

# OWL (Observe, Watch, Listen): Localizing Actions in Egocentric Video via Audiovisual Temporal Context

Merey Ramazanova<sup>1</sup> Victor Escorcia<sup>2</sup> Fabian Caba Heilbron<sup>3</sup> Chen Zhao<sup>1</sup> Bernard Ghanem<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>King Abdullah University of Science and Technology <sup>2</sup>Samsung AI Centre Cambridge <sup>3</sup>Adobe Research

{merey.ramazanova, victor.escorcia, chen.zhao, bernard.ghanem}@kaust.edu.sa caba@adobe.com



Figure 1. **Audiovisual temporal context is an important cue for the temporal localization of actions in egocentric unedited videos.** In the first video the recorder is preparing a glass of juice (a). The **green drawn boxes** spatially localize the juicebox. Knowing the content of the box in action ‘pour juice’ could help in predicting ambiguous actions ‘open juice’, ‘close juice’, and ‘grab juice’ **green arrows**). By following the **violet arrows** in the annotations, we can see the pattern of how people interact with kitchen items. In the second video (b), the action, “turning off the extractor fan”, is more evident when observing the interplay between audio and visual streams. The fan is invisible but the interruption of the humming noise in the audio signal provides context to the movement of the hand in the visual domain.

## Abstract

*Temporal action localization (TAL) is an important task extensively explored and improved for third-person videos in recent years. Recent efforts have been made to perform fine-grained temporal localization on first-person videos. However, current TAL methods only use visual signals, neglecting the audio modality that exists in most videos and that shows meaningful action information in egocentric videos. In this work, we take a deep look into the effectiveness of audio in detecting actions in egocentric videos and introduce a simple-yet-effective approach via Observing, Watching, and Listening (OWL) to leverage audio-visual information and context for egocentric TAL. For doing that,*

*we: 1) compare and study different strategies for where and how to fuse the two modalities; 2) propose a transformer-based model to incorporate temporal audio-visual context. Our experiments show that our approach achieves state-of-the-art performance on EPIC-KITCHENS-100.*

## 1. Introduction

Egocentric videos capture the world from a first-person point of view using wearable cameras. Arguably, in these video types, localizing actions in time is top of mind [14]. In doing so, we could enable world-changing applications ranging from generating consumer highlights to building ar-

tificial episodic memory for health monitoring. Compared to the existing literature in third-person temporal action localization (TAL) [5, 27, 46, 49], and despite its importance, TAL in egocentric videos remains relatively underexplored.

Localizing (in time) and recognizing human actions in egocentric video imposes several challenges. Due to the capture nature, videos tend to be long and highly unconstrained w.r.t. the activities occurring on the stream. Given that the capture happens through a camera mounted on a person’s head, challenging conditions such as undesired camera motions, occlusions, and poor quality video make the problem of localizing and recognizing actions a complex task. Additionally, existing egocentric datasets, *e.g.* EPIC-KITCHENS-100 [15], focus on localizing atomic actions that happen densely across long videos. Consequently, the performance of TAL in egocentric videos lags far behind compared to that in the third-person setting [9, 23].

Despite its challenges, there are particular properties of egocentric videos to benefit the TAL task. Since the videos are *unedited* and *continuous*, the audio stream is synchronized with the visual stream, capturing the sounds and appearance of what is happening in the video at the moment. This is different from videos in traditional datasets that are curated from online video platforms like YouTube. In such datasets and due to the editing, audio might not correspond to the original sounds present in the scene. We argue that audio, in egocentric video, plays an important role in assisting visual models to localize human actions. For example, looking at Fig. 1 (bottom), we notice a person reaching for something in a kitchen. Because of the camera view, we cannot see the object they are interacting with. Can we guess what exactly he is doing? How was this action even annotated? Maybe they are grabbing a box of cereal or a dish? By observing the lighting and the location (above the stove), we could imagine the interaction with the fan. But how can we discern if the fan was turned off or on? By hearing the sounds from the scene, you would not doubt that the person is *turning off the fan*. The fan’s distinctive humming noise and its disappearance indicate the action happening and its precise temporal endpoints.

Furthermore, using temporal context has been proven to be effective for both action recognition, and localization [12, 13, 24, 34, 43, 46–48]. In egocentric videos, temporal context might be even more informative. For instance, at being unedited and continuous, actions unfold, with a more often than not, predictable sequence [20, 21, 24]. Beyond visual cues, we argue that context from the audio stream also provide priors to better localize actions. This is not necessarily the case on edited videos, where multiple trimmed pieces and an edited sound stream compose the video. To illustrate how context can be helpful to localize egocentric actions, we present a toy example in Fig. 1 (top). The figure shows a sequence of egocentric actions. Looking at the

sequence holistically, the scenario is clear: the recorder is preparing a glass of juice. If we look at each shot separately (imitating a neural network trying to classify a trimmed clip), we could probably struggle to classify some actions. It is unclear that the box, which the recorder is grabbing from the fridge, then opening and closing, contains juice. When we see some orange liquid (and hear) pouring from it, we can better guess it must be orange juice. The instances *‘grab juice’* and *‘pour juice’* are almost five seconds away, but still are informative to each other. Moreover, by leveraging context, we can decode the sequential patterns of actions in cooking activities. These intuitions motivate us to investigate the role of audiovisual context for *egocentric* action localization purposes.

This work proposes **OWL (Observe, Watch, and Listen)**, a transformer-based architecture that fully leverages audio-visual context to localize actions in egocentric videos. OWL uses self-attention to encode context within each modality and cross-attention to capture relevant context across modalities. To develop OWL, we performed a detailed exploration of plausible design choices. First, we study which components of action localization would benefit from audio cues. We explore what part in the feature space would be best to fuse the audio-visual information. Finally, we analyze what temporal neighborhood would provide the richer context. Our experiments in EPIC-KITCHEN-100 validate that OWL effectively encodes audio-visual context for egocentric action localization and achieves state-of-the-art performance.

**Contributions.** We aim at developing temporal action localization in egocentric videos by means of audiovisual signals and temporal context as a way to boost localization performance. The contributions of our work are three-fold: **(1)** We did a thorough analysis on the effectiveness of the audio modality to boost localization performance. We design multiple alternatives to fuse audio into traditional action localization pipelines (Sec. 3.2.3). **(2)** We propose, OWL, a transformer-based method for egocentric action localization, that effectively fuses audiovisual context (Sec. 3.2.3). **(3)** We conduct extensive experiments on the EPIC-KITCHENS-100 dataset in Sec. 4. We compare the performance of the different fusion alternatives and OWL. All in all, OWL achieves state-of-the-art performance in the egocentric action localization.

## 2. Related Work

**Temporal action localization.** Given an untrimmed video, temporal action localization (TAL) aims to detect the boundaries and classes of all actions happening inside the video. Recent action localization works can be categorized into separate-stage and combined-stage methods. The separate-stage methods generate a set of class-agnostic proposals (generation) first and then use a separate classifier to

assign an action class to each proposal [5, 8, 18, 27, 28, 46]. Most of the existing separate-stage methods focus on generating better proposals and rely on the video-level class to classify them. Combined-stage solutions suggest doing action localization in one unified pipeline by optimizing for both tasks simultaneously [29, 33, 45, 49]. The combined-stage methods are more suitable for the datasets without too many classes, such as THUMOS14 [23]. In contrast, a separate-stage method is better when classifying proposals as the number of classes in a video increase. In this paper, considering that the egocentric dataset contains thousands of action classes, we follow the separate-stage approach.

**Egocentric (unedited) videos.** TAL has been extensively studied for third-person and mostly edited videos (typically, from consumer media platforms like YouTube and movies) [9, 23, 50]. The appearance of new large-scale egocentric datasets [14, 15, 22] opened up a unique opportunity for researchers to study human actions in unedited videos. The annotations for action localization in most common (third-person) benchmarks are relatively sparse, with a low variation in assigned classes per video (ActivityNet [9] has on average 1.5 instances and 1.0 class per video, in THUMOS14 [23] these numbers are 15.4 and 1.1, respectively). That makes it possible to condition the localized action class by gathering visual cues at the video-level. This paradigm is not suitable for more dense and diverse datasets. For instance, EPIC-KITCHENS-100 has on average 128.5 instances and 53.2 classes per video. That said, assigning proposals with a single video-level class would yield pretty poor localization results. To address the densely annotated videos on EPIC-KITCHENS-100, Damen *et al.* introduce a baseline separate-stage approach using BMN [27] proposals and SlowFast [19] classification. Contrarily, AGT [33] proposes a combined-stage method that leverage graph-based and transformer-based architectures to localize and classify actions jointly. Note that these approaches do not explicitly (or implicitly) model temporal context or leverage the egocentric audio streams. Our work lies in the separate-stage group; thus, to design OWL, we thoroughly investigate effective multi-modal and contextualized classifiers to assign each proposal an action class.

**Audiovisual learning.** In video understanding, video and audio are common modality choices for a multi-modal learning scenario. Deep learning facilitates audiovisual learning as it enables learning per-modality hierarchical representations [37], which are more optimal than designing hand-crafted features. Recent works provide us with more sophisticated solutions where the learned modality representations are being fused implicitly by the network and are optimized for the downstream task, such as [1, 17, 24, 25, 32, 42, 44]. While several works discussed the audiovisual scenario for the action recognition task [44], incorporating audio for TAL is not a widely researched




Figure 2. **Separate-stage framework for temporal action localization.** Proposal generation: given a sequence of snippet features, action proposals with start/end timestamps are produced. Proposal classifier: given a set of proposal features, classification scores for each proposal are produced.

area. [39] proposes a new task of audiovisual event localization that aims at predicting the event class from a 10-second clip. [4] studies multi-modal fusion approaches for audiovisual localization but ablates it on THUMOS14 and ActivityNet. Compared to them, we design our method for long, diverse egocentric videos. We are particularly motivated by [25], who emphasized the advantage of using egocentric unedited videos, with a focus on human hand-object interactions, for applying audiovisual learning. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first work that analyzes this advantage in egocentric TAL.

**Temporal context in action localization.** The importance of temporal context has been a long-standing aspect in action localization [2, 13, 36, 43, 46, 47]. [46, 47] propose graph-based methods, where they define proposals and snippets as graph nodes and perform graph convolutions for the information exchange. Our approach is closer to recent work that leverage the Transformer architecture [30, 33, 38]. Due to the rising popularity of transformers for vision tasks [3, 10, 16], [30, 33, 38] extended the transformer building blocks to the inner working of TAL as a way to infuse temporal context between proposals. In contrast to prior art, our work considers the interplay of multiple modalities, visual and audio, while also modeling the surrounding context of an action. By putting *audiovisual context* at the fore front, architectural differences arises in comparison to existing Transformer-based approaches.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1. Problem formulation

Given a sequence of video frames  $V = \{I_t\}_{t=1}^T$ , the task of temporal action localization (TAL) is to predict a set of segments  $\Psi = \{\psi_n\}_{n=1}^N$  with start/end timestamps and action class labels. In our work, we consider both the visual




Figure 3. **Fusion methods for the audio and video streams.** Early fusion (a) does features aggregation. Intermediate fusion (b) combines intermediate representations of each modality. The model can be trained jointly by optimizing for three losses, or we can simplify it by setting  $W_v = W_a = 0$  (the affected branches are highlighted with dashed lines). Late fusion (c) combines scores of two modalities. The gating module produces per-class weight for the scores generated by each modality. The weighted scores are aggregated by summation. Here we illustrate *cross-gating*, in which the gating module takes representations of both modalities as the input.

and audio modalities of the video sequence. We first encode either modality into snippet-level features  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times L}$ , where  $L$  is the number of encoded snippets and  $D$  is the channel dimension. The feature encoder usually adopts the pre-trained backbone of an action recognition model, such as TSN [41] and SlowFast [19]. We use the superscripts  $v$  and  $a$  for the visual and audio modalities, respectively, in the following description. For egocentric datasets such as EPIC-KITCHENS [14, 15], action labels are determined by the combination of noun and verb labels, which are directly predicted for each segment. Our approach to action localization follows a separate-stage pipeline, which first generates proposals and then classifies them, as shown in Fig. 2.

**Proposal generator.** Given the visual features  $\mathbf{x}^v$  and the audio features  $\mathbf{x}^a$  of the video sequence, the proposal generator  $\mathcal{G}$  (e.g. BMN [27]) predicts a set of candidate segments with temporal boundaries, namely, proposals  $\Phi = \{\phi_m = (t_{s,m}, t_{e,m}, s_m)\}_{m=1}^M$ , where  $\phi_m$  represents an action proposal, and  $t_{s,m}$ ,  $t_{e,m}$  and  $s_m$  are its start time, end time and score, respectively. Proposals don't have class labels, but only have confidence scores  $s_m$  of being an action.

**Proposal classifier.** Given the predicted set of proposals  $\Phi$ , as well as the snippet-level visual features  $\mathbf{x}^v$  and audio features  $\mathbf{x}^a$ , we first extract visual features  $\mathbf{x}_m^v$  and audio features  $\mathbf{x}_m^a$  for the  $m^{\text{th}}$  proposal by max-pooling the snippets within its start/end boundaries<sup>1</sup>. Then, the proposal classifier  $\mathcal{C}$  predicts from  $\mathbf{x}_m^v$  and  $\mathbf{x}_m^a$  verb and noun class labels  $c^{\text{verb}}$  and  $c^{\text{noun}}$ , as well as their respective scores  $s^{\text{verb}}$  and  $s^{\text{noun}}$ . Based on the predicted verbs and nouns, we generate action predictions  $\Psi = \{\psi_n = (t_{s,n}, t_{e,n}, c_n, s_n)\}_{n=1}^N$ , where  $c_n = (c_i^{\text{verb}}, c_j^{\text{noun}}) \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $s_n = s_i^{\text{verb}} s_j^{\text{noun}}$ .  $\mathcal{A}$  is a set of pre-defined actions, each composed of a noun and a

<sup>1</sup>We round the start/end values to the nearest snippets indices.

verb, and  $1 \leq i \leq M$  and  $1 \leq j \leq M$  are proposal indices.

## 3.2. Fusing audio and visual modalities

For both the proposal generator and the proposal classifier, we can choose to use either or both of the visual and audio modalities. Here, we discuss which modalities to use, and if we use both, where to use them and how to use them.

### 3.2.1 Which modality to use

The first question is how helpful the visual and audio modalities are to each temporal action localization pipeline stage. For the **proposal generator**  $\mathcal{G}$ , we can either: use only visual features (as most existing proposal generation methods), use only the audio features, or fuse the audio features with the visual features into one single input to the network. As we will discuss in Sec. 4.3, using both visual and audio modalities is the most effective strategy, even if we fuse the two modalities by simple concatenation. This shows that the audio modality helps predict proposals from snippet-level features when used with the visual modality. For the **proposal classifier**  $\mathcal{C}$ , we also find using both modalities together most effective. This stage is the focus of our exploration. We will compare and study different strategies to fuse the modalities, discussing where to fuse and how to fuse them in the following subsections.

### 3.2.2 Where to fuse the modalities

We use both modalities for the proposal classifier  $\mathcal{C}$ , so the second question is where in  $\mathcal{C}$  we fuse these modalities. We categorize the modality fusion into the following: early, late, and intermediate fusion, as shown in Fig. 3.

**Early fusion** happens at the input feature level (Fig. 3 a). Given the proposal’s visual features  $\mathbf{x}_m^v$  and audio features  $\mathbf{x}_m^a$ , we first fuse them and obtain one single feature vector  $\mathbf{x}_m = \mathcal{F}_{\text{early}}(\mathbf{x}_m^v, \mathbf{x}_m^a)$  (the fusing function  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{early}}$  will be discussed in Sec. 3.2.3). We feed  $\mathbf{x}_m$  to the following layers of operations (e.g., MLP), and classify it into different noun and verb classes.

**Late fusion** happens at the output score level (Fig. 3 c). The visual and audio features of all proposals are independently processed until they produce classification scores  $\mathbf{s}_m^v = \{\mathbf{s}_m^{\text{verb},v} \in \mathbb{R}^V, \mathbf{s}_m^{\text{noun},v} \in \mathbb{R}^U\}$ , and  $\mathbf{s}_m^a = \{\mathbf{s}_m^{\text{verb},a} \in \mathbb{R}^V, \mathbf{s}_m^{\text{noun},a} \in \mathbb{R}^U\}$  where  $V$  and  $U$  are the numbers of verb and noun classes, respectively. We fuse the scores from both modalities via  $\mathbf{s}_m = \mathcal{F}_{\text{late}}(\mathbf{s}_m^v, \mathbf{s}_m^a)$ , and apply *softmax* to  $\mathbf{s}_m$  to generate the final prediction for nouns and verbs (the fusing function  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{late}}$  will be discussed in Sec. 3.2.3).

**Intermediate fusion** happens at the intermediate feature level (Fig. 3 b). We process the audio and video features independently for certain layers, and generate intermediate features ( $\mathbf{z}_m^v$  and  $\mathbf{z}_m^a$ ). We fuse them to one feature via  $\mathbf{z}_m = \mathcal{F}_{\text{inter}}(\mathbf{z}_m^v, \mathbf{z}_m^a)$  (the fusing function  $\mathcal{F}_{\text{inter}}$  will be discussed in Sec. 3.2.3). The fused features  $\mathbf{z}_m$  as well as the visual and audio intermediate features  $\mathbf{z}_m^v$  and  $\mathbf{z}_m^a$  are processed independently in the following layers, and correspondingly predict three groups of classification scores. We use them all for training, and only use the scores from the fused features for inference.

### 3.2.3 How to fuse the modalities

For **early fusion** and **intermediate fusion**, we can simply fuse the two modalities by concatenating the visual and audio features along the channel dimension. This doesn’t require extra computations and counts on the following network layers to learn from the fused features. Our OWL uses intermediate fusion, and instead of simple concatenation, it adaptively fuses audio to visual features by correlating to the context (will be detailed in Sec. 3.3).

For **late fusion**, which applies on the classification scores, there is no straightforward way to do simple concatenation. Naively averaging or multiplying corresponding scores of the two modalities is not effective, due to the imbalance between the modalities. While audio can be a complementary source of information, it doesn’t contribute equally as the visual modality to solving the task. We observe that either modality ‘specializes’ in different classes, and it’s beneficial to combine the scores with different weights per class. For example, the action of ‘taking something’ is usually not evident from the sound, but ‘turning on’ a kitchen device is.

For effective late fusion, motivated by [31], we design a gating module to weight the per-class scores before fusing them. The gating module  $\Theta$  is composed of a fully-




Figure 4. **The proposed transformer-based proposal classifier.** We input the auditory sequence (yellow) into the encoder and the visual sequence (blue) into the decoder.  $K$ ,  $V$ , and  $Q$  refer to the components of multi-head attention as in [40]. The transformer encoder and decoder first perform a self-attention mechanism to enrich the intra-modal representations. Then, the decoder performs multi-head cross-attention to exchange these representations. The amount of context within which self-attention and cross-attention are being performed can be controlled by the attention mask of size  $M \times M$ , where  $M$  is the input sequences size.

connected layer followed by a sigmoid activation function. It learns from the concatenated intermediate features of the two modalities  $\mathbf{z}_m = [\mathbf{z}_m^v; \mathbf{z}_m^a]$  to predict weights for the verb and noun classes for both modalities:  $\mathbf{w}_m^v = \Theta^v(\mathbf{z})$ ,  $\mathbf{w}_m^a = \Theta^a(\mathbf{a})$ . The weights are applied to the classification scores  $\mathbf{s}_m^v$  and  $\mathbf{s}_m^a$  of two modalities for linear combination, and generate the final scores via  $\mathbf{s}_m = \mathbf{s}_m^v \odot \mathbf{w}_m^v + \mathbf{s}_m^a \odot \mathbf{w}_m^a$ . We call the gating strategy *cross-gating*.

Alternatively, we also experiment with a *self-gating* strategy, where the weights for each modality is learned only from its own features:  $\mathbf{w}_m^v = \Theta^v(\mathbf{z}^v)$ ,  $\mathbf{w}_m^a = \Theta^a(\mathbf{z}^a)$ .

### 3.3. Observe, watch, and listen

In this work, we concatenate the visual and audio snippet-level features in the proposal generator. We propose OWL (**O**bserve, **W**atch, **L**isten) for intermediate fusion model in the proposal classifier. OWL is built on the transformers architecture. It uses an encoder composed of a self-attention module to encode the audio features, and a decoder composed of a self-attention and a cross-attention modules to encode the visual features and to fuse both modalities (refer to Fig. 4). Besides **watching** the visual signal and **listening** to the audio signal, our OWL is also able to **observe** the context around each proposal.

**Watch and listen separately.** Both transformer encoder and decoder contain a self-attention module, where the features of all proposals for either modality are input tokens that generate Query(Q), Key(K) and Value(V) via different MLPs. Considering that transformer input are permutation invariant, whereas our proposals have clear positional relationship in terms of their start/end timestamps, we use po-

sitional encodings to preserve their temporal locational relationship. We encode the proposal start time scaled by the video length and absolute duration of each proposal. The relative start time  $p_{r,m}$  incorporates the position of an action in the video and the temporal order of actions. We believe that this information is useful when learning the patterns in human interactions with objects (Fig. 1). By encoding the absolute duration  $p_{d,m}$ , we inject the proposal temporal information that is lost after pooling operations. Specifically,

$$p_{d,m} = t_{e,m} - t_{s,m}, \quad (1)$$

$$p_{r,m} = \frac{t_{s,m}}{T}. \quad (2)$$

We pass  $p_{r,m}$  and  $p_{d,m}$  to a fully connected layer to generate the positional encoding  $\mathbf{p}_m \in \mathbb{R}^{D^e}$ .  $\mathbf{p}_m$  is concatenated to  $\mathbf{z}_m^v$  and  $\mathbf{z}_m^a$  before being passed to the transformer encoder.

For each token of either modality, the self-attention module **observes its relevant intra-modal context**, correlating other proposals to enhance its feature representation. Theoretically, this module can correlate all proposals in a video, but to study how much context is needed, we restrict the self-attention and the cross-attention to attend only to the proposals within its temporal neighborhood (inspired by [6]). After self-attention, we obtain updated visual and audio features  $\mathbf{z}_m^v$  and  $\mathbf{z}_m^a$  for each proposal.

**Watch and listen jointly.** The transformer decoder fuses both modalities. It contains a cross-attention module, which takes the updated features  $\mathbf{z}_m^v$  and  $\mathbf{z}_m^a$  of both modalities as input tokens. The visual modality tokens are used as Q, and audio modality tokens are used as K and V. Recall that attention mechanism transforms Q, K, V as

$$Attention(Q, K, V) = softmax\left(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{D}}\right)V. \quad (3)$$

Hereby, the audio features are linearly combined based on the similarities between video and audio features. The resulting features are enhanced by **observing the inter-modal context** from neighboring audio and video features.

**Training and inference.** We generate classification scores based on the enhanced features from the transformer  $\mathbf{s}_m = g(\mathbf{y}_m^v)$ , where  $\mathbf{s}_m = [\mathbf{s}_m^{\text{verb}}; \mathbf{s}_m^{\text{noun}}]$  contains the scores for verbs and nouns. We train our model to optimize for both noun and verb classification with a joint loss:

$$\mathcal{L} = \lambda^{\text{noun}} \mathcal{L}^{\text{noun}} + \lambda^{\text{verb}} \mathcal{L}^{\text{verb}}, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{noun}}$  and  $\mathcal{L}^{\text{verb}}$  are cross-entropy losses between the predicted classification scores and the one-hot encoded classes for nouns and verbs, respectively, and  $\lambda^{\text{noun}}$  and  $\lambda^{\text{verb}}$  are the weights for the corresponding losses. During inference, we multiple the scores of each noun and verb pairs to generate the scores for actions.

## 4. Experiments

### 4.1. Dataset

We evaluate our proposed method on the largest available egocentric video dataset: EPIC-KITCHENS-100 [15]. It contains 700 unscripted videos of people performing their daily kitchen routines. It has, on average, 129 annotated instances per video, which make it significantly harder to perform temporal action localization, compared to the established [23] and [9]. Around 28% of actions are overlapping and each annotated instance is composed of a verb and a noun pair describing an action performed with an object.

### 4.2. Implementation Details

**Features.** We experiment with TBN [25], SlowFast visual [19], and SlowFast auditory [26] features. We observe that using SlowFast features shows superior performance than TBN. Thus, we report all experiments using SlowFast features. We provide the experimental results with TBN in the supplementary material. We extract both auditory and visual SlowFast features at 5 FPS for training the proposal generator, and we max-pool them temporally for the proposal classification part. The extracted features have the dimensionality of  $D^v = D^a = D = 2304$ .

**Proposal generator.** We used BMN [27] for generating class-agnostic proposals. In the original implementation the input is rescaled to a fixed size before being fed to the network. Given that the dataset is dense and contains mostly atomic actions, we also implemented the sliding window approach (similarly to [35]). We use sliding window of size 256 and a stride of 128. We show the increase in Average Recall (AR) from using BMN over the sliding windows compared to the rescaled inputs, as well as the ablation for the best window size in the supplementary material. We find a simple concatenation of visual and audio features, followed by a single MLP layer, to be an effective strategy to fuse the modalities (early fusion). We apply Soft-NMS [7] during post-processing.

**Proposal classification.** For the cross-attention transformer, both the encoder and the decoder have 1 layer and 8 attention heads. We experiment using learned and fixed positional encodings, and find that the learned encodings perform better. We set  $D^e = 32$ .

### 4.3. Quantitative results

**Audiovisual impact.** To show the effect of the auditory signal on both proposal generation and classification, we demonstrate the performance for nine cases (Tab. 1): the proposal generator with visual (V) and/or auditory (A) inputs followed by early fusion classifier with visual (V) and/or auditory (A) inputs. We find that the audiovisual classifier (Class-AV) achieves the best results for all tasks (noun, verb, action). Furthermore, the audiovisual genera-

Table 1. **Showing how uni-modal and multi-modal inputs affect the performance, measured by the average mAP.** *Gen* stands for generation and *Class* for classification. *A*, *V*, and *AV* - auditory, visual, and audiovisual inputs, respectively (e.g. *Gen-V* x *Class-AV* means that we input video features to proposal generator and audiovisual to the proposal classifier). We report results of the validation set.

	Noun			Verb			Action		
	Class-A	Class-V	Class-AV	Class-A	Class-V	Class-AV	Class-A	Class-V	Class-AV
Gen-A	2.00	9.01	9.81	2.00	8.17	08.94	0.45	5.65	6.70
Gen-V	1.60	10.64	12.48	1.76	10.59	<b>11.96</b>	0.59	7.06	7.66
Gen-AV	2.03	11.22	<b>12.63</b>	2.10	10.01	11.47	0.71	7.69	<b>8.35</b>

tor (Gen-AV) performs the best for noun and action. This finding validates our intuition that audio is a complementary signal to the video for detecting egocentric actions for both localization and recognition. Our hypothesis is that audio helps localize actions in situations where visual interactions are occluded (an obstacle, bad camera view), unclear (dark environments), or ambiguous, and where the audio signal is strong enough and discriminative. We discuss some examples with these scenarios in Sec. 4.4 and Supplementary material. Note that our naive early fusion approach already gives 1.3% increase in action mAP when comparing only visual performance (7.06%) with the audiovisual (8.35%).

**Improving on the fusion.** We compare several fusion strategies in Tab. 2. All experiments were run on the same audiovisual proposals (*Gen-AV*). As mentioned above, early fusion results in a significant improvement over the visual-only model. The intermediate fusion with only audiovisual supervision (8.24% action mAP) does not perform better than early fusion. However, we can achieve better results by jointly training with the supervision from the visual and audio streams (8.75%). Doing late fusion with self-gating weights does not perform well (only 7.99%), but late fusion with cross-gating (Late F CG) achieves 8.82%. This finding is expected as cross-gating has richer representations of both modalities for weighting the class scores.

**Incorporating context.** In Tab. 3, we ablate on the attention window size  $W$ . We find that increasing the window size *does* improve the performance of our model, validating our theory that the temporal context is useful for the proposal classification. Specifically,  $W = 32$  (9.06%) and  $W = 64$  (9.29%) give us the best action average mAP. Using smaller window performs comparable to the late fusion or mid fusion (Tab. 2). Enlarging the window further degrades the performance slightly, suggesting that temporally distant proposals become irrelevant.

**Comparison with state-of-the-art.** We compare the performance of OWL with other existing methods on EPIC-KITCHENS-100 in Tab. 4. Our model performs significantly better than the baseline of [15], and AGT [33], and sets a new state-of-the-art performance on this challenging benchmark of 9.29% average mAP for the action class.

Table 2. **Fusion methods performance on the validation set measured by the average mAP (%).** SG and CG in late fusion correspond to the self-gating and cross-gating scenarios described in 3.2.2, respectively. We also show the modality streams being supervised in the second column.

Method	Supervision	Noun	Verb	Action
Early F	AV	12.63	11.47	8.35
Intermediate F	AV	12.55	11.66	8.24
Intermediate F	V, A, AV	<b>13.66</b>	<b>12.90</b>	8.75
Late F SG	V, A	11.51	10.84	7.99
Late F CG	V, A	12.66	12.89	<b>8.82</b>

Table 3. **The effect of attention window size  $W$ .** on in the transformer block described in Sec. 3.3. We report the performance on the validation set, measured by the average mAP (%). Each token on the attention pattern can attend to  $\frac{W}{2}$  tokens from each side.

W	0	4	16	32	64	128	256	512
Noun	12.52	13.33	13.32	13.22	<b>13.96</b>	13.89	13.23	12.64
Verb	11.86	11.60	11.39	12.15	11.67	<b>12.16</b>	11.64	11.53
Action	8.21	8.71	8.90	9.06	<b>9.29</b>	8.78	8.58	8.66

#### 4.4. Qualitative results

Fig. 5 visualizes the localization results of our cross-modal transformer model and compares it to the results of the uni-modal video model. As we can see the visual model fails to predict 'open juice' and 'close juice'. However, the audiovisual model predicts it successfully. Furthermore, the localized actions are on average more precise for the audiovisual model ('open fridge', 'pour juice'). Our intuition is that the pouring sound helps to localize the action better.

#### 5. Limitations

The scope of this work is limited to audio-visual context for TAL in untrimmed unedited videos with a large number of action categories per video. We acknowledge that the audio and visual signals may have an interesting interplay in highly edited videos, e.g. those on YouTube, TikTok, and movies. However, the audio signal in edited video might not be predominantly associated with the action. It might also be mixed with speech and music to evoke emotions in

Table 4. **Action localization results.** measured by mAP@tIoU (%) for tIoU  $\in$  (0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5) and the average mAP on the validation and test sets. For reporting results on the test set, we **do not use** validation set for training, compared to [15]. Second column indicates feature backbones used for the ablation: TSN [41], I3D [11], SF(A) [26], SF(V) [19].

Method	Features	mAP (Val) for Noun classes @tIoU						mAP (Test) for Noun classes @tIoU					
		0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	Avg.	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	Avg.
Damen <i>et al.</i> [15]	TSN,SF(V)	10.31	8.33	6.17	4.47	3.35	6.53	11.99	8.49	06.04	4.10	2.80	6.68
AGT [33]	I3D	11.63	9.33	7.05	6.57	3.89	7.70	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>OWL (ours)</b>	SF(A,V)	<b>17.94</b>	<b>15.81</b>	<b>14.14</b>	<b>12.13</b>	<b>9.80</b>	<b>13.96</b>	<b>16.78</b>	<b>15.22</b>	<b>13.60</b>	<b>11.64</b>	<b>9.74</b>	<b>13.40</b>

(a) Noun

Method	Features	mAP (Val) for Verb classes @tIoU						mAP (Test) for Verb classes @tIoU					
		0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	Avg.	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	Avg.
Damen <i>et al.</i> [15]	TSN,SF(V)	10.83	9.84	8.43	7.11	5.58	8.36	11.10	9.40	7.44	5.69	4.09	7.54
AGT [33]	I3D	12.01	10.25	8.15	7.12	6.14	8.73	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>OWL (ours)</b>	SF(A,V)	<b>14.48</b>	<b>13.05</b>	<b>11.82</b>	<b>10.25</b>	<b>8.73</b>	<b>11.67</b>	<b>16.78</b>	<b>15.43</b>	<b>14.01</b>	<b>12.73</b>	<b>11.24</b>	<b>14.04</b>

(b) Verb

Method	Features	mAP (Val) for Action classes @tIoU						mAP (Test) for Action classes @tIoU					
		0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	Avg.	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	Avg.
Damen <i>et al.</i> [15]	TSN,SF(V)	6.95	6.10	5.22	4.36	3.43	5.21	6.40	5.37	4.41	3.36	2.47	4.40
AGT [33]	I3D	7.78	6.92	5.53	4.22	3.86	5.66	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>OWL (ours)</b>	SF(A,V)	<b>11.01</b>	<b>10.37</b>	<b>9.47</b>	<b>8.24</b>	<b>7.26</b>	<b>9.29</b>	<b>9.69</b>	<b>9.03</b>	<b>8.07</b>	<b>7.11</b>	<b>6.23</b>	<b>8.03</b>

(c) Noun




Figure 5. **Qualitative results.** The same scenario as in Fig.1(a). The ground truth (GT) annotations are compared with the predicted actions of the visual-only model (V) and our cross-modal transformer (AV+C). We highlight with **red line** the GT actions that were missed by both models, and with **green line** the predictions where only one model succeeds. We can observe how our AV+C model produces temporally more precise and complete outputs.

the viewers. Thus, we believe that it is healthy to explore the two lines of research independently, edited vs. unedited.

## 6. Conclusion

This work studies multi-modal temporal action localization using egocentric unedited videos. The specific challenges of public egocentric video benchmarks (*e.g.*, unedited footage, localization of actions out of frame and large number of action classes per video) invite to rethink the inner workings of the TAL models. This work does so by means of two booster principles: multi-modality,

with audio, and temporal continuity to complement the visual signal. We validate our hypothesis by experimenting with the multiple audio-visual fusion approaches as well as context-aware pipelines. A technical contribution of our work is OWL, a transformer-based model that leverages both temporal context and modality fusion. By using OWL, we achieve state-of-the-art performance on the EPIC-KITCHENS-100 action localization task.

**Acknowledgements.** **V.E. contributions** involved conceptualisation, methodology, writing - review and editing, and supervision. This work was supported by the King Abdul-

lah University of Science and Technology (KAUST) Office of Sponsored Research through the Visual Computing Center (VCC) funding.

## References

- [1] Juan León Alcázar, Fabian Caba, Ali K Thabet, and Bernard Ghanem. Maas: Multi-modal assignation for active speaker detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 265–274, 2021. 3
- [2] Humam Alwassel, Fabian Caba Heilbron, and Bernard Ghanem. Action search: Spotting actions in videos and its application to temporal action localization. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 251–266, 2018. 3
- [3] Anurag Arnab, Mostafa Dehghani, Georg Heigold, Chen Sun, Mario Lučić, and Cordelia Schmid. Vivit: A video vision transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.15691*, 2021. 3
- [4] Anurag Bagchi, Jazib Mahmood, Dolton Fernandes, and Ravi Kiran Sarvadevabhatla. Hear me out: Fusional approaches for audio augmented temporal action localization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.14118*, 2021. 3
- [5] Yueran Bai, Yingying Wang, Yunhai Tong, Yang Yang, Qiyue Liu, and Junhui Liu. Boundary content graph neural network for temporal action proposal generation. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 121–137, 2020. 2, 3
- [6] Iz Beltagy, Matthew E Peters, and Arman Cohan. Longformer: The long-document transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05150*, 2020. 6
- [7] Navaneeth Bodla, Bharat Singh, Rama Chellappa, and Larry S Davis. Soft-nms—improving object detection with one line of code. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 5561–5569, 2017. 6
- [8] Fabian Caba Heilbron, Wayner Barrios, Victor Escorcia, and Bernard Ghanem. Scc: Semantic context cascade for efficient action detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1454–1463, 2017. 3
- [9] Fabian Caba Heilbron, Victor Escorcia, Bernard Ghanem, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Activitynet: A large-scale video benchmark for human activity understanding. In *Proceedings of IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2015. 2, 3, 6
- [10] Nicolas Carion, Francisco Massa, Gabriel Synnaeve, Nicolas Usunier, Alexander Kirillov, and Sergey Zagoruyko. End-to-end object detection with transformers. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 213–229. Springer, 2020. 3
- [11] 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 (CVPR)*, 2017. 8
- [12] Alejandro Cartas, Petia Radeva, and Mariella Dimiccoli. Modeling long-term interactions to enhance action recognition. In *2020 25th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, pages 10351–10358. IEEE, 2021. 2
- [13] Xiyang Dai, Bharat Singh, Guyue Zhang, Larry S. Davis, and Yan Qiu Chen. Temporal context network for activity localization in videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2017. 2, 3
- [14] Dima Damen, Hazel Doughty, Giovanni Maria Farinella, Sanja Fidler, Antonino Furnari, Evangelos Kazakos, Davide Moltisanti, Jonathan Munro, Toby Perrett, Will Price, et al. Scaling egocentric vision: The epic-kitchens dataset. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 720–736, 2018. 1, 3, 4
- [15] Dima Damen, Hazel Doughty, Giovanni Maria Farinella, Antonino Furnari, Evangelos Kazakos, Jian Ma, Davide Moltisanti, Jonathan Munro, Toby Perrett, Will Price, et al. Rescaling egocentric vision: Collection, pipeline and challenges for epic-kitchens-100. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, pages 1–23, 2021. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8
- [16] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929*, 2020. 3
- [17] Ariel Ephrat, Inbar Mosseri, Oran Lang, Tali Dekel, Kevin Wilson, Avinatan Hassidim, William T Freeman, and Michael Rubinstein. Looking to listen at the cocktail party: A speaker-independent audio-visual model for speech separation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.03619*, 2018. 3
- [18] Victor Escorcia, Fabian Caba Heilbron, Juan Carlos Niebles, and Bernard Ghanem. Daps: Deep action proposals for action understanding. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2016. 3
- [19] Christoph Feichtenhofer, Haoqi Fan, Jitendra Malik, and Kaiming He. Slowfast networks for video recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 6202–6211, 2019. 3, 4, 6, 8
- [20] Antonino Furnari and Giovanni Maria Farinella. What would you expect? anticipating egocentric actions with rolling-unrolling lstms and modality attention. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 6252–6261, 2019. 2
- [21] Rohit Girdhar and Kristen Grauman. Anticipative video transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 13505–13515, October 2021. 2
- [22] Kristen et al. Grauman. Ego4d: Around the World in 3,000 Hours of Egocentric Video. *CoRR*, abs/2110.07058, 2021. 3
- [23] Y.-G. Jiang, J. Liu, A. Roshan Zamir, G. Toderici, I. Laptev, M. Shah, and R. Sukthankar. Thumos challenge: Action recognition with a large number of classes. <http://csrcv.ucf.edu/THUMOS14/>, 2014. 2, 3, 6
- [24] Evangelos Kazakos, Jaesung Huh, Arsha Nagrani, Andrew Zisserman, and Dima Damen. With a little help from my temporal context: Multimodal egocentric action recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.01024*, 2021. 2, 3
- [25] Evangelos Kazakos, Arsha Nagrani, Andrew Zisserman, and Dima Damen. Epic-fusion: Audio-visual temporal binding for egocentric action recognition. In *Proceedings of the*

- IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 5492–5501, 2019. 3, 6
- [26] Evangelos Kazakos, Arsha Nagrani, Andrew Zisserman, and Dima Damen. Slow-fast auditory streams for audio recognition. In *ICASSP 2021-2021 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 855–859. IEEE, 2021. 6, 8
- [27] Tianwei Lin, Xiao Liu, Xin Li, Errui Ding, and Shilei Wen. Bmn: Boundary-matching network for temporal action proposal generation. In *Proceedings of The IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2019. 2, 3, 4, 6
- [28] Tianwei Lin, Xu Zhao, Haisheng Su, Chongjing Wang, and Ming Yang. Bsn: Boundary sensitive network for temporal action proposal generation. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2018. 3
- [29] Qinying Liu and Zilei Wang. Progressive boundary refinement network for temporal action detection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 11612–11619, 2020. 3
- [30] Xiaolong Liu, Qimeng Wang, Yao Hu, Xu Tang, Song Bai, and Xiang Bai. End-to-end temporal action detection with transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.10271*, 2021. 3
- [31] Antoine Miech, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Learnable pooling with context gating for video classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.06905*, 2017. 5
- [32] Arsha Nagrani, Shan Yang, Anurag Arnab, Aren Jansen, Cordelia Schmid, and Chen Sun. Attention bottlenecks for multimodal fusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.00135*, 2021. 3
- [33] Megha Nawhal and Greg Mori. Activity graph transformer for temporal action localization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.08540*, 2021. 3, 7, 8
- [34] Yan Bin Ng and Basura Fernando. Human action sequence classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.02602*, 2019. 2
- [35] Zhiwu Qing, Ziyuan Huang, Xiang Wang, Yutong Feng, Shiwei Zhang, Jianwen Jiang, Mingqian Tang, Changxin Gao, Marcelo H Ang Jr, and Nong Sang. A stronger baseline for ego-centric action detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.06942*, 2021. 6
- [36] Zhiwu Qing, Haisheng Su, Weihao Gan, Dongliang Wang, Wei Wu, Xiang Wang, Yu Qiao, Junjie Yan, Changxin Gao, and Nong Sang. Temporal context aggregation network for temporal action proposal refinement. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 485–494, 2021. 3
- [37] Dhanesh Ramachandram and Graham W Taylor. Deep multimodal learning: A survey on recent advances and trends. *IEEE signal processing magazine*, 34(6):96–108, 2017. 3
- [38] Deepak Sridhar, Niamul Quader, Srikanth Muralidharan, Yaixin Li, Peng Dai, and Juwei Lu. Class semantics-based attention for action detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 13739–13748, 2021. 3
- [39] Yapeng Tian, Jing Shi, Bochen Li, Zhiyao Duan, and Chenliang Xu. Audio-visual event localization in unconstrained videos. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 247–263, 2018. 3
- [40] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Proceedings of the 31st Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017. 5
- [41] Limin Wang, Yuanjun Xiong, Zhe Wang, Yu Qiao, Dahua Lin, Xiaoou Tang, and Luc Van Gool. Temporal segment networks: Towards good practices for deep action recognition. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 20–36, 2016. 4, 8
- [42] Weiyao Wang, Du Tran, and Matt Feiszli. What makes training multi-modal classification networks hard? In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12695–12705, 2020. 3
- [43] Chao-Yuan Wu, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Haoqi Fan, Kaiming He, Philipp Krahenbuhl, and Ross Girshick. Long-term feature banks for detailed video understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 284–293, 2019. 2, 3
- [44] Fanyi Xiao, Yong Jae Lee, Kristen Grauman, Jitendra Malik, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. Audiovisual slowfast networks for video recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08740*, 2020. 3
- [45] 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 (ICCV)*, page 5783–5792, 2017. 3
- [46] Mengmeng Xu, Chen Zhao, David S Rojas, Ali Thabet, and Bernard Ghanem. G-tad: Sub-graph localization for temporal action detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 10156–10165, 2020. 2, 3
- [47] Runhao Zeng, Wenbing Huang, Mingkui Tan, Yu Rong, Peilin Zhao, Junzhou Huang, and Chuang Gan. Graph convolutional networks for temporal action localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 7094–7103, 2019. 2, 3
- [48] Chuhan Zhang, Ankush Gupta, and Andrew Zisserman. Temporal query networks for fine-grained video understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4486–4496, 2021. 2
- [49] Chen Zhao, Ali K Thabet, and Bernard Ghanem. Video self-stitching graph network for temporal action localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 13658–13667, 2021. 2, 3
- [50] Hang Zhao, Antonio Torralba, Lorenzo Torresani, and Zhicheng Yan. Hacs: Human action clips and segments dataset for recognition and temporal localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 8668–8678, 2019. 3

## Supplementary Material

We complement our work with the following: (i) The details on the proposal generation (Sec. 1), (ii) per-class performance analysis (Sec. 2), and (iii) qualitative examples (please, check the attached slides).

### 1. Action proposals

This section analyzes the action proposals produced by the proposal generator, as explained in Sec. 3.1 and Fig. 2 (cf. the main manuscript). We measure the quality of the proposals with average recall (AR). [?] It is worth noting that proposals are class-agnostic and require further classification. AR measures the localization quality of the action proposals. We consider the limited number of predicted proposals when computing AR and compute it for several tIOU thresholds. In the following sections, we investigate which feature encoders to use and how to treat the input sequence.

#### 1.1. Feature encoders

Our focus is to investigate audiovisual inputs; thus, we consider the encoders that process auditory and visual signals. We consider TBN [?] and SlowFast [?, ?] networks as our feature encoders. TBN operates on RGB, Flow, and spectrogram, and Visual and Auditory SlowFast take video frames and spectrogram, respectively, as inputs. In Tab.1 we compare the performance of the proposal generator with TBN and SlowFast features. To see the effect of audiovisual features, we also show the results of a uni-modal proposal generator with visual-only or audio-only inputs. To create audiovisual SlowFast feature, we concatenate visual and auditory features of the corresponding SlowFast backbones. We notice that audiovisual SlowFast features (65.66%) outperforms TBN (64.61%) in the performance. Furthermore, we can observe that multi-modal SlowFast features outperforms uni-modal (65.66% for audiovisual vs 64.09% for visual and 56.38% for audio).

#### 1.2. Input sequence

As videos can vary in duration, their features can have different temporal dimensions. We investigate two types of input sequence treatment in the proposal generator: (1) rescaling the features to produce the input of a particular temporal size and (2) iterating over the features with a slid-

Features	Modality	AR (%)
TBN	RGB, flow, audio	64.61
SF	visual	64.09
SF	audio	56.38
SF	audio, visual	<b>65.66</b>

Table 1. **Average Recall (AR) for the proposals using TBN and SlowFast (SF) features for uni-modal and multi-modal scenarios.** We investigate which feature encoder results in superior performance and if the multi-modal scenario performs better than the uni-modal.


ing window. Sliding window treats time as the reference framework, whereas feature rescaling uses duration. As [?] mentioned, rescaling features is suboptimal for detecting short actions in long videos. This is particularly relevant for our work as EPIC-KITCHENS-100 is annotated with many atomic instances, and a video duration can exceed one hour. We observed that previous approaches for the temporal action localization in the dataset used both strategies. For instance, [?] utilizes feature rescaling and [?] uses the sliding window. Tab. 2 compares the AR of proposals using both strategies. We can see that the sliding window results in 10% AR increase compared to rescaling. That validates the idea that the sliding window is a better way to deal with the atomic actions in the dataset. Therefore, we conduct our experiments using the sliding window approach.

Features	AR (%)
TBN (rescaled)	54.91
TBN (sliding window)	<b>64.61</b>


Table 2. **Average Recall (AR) for the proposals using TBN features and treating the input sequence with rescaling or using sliding windows.**

#### 1.3. Window size

While processing the input sequence with a sliding window, we aim for the most effective window size. As [?] observed, over 98% of annotated action instances in EPIC-KITCHENS-100 [?] are shorter than 20 seconds. We ex-



(a) Verbs classes



(b) Noun classes

Figure 1. **Absolute per class improvement in performance of OWL with respect to the visual-only model, measured by the average precision (AP, %).** To observe the significant changes, we only visualize classes with the absolute difference in AP greater than 5%.

tracted features at 5fps; thus, to capture 98% of actions, we should aim for a minimal stride  $s = 20 * 5 = 100$ . In our experiments, we always take the stride  $s$  that equals half of the window size  $w$ . In Tab. 3 we investigate the best window size, starting with  $w = 200$  and  $s = 100$ . We keep increasing  $w$  as  $s$  until the performance degrades. That ensures that at least one sliding window will cover any action that does not exceed  $\frac{w}{2}$  seconds. We reach the higher performance with  $w = 300$  (and  $s = 150$ ). We believe that increasing the window size to 300 incorporates some relevant context to the model. However, increasing the window size further degrades the performance, suggesting that context becomes irrelevant (similarly to our transformer model’s temporal context).

## 2. Per-class performance of OWL

In Fig. 1 we show a per-class performance comparison of OWL relative to the visual-only model. We plot the absolute improvement, measured by average precision (AP), for noun (Fig. 1b) and verb (Fig. 1a) classes. We can ob-

Window Size	AR (%)
200	65.52
300	<b>65.66</b>
400	63.75

Table 3. **Average Recall (AR) for the proposals using different sliding window sizes.**

serve that OWL performs better than the visual-only model for most verb and noun classes. We attribute the improvements to audio or context incorporation and discuss them in the following subsections.

**Audio.** Verbs ‘pour’, ‘crush’, ‘drink’ have distinctive sounds, and OWL performs better than the visual-only model on these classes. ‘Drink’ is, arguably, the most interesting case as the source of sound is very close to the camera microphone. As we expect, OWL improves the AP by more than 10% on this class. Likewise, several noun classes, such as ‘machine:washing’, ‘toaster’, ‘fridge’,

'oven', 'fan:extractor', 'cooker:slow', 'kettle', 'microwave', 'dishwasher' are the electronic kitchen appliances which usually have distinctive sounds when turned on and off and while operating.

**Context.** Several verbs, such as '*transition*'(used interchangeably with '*move*', '*walk in*' in the dataset taxonomy), '*open*', '*put*', '*close*' have better predictions with OWL. We believe that the improvement for these verb classes can be attributed to context incorporation. As was mentioned in Fig. 1 of the main paper, humans often do their kitchen activities following some patterns (*e.g.* logical order in human-object interactions). We also hypothesize that food that is usually packed, such as '*yoghurt*', '*cream*', '*grape*', '*nut*', '*meat*', '*carrot*', '*salt*', '*juice*', '*cereal*', '*pasta*', '*hummus*' could be ambiguous for the model when are shown packed (as shown in Fig.1 in the main paper). However, with some knowledge from the context, the network can leverage this ambiguity, and we attribute some improvement for these classes to these cases.