

# EventZoom: A Progressive Approach to Event-Based Data Augmentation for Enhanced Neuromorphic Vision

Yiting Dong<sup>1,3,4\*</sup>, Xiang He<sup>2,3\*</sup>, Guobin Shen<sup>1,3,4</sup>, Dongcheng Zhao<sup>3,4</sup>, Yang Li<sup>2,3</sup>, Yi Zeng<sup>1,2,3,4,5†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Future Technology, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

<sup>2</sup>School of Artificial Intelligence, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

<sup>3</sup>Brain-inspired Cognitive Intelligence Lab, Institute of Automation, Chinese Academy of Sciences

<sup>4</sup>Center for Long-term Artificial Intelligence

<sup>5</sup>Key Laboratory of Brain Cognition and Brain-inspired Intelligence Technology, CAS

{dongyiting2020, hexiang2021, shenguobin2021, zhaodongcheng2016, liyang2019, yi.zeng}@ia.ac.cn




Figure 1: Visualization of Boxplots of multiple experiments using event augmentation methods in settings lacking temporal continuity and spatial integrity.

## Abstract

Dynamic Vision Sensors (DVS) capture event data with high temporal resolution and low power consumption, presenting a more efficient solution for visual processing in dynamic and real-time scenarios compared to conventional video capture methods. Event data augmentation serve as an essential method for overcoming the limitation of scale and diversity in event datasets. Our comparative experiments demonstrate that the two factors, spatial integrity and temporal continuity, can significantly affect the capacity of event data augmentation, which are guarantee for maintaining the sparsity and high dynamic range characteristics unique to event data. However, existing augmentation methods often neglect the preservation of spatial integrity and temporal continuity. To address this, we developed a novel event data augmentation strategy *EventZoom*, which employs a temporal progressive strategy, embedding transformed samples into the original samples through progressive scaling and shifting. The scaling process avoids the spatial information loss associated with cropping, while the progressive strategy prevents interruptions or abrupt changes in temporal information. We validated *EventZoom* across various supervised learning frameworks. The experimental results show that *EventZoom* consistently outperforms existing event data augmentation methods with SOTA

\*These authors contributed equally.

†Corresponding Author

performance. For the first time, we have concurrently employed Semi-supervised and Unsupervised learning to verify feasibility on event augmentation algorithms, demonstrating the applicability and effectiveness of *EventZoom* as a powerful event-based data augmentation tool in handling real-world scenes with high dynamics and variability environments.

## Introduction

Event data, as captured by Dynamic Vision Sensors (DVS), signifies a paradigm shift from traditional frame-based video capture to more sophisticated event-based or neuromorphic vision systems. (Hu, Liu, and Delbruck; Gallego et al. 2022; Lakshmi, Chakraborty, and Thakur 2019; Taverni et al. 2018). This mechanism generates asynchronous data streams and embodies several critical advantages, including high temporal resolution, low energy requirements, and substantial reductions in data redundancy (Schuman et al. 2017). This non-continuous, and asynchronous data capture method provides a finer granularity in capturing dynamic real-world changes. It offers considerable potential for applications such as visual navigation (Barranco et al. 2016; Zujevs et al. 2021), autonomous driving (Chen et al. 2020a), and gesture recognition (Amir et al. 2017; Zhang et al. 2021), by facilitating enhanced real-time decision and perception capabilities.

However, the deployment of event-based data systems in practical applications encounters significant challenges, predominantly due to the constraints on dataset availability and diversity and the inherent characteristics of event data itself (Gallego et al. 2022). Most event data datasets are limited in scale and scope. The dependency on specialized event camera hardware and specific environmental conditions for data collection complicates the creation of extensive and diverse datasets. Additionally, the inherent sparsity and the non-uniform temporal distribution of event data introduce complexities in data processing (He et al. 2020b). In this context, exploring data augmentation techniques specifically designed for event data becomes crucial. These techniques offer significant potential for better utilization of this novel type of visual data.

Exploration of data augmentation techniques for event data focuses on adapting traditional augmentation methods




Figure 2: The data augmentation process for *EventZoom* is illustrated. *Event Sample 1-3* undergoes a progressive scaling and shifting along the temporal dimension. The scaled sample are then incorporated into *Original Sample*. Depending on the *mixnum* settings, the number of samples varies. Each time step is assigned a unique label, which is synthesized based on the proportion of events inserted.

(Zhang et al. 2018; Yun et al. 2019; DeVries and Taylor 2017) to the temporal dimension. The few existing augmentation strategies typically draw from CutMix(Yun et al. 2019) techniques, selecting and replacing parts of an event stream with events from another stream. However, we believe that the temporal continuity and spatial integrity are more critical for event data, and methods involving cutting and replacement disrupt these characteristics. We conducted ablation experiments on the neuromorphic datasets to compare the effects under different settings to validate our hypothesis. The results, depicted in Figure 1, illustrate that event augmentation techniques that the lack of temporal continuity and spatial integrity detrimentally affect model’s performance. This issue arises traditional augmentation methods are tailored for image data characterized by regular spatial structures (Li et al. 2022; Shen, Zhao, and Zeng 2023). Event data, which fundamentally capture dynamic lighting changes rather than static images, challenge direct transfers of these methods, potentially disrupting the inherent temporal and spatial linkages within the data(Shorten and Khoshgoftaar 2019a).

Inspired by these insights, we developed *EventZoom*—a data augmentation strategy that preserves both temporal continuity and spatial integrity. *EventZoom* synthesizes new event sequences using a carefully designed yet efficient algorithm. Figure 1 illustrates the flow of data processing for *EventZoom*. It scales randomly event sequences and embed them into another sample, ensuring the preservation of spatial information. Simultaneously, the embedded event sequences undergo **Progressive Scaling and Shifting** along the temporal dimension to emphasize the temporal continuity. This approach not only maintains the authenticity of the data but also enriches its diversity and complexity. *EventZoom* is distinguished by its focus on retaining detailed information in the temporal and spatial dimensions, and thus broadening the scope of the training data.

Beyond supervised learning, the effectiveness of augmentation techniques in semi-supervised and unsupervised settings serves as a valuable benchmark for assessing the strength of data augmentation strategies, as these methods rely on exploring data consistency and latent features to facilitate learning. After extensive experimentation, we have validated the applicability of *EventZoom* across various learning environments, showcasing superior ability to enhances model predictability and processing capabilities in semi-supervised and unsupervised learning. *EventZoom* significantly enable more effective utilization of the unique advantages of event data to support the processing of real-world scenarios characterized by high dynamics and variability.

## Related Work

**Data Augmentation** applied to artificially expands the size and diversity of training datasets. Except traditional data augmentation for image data (geometric and photometric transformations (Maharana, Mondal, and Nemade 2022; Shorten and Khoshgoftaar 2019b; Mumuni and Mumuni 2022)), several advanced data augmentation techniques have emerged. Mixup (Mumuni and Mumuni 2022) technique blends features and labels from two or more images to create new samples. Cutout (DeVries and Taylor 2017) randomly masks parts of the input image. CutMix (Yun et al. 2019) combines elements of Mixup and Cutout by replacing part of an image with a segment from another and appropriately blending their labels. Techniques like PuzzleMix(Kim, Choo, and Song 2020) and SaliencyMix(Uddin et al. 2020) further strategically utilize salient regions from different images to enhance the training process. Moreover, automated methods such as AutoAugment(Cubuk et al. 2019) and RandAugment(Cubuk et al. 2020) employ reinforcement learning or random searches to discover the most effective augmentation strategies.

**Event Data Augmentation** The augmentation techniques for event data are specifically designed for their unique attributes, closely tied to time. EventDrop(Gu et al. 2021) enhances the regularization ability of the model by randomly dropping events. (Li et al. 2022) by analyzing the impact of various traditional data augmentation methods on event data and applying them accordingly. EventMix(Shen, Zhao, and Zeng 2023) randomly samples a Gaussian distribution in the event stream and replaces the area with a corresponding area from a random sample. EventRPG(Sun et al. 2024) utilizes CAM and region salience detection techniques to correlate the cut-out area with significant regions. ShapeAug(Bendig, Schuster, and Stricker 2024) achieves data augmentation by moving simple shapes within the image. EventAugment (Gu et al. 2024) searches for optimal combinations of enhancements through automatic parameter tuning. However, our experiments demonstrated the importance of preserving complete spatial and temporal information for enhancing event data, which are not addressed by the current works.

**Data Augmentation in Semi(Un)-supervised** Data augmentation is essential in semi-supervised (Berthelot et al. 2019b; Sohn et al. 2020; Berthelot et al. 2019a; Xie et al. 2020) and unsupervised learning scenarios(Wu et al. 2018; He et al. 2020a; Chen et al. 2020b; Chen and He 2021). Techniques such as consistency regularization (Xie et al. 2020) rely heavily on data augmentation. They demand that models maintain consistent predictions across different augmented versions of the same data, thereby boosting the reliability of unlabeled data distribution. In the context of unsupervised learning (Chen et al. 2020b; Chen and He 2021), data augmentation is instrumental in learning multiple perspectives of samples. By subjecting input data to various transformations, models can discern the intrinsic structures and variations within the data, which is vital for tasks like contrastive learning.

We provided a more comprehensive and detailed related work in Appendix A, where we thoroughly cover the background and existing research on data augmentation.

## Methods

To address the challenge of enhancing the *temporal continuity* and *spatial integrity* of event data, we developed a novel data augmentation strategy called EventZoom. This approach synthesizes new event sequences, sharing a concept akin to mixed-sample techniques. We show an event sequence generated using EventZoom in Figure 3 with different view to illustrate our approach visually.

### EventZoom

Let  $x_{ori}$  represent an event sequence within the format  $x_{ori} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times C \times H \times W}$ .  $T$  denotes the time steps,  $C, W, H$  the channel, width, height, and  $y_{ori}$  the corresponding label. EventZoom augments data by randomly selecting  $mixnum$  event sequences  $X = \{x^i\}_{i=1}^{mixnum}$ , which is not confined to the same category  $y_{ori}$  but different categories  $Y = \{y^i\}_{i=1}^n$ ,  $n$  means the total number of categories. The generation of new samples can be summarized in Equation 1:

$$x_{new} = F_{eventzoom}(x_{ori}, \{x^i\}_{i=1}^{mixnum}) \quad (1)$$

The new samples  $x_{new}^i$  are generated by sequentially embedding each sample  $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^{mixnum}$  into the original sample  $x_{ori}$ , as shown in Equation 2.

$$\begin{aligned} x_{new}^i &= G_{embed}(x_{new}^{i-1}, x^i) \quad , i > 1 \\ x_{new}^1 &= x^1 \quad , i = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

After each embedding, the resulting mixed sample is denoted as  $x_{new}^i$ . The function  $F_{eventzoom}$  represents the data augmentation method, while  $G_{embed}$  signifies the embedding operation performed at each time. This process is performed  $mixnum$  times.




Figure 3: Visualization of the samples generated by EventZoom. The Zoom Image is embedded into the original image.

To preserve spatial integrity, the selected sequence is scaled by a random factor  $\lambda$ , sampled from a Beta distribution  $Beta(\lambda_{min}, \lambda_{max})$ . The parameters  $\lambda_{min}$  and  $\lambda_{max}$  define the bounds of the distribution. In practice, to achieve gradual changes, EventZoom randomly selects two values,  $\lambda_s$  and  $\lambda_e$ , at the first and last time step, respectively. The intermediate  $\lambda$  values are obtained through linear interpolation:

$$\lambda_t = t \cdot \lambda_s + (1 - t) \cdot \lambda_e \quad (3)$$

where  $t$  represents the  $t$ -th time step.

To maintain the temporal continuity of the sample, the embedded sample undergoes a gradual shifting within the image boundaries. The position coordinates are determined by random values  $rx$  and  $ry$ , which are within the ranges  $(0, W)$  and  $(0, H)$ , respectively, where  $W$  and  $H$  are the width and height of the image. Similarly, to achieve gradual changes, EventZoom selects two random values  $(rx_s, ry_s)$  and  $(rx_e, ry_e)$  at the first and last time step. The intermediate position  $(rx_t, ry_t)$  is obtained through linear interpolation:

$$(rx_t, ry_t) = t \cdot (rx_s, ry_s) + (1 - t) \cdot (rx_e, ry_e) \quad (4)$$

The formal definition of sample mixing is given by Equation 5 as follows.

$$G_{embed}(x_{new}^{i-1}, x^i) = (1 - M^i) \odot x_{new}^{i-1} + Zoom(x^i) \quad (5)$$

where

$$Zoom(x_t^i) = Scale(Shift(x_t^i, (rx_t, ry_t)), lambda_t) \quad (6)$$

The Equation 5 illustrates the operation of  $G_{embed}$ , where  $x_i$  is embedded into the previously synthesized sample  $x_{new}^{i-1}$  after applying the  $Zoom$  operation. The corresponding positions in  $x_{new}^{i-1}$  are then set to zero. Here,  $M^i$  represents the positions for placing the patches, and  $\odot$  denotes pixel-wise multiplication. The  $Zoom$  operation involves a progressive scaling and shifting of the  $x^i$ . Specifically, the  $Zoom$  operation scales and shifting the  $x_t^i$  at time  $t$  based on the given parameters.

It is important to note that while each individual embedding involves a unidirectional progressive shifting and scaling, the combination of multiple different sample embedding results in an embedded sample with varying directional changes.

For label generation, to ensure simplicity and maintain the relevance of enhanced data to the original labels, the labels are weighted based on the percentage of the sample covered by  $M$ . Due to the progressive nature of the process, the percentage at different time points will vary. This can be formally defined as:

$$y_{new}^i = (1 - a_t^i)y_{new}^{i-1} + a_t^i y^i \quad (7)$$

Here,  $a_t^i$  represents the percentage of the event sequence that  $M_t^i$  occupies at time  $t$ . The label  $y^i$  is the one-hot label of  $x^i$ . The value of  $a_t^i$  is calculated using Equation 8.

$$a_t^i = \frac{\sum M_t^i}{C \times H \times W} \quad (8)$$

EventZoom is capable of outputting different soft labels across the time steps. Although it is possible to obtain more accurate labels, in practice, for the sake of computational convenience, we average all the labels.

## A Comparative Discussion

As shown in Table 1, we summarize the comparison between different methods in terms of maintaining Spatial Integrity(SI) and Temporal Continuity(TC).

The *CutMix* data augmentation technique, which employs a cut-and-paste strategy for image regions, is effective in conventional image processing scenarios but exhibits limitations when applied to event-based data. *CutMix* involves cutting a region from the image, leading to the information loss, particularly the temporal label information related to the cropped area, which may not align with the new context, thereby causing label mismatches(Uddin et al. 2020; Kim, Choo, and Song 2020).

The *Mixup* method functions by directly mixing data at the pixel level between two images, effectively simulating a high dimensional state that lies between them. However, for event data, which captures variations in lighting, this straightforward method of data mixing can result in non-authentic lighting conditions, leading to generating data that does not accurately reflect the physical world’s lighting dynamics.

Despite being designed for event data, *EventMix/EventRPG/EventAugmentation*, shares spatial issues similar to those of *CutMix*. Specifically, this type of methods not effectively address the consistency of spatial positioning during the cutting process, which can lead to label mismatches.

Model	Event Augmentation	Spatial Integrity (SI)	Temporal Continuity (TC)
CutMix	✗	✗	✗
MixUp	✗	✓	✗
NDA	✓	✗	✗
ShapeAug	✓	✓	✗
EventAugment	✓	✗	✗
EventDrop	✓	✗	✗
EventRPG	✓	✗	✗
EventMix	✓	✗	✗
EventZoom	✓	✓	✓

Table 1: The comparison of whether different methods maintain SI and TC after event data augmentation processing.

## Checking the Importance of Spatial Integrity and Temporal Continuity

To demonstrate the significance of spatial integrity and temporal continuity in data augmentation, we compared the performance disparities under various strategies in our ablation study.

1. **Scaling** can be configured as **Progressive Scaling(PS)**, **Random Scaling(RS)**, or **Static Scaling(SS)**.

2. **Shifting** can be configured as **Progressive Position(PS)**, **Random Position(RS)**, or **Static Position(SP)**.

2. **Cropping** can be configured as either **Cropping(C)** or **Scaling**.

As illustrated in Figure 1, different box plots correspond to various settings. Random scaling and shifting disrupt temporal continuity, whereas cropping methods compromise spatial integrity. The comparison highlights the progressive advantages of Eventzoom. More detailed experimental setup and explanation is added in Appendix B.

## Experiment

To validate the effectiveness of EventZoom, we conducted comprehensive experiments across three distinct event-driven datasets: DVS-CIFAR10, N-Caltech101, UCF101-DVS. These datasets were rigorously tested in supervised, semi-supervised, and unsupervised learning settings to comprehensively evaluate EventZoom’s performance across varying learning paradigms. DVS-CIFAR10 is a dynamic vision version of the classic CIFAR10 image dataset, comprising dynamic visual data across ten categories, suitable for fundamental image recognition tasks. N-Caltech101, repurposed from the Caltech101 image dataset, includes data for 101 object categories captured by event cameras. UCF101-DVS, derived from the popular UCF101 video dataset, is tailored for action recognition studies and features a diverse array of motion scenarios. We used spiking neural networks (SNNs) (Wang, Lin, and Dang 2020; Fang et al. 2021; Zhu et al. 2024; Wu et al. 2021) for validation of each group of experiments. Additionally, to align with current training

Dataset	Data Augmentation	Training Method	Neural Network	Resolution	Accuracy
DVS-CIFAR10	EventDrop(Gu et al. 2021)	STBP	Pre-Act Resnet18	(48,48)	77.73
	ShapeAug(Bendig, Schuster, and Stricker 2024)	STBP	Pre-Act Resnet18	(128,128)	75.70
	NDA(Li et al. 2022)	STBP-ttBN	Spike-VGG11	(48,48)	79.60
	NDA(Li et al. 2022)	STBP-ttBN	Spike-VGG11	(128,128)	81.70
	EventMix(Shen, Zhao, and Zeng 2023)	STBP	Pre-Act Resnet18	(48,48)	81.45
	EventRPG(Sun et al. 2024)	TET	Spike-VGG11	(48,48)	<u>85.55</u>
	<b>EventZoom</b>	STBP	Pre-Act Resnet18	(48,48)	<u>85.40</u>
	<b>EventZoom</b>	STBP	Spike-VGG11	(48,48)	<b>85.90</b>
N-Caltech101	EventDrop(Gu et al. 2021)	STBP	Pre-Act Resnet18	(48,48)	74.04
	ShapeAug(Bendig, Schuster, and Stricker 2024)	STBP	Pre-Act Resnet18	(128,128)	68.70
	EventAugment(Gu et al. 2024)	STBP	Spike-VGG11	(48,48)	75.23
	NDA(Li et al. 2022)	STBP-ttBN	Spike-VGG11	(48,48)	78.20
	NDA(Li et al. 2022)	STBP-ttBN	Spike-VGG11	(128,128)	83.70
	EventMix(Shen, Zhao, and Zeng 2023)	STBP	Pre-Act Resnet18	(48,48)	79.47
	EventRPG(Sun et al. 2024)	TET	Spike-VGG11	(128,128)	85.00
	<b>EventZoom</b>	TET	Spike-VGG11	(48,48)	<b>85.75</b>
UCF101-DVS	C3D(Ji et al. 2012)	BP	ConvNet	(48,48)	47.20
	EventMix(Shen, Zhao, and Zeng 2023)	BP	Resnet18-ANN	(48,48)	60.63
	<b>EventZoom</b>	STBP	Pre-Act Resnet18	(48,48)	<b>62.38</b>

Table 2: Comparison of different data augmentation methods across various datasets. Due to the different Settings adopted by different methods, we list the corresponding model architecture, training method, and corresponding resolution.

paradigms and ensure fair comparison with existing methodologies, we adopted the common practice of converting event sequences into frames to facilitate neural network training.

## Supervised Learning

We performed extensive experiments to compare EventZoom with other event data augmentation strategies. Table 2 shows the accuracy of different methods across all datasets. The results clearly indicate that EventZoom significantly outperforms other event augmentation methods. Our approach surpasses the best-performing existing event augmentation methods even under weaker training setting.

Moreover, we compared EventZoom against traditional image data augmentation methods directly applied to event data. We highlight that, despite the distinct nature of the data types, these methods still demonstrate modest performance improvements when adapted to event data. Experimental results for each dataset are shown in Table 3. For instance, the mixup method was extended to the temporal dimension, blending corresponding frames between different samples. In the cutmix method, we pasted patches from one frame onto the corresponding position in another sample over time. As a contrast, we also implemented eventmix, which randomly selects Gaussian-distributed samples in the sequence and mixes them with others.

Table 3 demonstrates that EventZoom achieved the best performance. Eventmix, compared to CutMix, maintain the spatial integrity, resulting in superior performance. Meanwhile, the MixUp method, which typically preserves structural integrity in neatly structured image data, might disrupt illumination information in event data, leading to poorer performance. EventZoom not only maintains complete spatial information without using patch synthesis by cropping but also preserves full temporal information, increasing diversity without disrupting coherence.

Data Augmentation	DVS-CIFAR10	N-Caltech101	UCF101-DVS
	Pre-Act ResNet-18		
No Augmentation	80.80	67.93	55.54
MixUp (Zhang et al. 2018)	81.40	68.62	56.36
CutMix (Yun et al. 2019)	80.70	67.93	57.58
EventMix (Shen, Zhao, and Zeng 2023)	84.60	70.45	58.26
<b>EventZoom</b>	<b>85.40</b> (+4.60)	<b>78.39</b> (+10.46)	<b>62.38</b> (+6.84)
	Shallow-Spiking-VGG11		
No Augmentation	81.40	71.49	50.43
MixUp (Zhang et al. 2018)	83.60	68.96	53.91
CutMix (Yun et al. 2019)	81.90	70.11	55.16
EventMix (Shen, Zhao, and Zeng 2023)	84.40	73.67	57.20
<b>EventZoom</b>	<b>84.80</b> (+4.40)	<b>80.00</b> (+8.51)	<b>63.54</b> (+13.11)

Table 3: Comparison of different conventional data augmentation methods across various datasets. Deeper colors represent higher accuracy levels.

## Semi-supervised Learning

In semi-supervised learning environments, our experiments focused on conditions of limited labeled data. Assume the dataset is  $D$ , where the unlabeled part of data is denoted as  $D_{unlabel} = \{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ , while the labeled part of data is denoted as  $D_{label} = \{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$ . We employed the architecture from (Xie et al. 2020), a benchmark commonly used in semi-supervised tasks. In the semi-supervised setting, the efficacy of various data augmentation strategies often depends on how they enhance unlabeled data  $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$  to adapt the model  $M$  to the unlabeled distribution  $P \sim \{x_i\}_{i=1}^m$ . We set up experiments using varying proportions of labeled data to test each augmentation method’s ability under conditions of label sparsity. The results of these experiments are summarized in Table 4.



Model	Data Augmentation	DVS-CIFAR10		
		40 labels $\uparrow$	100 labels $\uparrow$	250 labels $\uparrow$
Pre-Act ResNet-18	No Augmentation	57.00	70.20	78.90
	MixUp (Zhang et al. 2018)	63.10	73.70	81.90
	CutMix (Yun et al. 2019)	61.90	74.40	80.80
	EventMix (Shen, Zhao, and Zeng 2023)	61.00	72.80	79.50
	<b>EventZoom</b>	<b>71.60</b> (+20.60)	<b>76.80</b> (+6.60)	<b>82.40</b> (+3.50)
Shallow-spiking-VGG11	No Augmentation	63.30	70.00	76.80
	MixUp (Zhang et al. 2018)	69.60	75.60	79.40
	CutMix (Yun et al. 2019)	71.20	75.20	78.70
	EventMix (Shen, Zhao, and Zeng 2023)	68.00	74.10	78.40
	<b>EventZoom</b>	<b>71.40</b> (+8.10)	<b>76.00</b> (+6.00)	<b>80.70</b> (+3.90)

Dataset Info	
Dataset	DVS-CIFAR10
Train portion	Val portion
9000	1000
Used Labels Num	No Labels Num
40 $\times$ 10	8600
100 $\times$ 10	8000
250 $\times$ 10	6500

Table 4: Comparison of different data augmentation methods for semi-supervised learning tasks. Experiments were conducted with settings featuring 40, 100, and 250 labels respectively. Deeper colors represent higher accuracy levels.

model	Shallow-spiking-VGG11	
Data Augmentation	P:N-Caltech101/P:N-Caltech101/ F:N-Caltech101 F:DVS-CIFAR10	
No Augmentation	15.71	25.50
MixUp (Zhang et al. 2018)	45.76 (+30.05)	37.50 (+12.00)
EventMix (Shen, Zhao, and Zeng 2023)	48.28 (+32.57)	39.00 (+17.00)
<b>EventZoom</b>	<b>50.00</b> (+34.29)	<b>44.10</b> (+19.40)

Table 5: Comparison of different data augmentation methods for unsupervised learning tasks.

When comparing EventZoom with traditional image augmentations adapted for event data and other event-specific augmentations, EventZoom consistently demonstrated superior performance across all label proportions, particularly in extremely label-sparse settings (e.g., only 40 labeled instances per class). When EventZoom only has 40 labels, it can even have similar results as 100 labels without data augmentation. This improvement suggests that EventZoom’s method of creating complex synthetic event sequences make greater use of the unlabeled data distribution, effectively bridging the gap between labeled and unlabeled data.

## Unsupervised Learning

In unsupervised learning environments, our experiments focused on conditions of no labeled data, defined as  $\forall x_i \in D_{unlabel}, x_i \in D$ . In particular, we focus on the contrastive learning algorithms with instance discrimination as a proxy task, which rely heavily on data augmentation. We adopted the architecture in (Chen and He 2021), a benchmark commonly used in unsupervised learning tasks, which models the relationship between the same sample under different augmentations. We assessed using a linear evaluation, in which, the parameters of the backbone are frozen and append a linear classification layer for learning during this phase. The N-Caltech101 dataset was used as the pre-training dataset. For the linear evaluation, both the DVS-CIFAR10 and N-Caltech101 datasets used as fine-tuning datasets. The results are presented in Table 5.

Without augmentation, the model achieved only low ac-

curacy, making effective learning challenging, highlighting the importance of augmentation for this task. The results under both settings indicate that EventZoom outperforms traditional augmentation methods and other event-based augmentation techniques. In the Table,  $P$  represents pre-training and  $F$  represents fine-tuning. It is noteworthy that similar unsupervised learning experiments were conducted in NDA. However, in NDA (Li et al. 2022), all parameters were used during the linear evaluation phase, whereas we adhered to the standard unsupervised learning paradigm by training only the linear classification layer. This experiment demonstrates that EventZoom effectively utilizes both the temporal and spatial features of event data, significantly enhancing the ability of contrastive learning algorithms to extract and learn robust features from event data.

Model	Shallow-Spiking-VGG11					
Data Augmentation	EventZoom					
	0.0 - 0.0	0.2 - 0.6	0.3 - 0.7	0.3 - 1.0	0.4 - 1.3	0.5 - 1.5
	71.49	71.26 (-0.23)	72.29 (+0.80)	74.94 (+3.45)	77.47 (+5.98)	80.00 (+8.51)

Table 6: Comparison of different  $\lambda_{min}$  and  $\lambda_{max}$  with model performance. Each value represents the accuracy in the corresponding range ( $\lambda_{min} - \lambda_{max}$ ), where 0.0-0.0 means no data augmentation.




Figure 4: Comparison of different data augmentation methods at different time steps.




Figure 5: The figure shows the original (first row) and EventZoom enhanced (second row) version of an event sample. We set  $MixNum$  to 2 for illustrative purposes.

## Ablation Study

To gain a deeper understanding of the impact of various parameters on the effectiveness of the EventZoom data augmentation, we conducted a series of ablation experiments. To ensure fairness and consistency in testing, we maintained the same settings for all other experimental configurations, except for the parameters used in the ablation studies.




Figure 6: Radar plot of mixnum with different number of embedding samples, where baseline is the benchmark without data augmentation.

**Sensitivity of Different Methods to Time Step** The comparison of different augmentation methods under various time step settings is illustrated in Figure 4. As the *time step* increases, there is a noticeable improvement in model performance. Notably, EventZoom consistently outperforms other methods in accuracy at each time step, showcasing its robust stability across different temporal scales.

**Changes in  $\lambda_{min}$  and  $\lambda_{max}$**  The parameters  $\lambda_{min}$  and  $\lambda_{max}$  dictate the range of the random scaling factor  $\lambda$ . Adjusting these parameters enables control over the proportion of embedded event samples. We evaluated EventZoom across various settings of  $\lambda_{min}$  and  $\lambda_{max}$  to determine the optimal configuration. N-Caltech101 is used in this experiment. As indicated in Table 6, the model achieved optimal performance within the range of 0.5 to 1.5. Notably, a  $\lambda$  value greater than 1 results in data scaling that exceeds the size of the original samples, introducing greater scale diversity.

**Illustration of a sample event** In Figure 5, we present frame-by-frame visualizations of a sample generated using EventZoom. The augmented effects are visible in the figure.

Each frame in the figure is arranged horizontally, with the first row depicting the visualization of the original sample and the second row showing the augmented sample. It is noticeable that the augmented sample exhibits more complex features.

**Comparison of the number of embedded samples** We explored how many embedded samples is optimal. The parameter *mixnum* represents the number of different samples inserted during the augmentation process. As shown in Figure 6. Increasing *mixnum* may introduce more diversity, but it could also increase the complexity and noise in the training data.  $\lambda_{min}$  and  $\lambda_{max}$  are 0.5-1.5.

**Distribution of Labels** To gain a deeper understanding of EventZoom, we visualized the distribution of labels generated under various  $\lambda_{min} - \lambda_{max}$  settings. Notably, EventZoom is capable of producing different labels at different times, which more accurately alleviates the issue of label mismatches.




Figure 7: The distribution of the number of labels under different  $\lambda_{min} - \lambda_{max}$ . The red line is the cumulative curve.

## Conclusion

This paper proposed a novel event augmentation method EventZoom strategy, which synthesizes new event sequences using a progressive embedding samples technique. EventZoom effectively preserving the *spatial integrity* and *temporal continuity* of the data, which are essential factors affecting the capacity of model, validated and analyzed by specific experiments. We conducted comprehensive experiments of EventZoom across various learning frameworks, including supervised, semi-supervised, and unsupervised learning, highlighting the EventZoom ability by SOTA performance. Despite these advances, currently EventZoom has only been tested under classification frameworks. Due to the lack

of suitable event datasets for downstream tasks, further testing has not yet been conducted. However, our preliminary experiments in downstream tasks still demonstrate the effectiveness of our method. The development of EventZoom advances event-based visual processing technology, providing robust support for handling real-world scenes with high dynamics and variability.

## References

- Amir, A.; Taba, B.; Berg, D.; Melano, T.; McKinstry, J.; Di Nolfo, C.; Nayak, T.; Andreopoulos, A.; Garreau, G.; Mendoza, M.; et al. 2017. A low power, fully event-based gesture recognition system. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 7243–7252.
- Barranco, F.; Fermuller, C.; Aloimonos, Y.; and Delbruck, T. 2016. A dataset for visual navigation with neuromorphic methods. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 10: 178231.
- Bendig, K.; Schuster, R.; and Stricker, D. 2024. ShapeAug: Occlusion Augmentation for Event Camera Data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02274*.
- Berthelot, D.; Carlini, N.; Cubuk, E. D.; Kurakin, A.; Sohn, K.; Zhang, H.; and Raffel, C. 2019a. Remixmatch: Semi-supervised learning with distribution alignment and augmentation anchoring. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.09785*.
- Berthelot, D.; Carlini, N.; Goodfellow, I.; Papernot, N.; Oliver, A.; and Raffel, C. A. 2019b. Mixmatch: A holistic approach to semi-supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32.
- Chen, G.; Cao, H.; Conradt, J.; Tang, H.; Rohrbein, F.; and Knoll, A. 2020a. Event-based neuromorphic vision for autonomous driving: A paradigm shift for bio-inspired visual sensing and perception. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 37(4): 34–49.
- Chen, T.; Kornblith, S.; Norouzi, M.; and Hinton, G. 2020b. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International conference on machine learning*, 1597–1607. PMLR.
- Chen, X.; and He, K. 2021. Exploring simple siamese representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 15750–15758.
- Cubuk, E. D.; Zoph, B.; Mane, D.; Vasudevan, V.; and Le, Q. V. 2019. Autoaugment: Learning augmentation strategies from data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 113–123.
- Cubuk, E. D.; Zoph, B.; Shlens, J.; and Le, Q. V. 2020. Randaugment: Practical automated data augmentation with a reduced search space. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, 702–703.
- DeVries, T.; and Taylor, G. W. 2017. Improved Regularization of Convolutional Neural Networks with Cutout. *ArXiv:1708.04552 [cs]*.
- Fang, W.; Yu, Z.; Chen, Y.; Huang, T.; Masquelier, T.; and Tian, Y. 2021. Deep residual learning in spiking neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 21056–21069.
- Gallego, G.; Delbruck, T.; Orchard, G.; Bartolozzi, C.; Taba, B.; Censi, A.; Leutenegger, S.; Davison, A. J.; Conradt, J.; Daniilidis, K.; and Scaramuzza, D. 2022. Event-Based Vision: A Survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(1): 154–180.
- Gu, F.; Dou, J.; Li, M.; Long, X.; Guo, S.; Chen, C.; Liu, K.; Jiao, X.; and Li, R. 2024. EventAugment: Learning Augmentation Policies from Asynchronous Event-based Data. *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive and Developmental Systems*.
- Gu, F.; Sng, W.; Hu, X.; and Yu, F. 2021. Eventdrop: Data augmentation for event-based learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.05836*.
- He, K.; Fan, H.; Wu, Y.; Xie, S.; and Girshick, R. 2020a. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 9729–9738.
- He, W.; Wu, Y.; Deng, L.; Li, G.; Wang, H.; Tian, Y.; Ding, W.; Wang, W.; and Xie, Y. 2020b. Comparing SNNs and RNNs on neuromorphic vision datasets: Similarities and differences. *Neural Networks*, 132: 108–120.
- Hu, Y.; Liu, S.-C.; and Delbruck, T. ??? v2e: From Video Frames to Realistic DVS Events. 10.
- Ji, S.; Xu, W.; Yang, M.; and Yu, K. 2012. 3D convolutional neural networks for human action recognition. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 35(1): 221–231.
- Kim, J.-H.; Choo, W.; and Song, H. O. 2020. Puzzle mix: Exploiting saliency and local statistics for optimal mixup. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 5275–5285. PMLR.
- Lakshmi, A.; Chakraborty, A.; and Thakur, C. S. 2019. Neuromorphic vision: From sensors to event-based algorithms. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 9(4): e1310.
- Li, Y.; Kim, Y.; Park, H.; Geller, T.; and Panda, P. 2022. Neuromorphic data augmentation for training spiking neural networks. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 631–649. Springer.
- Maharana, K.; Mondal, S.; and Nemade, B. 2022. A review: Data pre-processing and data augmentation techniques. *Global Transitions Proceedings*, 3(1): 91–99.
- Mumuni, A.; and Mumuni, F. 2022. Data augmentation: A comprehensive survey of modern approaches. *Array*, 16: 100258.
- Schuman, C. D.; Potok, T. E.; Patton, R. M.; Birdwell, J. D.; Dean, M. E.; Rose, G. S.; and Plank, J. S. 2017. A survey of neuromorphic computing and neural networks in hardware. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.06963*.
- Shen, G.; Zhao, D.; and Zeng, Y. 2023. Eventmix: An efficient data augmentation strategy for event-based learning. *Information Sciences*, 644: 119170.



Shorten, C.; and Khoshgoftaar, T. M. 2019a. A survey on Image Data Augmentation for Deep Learning. *Journal of Big Data*, 6(1): 60.

Shorten, C.; and Khoshgoftaar, T. M. 2019b. A survey on image data augmentation for deep learning. *Journal of big data*, 6(1): 1–48.

Sohn, K.; Berthelot, D.; Carlini, N.; Zhang, Z.; Zhang, H.; Raffel, C. A.; Cubuk, E. D.; Kurakin, A.; and Li, C.-L. 2020. Fixmatch: Simplifying semi-supervised learning with consistency and confidence. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 596–608.

Sun, M.; Zhang, D.; Ge, Z.; Wang, J.; Li, J.; Fang, Z.; and Xu, R. 2024. EventRPG: Event Data Augmentation with Relevance Propagation Guidance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09274*.

Taverni, G.; Moeys, D. P.; Li, C.; Cavaco, C.; Motsnyi, V.; Bello, D. S. S.; and Delbruck, T. 2018. Front and back illuminated dynamic and active pixel vision sensors comparison. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, 65(5): 677–681.

Uddin, A.; Monira, M.; Shin, W.; Chung, T.; Bae, S.-H.; et al. 2020. Saliencymix: A saliency guided data augmentation strategy for better regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.01791*.

Wang, X.; Lin, X.; and Dang, X. 2020. Supervised learning in spiking neural networks: A review of algorithms and evaluations. *Neural Networks*, 125: 258–280.

Wu, J.; Xu, C.; Han, X.; Zhou, D.; Zhang, M.; Li, H.; and Tan, K. C. 2021. Progressive tandem learning for pattern recognition with deep spiking neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(11): 7824–7840.

Wu, Z.; Xiong, Y.; Yu, S. X.; and Lin, D. 2018. Unsupervised feature learning via non-parametric instance discrimination. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 3733–3742.

Xie, Q.; Dai, Z.; Hovy, E.; Luong, T.; and Le, Q. 2020. Unsupervised data augmentation for consistency training. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 6256–6268.

Yun, S.; Han, D.; Oh, S. J.; Chun, S.; Choe, J.; and Yoo, Y. 2019. CutMix: Regularization Strategy to Train Strong Classifiers with Localizable Features. *ArXiv:1905.04899 [cs]*.

Zhang, H.; Cisse, M.; Dauphin, Y. N.; and Lopez-Paz, D. 2018. mixup: Beyond Empirical Risk Minimization. *ArXiv:1710.09412 [cs, stat]*.

Zhang, Y.; Wu, L.; He, W.; Zhang, Z.; Yang, C.; Wang, Y.; Wang, Y.; Tian, K.; Liao, J.; and Yang, Y. 2021. An event-driven spatiotemporal domain adaptation method for DVS gesture recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Express Briefs*, 69(3): 1332–1336.

Zhu, R.-J.; Zhang, M.; Zhao, Q.; Deng, H.; Duan, Y.; and Deng, L.-J. 2024. Teja-snn: Temporal-channel joint attention for spiking neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*.

Zujevs, A.; Pudzs, M.; Osadcuks, V.; Ardavs, A.; Galauskis, M.; and Grundspenkis, J. 2021. An event-based vision dataset for visual navigation tasks in agricultural environments. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 13769–13775. IEEE.

## Checklist

Unless specified otherwise, please answer “yes” to each question if the relevant information is described either in the paper itself or in a technical appendix with an explicit reference from the main paper. If you wish to explain an answer further, please do so in a section titled “Reproducibility Checklist” at the end of the technical appendix.

This paper:

1. Includes a conceptual outline and/or pseudocode description of AI methods introduced (yes)
2. Clearly delineates statements that are opinions, hypothesis, and speculation from objective facts and results (yes)
3. Provides well marked pedagogical references for less-familare readers to gain background necessary to replicate the paper (yes)

Does this paper make theoretical contributions? (no)

If yes, please complete the list below.

1. All assumptions and restrictions are stated clearly and formally. (yes/partial/no)
2. All novel claims are stated formally (e.g., in theorem statements). (yes/partial/no)
3. Proofs of all novel claims are included. (yes/partial/no)
4. Proof sketches or intuitions are given for complex and/or novel results. (yes/partial/no)
5. Appropriate citations to theoretical tools used are given. (yes/partial/no)
6. All theoretical claims are demonstrated empirically to hold. (yes/partial/no/NA)
7. All experimental code used to eliminate or disprove claims is included. (yes/no/NA)

Does this paper rely on one or more datasets? (yes)

If yes, please complete the list below.

1. A motivation is given for why the experiments are conducted on the selected datasets (yes)
2. All novel datasets introduced in this paper are included in a data appendix. (NA)
3. All novel datasets introduced in this paper will be made publicly available upon publication of the paper with a license that allows free usage for research purposes. (NA)
4. All datasets drawn from the existing literature (potentially including authors’ own previously published work) are accompanied by appropriate citations. (yes)
5. All datasets drawn from the existing literature (potentially including authors’ own previously published work) are publicly available. (yes)
6. All datasets that are not publicly available are described in detail, with explanation why publicly available alternatives are not scientifically satisfying. (NA)

Does this paper include computational experiments? (yes)

If yes, please complete the list below.

1. Any code required for pre-processing data is included in the appendix. (yes).
2. All source code required for conducting and analyzing the experiments is included in a code appendix. (yes)
3. All source code required for conducting and analyzing the experiments will be made publicly available upon publication of the paper with a license that allows free usage for research purposes. (yes)
4. All source code implementing new methods have comments detailing the implementation, with references to the paper where each step comes from (yes)
5. If an algorithm depends on randomness, then the method used for setting seeds is described in a way sufficient to allow replication of results. (NA)
6. This paper specifies the computing infrastructure used for running experiments (hardware and software), including GPU/CPU models; amount of memory; operating system; names and versions of relevant software libraries and frameworks. (yes)
7. This paper formally describes evaluation metrics used and explains the motivation for choosing these metrics. (yes)
8. This paper states the number of algorithm runs used to compute each reported result. (yes)
9. Analysis of experiments goes beyond single-dimensional summaries of performance (e.g., average; median) to include measures of variation, confidence, or other distributional information. (yes)
10. The significance of any improvement or decrease in performance is judged using appropriate statistical tests (e.g., Wilcoxon signed-rank). (partial)
11. This paper lists all final (hyper-)parameters used for each model/algorithm in the paper's experiments. (yes)
12. This paper states the number and range of values tried per (hyper-) parameter during development of the paper, along with the criterion used for selecting the final parameter setting. (yes)