

Learning Object States from Actions via Large Language Models

Masatoshi Tateno^{1,2}, Takuma Yagi², Ryosuke Furuta¹, and Yoichi Sato¹

¹ The University of Tokyo

{masatate, furuta, ysato}@iis.u-tokyo.ac.jp

² National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST)

{takuma.yagi}@aist.go.jp

Abstract. Temporally localizing the presence of object states in videos is crucial in understanding human activities beyond actions and objects. This task has suffered from a lack of training data due to object states' inherent ambiguity and variety. To avoid exhaustive annotation, learning from transcribed narrations in instructional videos would be intriguing. However, object states are less described in narrations compared to actions, making them less effective. In this work, we propose to extract the object state information from action information included in narrations, using large language models (LLMs). Our observation is that LLMs include world knowledge on the relationship between actions and their resulting object states, and can infer the presence of object states from past action sequences. The proposed LLM-based framework offers flexibility to generate plausible pseudo-object state labels against arbitrary categories. We evaluate our method with our newly collected Multiple Object States Transition (MOST) dataset including dense temporal annotation of 60 object state categories. Our model trained by the generated pseudo-labels demonstrates significant improvement of over 29% in mAP against strong zero-shot vision-language models, showing the effectiveness of explicitly extracting object state information from actions through LLMs.

Keywords: Object State Recognition · Learning from Narrated Videos
· Large Language Models

1 Introduction

What do we need to understand in a scene of cooking an omelet? Actions and objects involved in the scene, like “crack eggs into a bowl” are some of the key elements but that is not all. As the scene progresses, objects undergo state changes triggered by human actions. For example, when one cracks an egg and then whisks it, the *whole* egg becomes *cracked*, and then becomes *whisked* once the action is accomplished, while it remains *raw* during these actions. In addition to actions and objects, it is important to understand how the state of objects actually changes as a result of the actions, which is necessary for various domains such as cooking [33], assembly [10, 36], and robotics [21].




Fig. 1: We propose to generate pseudo-object state labels from relatively abundant action information included in narration using LLMs (left). Inferred pseudo-labels are used to train a frame-wise object state classifier (right).

Despite its importance, the object state recognition task has suffered from the lack of training data. Even a single type of object can have dozens of states. They are not necessarily exclusive, and the criteria of their distinction are often ambiguous (*e.g.*, large cut vs. small cut [35]). Manual annotation of temporally-changing object states (*e.g.*, [26]) requires a lot of exhausting work and is vulnerable to the change of vocabulary.

To bypass the annotation effort, learning from instructional videos on the Internet with automatically transcribed narrations is adopted in various video recognition tasks [2, 5, 28]. Narrations in instructional videos offer valuable information about what people do in the videos and can be used as a scalable resource for training models.

However, learning object states from video narrations has not been as successful as learning actions and objects. In instructional videos, speakers talk about the most important events first, and often omit obvious or unimportant information [16, 31]. They often do not tell much about the states of objects compared to what they are doing (actions) and what they are handling (objects). Therefore, naively training recognition models for less described entities from raw narrations may lead to suboptimal results.

How can we utilize the untold object state information implicitly told in narrations? We propose to use off-the-shelf large language models (LLMs) to infer the likely object states from action information included in video narrations (Figure 1 left). LLMs trained by massive amounts of text corpus are showing impressive reasoning abilities in various tasks [6, 7]. They are especially good at re-arranging information such as summarization [47] and paraphrasing [47].

Our key idea is to infer the presence of object states from video narrations by LLMs from the actions described in video narrations. We argue that the sequence of past actions extracted from video narrations tells about when an object state appears and disappears. For example, after peeling, slicing, and grating the apple, the state is no longer *sliced* because the apple lost the distinct shape of slice. The relationship between actions and object states implicitly

encoded in LLMs allows us to generate pseudo-object state labels for training a frame-wise object state classification model (Figure 1 right).

Specifically, we propose a three-step framework to infer temporally localized object state information from video narrations. First, given transcribed narrations with a target object category name, we extract a set of *manipulation actions* describing the actions related to target objects. Next, for each primary action, we generate its *state descriptions* which describes the resulting states caused or inferred by that specific action. Finally, the accumulated list of inferred state descriptions is used to determine the presence of a specific object state at each time. LLMs are used in each phase to bridge between the above concepts.

We also use vision-language models (VLMs) to temporally align the inferred object state labels and video frames. The inferred object state labels are used to train a frame-wise classification model. Since pseudo-labels are sparse, we found training temporal segmentation models directly from pseudo-labels leads to suboptimal results. To this end, we introduce a simple self-training scheme of training a student model with an ensemble of the outputs of two teacher models with different temporal windows initialized using raw pseudo-labels.

Since there are no suitable datasets evaluating temporal segmentation performance of object states, we collected a new Multiple Object States Transition (MOST) dataset containing 60 object states from six object categories (apple, egg, flour, shirt, tire, and wire). The MOST dataset is designed to evaluate finding the presence of object states, different from the previous datasets [17, 40] which aim to find state-changing actions rather than object states.

Experimental evaluation showed that our model demonstrates significant improvement of over 29% in mAP against strong zero-shot vision-language models [34, 45], suggesting the effectiveness of explicitly extracting object state information implicit in narrations, through LLMs. It also achieved competitive performance in localizing state-changing actions in the ChangeIt dataset [40] with minimum modifications.

2 Related Work

2.1 Learning Object States from Images

Learning and recognizing object states from images has been studied from their early days by collecting images from the Internet [15, 19, 30, 32, 35, 39]. Tasks such as action-effect prediction [15], state discovery [19], action-state composition learning [32, 35] are studied. In these tasks, learning the relationship between actions and states is their primary interest. However, there is a limitation that images do not tell about the dynamics of how the object states change as a result of actions. In addition, action-state composition pairs need to be pre-defined, which imposes additional costs on adding new pairs.

2.2 Learning Object States from Videos

Videos capture the dynamics of object state changes better than images. Tasks such as object state classification [14, 26], discovery of internal states [3, 10],

action-state modeling [13, 57], and point-of-no-return temporal localization [17] has been studied. While early works relied on small-scale video collection and annotation, learning from abundant Internet videos with video captions has become a trend due to its scalability [5, 40, 41]. Souček *et al.* [40] propose a unsupervised method to learn the object state change dynamics from Internet videos using causal ordering constraints, further extended to multi-task learning [41]. Concurrently, Xue *et al.* [50] uses LLMs to mine the possible object with specific state transition from video narrations using LLMs in an open-world manner. While ordering constraints provide natural supervision for object state recognition, it is based on unrealistic assumptions that (i) the state-changing action always exists and (ii) the state change occurs only once in a video. Our work pursues different directions of using LLMs to extract object state information from narrations in a scalable manner without relying on heuristics.

2.3 Learning from Video Narrations

The transcribed narrations of Internet videos can be used as a scalable resource for video learning tasks [2, 11, 24, 28, 29, 37, 38, 42, 49, 53–56]. However, these ASR narrations are found to be suboptimal due to irrelevant or noisy descriptions (*e.g.*, introduction, random chat, advertisement) and erroneous temporal boundaries. To mitigate the above issue, techniques such as multiple instance learning [28], distant supervision via wikiHow [24], use of knowledge graph [54], learning the alignability of narrations [18], sequence-to-sequence alignment [11], and temporal modeling [53], has been proposed. The emphasis of these methods has been on verbs and nouns in narration, and learning of adjectives including states has only been addressed to a limited extent. Instead of removing or replacing irrelevant information from narrations, we attempt to extract object state information from narrations, using the internal knowledge of LLMs.

2.4 LLMs for Visual Learning

LLMs trained by large amounts of text corpus (*e.g.*, [6]) have been demonstrating remarkable ability in various text reasoning tasks. Recently, several attempts to leverage LLMs to visual learning are made in tasks as image captioning [9, 22], action recognition [23], video understanding [44, 46, 51], and active object grounding [48]. In video-text tasks, the high flexibility of LLMs allows us to extract essential information from noisy narratives [44] and to expand text labels by summarization and rephrasing [52]. Lin *et al.* [23] propose an unsupervised approach using off-the-shelf VLMs and LLMs to construct a text bag corresponding to unlabeled videos, which is optimized by a multiple-instance learning objective. LAVILA [52] uses LLMs to densely describe the events in long-form videos. Alper *et al.* [4] propose a similar scheme of producing free-form text labels through LLMs for human-human interaction prediction problems. Instead of using LLMs for simple rephrasing or captioning, we propose to use LLMs as a bridge between two different concepts—actions and object states. We show that information not

always mentioned often, such as object states, can be efficiently recovered from label-abundant concepts such as actions.

3 Method

3.1 Problem Setting

Our goal is to predict the timings of where a specific object state is present in a video. Therefore, we formulate the problem as a multi-label frame-wise classification task.

Formally, we assume a set of instructional videos $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{V}$ including the object of interest with multiple object state changes. Each video is accompanied by a set of video narrations describing the content of the video. Given a video $\mathbf{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_T\}$ of length T , the goal is to predict a sequence of binary vectors $\mathbf{Y} = \{\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \dots, \mathbf{y}_T\}$, where $\mathbf{y}_i = \{y_i^1, y_i^2, \dots, y_i^K\}$ is a binary vector denoting the presence of K object state labels at time i .

Since there is often a range of meanings for an object state, we assume pairs of a state name (*e.g.*, sliced) and its textual definition composed of a few sentences (*e.g.*, “the state of an apple that has been cut into thin or narrow pieces. It does not include the case where the apple is split into two or three large pieces. Even if it is cooked, it is still applicable as long as it retains the shape of the pieces.”). Object state labels are not mutually exclusive and more than one object state may appear in a video frame simultaneously (*e.g.*, a shirt may be *soaked* and *dried* at the same time).

3.2 Object State Label Extraction from Actions via LLMs

To address the lack of object state information in video narrations, we introduce a three-stage framework for generating object state labels from video narrations via LLMs, namely consisting of (a) manipulation action extraction (b) state description generation from actions (c) context-aware object state label inference. The key observation is that the presence of an object state, which is not necessarily mentioned in the narrations, can be inferred from (1) the actor’s current actions and (2) the past object state of the object. We leverage LLMs at each stage to efficiently extract object state information from noisy narrations.

Manipulation Action Extraction The goal of this stage is to extract a set of manipulation actions of the actor from ASR narrations. Raw ASR transcriptions accompanied with instructional videos offer valuable information on the actor’s actions. However, raw narrations often contain transcription errors, over-segmentation, and irrelevant contents unrelated to the visible actions which may harm inferring object states. To this end, we first leverage LLMs to extract *manipulation actions* that the actor actually conducts in the scene, from narrations (See supplementary for full prompts). Specifically, a small block of narrations and their timestamps (10 sentences per block) are fed into LLMs to output a




Fig. 2: Three-stage framework of inferring presence of object state labels from video narration. (a) Manipulation action extraction from narration. (b) Object state description generation from actions. (c) Context-aware object state label inference.

set of manipulation actions. (Figure 2 (a)) Note that manipulation actions do not correspond to original narrations one by one. To obtain the time interval for each extracted action, we also prompt LLMs to refer back to mark the narration that best match what the action says, and take the interval of it as the interval of the manipulation action.

Object State Description Generation from Actions Next, we sequentially generate a set of *state description* from manipulation actions, which is used as intermediate information before generating the object state pseudo-labels (Figure 2 (b)). State description is a short sentence including the target object name and a description concisely describing their state. The motivation of state description is to keep track of the object’s state at that time while (i) detecting whether the object has undergone any kind of state change and (ii) dealing with changes in the object name.

In this stage, we assume a set of action blocks, each including 10 manipulation actions, and the initial state description is set as “The state of <object name> is unknown.”. At each block, we pass the set of current manipulation actions and the last state description to LLMs and generate a sequence of state descriptions corresponding to each action. By considering the past state description, LLMs can track what change has been applied to the object, and generate temporally consistent state descriptions across videos.

We found that explicitly generating the current object name is crucial in this case because the names of the objects often change as a result of object state changes. For example, a sliced apple mixed with other ingredients would be later called a *mixture* in some narrations. In such a case, it is no longer called as *apple*

anymore. Therefore, an explicit mechanism to infer that the *apple* has changed to a *mixture* is necessary to keep track of the object state changes.

Context-aware Object State Label Inference Finally, we infer whether a target object state (*e.g.*, whole, cooked, or sliced) is present at the timing of each state description. (Figure 2 (c)) For each state description, we feed the concatenation of all the state descriptions up to that timing to LLMs and prompt it to produce the presence (in either “Yes”, “No” or “ambiguous”) of each of the K object states. Because some object states are kept unchanged from the beginning of the video, it is crucial to input all their temporal context. Since target object state names are often not enough to determine their meanings, we also input their detailed definition to LLMs. We allow LLMs to answer “ambiguous” if the given list of state descriptions does not contain enough information. The object state labels determined as ambiguous are not used for training.

3.3 Interval Alignment via VLMs

We now obtained a list of object state labels with their corresponding manipulation actions and time intervals. The intervals of actions roughly correspond to the presence of the object states. However, they are not correctly temporally aligned due to misalignment between (a) narrations and video frames (b) the presence of object states and actions. Therefore, there is a need to match between object states and video frames. Instead of explicit alignment (*e.g.*, [11]) we introduce a simple two-stage technique of assigning object state labels to video frames, using off-the-shelf vision-language models (VLMs).

Figure 3 shows the detailed procedure. Similar to Sec. 3.2, our observation is that the interval of an object state roughly matches with that of its corresponding action. First, given a video frame, we ask the VLM the most plausible manipulation action to the frame from candidate manipulation actions within before/after Δt seconds around the frame (Figure 3 (a)). We allow the VLM to choose “others” option if no actions represent the frame. The frame is not used for training if “others” is chosen.

Once we assign likely actions to each frame, we then use the corresponding object state description to filter out irrelevant frames using VLMs (Figure 3 (b)). We assign object state labels with their value (true/false) to the video frames that passed this phase.

Note that determining intervals by looking at the action does not mean that pseudo-labels are assigned only if state-changing actions exist. We can infer the presence of object states from some actions not related to their state change. For example, “picking apples from the tree” implies that the apples are whole and not sliced or cooked even though it does not trigger object state changes.

3.4 Learning from Pseudo-Object State Labels

Finally, we train the frame-wise object state classifier using generated pseudo-object state labels.




Fig. 3: Temporal alignment between video frames and action/object state description pair. (a) Given video frame, we select most likely actions from surrounding candidates using VLMs. (b) Interval is further filtered by matching frame and state description.




Fig. 4: Self-training via ensemble of teacher models.

Pseudo-Label Preprocessing To make the model sensitive only to visible target objects, we use CLIP [34] to assign negative labels to the frames without target objects. We take the cosine similarity between a video frame and pre-defined target object names and assign negative labels to all the object states if their maximum score is under a certain threshold.

Self-Training from Ensemble The generated pseudo-labels are partially assigned to video frames. While we would like to employ temporal models to capture the dynamics between actions and object states, directly learning from the partial pseudo-labels results in suboptimal results. We introduce a self-training scheme based on mean teacher learning [43] which updates the target student model from the ensemble of teacher models initialized from pseudo-labels.

Figure 4 shows the overview of training. We first train two frame-wise *teacher* state classification models with different temporal windows: **MLP** and **TCN**, using the original pseudo-labels. Both models have a pre-trained backbone fixed during training and additional layers for fine-tuning, while they are similar to ac-

tion segmentation models (*e.g.*, [12]), the final layer of each model has a sigmoid activation because object states are not mutually exclusive. They are trained with standard binary cross entropy loss only calculated for valid pseudo-labels.

In this work, we use the InvernVideo [45] visual encoder for the backbone. **MLP** has a 2-layer MLP head and it does not take any temporal context into account. **TCN** has stacked temporal convolutional networks to model the temporal relationship between frames. We modify MS-TCN [12] to replace the softmax layer in each stage with a sigmoid layer. At this phase, **TCN** does not perform well due to missing pseudo-labels.

Given the above two models as teacher models, we propose to train another set of **MLP** and **TCN** as student models, taking the weighted sum of teacher models’ predictions as ground truth. The ensemble of two soft labels mitigates the missing label issue on training the student **TCN** model. Formally, the new ensembled target $\mathbf{y}_t^{\text{ens}}$ for t -th video frame can be denoted as follows:

$$\mathbf{y}_t^{\text{ens}} = \alpha \cdot \hat{\mathbf{y}}_t^{\text{TCN}} + (1 - \alpha) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{y}}_t^{\text{MLP}}. \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_t^{\text{TCN}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_t^{\text{MLP}}$ are the output of **MLP** and **TCN**, respectively, and $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ denote the weight of different labels. In this work, we set α to 0.5.

Following the mean teacher strategy [18, 43], we concurrently update the parameters of the teacher models via the Exponential Moving Average (EMA) mechanism. The teacher models are gradually updated to follow the student models. We use the momentum coefficient of 0.999. After student model training, only the student **TCN** model is used for inference.

4 Experiments

We examine our proposed approach in two benchmarks: Newly collected Multiple Object States Transition (MOST) dataset and the existing ChangeIt dataset [40].

4.1 Multiple Object States Transition Dataset (MOST)

Since there were no publicly available datasets on temporally localizing the presence of object states, we created a new evaluation dataset called Multiple Object States Transition (MOST) dataset. We manually collected instructional videos from YouTube for six object categories: apple, egg, flour, shirt, tire, and wire, that take various types of object states. We selected around 10 object states per object category to annotate, covering the popular states the object may take (see supplementary for full lists). For the videos showing the target object, annotators marked the interval where each object state exists. As a result, 61 videos with a total duration of 159.6 minutes were fully annotated.

As shown in the examples (see Figure 5), the object states are densely annotated, and have more complicated transition patterns between different states to measure when the object state is actually present rather than finding the timing of state-changing actions as in previous datasets [3, 40].




Fig. 5: Annotation example of MOST dataset. Red bands show presence of object states by time (seconds). All labels are marked negative if target objects are not visible.

Indeed, ChangeIt [40] annotates object state labels as pre/post condition of actions. For example, the *initial* label for *Cake frosting* is only marked just before the action starts, but the frames of unfrosted cake that are temporally distant from the action are labeled as *background*, which means that the presence of object states cannot be determined solely without state-changing actions.

The MOST dataset covers various object states including those that are not necessarily associated with actions (*e.g.*, straight, dry, flat, smooth), providing a more direct benchmark of object state recognition.

4.2 Implementation Details

Training Data We used the subset of HowTo100M [29] as training data. We assume access to the target object names and their states to recognize. Given a target object name (*e.g.*, apple), we first selected videos that included the object name in the title and narration. We further selected videos that included the verbs likely to be associated with the target objects. We used LLMs to automatically create a list of the likely associated verbs. For example, from an object-state pair “peeled apple”, verbs such as “peel”, “slice”, and “cut” are suggested. Finally, we removed videos with very long narrations ($> 12,000$ words) to fit the maximum context length of LLMs, resulting in around 2K videos per object category by adjusting the maximum YouTube search rank (see supplementary for details).

For evaluation of ChangeIt dataset [40], we used the subset of the original ChangeIt videos including narrations for training. We selected at most 350 videos per category with the highest noise adaptive weight [40]. This results in 10,749 videos in total, which is 32% of the original dataset.

Pseudo-Label Generation We used the pre-processed narrations from [18] that removed low-quality subtitles. We used GPT-3.5 (`gpt-3.5-turbo-1106`) for the LLM to process narrations. Samples that did not follow the specified output format (approximately 1%) are discarded. We used LLaVA-1.5 13B [25] 4-bit quantized model for VLMs used for temporal alignment. We set the window Δt to 10 seconds on selecting manipulation action candidates.

We applied our framework to videos of 1,123 hours in total. As a result, pseudo-labels are assigned to 74% of the video frames.

Models For the feature backbone, we used the pre-trained InternVideo visual encoder (InternVideo-MM-14-L) [45] and sampled 8 frames per second to obtain the feature vectors at 1 fps. For the **TCN** classifier, we used MS-TCN [12] with 4 stages. Each stage consists of 10 layers of 512 dimensions, followed by a final linear layer of K outputs with Sigmoid activation. The **MLP** classifier is a simple MLP consisting of a linear layer of 512 dimensions followed by ReLU activation and the final linear layer of K outputs followed by Sigmoid activation. The models were trained separately for each object category.

Optimization We have two learning stages: one for learning the teacher models using pseudo-labels generated by LLMs and the other for self-training with the student model. We train each model with a batch size of 16 for 50 epochs in the first stage, followed by 50 epochs in the second one. We use the Adam optimizer [20] with decoupled weight decay regularization [27]. We set the learning rate to $1e-4$ and the weight decay to 0.01.

Datasets and Metrics For MOST dataset, we report F1-max and Average Precision (AP) to measure the correctness of temporal localization of object states. To make scores comparable against uncalibrated zero-shot models, we report F1-max which is the maximum F1 score at the optimal threshold. We set the thresholds for each object state category.

ChangeIt dataset evaluates the performance of temporally localizing (i) the initial state, (ii) the state-modifying action, and (iii) the end state. For 44 state-changing actions, 667 videos up to 48 hours are annotated for evaluation. Following [40] we report precision@1 for action and state respectively.

4.3 Evaluation on MOST Dataset

Comparison to off-the-shelf VLMs To show the effectiveness of explicitly generating object state labels from narrations via LLMs, we compared our method with three zero-shot VLM models trained from various vision-language data: LLaVA [25], CLIP [34], and InternVideo [45].

LLaVA is a large multi-modal LLM that accepts a pair of an image and texts. We used the same model (LLaVA-1.5 13B 4-bit quantized) which is used in interval alignment of our proposed method. We feed each video frame and object state definition to LLaVA and prompt it to first describe the image and then answer whether the object state is present in the image. As the model only produce binary predictions, we only compute the F1-max score.


CLIP [34] is a simple yet strong model trained by massive image-text pairs with contrastive learning. We input each video frame and object state text to the image and text encoder to calculate the similarity score between frames and object states. Similar to [40], we tested several text prompts such as “a photo of <object state><object name>” (*e.g.*, “a photo of cracked egg”) and reported their best results (see supplementary for details).

Table 1: Comparison with other baselines on MOST dataset. F1 denotes F1-max score and mAP denotes mean Average Precision score averaged across object state categories.

Method	Apple		Egg		Flour		Shirt		Tire		Wire		Average	
	F1	mAP	F1	mAP										
LLaVA [25]	0.34	—	0.29	—	0.35	—	0.28	—	0.47	—	0.27	—	0.33	—
CLIP [34]	0.42	0.35	0.37	0.28	0.38	0.26	0.33	0.27	0.55	0.45	0.33	0.25	0.39	0.31
InternVideo [45]	0.46	0.39	0.44	0.39	0.43	0.36	0.40	0.32	0.57	0.45	0.40	0.31	0.45	0.37
Ours	0.53	0.50	0.53	0.48	0.55	0.49	0.50	0.45	0.61	0.52	0.50	0.42	0.54	0.48

InternVideo [45] is a video-language foundation model based on masked video reconstruction and multi-modal contrastive learning, demonstrating strong results on various video recognition tasks. We input the model 8 video frames and the object state text similar to CLIP.

Table 1 shows the quantitative results. Our method achieves significantly better results and outperforms all the strong zero-shot baselines in both F1-max and AP, showing the effectiveness of learning from LLM-based object state pseudo-labels.

**Fig. 6:** Qualitative results of proposed model (target object: apple). Blue and red bar denote our model’s prediction and ground truth, respectively.

Qualitative Analysis Figure 6 shows the predictions of our trained model. Blue and red bar denote the prediction and the ground truth labels, respectively. Overall our model correctly localize the presence of multiple object states while there are false positive predictions in some labels (*e.g.*, sliced, cooked).

4.4 Ablation Study

Does temporal context matter in pseudo-label generation? We compare the model trained with pseudo-object state labels without using temporal context (Table 2 top). In this model, we infer the state description and the object




Fig. 7: Effect of temporal context on object state label inference. Action “Observing coagulation” tells only that egg is changing from unsolidified to solidified state, but it lacks other information such as whether egg is in shell or broken. These lack of information often leads to incorrect reasoning (top). This issue is mitigated by taking past history of actions into account (bottom).




Fig. 8: Qualitative analysis on the impacts from our key component. (a) Pseudo-labels generated w/o considering temporal context lead to false positive (top) and false negative (bottom) predictions due to incorrect label assignment. (b) The self-training model inherits the best aspects of both the MLP and MS-TCN models.

state labels each from single manipulation action one-by-one. We observe 3% gain on mAP showing that temporal context matters in inferring object states from actions. In Figure 7, we show an example of incorrect label generation due to a lack of context information. Figure 8a shows that models trained with context-aware labels produce better predictions.

Is self-training effective? Table 2 middle shows the performance of **TCN** and **MLP** models directly trained from pseudo-labels. While **TCN** trained from raw pseudo-labels shows inferior results against **MLP**, its performance surpasses **MLP** by 3% after self-learning. Figure 8b comparison against a video of *a wire twisted*. The final model suppresses the errors of the two teacher models.

Does action/state alignment help? As shown in Table 2 bottom, action/state alignment using VLMs showed a marginal improvement of 2%.

Table 2: Ablation results.

Method	F1-max mAP	
Full model	0.54	0.48
w/o context-aware pseudo-labels	0.52	0.45
w/o self-training (MS-TCN)	0.44	0.36
w/o self-training (MLP)	0.51	0.45
w/o action/state alignment	0.53	0.46

4.5 Evaluation on ChangeIt Dataset

Since the problem is different from that of MOST dataset, we made minor modifications to produce the three labels (*initial state*, *action*, and *end state*) during pseudo-label generation. We assign *background* label to video frames without a target object as in Section 3.4. Due to high computational demands, we omit the matching between state description and video frames. For a fair comparison, we also use the causal ordering constraints [40] at inference by selecting the frames of *initial state*, *action*, and *end state* with their highest probabilities while respecting their causal order.

Table 3 shows the results. Although our method uses less training data (approx. 30%), our method achieves competitive performance against the best single-task learning model [40], without relying on the strong heuristics of causal ordering constraints during training.

Table 3: Comparison on ChangeIt dataset. The rightmost two columns show precision@1 for states and actions, respectively.

Method	Training Data	State prec.	Action prec.
Single task models			
Random w/ constraint	—	0.15	0.41
CLIP ViT-L/14 [34]	Zero-shot	0.30	0.63
Alayrac <i>et al.</i> [2]	ChangeIt (full)	0.30	0.59
Look for the Change [40]	ChangeIt (full)	0.35	0.68
Ours	ChangeIt (w/narration)	0.42	0.56
Multi-task models			
Multi-Task [41]	ChangeIt (full)	0.49	0.80

5 Conclusion

We have developed a new framework for learning object states from narrated videos leveraging LLMs. The key idea is to infer the presence of object states from actions included in video narrations with the help of LLMs. We have found that considering the temporal context and self-training further boosts the accuracy of temporally localizing the presence of object states. We have shown that learning from explicitly generated pseudo-labels demonstrates significant improvement against strong vision-language models. This work opens up the possibility of using LLMs as a catalyst for recognizing label-scarce concepts through label-abundant concepts.

The limitation of this method is that it cannot produce pseudo-labels when narrations are missing. One workaround may be to densely describe the actions using existing VLMs as in [8] before object state label generation.

References

1. Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F.L., Almeida, D., Altenschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S., et al.: Gpt-4 technical report. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774 (2023)
2. Alayrac, J.B., Bojanowski, P., Agrawal, N., Sivic, J., Laptev, I., Lacoste-Julien, S.: Unsupervised learning from narrated instruction videos. In: Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 4575–4583 (2016)
3. Alayrac, J.B., Laptev, I., Sivic, J., Lacoste-Julien, S.: Joint discovery of object states and manipulation actions. In: Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). pp. 2127–2136 (2017)
4. Alper, M., Averbuch-Elor, H.: Learning human-human interactions in images from weak textual supervision. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV) (2023)
5. Bertasius, G., Torresani, L.: Cobe: Contextualized object embeddings from narrated instructional video. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)* **33**, 15133–15145 (2020)
6. Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J.D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., et al.: Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)* **33**, 1877–1901 (2020)
7. Bubeck, S., Chandrasekaran, V., Eldan, R., Gehrke, J., Horvitz, E., Kamar, E., Lee, P., Lee, Y.T., Li, Y., Lundberg, S., et al.: Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with gpt-4. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712 (2023)
8. Chen, G., Zheng, Y.D., Wang, J., Xu, J., Huang, Y., Pan, J., Wang, Y., Wang, Y., Qiao, Y., Lu, T., et al.: Videollm: Modeling video sequence with large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13292 (2023)
9. Chen, J., Guo, H., Yi, K., Li, B., Elhoseiny, M.: Visualgpt: Data-efficient adaptation of pretrained language models for image captioning. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 18030–18040 (2022)
10. Damen, D., Leelasawassuk, T., Mayol-Cuevas, W.: You-do, i-learn: Egocentric unsupervised discovery of objects and their modes of interaction towards video-based guidance. *Computer Vision and Image Understanding (CVIU)* **149**, 98–112 (2016)
11. Dvornik, N., Hadji, I., Zhang, R., Derpanis, K.G., Wildes, R.P., Jepson, A.D.: Stepformer: Self-supervised step discovery and localization in instructional videos. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 18952–18961 (2023)
12. Farha, Y.A., Gall, J.: Ms-tcn: Multi-stage temporal convolutional network for action segmentation. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 3575–3584 (2019)
13. Fathi, A., Rehg, J.M.: Modeling actions through state changes. In: Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 2579–2586 (2013)
14. Fire, A., Zhu, S.C.: Inferring hidden statuses and actions in video by causal reasoning. In: Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW). pp. 48–56 (2017)
15. Gao, Q., Yang, S., Chai, J., Vanderwende, L.: What action causes this? towards naive physical action-effect prediction. In: Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL). pp. 934–945 (2018)

16. Gordon, J., Van Durme, B.: Reporting bias and knowledge acquisition. In: Proceedings of the Workshop on Automated Knowledge Base Construction. pp. 25–30 (2013)
17. Grauman, K., Westbury, A., Byrne, E., Chavis, Z., Furnari, A., Girdhar, R., Hamburger, J., Jiang, H., Liu, M., Liu, X., et al.: Ego4d: Around the world in 3,000 hours of egocentric video. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 18995–19012 (2022)
18. Han, T., Xie, W., Zisserman, A.: Temporal alignment networks for long-term video. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 2906–2916 (2022)
19. Isola, P., Lim, J.J., Adelson, E.H.: Discovering states and transformations in image collections. In: Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 1383–1391 (2015)
20. Kingma, D.P., Ba, J.: Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In: Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) (2015)
21. Koppula, H.S., Saxena, A.: Anticipating human activities for reactive robotic response. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS). pp. 2071–2071 (2013)
22. Li, J., Li, D., Savarese, S., Hoi, S.: Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In: Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML) (2023)
23. Lin, W., Karlinsky, L., Shvetsova, N., Possegger, H., Kozinski, M., Panda, R., Feris, R., Kuehne, H., Bischof, H.: Match, expand and improve: Unsupervised finetuning for zero-shot action recognition with language knowledge. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). pp. 2851–2862 (2023)
24. Lin, X., Petroni, F., Bertasius, G., Rohrbach, M., Chang, S.F., Torresani, L.: Learning to recognize procedural activities with distant supervision. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 13853–13863 (2022)
25. Liu, H., Li, C., Li, Y., Lee, Y.J.: Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03744 (2023)
26. Liu, Y., Wei, P., Zhu, S.C.: Jointly recognizing object fluents and tasks in egocentric videos. In: Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). pp. 2924–2932 (2017)
27. Loshchilov, I., Hutter, F.: Decoupled weight decay regularization. In: Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR) (2019)
28. Miech, A., Alayrac, J.B., Smaira, L., Laptev, I., Sivic, J., Zisserman, A.: End-to-end learning of visual representations from uncurated instructional videos. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 9879–9889 (2020)
29. Miech, A., Zhukov, D., Alayrac, J.B., Tapaswi, M., Laptev, I., Sivic, J.: Howto100m: Learning a text-video embedding by watching hundred million narrated video clips. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). pp. 2630–2640 (2019)
30. Misra, I., Gupta, A., Hebert, M.: From red wine to red tomato: Composition with context. In: Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 1792–1801 (2017)
31. Misra, I., Lawrence Zitnick, C., Mitchell, M., Girshick, R.: Seeing through the human reporting bias: Visual classifiers from noisy human-centric labels. In: Pro-

- ceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 2930–2939 (2016)
32. Nagarajan, T., Grauman, K.: Attributes as operators: factorizing unseen attribute-object compositions. In: Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV). pp. 169–185 (2018)
 33. Nishimura, T., Hashimoto, A., Ushiku, Y., Kameko, H., Mori, S.: State-aware video procedural captioning. In: Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Multimedia (ACMMM). pp. 1766–1774 (2021)
 34. Radford, A., Kim, J.W., Hallacy, C., Ramesh, A., Goh, G., Agarwal, S., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Mishkin, P., Clark, J., et al.: Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In: Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML). pp. 8748–8763 (2021)
 35. Saini, N., Wang, H., Swaminathan, A., Jayasundara, V., He, B., Gupta, K., Shrivastava, A.: Chop & learn: Recognizing and generating object-state compositions. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). pp. 20247–20258 (2023)
 36. Sener, F., Chatterjee, D., Shelepov, D., He, K., Singhania, D., Wang, R., Yao, A.: Assembly101: A large-scale multi-view video dataset for understanding procedural activities. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 21096–21106 (2022)
 37. Sener, O., Zamir, A.R., Savarese, S., Saxena, A.: Unsupervised semantic parsing of video collections. In: Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). pp. 4480–4488 (2015)
 38. Shen, Y., Wang, L., Elhamifar, E.: Learning to segment actions from visual and language instructions via differentiable weak sequence alignment. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 10156–10165 (2021)
 39. Shirai, K., Hashimoto, A., Nishimura, T., Kameko, H., Kurita, S., Ushiku, Y., Mori, S.: Visual recipe flow: A dataset for learning visual state changes of objects with recipe flows. In: Proceedings of the International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING). pp. 3570–3577 (2022)
 40. Souček, T., Alayrac, J.B., Miech, A., Laptev, I., Sivic, J.: Look for the change: Learning object states and state-modifying actions from untrimmed web videos. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 13956–13966 (2022)
 41. Souček, T., Alayrac, J.B., Miech, A., Laptev, I., Sivic, J.: Multi-task learning of object states and state-modifying actions from web videos. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence (TPAMI)* pp. 1–17 (2024)
 42. Sun, C., Myers, A., Vondrick, C., Murphy, K., Schmid, C.: Videobert: A joint model for video and language representation learning. In: Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV). pp. 7464–7473 (2019)
 43. Tarvainen, A., Valpola, H.: Mean teachers are better role models: Weight-averaged consistency targets improve semi-supervised deep learning results. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)* **30** (2017)
 44. Wang, Y., He, Y., Li, Y., Li, K., Yu, J., Ma, X., Chen, X., Wang, Y., Luo, P., Liu, Z., Wang, Y., Wang, L., Qiao, Y.: Internvid: A large-scale video-text dataset for multimodal understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06942* (2023)
 45. Wang, Y., Li, K., Li, Y., He, Y., Huang, B., Zhao, Z., Zhang, H., Xu, J., Liu, Y., Wang, Z., Xing, S., Chen, G., Pan, J., Yu, J., Wang, Y., Wang, L., Qiao, Y.: Internvideo: General video foundation models via generative and discriminative learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.03191* (2022)

46. Wang, Z., Li, M., Xu, R., Zhou, L., Lei, J., Lin, X., Wang, S., Yang, Z., Zhu, C., Hoiem, D., et al.: Language models with image descriptors are strong few-shot video-language learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)* **35**, 8483–8497 (2022)
47. Witteveen, S., Andrews, M.: Paraphrasing with large language models. In: *Proceedings of the Workshop on Neural Generation and Translation*. pp. 215–220 (2019)
48. Wu, T.L., Zhou, Y., Peng, N.: Localizing active objects from egocentric vision with symbolic world knowledge. In: *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)* (2023)
49. Xue, H., Hang, T., Zeng, Y., Sun, Y., Liu, B., Yang, H., Fu, J., Guo, B.: Advancing high-resolution video-language representation with large-scale video transcriptions. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. pp. 5036–5045 (2022)
50. Xue, Z., Ashutosh, K., Grauman, K.: Learning object state changes in videos: An open-world perspective. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11782* (2024)
51. Zeng, A., Attarian, M., Choromanski, K.M., Wong, A., Welker, S., Tombari, F., Purohit, A., Ryo, M.S., Sindhvani, V., Lee, J., et al.: Socratic models: Composing zero-shot multimodal reasoning with language. In: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)* (2022)
52. Zhao, Y., Misra, I., Krähenbühl, P., Girdhar, R.: Learning video representations from large language models. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. pp. 6586–6597 (2023)
53. Zhong, Y., Yu, L., Bai, Y., Li, S., Yan, X., Li, Y.: Learning procedure-aware video representation from instructional videos and their narrations. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. pp. 14825–14835 (2023)
54. Zhou, H., Martín-Martín, R., Kapadia, M., Savarese, S., Niebles, J.C.: Procedure-aware pretraining for instructional video understanding. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. pp. 10727–10738 (2023)
55. Zhou, L., Xu, C., Corso, J.: Towards automatic learning of procedures from web instructional videos. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*. vol. 32 (2018)
56. Zhukov, D., Alayrac, J.B., Cinbis, R.G., Fouhey, D., Laptev, I., Sivic, J.: Cross-task weakly supervised learning from instructional videos. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. pp. 3537–3545 (2019)
57. Zhuo, T., Cheng, Z., Zhang, P., Wong, Y., Kankanhalli, M.: Explainable video action reasoning via prior knowledge and state transitions. In: *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Multimedia (ACMMM)*. pp. 521–529 (2019)

Supplementary Materials

Masatoshi Tateno^{1,2}, Takuma Yagi², Ryosuke Furuta¹, and Yoichi Sato¹

¹ The University of Tokyo

{masatate, furuta, ysato}@iis.u-tokyo.ac.jp

² National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST)

{takuma.yagi}@aist.go.jp

A Details on MOST Dataset

A.1 Object State Category and Their Definition.

MOST dataset covers six object categories: apple, egg, flour, shirt, tire, and wire. This selection covers diverse situations such as cooking, housework, hobbies, cars, crafts, and electronics. We select around 10 object states per object category and provide state definitions for each category name to ensure consistent annotation across the dataset. The definition essentially follows the dictionary meaning, but to avoid ambiguity, especially regarding the conditions under which a state disappears, these conditions are explicitly included in the definition. Table 1 shows the full list of object categories, state names, and their definitions. This information is used for annotation, pseudo-label generation, and model training/inference.

Table 1: Object State Category and Definition

Object	State	Definition
apple	whole	"The apple is whole" refers to the state of an apple that has not been cut or sliced and retains its original round shape. Even if it has been peeled or cooked, it is still applicable as long as it retains its original round shape.
	peeled	"The apple is peeled" refers to the state of an apple that has had its skin removed by peeling. If the apple is cooked or loses its round shape by being sliced or grated, we don't say it is peeled.
	grated	"The apple is grated" refers to the state of an apple that has been shredded or grinded into finer or smoother pieces. Sometimes grating can release moisture, but 'grated' refers to the presence of coarse grains. It no longer applies to smooth smoothies or sauces made by mixers or blenders.
	cut	"The apple is cut" refers to the state of an apple that has been coarsely split into 2 or 3 pieces. If it is sliced into small pieces, we don't say it is cut. It doesn't matter whether the apple is peeled or not.

	sliced	"The apple is sliced" refers to the state of an apple that has been cut into thin or narrow pieces. It does not include the case where the apple is split into two or three large pieces. Even if it is cooked, it is still applicable as long as it retains the shape of the pieces.
	cooked	"The apple is cooked" refers to the state of an apple that has been sufficiently heated in any way.
	baked	"The apple is baked" refers to the state of an apple that has been cooked in an oven.
	smooth	"The apple is smooth" refers to the state of an apple that has been squeezed or blended into a smooth texture. If the apple has turned to a liquid (completely juiced), we don't say it is smooth.
	dried	"The apple is dried" refers to the state of an apple that has been dried by removing moisture. This can be done by various methods, such as drying in the sun, drying in the oven, or drying in a dehydrator.
	mixed with other ingredients	"The apple is mixed with other ingredients" refers to the state of apple combined with other components in a recipe. It is applicable only when we can see multiple ingredients are mixed. If they have dissolved into a single object, the state doesn't apply. It doesn't refer to adding only seasonings or water. This state is not affected by the fact it is cooked or not.
	caramelized	"The apple is caramelized" refers to the state of apple that has been cooked with brown sugar, typically until it turns a golden brown color.
egg	intact	"The egg is intact" refers to the state of an egg's shell being unbroken or undamaged in a cooking situation. It implies that the egg has not cracked or shattered, ensuring that the contents of the egg, remain contained within the shell. As long as the shell is unbroken, the state applies even if it is boiled.
	raw	"The egg is raw" refers to an egg that has not been heated. It means that the egg's contents, including the yolk or egg white, have not undergone any cooking process involving heating, such as boiling, frying, or baking. As long as the egg has not been heated, it is raw even if it is whisked or mixed with other ingredients.
	boiled	"The egg is boiled" refers to the state of an egg cooked by immersing it with its shell in boiling water until it reaches the desired level of doneness. If the egg is boiled with its shell cracked open, "The egg is boiled" doesn't apply because it is poached.
	poached	"The egg is poached" refers to the state in which the egg is cooked by cracking it into hot water. It does not apply if the egg is boiled with the shell still attached.

	cracked	"The egg is cracked" refers to the state of a broken eggshell. After the eggshell is disposed of or removed, it is not "cracked" anymore.
	runny	"The egg is runny" refers to the state of the egg yolk or the entire egg when it is not fully cooked and has a semi-liquid consistency. This applies only if the yolk can be seen to be thick and liquid. If the egg is raw or cracked where it is not heated at all, "The egg is runny" doesn't apply.
	whisked	"The egg is whisked" refers to state of an egg beaten using a whisk or fork until the yolk and white are fully combined. The statement includes when only yolk or white is whisked. If the egg has been heated and cooked, "The egg is whisked" doesn't apply.
	cooked	"The egg is cooked" refers to the state of an egg when it has been heated sufficiently to reach a desired level of doneness. This doesn't apply to raw eggs or eggs that have been heated but are still runny.
	fried	"The egg is fried" refers to the state of an egg cooked by cracking it into a heated pan with oil or butter until the white part is cooked and the yolk is still runny or fully cooked. To be "fried" a certain degree of dry texture is necessary, and watery scrambled eggs is not applicable.
	scrambled	"The egg is scrambled" refers to the state of the cooked egg where the yolk and white of the egg are mixed together and cooked until they form a soft, creamy texture. "The egg is scrambled" applies if the egg has formed a texture by heat. If the egg is not heated well, the state is not applicable.
	foamy	"The egg is foamy" refers to the state of beaten egg whites that have been whisked vigorously until they form a light and airy texture. This is achieved by incorporating air into the egg whites, resulting in a foam-like consistency with soft peaks. If the egg has been cooked, the statement doesn't apply.
	baked	"The egg is baked" refers to the state of an egg cooked by placing it in an oven or similar heat source. Baking an egg typically involves cracking it into a dish or ramekin and then cooking it until the egg white is set and the yolk is still slightly runny.
	mixed with other ingredients	"The egg is mixed with other ingredients" refers to the state of eggs combined with other components in a recipe. It is applicable only when we can see multiple ingredients are mixed. The mix of only egg white and egg yolk is not applicable here. If they have dissolved into a single object, the state doesn't apply. It doesn't refer to adding only seasonings or water. This state is not affected by the fact it is cooked or not.
flour	dry	"The flour is dry" refers to the state of flour when it has not absorbed any moisture or liquid. In this condition, the flour remains in its loose, powdery form, without any clumps or dampness. If any moisture like water or egg is added, it is no longer dry.

	mixed with water	"The flour is mixed with water" refers to the state of flour that has been combined with water. If it is sufficiently kneaded or cooked, losing the fluidity, "The flour is mixed with water" is no longer applicable.
	combined with other ingredients	"The flour is combined with other ingredients" refers to the state of flour that has been combined with other ingredients in a recipe. It doesn't refer to adding only seasonings or water.
	lumpy	"The flour is lumpy" refers to the state of flour when it contains small clumps or aggregates, often as a result of moisture exposure or poor storage conditions. If the flour is sufficiently kneaded to remove the clumps, "The flour is lumpy" is no longer applicable.
	kneaded (dough)	"The flour is kneaded dough" refers to the state of flour that has been kneaded by hand or with a machine. Once the dough is flattened or cooked, "The flour is kneaded dough" is no longer applicable.
	flattened	"The flour is flattened" refers to the state of flour that it has been kneaded and stretched thin, or has become pacake butter and is spread thin. If it is not flattened, "The flour is flattened" is not applicable.
	baked	"The flour is baked" refers to the state of flour that has undergone a cooking process, typically in an oven or another heat source, which transforms its raw form into a firmer, cohesive and often golden-brown structure. If it is cooked in panful of oil, it is not baked but fried.
	fried	"The flour is fried" refers to the state of flour that has been cooked in panful of oil until it changes into crispy texture and often golden-brown color.
shirt	stained	"The shirt is stained" refers to the state of the shirt that has been marked or discolored by a foreign substance. This could have been caused by a variety of factors such as spilled food, ink, dirt, sweat, or any other substance that might leave a residue or color behind. However, if the color is intentionally added (e.g. dyeing), "The shirt is stained" does not apply.
	soaked	"The shirt is soaked" refers to the state of the shirt that has absorbed a significant amount of liquid, rendering it wet throughout. In this context, "soaked" does not merely mean a small splash or a few droplets of water but indicates that the shirt is thoroughly drenched.
	dry	"The shirt is dry" refers to the state of the shirt that indicates an absence of moisture or wetness on or within the fabric.
	wrinkled	"The shirt is wrinkled" refers to the state of the shirt that exhibits creases, folds, or irregularities on its surface rather than being smooth or flat.
	smooth	"The shirt is smooth" refers to the state of the shirt that indicates it has a flat and even surface without any wrinkles, creases, or rough patches.

	dyed	"The shirt is dyed" refers to the state of the shirt that has undergone a process to change its color. In this context, 'dyed' means the shirt has been treated with dyes or pigments to impart a specific color or design onto its fabric.
	folded	"The shirt is folded" refers to the state of the shirt that has been folded to make it more compact, neat, and easier to store.
	piled	"The shirt is piled" refers to the state of a shirt that has been stacked or heaped with other items, possibly other shirts or clothes.
	rolled	"The shirt is rolled" refers to the state of the shirt that has been folded or twisted into a cylindrical or tubular shape by rolling.
	hung	"The shirt is hung" refers to the state of the shirt that indicates it has been suspended, usually from a hanger, hook, or another support structure.
tire	flat	"The tire is flat" refers to the state of a tire that has lost its internal air pressure (deflated) to the point where it no longer maintains its rounded shape or provides the necessary cushioning for a vehicle's load.
	rinsed	"The tire is rinsed" refers to the state of a tire that has been washed away by water. If the soap or cleaner is on the tire, "The tire is rinsed" does not apply.
	taken off from the car	"The tire is taken off from the car" refers to the state of the tire that is no longer attached or mounted to the vehicle.
	nuts re- moved	"The tire is nuts removed" refers to the state of a tire that has had its lug nuts or wheel nuts removed. These nuts are used to secure the wheel to the vehicle's axle, ensuring that the tire stays in place while the vehicle is in motion.
	covered with wheel cleaner	"The tire is covered with wheel cleaner" refers to the state of the tire that has been treated or coated with a specific cleaning foam designed for wheels. If we cannot see the foam, "The tire is covered with wheel cleaner" does not apply.
	dirty	"The tire is dirty" refers to the state of the tire that indicates contamination or uncleanliness with soil on its surface.
	mounted on a rim	"The tire is mounted on a rim" refers to the state of a tire that has been attached and secured onto a wheel's metal structure, commonly known as the rim. This condition applies from the point where the tire is fully engaged in the rim.
wire	straight	"The wire is straight" refers to the state of a straight wire or cable that has not been coiled or twisted. A wire can become straight by pulling it and add tension to it.
	twisted	"The wire is twisted" refers to the state of a wire or cable that has been rotated around itself or another wire, causing it to form a helical or spiral shape.
	soldered	"The wire is soldered" refers to the state of a wire that has been joined or attached to another component using solder. If the solder is not used, it is not soldered.

cut	"The wire is cut" refers to the state of a wire or cable that has been cut using a tool such as a wire cutter. If the end of cut wire is connected to the other end or to another component, it is not cut anymore.
damaged	"The wire is damaged" refers to the state of a wire or cable that has been damaged or broken. If the wire is intentionally cut, stripped, or soldered, it is not considered damaged.
exposed	"The wire is exposed" refers to the state of a wire or cable with its skin or insulation removed, exposing the metal underneath. If the exposed wire is connected to another component, it is not exposed anymore.
coiled	"The wire is coiled" refers to the state of a coiled wire or cable that has been wrapped around itself or another wire, causing it to form a helical or spiral shape. We don't say it is coiled if it has only one loop.
braided	"The wire is braided" refers to the state of a wire that has been woven or interlaced into a braided pattern.
looped	"The wire is looped" refers to the state of a wire that has been bent into a loop or circle. If wires are tangled, it is not looped. If a wire is not looped if it is coiled.
connected	"The wire is connected" refers to the state of a wire or cable that has been attached to another component or element (not wire). If the wire is connected with another wire, we don't say it is not connected.

A.2 Ground Truth Label Annotation

For evaluation, we manually collected YouTube videos for each object category and densely annotated the interval of object states' presence at 30 fps based on the object state names and their definition. As a result, 61 videos with a total duration of 159.6 minutes were fully annotated. On average, five different states appeared in a single video. This is more than that of ChangeIt [40] dataset where only *initial/end* states are present in one video. Figure 1 provides the detailed distribution of MOST dataset.

During annotation, trained annotators were asked to annotate object states based on the definition in Table 1. If multiple object instances in different states appear in one frame, all of the present state labels are assigned to the frame. For example, if two apples are present in one frame, one peeled but the other sliced, the "peeled" and the "sliced" labels are assigned to the frame.

B Full Prompts Used to Infer Object States via LLM

We proposed a method to infer object state labels from the narration of videos in Section 3.2 of the main paper. The process consists of (a) extracting manipulation actions from narration, (b) generating state descriptions from the actions, and (c) inferring context-aware object state labels. Table 2, 3, and 4 show the prompts for (a), (b), and (c), respectively.




Fig. 1: Data distribution of MOST dataset. Y-axis denotes number of videos that each state presents.

When we adjust our model to ChangeIt [40] dataset, we only change the prompts for state label inference as shown in Table 5. Since ChangeIt dataset only includes the state-changing action category names, we prepared several adjectives that represent the end state of each action category.

For each process, outputs from the LLM are parsed and we use only direct answers with a specified format. See Section D.2 for examples of raw LLM output.

Table 2: Prompt for manipulation action extraction. We replace {block of transcribed narration} with at most 10 sentences of transcribed narration concatenated by newline. Black text is used as is.

Analyze a segment of video transcript provided in CSV format. The CSV only has one column and no headers.

{block of transcribed narration}

You need to list and describe all object manipulating actions performed in the video in detail. Do not include actions such as greeting, thanking, explaining or summarizing that do not manipulate any object. Do not summarize actions too short, but make sure you describe all the actions in each sentence in detail. Especially, make sure to use original nouns (object names) and verbs (human actions) when you summarize.

In addition, for each action, extract the part of the transcript that describes or supports the action. Make sure to extract the whole sentence for support. When you need to combine multiple lines from the transcript to support an action, separate them with a space instead of a comma or line break.

The answer format should be in CSV format. Make sure to use quotation marks for each action and the part of the transcript.

Format: "<detailed summary of action>", "<part of the transcript (This should be exactly the same as the original. Don't skip.)>"

Example: "Adding whisked eggs into the pan.", "let's add the whisked eggs into the pan"

Table 3: Prompt to generate object state description. We replace `{object}` with primary object name (Table 12), `{previous state description}` with previous last state description, `{action sequence}` with 10 actions concatenated by newline. Black text is used as is.

You will be given a sequence of actions. Trace the history of changes in the internal state of `{object}` and describe it in detail for each action. The initial state of the `{object}` is "`{previous state description}`". You don't need to include the initial state in the answer.

The answer format should be in CSV with the action column and state description column. Make sure that each state description includes the whole history of what has been done on the `{object}` so far. The description should be a complete sentence starting with "The `{object}`", but do not finish only with this.

If the internal state doesn't change after the action, you don't have to change the state description from the previous one. Use quotation marks for the description. The answer format:

```
"action","state"
```

Here is the sequence of actions.

```
{action sequence}
```

Table 4: Prompt to infer object state label from descriptions. We replace `{object}` with primary object name (Table 12), `{list of state description up to that point}` with state descriptions concatenated by newline, `{state}` with object state text (*e.g.* *The egg is raw*), and `{definition}` with state definition. Black text is used as is.

This is a history of state of `{object}`:
`{list of state description up to that point}`

Now, does the state of `{object}` fit the definition of "`{state}`"?

Object state definition:
`{definition}`

Think step-by-step as follows:

- First, list all points for judging the state "`{state}`" from the object state definition. Make sure to describe in detail.
- Second, carefully compare all listed judging points to the whole history of the object state by tracing it in detail.
- Then, answer Yes/No about whether the current state of `{object}` is consistent with the definition and give detailed reasons. If the history doesn't contain enough information for judging, answer Ambiguous.

Make sure to answer the three things above in detail, separating them by newline as follows:

Judging points: [judging points from object state definition]

Comparison: [comparison]

Answer: [yes/no/ambiguous and why]

Table 5: Prompt to infer object state label from descriptions for ChangeIt dataset. We replace `{object}` with primary object name (Table 12), `{list of state description up to that point}` with state descriptions concatenated by newline, `{end state}` with prepared end states concatenated by comma, and `{action}` with state-changing action category name. Black text is used as is.

This is a history of state of `{object}`:
`{list of state description up to that point}`

You need to infer the state of the `{object}` based on the history. When you answer, choose from the options below.

Options:

Initial - The `{object}` is just before being `{end state}`, but `{action}` has not started.

Action - The `{object}` is now being `{end state}`.

End - The `{object}` has already been `{end state}`, and `{action}` has been completed.

Ambiguous - Cannot identify the state from the action information, or the action is totally unrelated to `{action}`.

Think step-by-step as follows:

- First, describe the current state of the object in detail based on the history.
- Then, answer Initial/Action/End/Ambiguous and reason.

Current State: [detailed state description]

Answer: [yes/no/ambiguous and why]

C Full Prompts used in Interval Alignment via VLMs

We use LLaVA-1.5 [25] as VLM, and each video frame is fed to LLaVA in its original resolution of 240p with text prompts to assign the correct action and the state description. We provide the prompts for action inference and state description filtering in Table 6 and Table 7, respectively. For action inference, we prepare action candidates and prompt LLM to choose one of them. For state description filtering, the inferred action is added as context for a better understanding of the given video frame.

Table 6: Prompt to choose most plausible action. We replace {list of candidate actions} with candidate actions listed with “-” as first character and concatenated by newline. Black text is used as is.

Which action most describes the image? Choose from the options below. The answer should be taken verbatim from the text of the option.

{list of candidate actions}

Table 7: Prompt to filter unrelated video frame. We replace {inferred action} with selected plausible action, and {state} with object state text (*e.g.* *The egg is raw*). Black text is used as is.

The image possibly shows people {inferred action}. Describe the progress of the action in detail. And then answer whether "{state}" is true or not. Finally, specify the judgement with "The answer is True/False".

D Additional Information on Experiments

D.1 Experimental Setup

Training Data Collection We used GPT-4 [1] for creating the verb list for subset selection. Table 8 shows the prompt for listing associated verbs. The resulting verb list is shown in Table 10. We provide the number of training videos, the hours of videos, and the pseudo-label assignment rate in Table 9.

Table 8: Prompt to list associated verbs. `{list of object states}` with list of object state texts (e.g. *The egg is raw*) concatenated by newline.

List as many verbs that describe actions associated with each object state. Associated actions include the actions that are necessary to produce the object state and actions commonly performed on objects in that state.

`{list of object states}`

The answer format should be in comma-delimited CSV format. The verbs should be in infinitive form and single word.

Format: "<object state>(completely the same as given state description)", "<verb>,<verb>, ..., <verb>"

Table 9: Statistics of training data. Label assignment rate denotes the percentage of frames with either positive or negative labels assigned, averaged across all object state categories.

Category	Number of videos	Video duration (hours)	Label assignment rate
Apple	2095	224	86%
Egg	2379	229	64%
Flour	1091	114	81%
Shirt	1451	160	78%
Tire	1520	167	67%
Wire	1630	229	73%
Total	10166	1123	74%

Table 10: List of associated verbs for each object state. This information is used to find videos to use in training.

Object	State	Associated Verbs
apple	whole	buy, pick, choose, handle, display, store
	peeled	peel, slice, cut, core, dip
	grated	grate, mix, stir, press, dry
	cut	cut, chop, slice, dice, core
	sliced	slice, serve, arrange, layer, present
	cooked	cook, boil, stew, simmer, heat
	baked	bake, heat, glaze, cover, fill
	smooth	blend, puree, whip, process, stir
	dried	dry, store, package, grind, rehydrate
	mixed ...	mix, stir, blend, incorporate, season
	caramelized	caramelize, heat, stir, glaze, serve
egg	intact	handle, observe, inspect
	raw	crack, beat, whisk
	boiled	peel, eat, cool
	poached	serve, eat, season
	cracked	break, separate, whisk
	runny	stir, cook, season
	whisked	pour, mix, beat
	cooked	eat, serve, cut
	fried	flip, serve, eat
	scrambled	stir, eat, serve
	foamy	beat, fold, stir
	baked	remove, eat, serve
	mixed ...	stir, whisk, bake
flour	dry	measure, sift, pour, store
	mixed ...	stir, whisk, blend, mix
	combined ...	combine, mix, beat, incorporate
	lumpy	sift, beat, whisk, crush
	kneaded	knead, punch, stretch, fold
	flattened	roll, press, flatten, spread
	baked	bake, cool, cut, serve
	fried	fry, turn, drain, serve
shirt	stained	spill, drop, smear, splash, soak
	soaked	drench, immerse, submerge, squirt, splash
	dry	air-dry, blow-dry, heat, wring, squeeze
	wrinkled	crumple, crush, squeeze, wear, curl
	smooth	iron, press, flatten, stretch, pull
	dyed	color, soak, immerse, dip, stain
	folded	crease, bend, pleat, wrap, tuck
	piled	stack, heap, accumulate, gather, assemble
rolled	spin, rotate, turn, scroll, wrap	

	hung	suspend, drape, fasten, hook, display
tire	flat	inflate, inspect, replace, repair
	rinsed	spray, scrub, wash, dry
	taken off ...	unscrew, remove, lift, lower
	nuts ...	unscrew, replace, remove, loose
	covered ...	spray, spread, rub, clean
	dirty	wash, scrub, rinse, clean
	mounted ...	fit, secure, align, install
	wire	straight
twisted		twist, coil, bend, entangle
soldered		solder, join, attach, adhere
cut		cut, truncate, sever, divide
damaged		damage, hit, break, puncture
exposed		expose, uncover, reveal, unveil
coiled		coil, roll, loop, curl
braided		braid, twist, weave, interlace
looped		loop, circle, bend, round
connected		connect, link, tie, join

Details on Baseline Models For the LLaVA baseline, we fed each video frame and text prompt in Table 11 to the model. The output from LLaVA is parsed and we use only True or False for prediction. For the CLIP baseline, we input each video frame and object state text to the image and text encoder to calculate the similarity score between frames and object states, and use it as a confidence score. We tested several text prompts: “a photo of <object state><primary object name>”, “The <primary object name>is <object state>”, “a photo of <primary/secondary object name>”, and “<object definition>”. The best prompt is chosen for the object category, which maximizes the average score in the category. For the InternVideo baseline, we input the model in 8 fps and the object state text in the same way as CLIP. We used the scores reported in the original papers for the results of compared models in the ChangeIt dataset.

Table 11: Prompt for zero-shot object state inference using LLaVA. We replace `{state}` with object state text (e.g. *The egg is raw*), `{definition}` with object state definition.

Answer whether the image shows that "`{state}`". First describe the image. Then, specify the judgement with "The answer is True/False."

`{definition}`

Implementation Details When generating pseudo-labels, we use CLIP [34] to assign negative labels to the frames without target objects by taking the cosine similarity between a video frame and pre-defined target object names. Since the target object changes its states and can be called in another way, we manually set several object names for each category as shown in Table 12. The object names are then used in text prompts as “a photo of <object name>”. We take the maximum similarity score across the different prompts for each frame and compare it to the threshold of 0.2. When we generate pseudo-labels for ChangeIt dataset [40], we compute the threshold between 0.16 to 0.25 and report the best results since the annotation rules of the *background* label are not unified, and are different for each object category in the dataset.

Our proposed **TCN** model consists of the pre-trained InternVideo visual encoder (InternVideo-MM-14-L) [45] followed by a modified MS-TCN [12] classifier. MS-TCN is a multi-stage temporal convolutional network where each stage outputs a prediction that is refined by the subsequent stages. We implement 4 stages where each stage consists of 10 layers of 512 dimensions followed by a final linear layer of K outputs with sigmoid activation. Dropout value of 0.5 is used after each layer. We replace the softmax activation with sigmoid to match the multi-label setting.

Table 12: Object names used for assigning background labels using CLIP model. In addition to the primary object name (second column), additional secondary object names are used for filtering (third column).

Category	Primary Object Name	Secondary Object Name
Apple	apple	apples, apple sauce, apple pie
Egg	egg	eggs, egg mixture, meringue, omelet, soufflée, cake, quish
Flour	flour	dough, pizza, pancake, fritter
Shirt	shirt	t-shirt, clothes
Tire	tire	tires, wheel
Wire	wire	wires, cable, ring, wire accessory

D.2 Results

Qualitative Results of Pseudo-Labeling via LLMs Figure 2, 3, and 4 provide the raw output from LLMs in the process of (a) extracting manipulation actions from narration, (b) generating state descriptions from the actions, and (c) inferring context-aware object state labels, respectively.




Fig. 2: Examples of actual input narration and LLM outputs for action.




Fig. 3: Examples of actual manipulative action and LLM outputs for object state description.




Fig. 4: Examples of actual state description and LLM outputs for object state label inference.

Additional Qualitative Results We provide qualitative results in comparison with our model’s predictions and the ground truth in Table 5 - 10. We pick up a particularly relevant state in each video and display the results. For all tables, blue bars represent predictions, and red bars represent ground truth.




Fig. 5: Qualitative results of proposed model (target object: apple).




Fig. 6: Qualitative results of proposed model (target object: egg).




Fig. 7: Qualitative results of proposed model (target object: flour).




Fig. 8: Qualitative results of proposed model (target object: shirt).




Fig. 9: Qualitative results of proposed model (target object: tire).




Fig. 10: Qualitative results of proposed model (target object: wire).

Per-state Results For an in-depth understanding of the proposed method, we report per-state performance in Table 13. We categorize the object-state pairs into four groups in terms of their position in the task of instructional videos.

- a) **Typical goal state.** The object states that are commonly present as the final state of certain tasks, such as *baked apple/egg/flour*, *scrambled egg*, *fried egg/flour*, *tire mounted on a rim*, and *soldered wire*. We observe strong performance for this type. One reason is that these states are crucial in instructional videos, often containing the necessary action information to achieve these states in the narration. Additionally, these states almost do not change due to subsequent actions, eliminating the need for complex reasoning.
- b) **Intermediate state.** The intermediate object states in certain tasks, such as *peeled apple*, *cut apple*, *cracked egg*, *rinsed tire*, and *twisted wire*. We observe moderate performance for this type. Since people sometimes skip mentioning intermediate actions included in a task in a video, it is sometimes more difficult to assign correct state labels than the goal states. Furthermore, the presence of states may change several times due to subsequent actions, which makes it complicated to assign labels.
- c) **Typical initial state.** The object state that would normally exist initially if nothing were done to the object, such as *whole apple*, *intact egg*, *raw egg*, and *dry flour*. We surprisingly observe strong performance for this type. We initially thought that it is difficult for LLMs to infer these states because they don’t emerge as a result of a certain action. However, LLMs can successfully infer these classes from actions that are not directly related. For example, “picking apples from the tree” implies that the apple is in whole state.
- d) **Unintended state in instructional videos.** The object states that are not usually intended in instructional videos, such as *damaged wire*, *dirty tire*, and *stained shirt* (*i.e.* there are few instructional videos that intentionally damage wire). We observe poor performance for this type.

Table 13: Per-state category results. Each object state category is assigned to one of four subgroups.

Object State	F1-max	
	Ours	InternVideo
(a.) <i>Typical goal state</i>		
The apple is cooked.	0.76	0.60
The apple is baked.	0.67	0.45
The apple is caramelized.	0.70	0.57
The apple is dried.	0.70	0.70
The egg is boiled.	0.64	0.44
The egg is poached.	0.52	0.59
The egg is cooked.	0.77	0.71

The egg is fried.	0.64	0.35
The egg is scrambled.	0.63	0.85
The egg is baked.	0.88	0.36
The flour is baked.	0.60	0.26
The flour is fried.	0.61	0.58
The shirt is smooth.	0.66	0.62
The shirt is dyed.	0.61	0.33
The shirt is folded.	0.63	0.60
The shirt is piled.	0.39	0.17
The shirt is hung.	0.32	0.38
The tire is flat.	0.59	0.51
The tire is taken from the car.	0.89	0.87
The tire is mounted on a rim.	0.90	0.90
The wire is soldered.	0.65	0.52
The wire is braided.	0.61	0.27
The wire is looped.	0.81	0.30
<hr/>		
(b.) Intermediate state		
The apple is peeled.	0.32	0.35
The apple is grated.	0.12	0.26
The apple is cut.	0.56	0.68
The apple is sliced.	0.76	0.74
The apple is smooth.	0.45	0.17
The apple is mixed with other ingredients.	0.18	0.15
The egg is cracked.	0.19	0.26
The egg is runny.	0.23	0.25
The egg is whisked.	0.52	0.60
The egg is foamy.	0.48	0.19
The egg is mixed with other ingredients.	0.40	0.31
The flour is mixed with water.	0.41	0.60
The flour is combined with other ingredients.	0.31	0.31
The flour is lumpy.	0.62	0.58
The flour is kneaded.	0.52	0.38
The flour is flattened.	0.67	0.34
The shirt is soaked	0.52	0.50
The shirt is wrinkled	0.32	0.36
The shirt is rolled.	0.45	0.22
The tire is rinsed.	0.43	0.34
The tire is nuts removed.	0.80	0.79
The tire is covered with wheel cleaner.	0.48	0.37
The wire is twisted.	0.47	0.54
The wire is cut.	0.30	0.35
The wire is exposed.	0.69	0.82
The wire is coiled.	0.49	0.50
The wire is connected.	0.19	0.26

(c.) Typical initial state

The apple is whole.	0.59	0.40
The egg is raw.	0.72	0.48
The egg is intact.	0.27	0.34
The flour is dry.	0.66	0.42
<hr/>		
(d.) Unintended state in instructional videos		
The shirt is stained.	0.40	0.15
The tire is dirty.	0.21	0.20
The wire is straight.	0.43	0.29
The wire is damaged.	0.23	0.11
<hr/>		