each with a different color, where within each shot, frames are sequentially numbered starting from 1 up to the end of the shot. As will be discussed in Section III-B, the obtained shots will be used in the next stage of the proposed approach.

After obtaining the shot boundaries, each E is decomposed into a set of smaller video segments  $S_j = \{e_t\}_{t=1}^L$ , where L is is the video sub-sequence length and  $j = 1 \dots J$  is the subsequence identifier. J is the total number of segments, which is dependent on the input video's length (T). Each video is divided into smaller segments using two methods: sequential split and dilated split. For sequential split, we select every Lconsecutive frame as one sub-sequence. During training, we randomly shift the starting point of each sub-sequence by  $\triangle$ (a value within the range of  $\pm [0, L/2]$ ) for each training epoch to enhance the diversity of the samples. During inference, we do not apply any shift. For dilated split, we sample segments of L frames with a variable dilation rate that depends on the input video length. We start by padding the vector E with zeros until its length is divisible by L. If  $n = \lceil T/L \rceil$ , we then pick every *n*-th frame for each sub-sequence, starting from the first frame for the first sub-sequence, the second frame for the second sub-sequence, and so on.

#### B. Generator architecture and training

This section describes details of the proposed generator training stage. We refer to this stage as the self-supervised pre-training stage. The generator comprises a transformer encoder [32]. The input to the video generator is a masked video sub-sequence,  $M_j$ . The embedding of some frames in  $M_j$  are masked, meaning they are replaced with a special fixed masked token embedding (**m**), which is filled with arbitrary values. The generator then tries to reconstruct the original embeddings at the masked frames using the embeddings of the non-masked frames to obtain a reconstructed video subsequence  $\hat{S}_j$ . Fig. 2.A shows the generator's architecture.

The generator training stage is depicted in Fig. 1.B. This generator does not require ground-truth annotations and uses the input video as the ground truth. It is trained in a self-supervised manner using the following loss function:

$$\mathcal{L}_{CE} = \sum_{t=1}^{L} (1 - \frac{\boldsymbol{e}_t \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{e}}_t}{\|\boldsymbol{e}_t\|_2 \cdot \|\hat{\boldsymbol{e}}_t\|_2}),$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{L1} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{t=1}^{L} ||\boldsymbol{e}_t - \hat{\boldsymbol{e}}_t||_1,$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{rec} = \mathcal{L}_{CE} + \mathcal{L}_{L1},$$
(1)

where  $e_t$  stands for the *t*-th frame embedding of the input video sub-sequence, while  $\hat{e}_t$  denotes the reconstructed frame



Fig. 2. The architectures of A) generator B) summarizer.

embedding.  $\mathcal{L}_{rec}$  measures the similarity between the input video and its reconstructed version. The above loss function is a combined function that calculates both the absolute difference ( $\mathcal{L}_1$ ) and the cosine similarity ( $\mathcal{L}_{CE}$ ) between the reconstructed and the original frame embeddings (CE stands for cosine embedding loss).

The masking algorithm consists of two steps. In the first step, a random shot of the video is selected. Within that shot, a random window of consecutive frames, with a length equal to  $D_R$  (%) of the shot length, is chosen as a window candidate. This process continues until the total sum of the window candidates' lengths reaches  $M_R$  (%) of L. In the second step, we apply masking to the window candidates. Each window candidate undergoes a flexible masking operation, which can result in one of the following three outcomes:

- Masking: where each frame embedding within the window candidate is replaced by a masked token embedding *m*. This has an 80% chance of occurring in our setup.
- Replacement: where the window candidate is replaced with another randomly selected window that is not among the window candidates. This has a 10% chance of occurring in our setup.
- No change: where the window candidate remains as is. This has a 10% chance of occurring.

We use the above mentioned dynamic window masking scheme for two reasons. First, by masking frames that are similar to the masked frame within the same shot, we facilitate the generator model to find more complex frame relations during the training process. Second, incorporating a dynamic ratio alongside partial shot masking ensures the model retains contextual information about the frames, preventing entirely blind reconstructions.

At this stage, the weights of the generator are used as the

initial weights for the summarizer or decoder, which is detailed in the next section.

## C. Summarizer's architecture and training

The summarizer model is composed of a transformer encoder, followed by a fully-connected (FC) layer with a sigmoid activation function. Fig. 2.B illustrates the summarizer's architecture. Here, the same encoder module as in the generator is utilized where its weights are initialized using the weights of the generator trained in Section III-B. Fig. 2.B illustrates the summarizer's architecture. The key distinction between the generator and the summarizer is the added FC layer that maps each d-dimensional frame embedding into a single frame score. The FC layer is initialized randomly.

The summeriser's transformer encoder accepts the frame embeddings  $S_j = \{e_t\}_{t=1}^{L}$  as input and yields the hidden states  $\{h_t\}_{t=1}^{L}$  for each frame. These hidden states encapsulate the temporal dependencies and contextual information of the frames. The final FC layer then calculates a frame importance score or selection probability,  $p_t$ , for each frame, signifying its relevance to the generated summary as follows:

$$p_t = \sigma \left( \boldsymbol{h}_t \boldsymbol{w}_{sc}^T \right), \qquad (2)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{w}_{sc} \in \mathbb{R}^{H_D}$  represents the trainable weights of the FC layer. Essentially,  $\boldsymbol{w}_{sc}$  acts as a trainable parameter, related to a self-gating mechanism [37] that determines the importance of each frame.

Fig. 1.C illustrates the summarizer training process. The training process is as follows: the summarizer takes in the input video sub-sequence  $S_j$  and generates  $\{p_t\}_{t=1}^T$ . A frame action sub-sequence  $\{a_t\}_{t=1}^L$  is then generated by sampling each individual  $p_t$ , as follows:

$$a_t \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p_t),$$
 (3)

where  $a_t \in \{0, 1\}$  indicates whether the *t*-th frame is selected or replaced with the masked token embedding (**m**). The summary  $M_i$  is defined as:

$$M_i = \{ e_t \text{ if } a_t = 1 \text{ else } m, t = 1, 2, \dots T \}.$$
 (4)

The summary  $M_j$  is then passed to the video generator, which reconstructs the input video. The reconstruction loss in (1) between the reconstruction and the original is calculated and converted into a reward ( $\mathcal{R}_s$ ) using the following equation:

$$\mathcal{R}_s = \sigma(-\mathcal{L}_{rec}). \tag{5}$$

Which indicates that  $\mathcal{R}_s$  is equal to the sigmoid of the negative value of the reconstruction loss.

During training, the goal of the summarizer is to increase  $\mathcal{R}_s$  over time, which based on (5) happens when  $\mathcal{L}_{rec}$  is minimized. In essence, the summarizer is trained to create summaries that enhance the quality of the video reconstruction, focusing on the similarity between the original and the reconstructed frame embeddings.

Mathematically, the summarization's objective is to learn a policy function [38], denoted as  $\pi_{\theta}$ , with parameters  $\theta$ . This

function optimizes the anticipated rewards and is defined as follows:

$$J(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{p_{\theta}\left(\{a_t\}_{t=1}^L\right)}[\mathcal{R}_s],\tag{6}$$

where  $J(\theta)$  is the objective function. The goal is to find parameter values that maximize the objective function. The probability of a sequence of actions  $\{a_t\}_{t=1}^{L}$  under the policy parameterized by  $\theta$  is represented by  $p_{\theta}(\{a_t\}_{t=1}^{L})$ . In this context, actions represent the choice of whether to keep a frame in the summary or not. The expectation operator is represented by  $\mathbb{E}$ .

Using the episodic REINFORCE algorithm [33], we can calculate the derivative of the objective function  $J(\theta)$  with respect to  $\theta$  [39]:

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{L} \mathcal{R}_{s}^{(n)} \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta} \left( a_{t} \mid \boldsymbol{h}_{t} \right), \qquad (7)$$

where  $\mathcal{R}_s^{(n)}$  represents the reward at the *n*-th episode, and N denotes the total number of episodes. Here, an episode refers to each iteration of sampling  $p_t$ , creating  $M_j$ , and then calculating its reward. To facilitate convergence and reduce variances, we subtract the moving average of past rewards, b, from the reward [33]. The updated gradient is:

$$\nabla_{\theta} J(\theta) \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{L} \left( \mathcal{R}_{s}^{(n)} - b \right) \nabla_{\theta} \log \pi_{\theta} \left( a_{t} \mid \boldsymbol{h}_{t} \right).$$
(8)

The summarizer can inflate  $\mathcal{R}_s$  by assigning a higher score to frames with fewer masked frames, making them easier to reconstruct by the generator. To counteract this, we employ a regularization loss,  $L_{\text{reg}}$ , defined as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}} = \left|\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} p_t - \delta\right|,\tag{9}$$

where  $\delta$  is the regularization factor. This regularization loss restricts the number of frames chosen for the summary by aligning the average frame scores with  $\delta$ . This approach imposes sparsity in the frame selection.

We employ the stochastic gradient method to train the proposed model. Specifically, the model parameters are updated as follows:

$$\theta = \theta - \gamma \nabla_{\theta} \left( -J + \beta \mathcal{L}_{\text{reg}} \right), \tag{10}$$

where the calculated gradient and the regularization term are combined. Here,  $\gamma$  represents the learning rate, and  $\beta$  is the coefficient for the regularization factor.

#### D. Inference and summary generation

The inference stage is illustrated in Fig. 1.D. During this stage, the input frame embeddings  $\boldsymbol{E} = \{\boldsymbol{e}_t\}_{t=1}^T$  are first divided into multiple segments  $\boldsymbol{S}_k = \{\boldsymbol{e}_t\}_{t=1}^L$ , where L is the new video length and k = 1...K is the sub-sequence identifier. This process is carried out using the operations described in Section III-A with  $\triangle$  set to 0. This parameter,  $\triangle$ , was initially developed for training to introduce diversity in the training data. However, during inference, such diversification is unnecessary, hence the decision to set it to 0. Each  $\boldsymbol{S}_k$ 

is then passed to the summarizer, which produces a frame score sub-sequence,  $P_k = \{p_t\}_{t=1}^L$ , where each  $p_t$  indicates the importance score of each frame. However, since the input video was decomposed into multiple overlapping segments, each frame receives multiple importance scores. We compute the final frame score  $o_t$  for a single frame by calculating the average of these assigned scores for a single frame. The final output of this frame score generation algorithm is  $O = \{o_t\}_{t=1}^T$ , which is the sequence of all final frame scores. This pipeline is presented in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: Frame Score Generation Algorithm
Input: $E = \{e_1, e_2, e_T\}$
$E$ is split into multiple segments $\{S_1, S_2,\}$ ;
for $oldsymbol{S}_k \in \{oldsymbol{S_1},oldsymbol{S_2},\}$ do
$P_k \leftarrow \text{Summarizer}(S_k);$
end
for $t \in \{1T\}$ do
$o_t \leftarrow Average(p_t \in P_{k \in \{1K\}});$
end
<b>Output:</b> $O \leftarrow \{o_1, o_2, o_T\}$

We set the summary length limit to 15%, which is a typical and commonly used number [9]. Most methods for generating summaries select the most informative shots from a video. The informativeness of a shot is calculated by averaging the scores of all its frames (shot-level score). The goal is to select as many high-scoring shots as possible without exceeding the summary length limit. This selection step can be considered as a binary Knapsack problem, which can be solved using dynamic programming [40]. The final video summary is the solution obtained from this process.

#### **IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS**

In this section, we present and discuss our experimental results, compare them with the current state-of-the-art methods, and conduct an ablation study. To ensure a fair comparison, we followed a widely accepted evaluation protocol, and used the same datasets and evaluation methods utilized by many leading approaches [13, 18, 20–27] in this field. Subsequent sections will provide detailed insights into this standardized procedure and a comprehensive presentation of our findings.

#### A. Datasets and the evaluation method

To evaluate the performance of our proposed method, we utilized two standard benchmark datasets: SumMe [41] and TVSum [42]. The TVSum dataset consisted of 50 videos ranging from 1 to 11 minutes in duration. These videos were annotated by 20 users, who assigned an importance score on the scale of 1 to 5 to each 2-second frame sub-sequence. Conversely, the SumMe dataset consisted of 25 videos with durations spanning 1 to 6 minutes. The annotation process was performed by 15 to 18 individuals who created a summary for each video by selecting key (the most important) shots within each video. These summaries had to be between 5% and 15% of the total video length.

The predominant evaluation metric employed in state-ofthe-art video summarization methods is the F-Score similarity measure [13, 18, 20–27]. F-Score quantifies the similarity between the automatically generated video summary and the user-annotated summary by assessing the overlap between the user summary (U) and the automated summary (A), both of which are sequences of 0s and 1s representing not selected or selected frames of the summary. The formula for calculating the F-Score is as follows:

$$F = 2 \times 100 \times \frac{P \times R}{P + R}, \ P = \frac{\boldsymbol{A} \cap \boldsymbol{U}}{Len(\boldsymbol{A})}, \ R = \frac{\boldsymbol{A} \cap \boldsymbol{U}}{Len(\boldsymbol{U})}, \ (11)$$

where P and R denote Precision and Recall, while Len(.) is a function that returns the length of its input sequence. For each video in the SumMe and TVSum datasets, the output of the video summarization algorithm was compared against annotations provided by all users. This comparison yielded multiple F-score values corresponding to the number of annotations. To consolidate these into a singular F-score, a reduction operation was applied. For TVSum, the established benchmark criterion involves averaging all F-scores to derive the final result. In contrast, for SumMe, the ultimate F-score was determined by selecting the maximum F-score among all evaluations. After obtaining the F-scores for all videos in each dataset, an overall F-score was computed for each video summarization method by averaging the F-scores across all videos in that dataset.

In [43], an evaluation method was introduced that compares frame-level automated scores with user-annotated frame importance scores using Kendall's  $\tau$  [44] and Spearman's  $\rho$  [45] rank correlation coefficients. This approach was exclusively applicable to the TVSum dataset only, as the annotations for this dataset include frame-level importance scores assigned by users, which were not available in the SumMe benchmark. Both  $\tau$  and  $\rho$  were measures of rank correlation. In this context, the frame scores assigned by users and generated by the machine acted as the rankings. These two measurements were used to assess the similarity between these rankings. This method held an advantage over the F-score measurement method as it was not influenced by the video shot segmentation mechanism. For instance, in an F-score based measurement method, if the KTS assigns a group of long consecutive frames (lengthier than 15% of the length of the input video) as one large shot, the Knapsack dynamic solution is unlikely to select the same shot. Regardless of how the frame scores within this shot changes (e.g. from low to high), the final F-score would not be impacted. However, in the case of  $\rho$  and  $\tau$ , the change in the frame score directly impacts the outcome.

For a given test video, the estimated frame-level importance scores were compared against the available user annotations.  $\tau$  and  $\rho$  values for each comparing pair are then computed. These values are then averaged to form the final  $\tau$  and  $\rho$  values for that test video. The computed  $\tau$  and  $\rho$  values for all test videos are then averaged, and this average is used to measure the method's performance on the test set.

To maintain consistency, we employed predefined 5-fold data splits (80% training, 20% test) for each dataset proposed by [46] and used in [13, 18, 20–27]. The experiment was

replicated five times, once for each split, and the average results were reported here.

#### B. Implementation setup

In line with the standard approach adopted by state-of-theart (SOTA) unsupervised video summarization methods, we employed a pre-existing video feature extraction setup proposed by [46]. In this setup, the feature arrays were generated through a two-step process: first, the input videos were downsampled to 2 frames per second (fps), and second, the 1024dimensional output of GoogleNet's [34] penultimate layer was obtained for the sampled frames. During our proposed segmentation phase, videos were segmented into segments of L = 128 frames.

The architectural configuration of the proposed model was set as follows: The number of transformer encoder layers (l), the number of attention heads (h), and the hidden input dimension size h were set to 3, 8, and 1024, respectively. The feedforward layers of the encoder had an expansion factor of 4, resulting in a hidden-state-dimension size of 4096. The scoring layer was an FC layer with an input dimension size of 1024 (d) and an output dimension size of 1.

The initial training phase, known as self-supervised training, spanned 250 epochs with a batch size of 128. The optimization was carried out using the AdamW optimizer in conjunction with a Cosine learning rate scheduler. The scheduler included a warm-up period of 100 epochs, during which the learning rate linearly increased from 0 to 0.01. Subsequently, the learning rate followed a cosine wave pattern, gradually decreasing after the warm-up period, to reach zero by the 1000th epoch. However, in our experiments, training was completed at epoch 250, before the learning rate reached zero. The training parameters of this phase including  $D_R$  (dynamic masking ratio) and  $M_R$  (sub-sequence masking ratio) were set to 0.5 and 0.25, respectively.

Moving on to the summarizer training stage, we conducted 300 epochs with a batch size of 16. The parameter N (number of episodes) was set to 5, and the learning rate was fixed at 0.00001, utilizing the AdamW optimizer. The checkpoint with the least reconstruction loss was retained as the final model. In this phase, the parameter  $\delta$  in (9) was set to 0.5. Additionally,  $\beta$ , the regularization loss coefficient, was set to 0.001.

Our experiments were executed on a Compute Canada node equipped with an NVIDIA V100 Volta GPU, with 32G HBM2 memory.

### C. Comparison against the state-of-the-art methods

In this section, we conduct a comparative analysis between the outcomes produced by our approach, referred to as Trained Reward Summarizer (TR-SUM), and the current state-of-theart methods in unsupervised video summarization (SUM-GAN [13], Cycle-Sum [21], DR-DSN [14], SUM-GAN-AAE [20], SUM-GAN-sl [24], CSNet [22], RS-SUM [19], AC-SUM-GAN [23], CA-SUM [18]).

The results of this comparative analysis are summarized in Table II. In this table, previous works marked by \* are methods in which a different regularization factor ( $\delta$ ) was used for each

TABLE II F-SCORE COMPARISON RESULTS.

Dataset	SumMe	TVSum		
Method	F-score	F-score	$\mid \tau$	$  \rho$
SUM-GAN [13]	41.7	56.3	-	-
Cycle-Sum* [21]	41.9	57.6	-	-
DR-DSN* [14]	41.4	57.6	0.02	0.026
SUM-GAN-AAE* [20]	48.9	58.3	-	-
SUM-GAN-s1* [24]	47.8	58.4	-	-
CSNet [22]	51.3	58.8	0.025	0.034
RS-SUM [19]	52	61.1	0.08	0.106
<b>TR-SUM (Ours)</b>	54.5	62.3	0.092	0.122
AC-SUM-GAN** [23]	50.8	60.6	0.038	0.05
CA-SUM** [18]	51.1	61.4	0.16	0.21
Human	54	54	0.177	0.204

dataset. In these cases, multiple models were trained with  $\delta$  values ranging from 0.1 to 0.9 for each fold of both datasets. The highest average F-score achieved by a single  $\delta$  on all folds of a dataset is reported (for example, SumMe peaks at  $\delta$  set to 0.8, while TVSum peaks at 0.7). Instances marked with \*\* represent methods that reported the average F-score achieved by different regularization factors for each fold (for example, for the first fold of SumMe,  $\delta$  was set to 0.3, while for the second fold, it was set to 0.6). In contrast, our method employed a constant  $\delta$  value of 0.5 for all folds across both datasets.

The results presented in Table II demonstrate that our method achieves the highest F-score on both datasets and ranks second in terms of  $\rho$  and  $\tau$ , trailing only behind CA-SUM [18]. However, it is important to note that in the case of CA-SUM [18], initially, for each data fold, five instances of a model with different  $\delta$  values (ranging from 0.5 to 0.9) were trained for 400 epochs. The network weights at each epoch for each  $\delta$  were saved as a checkpoint, resulting in a total of 2000 checkpoints for each of the 5 data folds. Subsequently, an algorithm was employed to select one checkpoint out of 2000 per fold. This selection process aimed to choose weights for each fold that would yield high  $\rho$  and  $\tau$  values.

The previous leading method in unsupervised video summarization, i.e., RS-SUM [19], utilized a structure similar to our method. This structure was also based on transformer blocks and segmented videos into intervals of 128 frames. The computational complexity difference between TR-SUM and RS-SUM is detailed in Table III, which underscores the differences in terms of inference time and the number of MACs (Multiply-Accumulate Operations) per video subsequence (collected using the ptflops [47] package). This table indicates a significant performance advantage of TR-SUM over RS-SUM. Specifically, TR-SUM is 310 times faster than RS-SUM in analyzing a video sub-sequence. Moreover, TR-SUM has 20 times less computational complexity than RS-SUM. This highlights another advantage of our method over RS-SUM during the inference stage. RS-SUM uses an iterative algorithm to generate frame scores, necessitating multiple passes of each video through their model to achieve stable output frame scores. In contrast, our method requires a single

TABLE III TIME AND MACS COMPARISON BETWEEN RS-SUM AND TR-SUM.

Dataset	SumMe		TV	Sum
Method	Time	MACs	Time	MACs
RS-SUM* [19] TR-SUM	2.718 0.009	9.7E+10 <b>4.8E+09</b>	2.789 <b>0.009</b>	9.7E+10 <b>4.8E+09</b>

 TABLE IV

 Description of important parameters studied in this ablation.

Stage	Parameter
Video decomposition	L Segment's length
Model configuration	<i>l</i> : number of multi-head attention layers <i>h</i> : number of attention heads per each layer
Self-supervised training	Frame masking method $M_R$ : Masking ratio Reconstruction loss function
Summarizer training	δ: Regularization Factor β: Regularization Factor Coefficient

pass of each video through our model to generate the output frame scores.

#### D. Ablation Study

In this section, we perform an ablation study to investigate the impact of various parameters on the performance of the proposed model. We categorize our study into four subsections: Video decomposition, model configuration, selfsupervised training, and summarizer training parameters. Table IV presents these parameters, and the sections they correspond to, and provides a brief description of each section.

To establish a base model for this work, we conducted exhaustive search experiments on key parameters: L, l, h, and the masking method. We set  $M_R$  and the reconstruction loss function to values determined in the previous work [19], and fixed  $\delta$  and  $\beta$  to values in between selected numbers. This exhaustive search experiment prioritized achieving a higher F-score over  $\tau$  and  $\rho$ . After determining the base model, we conducted subsequent ablation studies, adjusting one parameter at a time while keeping the baseline values unchanged.

1) Video decomposition: This section focuses solely on the parameter L, representing the length of the segments. The impact of changing L on the model's F-score is illustrated in Fig. 3. Selecting extremely high or low values for L results in a F-score decline. The figure suggests that the optimal point for attaining a satisfactory F-score on both datasets is around L = 128. Regarding  $\rho$  and  $\tau$ , an increase in sequence length appears to reduce these values, similar to the results we obtained for the F-score. Interestingly,  $\rho$  and  $\tau$  also peak at L = 128, further reinforcing the significance of that value.

2) Model configuration parameters: The two parameters investigated in this section are l (the number of layers) and h (the number of attention heads) of the transformer model. Table V shows the impact of these parameters on



Fig. 3. Effect of L on F-score,  $\rho$ , and  $\tau$ .

TABLE V THE EFFECT OF THE NUMBER OF ATTENTION HEADS AND LAYERS ON THE SUMMARY EVALUATION METRICS.

Da	taset	SumMe	TVSum			
l	$\mid h$	F-score	F-score	$ $ $\tau$	$\rho$	
1	1	50.2	61.2	0.051	0.067	
1	4	53.6	61.6	0.070	0.093	
1	8	49.7	61.6	0.074	0.098	
3	1	53.1	61.4	0.037	0.049	
3	4	53.4	61.8	0.051	0.067	
3	8	54.5	62.3	0.092	0.122	
6	1	54.0	61.7	0.053	0.069	
6	4	54.3	61.7	0.062	0.081	
6	8	52.8	61.2	0.063	0.084	

the performance of the proposed model. As seen from these results, increasing l from 1 to 3 enhances the model's F-score. However, for l > 3, no specific trend is observed. While a single-layer transformer may not be sufficient to capture complex relationships, employing too many layers increases the risk of overfitting during the first training phase.

Regarding h, the results suggest that an increase in h enhances the  $\rho$  and  $\tau$ . With l set to the optimal value of 3 and h to 8, we observed the highest performance, indicating a synergistic effect between these parameters.

3) Self-supervised training parameters: One of the most crucial factors to discuss is the effect of the dynamic masking method on the quality of generated summaries, which stands out as one of the key innovations introduced by this paper. As an alternative to the dynamic shot masking method proposed here, one could consider randomly masking a selection of frames during self-supervised training or adopting the method proposed in RS-SUM. The latter utilizes a fixed-size window masking scheme within each shot, in contrast to our method, which employs windows with dynamic lengths that expand or shrink based on the shot length. Table VI presents the results of this comparison. In this table,  $W_s$  denotes the window size

Dataset	SumMe	Т	VSum	
Masking method	F-score	F-score	$\mid \tau$	ρ
Random Masking Fixed window masking ( $W_s$ =3) Fixed window masking ( $W_s$ =7) Fixed window masking ( $W_s$ =11) Fixed window masking ( $W_s$ =15) Dynamic masking	52.9 53.8 47.2 53.4 53.0 54.5	61.9 61.6 60.8 61.6 61.1 62.3	0.088 0.060 0.071 0.068 0.066	0.117 0.079 0.094 0.090 0.087



Fig. 4. The effect of Masking ratio on F-score,  $\rho$ , and  $\tau$ .

in the fixed window masking method. From these results, the dynamic masking method produces the best outcomes.

Another important factor is the impact of  $M_R$ , representing the total masking ratio. This ratio is the proportion of the total selected masking frame candidates to the size of the entire sub-sequence. As illustrated in Fig. 4, the F-score of the model exhibits a relative maximum when  $M_R = 0.25$ on both benchmark datasets. This observation aligns with the findings reported in a previous work by [19].

The last parameter evaluated in this section is the reconstruction loss function defined in (1). In Table VII, we show the effect of using alternative reconstruction loss functions such as MSE. MSE and L1 appear to perform similarly; however, the combination of L1 with CE outperforms all single combinations, including the combination of MSE with CE loss function. This underscores the superiority of the proposed combination in achieving better results.

4) Summarizer's training parameters: In this section, we explore the impact of the two key training parameters, namely  $\delta$  and  $\beta$ , as defined in (9) and (10). As  $\beta$  is increased, we anticipate a decline in the model's performance. This is due to the loss being dominated by the regularization term, thereby neglecting the effect of the rewards. Alternatively, if  $\beta$  is set too low, causing the reward becomes the dominating factor,

 TABLE VII

 THE EFFECT OF THE RECONSTRUCTION LOSS FUNCTION.

Dataset	SumMe	]	ΓVSum			
Reconstruction Loss Function   F-score   F-score   $\tau$   $\rho$						
СЕ	53.9	60.5	0.032	0.042		
L1	53.3	61.7	0.077	0.102		
MSE	52.6	61.9	0.068	0.090		
MSE+CE	54.0	61.5	0.057	0.076		
L1+CE	54.5	62.3	0.092	0.122		



Fig. 5. The effect of  $\beta$  on F-score,  $\rho$ , and  $\tau$ .

it will also negatively impact the performance. This occurs because the reward term encourages the model to assign high scores to all frames, resulting in fewer frames being masked and thereby making it easier for the generator to reconstruct the missing frames.

Therefore, we can infer that if the  $\beta$  value is increased from a small number, the performance of the trained model would start to increase, and eventually decline. This pattern is observed in Fig. 5, which illustrates the effect of  $\beta$  on all metrics on the SumMe and TVSum datasets on a logarithmic scale.

Additionally, the effect of  $\delta$  on the F-score is illustrated in Fig. 6. The influence of  $\delta$  varies across different datasets. As shown in previous studies [14, 20, 21, 23, 24], a model typically reaches its peak performance at different  $\delta$  values for each dataset. The reason  $\delta$  impacts each dataset differently could be attributed to the summary generation stage, where the relationship between the distribution of scores and shot length determines the shots that will be selected. Given that datasets have different distributions of shot lengths, different distributions of frame scores are required to achieve a better F-score. Since  $\delta$  directly influences the mean or center of the distribution, and the two datasets have quite different shot formats, different patterns of F-score against  $\delta$  are observed on each dataset.



Fig. 6. The effect of  $\delta$  on F-score,  $\rho$ , and  $\tau$ .

#### E. Qualitative visual analysis of the generated summaries

In this section, we provide visual samples to illustrate the effectiveness of our method. Figs. 7 and 8 display a summary of the suggested annotation by our method and the human observer. Each figure consists of two sections: "Human" and "TR-SUM". Within each section, the bar plots show the normalized frame scores in blue. The alternating white and grey background color indicates the start or end of a new shot. The segments colored in green are the shots selected for the summary. The highest scoring frame within each green segment is marked in red. These frames are stitched together horizontally and displayed in the second row below the bar plot. For the "Human" section, the annotation with the highest F-score when compared against the rest of the annotations is the one displayed. The 'TR-SUM' section shows the frame scores and summary generated by our algorithm.

Figs. 7 and 8 demonstrate a noticeable visual correspondence between the key frames chosen by the human annotator and those by our model. It is evident that our algorithm's highest scoring frames bear a striking visual resemblance to the high scoring frames selected by the human annotator. This suggests that our method of relying on reconstruction loss to identify representative frames within a video aligns well with human judgment. Moreover, these figures reveal a significant correlation between the frame scores generated by our algorithm and the human annotator. This is evident in the matching peaks and troughs between the frame scores generated by the human and our model. This indicates that the high F-score values of our algorithm are not a result of random scores that merely produce a good F-score in combination with the Knapsack selection. Instead, it is a testament to the robustness and precision of our proposed algorithm.

Upon examining the frame score patterns of our algorithm's output, it is clear that long static shots, such as those at the beginning or end of a video, exhibit identifiable patterns. These sections will be filtered out and not selected by the Knapsack



Fig. 7. The comparison between human-annotated frame scores and generated summaries with our algorithm's output for the "Beekeeping101". The normalized frame scores are depicted in blue. Alternating grey and white backgrounds identify the start and end of each shot. Green segments highlight the shots selected for the summary. Within these green segments, the frame with the highest score is marked in red. The content of these highest scoring frames is displayed in a series of horizontally stitched frames.



Fig. 8. The comparison between human-annotated frame scores and generated summary vs. our algorithm's output for the "How to clean your dog's ears" Video.

algorithm due to their length. However, even if another shot selection method is deployed, it is possible to filter out sections that exhibit these patterns.

#### V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this paper introduced a unique, unsupervised approach to video summarization using reinforcement learning. The proposed method leverages a learnable pipeline to generate rewards for the reinforcement algorithm, a departure from previous methods that relied on manual reward functions. The pipeline uses a trained video generator to transform a partially masked video into a complete video by reconstructing the masked frames. The reward is then derived from the similarity rate between the reconstructed and input videos. This process is predicated on the notion that an informative summary will yield a reconstruction closely resembling the input video. The video generator, trained through a selfsupervised learning stage, also serves as a pre-training stage for the summarizer. In the inference stage, the summarizer alone is used to generate frame scores and, subsequently, a video summary. Experimental results on the TVSum and

SumMe datasets demonstrate the effectiveness of our method by achieving an F-score of 62.3 and 54.5 respectively, thereby outperforming existing methods. This underscores the potential of our approach in producing high-quality video summaries and opens up new avenues for future research in this domain.

#### REFERENCES

- M. Otani, Y. Song, Y. Wang, et al., "Video summarization overview," Foundations and Trends<sup>®</sup> in Computer Graphics and Vision, vol. 13 (4), pp. 284–335, 2022.
- [2] P. G. Shambharkar and R. Goel, "From video summarization to real time video summarization in smart cities and beyond: A survey," *Frontiers in big Data*, vol. 5, p. 1 106776, 2023.
- [3] M. Gygli, Y. Song, and L. Cao, "Video2gif: Automatic generation of animated gifs from video," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 1001–1009.
- [4] A. Sabha and A. Selwal, "Towards machine vision-based video analysis in smart cities: A survey, framework, applications and open issues," *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, pp. 1–52, 2023.
- [5] I. Avellino *et al.*, "Surgical video summarization: Multifarious uses, summarization process and ad-hoc coordination," *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, vol. 5 (CSCW1), pp. 1–23, 2021.
- [6] D. Gupta and A. Sharma, "A comprehensive study of automatic video summarization techniques," *Artificial Intelligence Review*, vol. 56 (10), pp. 11 473–11 633, 2023.
- [7] V. Tiwari and C. Bhatnagar, "A survey of recent work on video summarization: Approaches and techniques," *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, vol. 80 (18), pp. 27187–27221, 2021.
- [8] S. Jadon and M. Jasim, "Unsupervised video summarization framework using keyframe extraction and video skimming," in 2020 IEEE 5th International Conference on Computing Communication and Automation (ICCCA), IEEE, 2020, pp. 140–145.
- [9] E. Apostolidis *et al.*, "Video summarization using deep neural networks: A survey," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 109 (11), pp. 1838–1863, 2021.
- [10] J. A. Ghauri, S. Hakimov, and R. Ewerth, "Supervised video summarization via multiple feature sets with parallel attention," in 2021 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME), IEEE, 2021, 1–6s.

- [11] W. Zhu *et al.*, "Relational reasoning over spatial-temporal graphs for video summarization," *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, vol. 31, pp. 3017–3031, 2022.
- [12] E. Apostolidis *et al.*, "Combining global and local attention with positional encoding for video summarization," in 2021 *IEEE International Symposium on Multimedia (ISM)*, IEEE, 2021, pp. 226–234.
- [13] B. Mahasseni, M. Lam, and S. Todorovic, "Unsupervised video summarization with adversarial lstm networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2017, pp. 202–211.
- [14] K. Zhou, Y. Qiao, and T. Xiang, "Deep reinforcement learning for unsupervised video summarization with diversityrepresentativeness reward," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 32, 2018.
- [15] N. Gonuguntla, B. Mandal, N. Puhan, *et al.*, "Enhanced deep video summarization network," BMVC, 2019.
- [16] B. Zhao, X. Li, and X. Lu, "Property-constrained dual learning for video summarization," *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, vol. 31 (10), pp. 3989–4000, 2019.
- [17] U.-N. Yoon, M.-D. Hong, and G.-S. Jo, "Interp-sum: Unsupervised video summarization with piecewise linear interpolation," *Sensors*, vol. 21 (13), p. 4562, 2021.
- [18] E. Apostolidis *et al.*, "Summarizing videos using concentrated attention and considering the uniqueness and diversity of the video frames," ser. ICMR '22, Newark, NJ, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, pp. 407–415, ISBN: 9781450392389.
- [19] M. Abbasi and P. Saeedi, "Adopting self-supervised learning into unsupervised video summarization through restorative score.," pp. 425–429, 2023. DOI: 10.1109/ICIP49359.2023. 10222350.
- [20] E. Apostolidis *et al.*, "A stepwise, label-based approach for improving the adversarial training in unsupervised video summarization," in *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on AI for Smart TV Content Production, Access and Delivery*, 2019, pp. 17–25.
- [21] L. Yuan et al., "Unsupervised video summarization with cycle-consistent adversarial lstm networks," *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, vol. 22 (10), pp. 2711–2722, 2019.
- [22] Y. Jung et al., "Discriminative feature learning for unsupervised video summarization," in Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on artificial intelligence, vol. 33, 2019, pp. 8537– 8544.
- [23] E. Apostolidis *et al.*, "Ac-sum-gan: Connecting actor-critic and generative adversarial networks for unsupervised video summarization," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems* for Video Technology, vol. 31 (8), pp. 3278–3292, 2020.
- [24] E. Apostolidis *et al.*, "Unsupervised video summarization via attention-driven adversarial learning," in *International Conference on multimedia modeling*, Springer, 2020, pp. 492–504.
- [25] Y. Jung *et al.*, "Global-and-local relative position embedding for unsupervised video summarization," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*, Springer, 2020, pp. 167–183.
- [26] Y.-T. Liu *et al.*, "Learning hierarchical self-attention for video summarization," in 2019 IEEE international conference on image processing (ICIP), IEEE, 2019, pp. 3377–3381.
- [27] X. He et al., "Unsupervised video summarization with attentive conditional generative adversarial networks," in Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on multimedia, 2019, pp. 2296–2304.
- [28] H. Li, D. Klabjan, and J. Utke, "Unsupervised video summarization," arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03745, 2023.
- [29] M. Arjovsky and L. Bottou, "Towards principled methods for training generative adversarial networks," *arXiv preprint arXiv*:1701.04862, 2017.

- [30] J. Gao et al., "Unsupervised video summarization via relationaware assignment learning," *IEEE Transactions on Multime*dia, vol. 23, pp. 3203–3214, 2020.
- [31] S. Li *et al.*, "Independently recurrent neural network (indrnn): Building a longer and deeper rnn," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 5457–5466.
- [32] A. Vaswani et al., "Attention is all you need," Advances in neural information processing systems, vol. 30, 2017.
- [33] R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto, *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*. MIT press, 2018.
- [34] C. Szegedy et al., "Going deeper with convolutions," in Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 2015, pp. 1–9.
- [35] J. Carreira and A. 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.
- [36] D. Potapov et al., "Category-specific video summarization," in European conference on computer vision, Springer, 2014, pp. 540–555.
- [37] P. Ramachandran, B. Zoph, and Q. V. Le, "Searching for activation functions," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.05941*, 2017.
- [38] M. Sewak and M. Sewak, "Policy-based reinforcement learning approaches: Stochastic policy gradient and the reinforce algorithm," *Deep Reinforcement Learning: Frontiers of Artificial Intelligence*, pp. 127–140, 2019.
- [39] R. J. Williams, "Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning," *Machine learning*, vol. 8, pp. 229–256, 1992.
- [40] Y. Song et al., "Tvsum: Summarizing web videos using titles," in Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 2015, pp. 5179–5187.
- [41] M. Gygli *et al.*, "Creating summaries from user videos," in *European conference on computer vision*, Springer, 2014, pp. 505–520.
- [42] Y. Song et al., "Tvsum: Summarizing web videos using titles," in Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, 2015, pp. 5179–5187.
- [43] M. Otani et al., "Rethinking the evaluation of video summaries," in Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2019, pp. 7596–7604.
- [44] M. G. Kendall, "The treatment of ties in ranking problems," *Biometrika*, vol. 33 (3), pp. 239–251, 1945.
- [45] D. Zwillinger and S. Kokoska, *CRC standard probability and statistics tables and formulae*. Crc Press, 1999.
- [46] K. Zhang *et al.*, "Video summarization with long shortterm memory," in *European conference on computer vision*, Springer, 2016, pp. 766–782.
- [47] V. Sovrasov. "Ptflops: A flops counting tool for neural networks in pytorch framework." (), [Online]. Available: https: //github.com/sovrasov/flops-counter.pytorch.