
AffectGPT: Dataset and Framework for Explainable Multimodal Emotion Recognition

Zheng Lian¹, Haiyang Sun¹, Licai Sun¹, Jiangyan Yi¹, Bin Liu¹, Jianhua Tao^{2,3}

¹Institute of Automation, Chinese Academy of Sciences

²Department of Automation, Tsinghua University

³Beijing National Research Center for Information Science and Technology, Tsinghua University

lianzheng2016@ia.ac.cn

Abstract

Explainable Multimodal Emotion Recognition (EMER) is an emerging task that aims to achieve reliable and accurate emotion recognition. However, due to the high annotation cost, the existing dataset (denoted as EMER-Fine) is small, making it difficult to perform supervised training. To reduce the annotation cost and expand the dataset size, this paper reviews the previous dataset construction process. Then, we simplify the annotation pipeline, avoid manual checks, and replace the closed-source models with open-source models. Finally, we build **EMER-Coarse**, a coarsely-labeled dataset containing large-scale samples. Besides the dataset, we propose a two-stage training framework **AffectGPT**. The first stage exploits EMER-Coarse to learn a coarse mapping between multimodal inputs and emotion-related descriptions; the second stage uses EMER-Fine to better align with manually-checked results. Experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed method on the challenging EMER task. To facilitate further research, we will make the code and dataset available at: <https://github.com/zeroQiaoba/AffectGPT>.

1 Introduction

Emotion recognition is an important research topic in human-computer interaction. Its main goal is to predict the most likely label from a fixed space [1] (such as the seven basic emotions in Ekman’s theory [2]). However, emotions are complex. Limiting the label space and fixing the number of predictions may lead to inaccurate descriptions of emotions. Meanwhile, traditional emotion recognition lacks the explanation process, which is crucial to enhance the annotation reliability.

To this end, researchers propose a new task called Explainable Multimodal Emotion Recognition (EMER) [3]. Unlike traditional emotion recognition, EMER exploits multi-modal and multi-faceted clues to predict emotions in an open-vocabulary (OV) manner. These clues can also serve as support and evidence for these predictions. Therefore, EMER provides a promising way for accurate and reliable emotion recognition. However, due to the high annotation cost, previous works only contain a small number of labeled samples (denoted as EMER-Fine) [3]. These samples can only evaluate the performance of pre-trained systems and are not enough for supervised training.

To reduce the annotation cost, we review the previous dataset construction process. It contains four steps: pre-labeling audio and video clues, manually checking these clues, disambiguating subtitles, and translating to obtain bilingual descriptions [3]. This process relies on manual checks and closed-source models. To reduce the annotation cost, we try to avoid manual checks and use open-source models instead. Then, we build **EMER-Coarse**, a coarsely-labeled dataset containing large-scale data. Since emotion recognition focuses on identifying human emotional states, we construct this dataset based on MER2024-SEMI [4], which contains 115,595 human-centric videos.

Besides EMER-Coarse, we propose **AffectGPT**, a two-stage training framework for EMER. In the first stage, we use large-scale EMER-Coarse to learn a coarse alignment between multimodal inputs and emotion-related descriptions. In the second stage, we use small-scale EMER-Fine to better align with manually-checked results. The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows:

- **(Dataset)** We build EMER-Coarse, a large-scale dataset for EMER. This dataset contains 115,595 samples, much more than previous datasets and sufficient for supervised training.
- **(Method)** We propose AffectGPT, a two-stage framework for EMER. The first stage learns a coarse mapping and the second stage better aligns with manually-checked results.
- **(Performance)** Experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of this framework. Our systematic analysis can also provide some inspiration for subsequent researchers.

2 Task and Evaluation

This section reviews the task definition and evaluation metrics of EMER. Unlike traditional emotion recognition, EMER aims to predict emotions in an explainable and open-vocabulary manner. Following previous works [3], we focus on emotion recognition and use the overlap between predicted and annotated results as the evaluation metric. Since we do not fix the label space, different models may generate synonyms. To remove their impacts, we first group all labels using GPT-3.5 [5] (“gpt-3.5-turbo-16k-0613”): *Please assume the role of an expert in the field of emotions. We provide a set of emotions. Please group the emotions, with each group containing emotions with the same meaning. Directly output the results. The output format should be a list containing multiple lists.*

Specifically, assume that $G(\cdot)$ is the GPT-generated mapping function between labels and group IDs. $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^M$ and $\{\hat{y}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ are the annotated and predicted labels, respectively. Here, M and N are the number of labels. Before metric calculation, we first map each label into its group ID:

$$\mathcal{Y} = \{G(x)|x \in \{y_i\}_{i=1}^M\}, \hat{\mathcal{Y}} = \{G(x)|x \in \{\hat{y}_i\}_{i=1}^N\}. \quad (1)$$

Then, we calculate the average of precision and recall as the final metric:

$$\text{Accuracy}_s = \frac{|\mathcal{Y} \cap \hat{\mathcal{Y}}|}{|\hat{\mathcal{Y}}|}, \text{Recall}_s = \frac{|\mathcal{Y} \cap \hat{\mathcal{Y}}|}{|\mathcal{Y}|}, \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Avg} = \frac{\text{Accuracy}_s + \text{Recall}_s}{2}. \quad (3)$$

3 EMER-Coarse

This section reviews the previous dataset construction pipeline [3] and attempts to reduce the annotation cost. Specifically, the previous pipeline consists of four steps: pre-labeling to generate multimodal clues, manual checking these clues, disambiguation of subtitles, and translation to obtain bilingual descriptions. The main cost lies in manual checks and the use of closed-source models for pre-labeling, disambiguation, and translation. To reduce the cost, we try to avoid manual checks and replace these closed-source models with open-source models. In this section, we test the mainstream open-source LLMs and MLLMs. Since the results vary slightly between distinct runs, we run all experiments twice and report the average score and standard deviation.

3.1 Pre-labeling

Previously, the pre-labeling process relied on the closed-source GPT-4 (“gpt-4-vision-preview”). To find its replacement, we evaluate the performance of some representative open-source MLLMs. According to previous findings [3], adding subtitles using a two-step strategy can achieve better performance, i.e., first extracting emotion-related descriptions from MLLMs and then using them to disambiguate the subtitle. In this section, we follow this strategy and report results in Table 1. In this table, some results are taken from previous works [3] as they follow the same experimental setup.

Besides the single MLLM, can we achieve better performance if we combine different MLLMs? To answer this question, we further select the top-performing audio and video MLLMs and report the

performance of their combinations. In Table 1, we observe that these combinations usually bring performance improvement. Among them, the combination of SALMONN and Chat-UniVi performs best, even surpassing GPT-4. Therefore, we use it for pre-labeling.

Table 1: Performance of different MLLMs and their combinations. Following previous works [3], we consider language influence and report the results under different languages.

Model	L	V	A	English			Chinese		
				Avg	Accuracy _s	Recall _s	Avg	Accuracy _s	Recall _s
Audio + Subtitle									
Qwen-Audio [6]	✓	×	✓	40.23±0.09	49.42±0.18	31.04±0.00	43.53±0.04	53.71±0.00	33.34±0.09
OneLLM [7]	✓	×	✓	43.04±0.06	45.92±0.05	40.15±0.06	46.77±0.01	52.07±0.06	41.47±0.08
SECap [8]	✓	×	✓	46.94±0.10	54.52±0.15	39.37±0.05	47.09±0.15	55.55±0.23	38.64±0.08
SALMONN [9]	✓	×	✓	48.06±0.04	50.20±0.04	45.92±0.04	48.53±0.03	52.24±0.00	44.82±0.05
Video + Subtitle									
Otter [10]	✓	✓	×	44.40±0.09	50.71±0.10	38.09±0.09	46.92±0.04	52.65±0.16	41.18±0.08
VideoChat [11]	✓	✓	×	45.70±0.09	42.90±0.27	48.49±0.10	45.63±0.04	47.20±0.12	44.05±0.05
Video-LLaMA [12]	✓	✓	×	44.74±0.14	44.14±0.13	45.34±0.15	47.27±0.03	47.98±0.07	46.56±0.01
Video-LLaVA [13]	✓	✓	×	47.12±0.15	48.58±0.02	45.66±0.29	49.59±0.05	53.95±0.03	45.23±0.13
VideoChat2 [14]	✓	✓	×	49.60±0.28	54.72±0.41	44.47±0.15	49.90±0.06	57.12±0.08	42.68±0.04
OneLLM [7]	✓	✓	×	50.99±0.08	55.93±0.09	46.06±0.06	51.84±0.08	56.43±0.04	47.26±0.11
LLaMA-VID [15]	✓	✓	×	51.29±0.09	52.71±0.18	49.87±0.00	52.45±0.02	57.30±0.00	47.61±0.03
mPLUG-Owl [16]	✓	✓	×	52.79±0.13	54.54±0.13	51.04±0.13	51.43±0.03	56.40±0.11	46.47±0.18
Video-ChatGPT [17]	✓	✓	×	50.73±0.06	54.03±0.04	47.44±0.07	55.34±0.02	61.15±0.10	49.52±0.06
Chat-UniVi [18]	✓	✓	×	53.09±0.01	53.68±0.00	52.50±0.02	54.20±0.02	58.54±0.01	49.86±0.03
GPT-4V [19]	✓	✓	×	56.69±0.04	48.52±0.07	64.86±0.00	57.34±0.01	54.61±0.02	60.07±0.01
Audio + Video + Subtitle									
SECap + mPLUG-Owl	✓	✓	✓	57.71±0.05	50.05±0.23	65.38±0.33	55.22±0.22	51.65±0.27	58.79±0.16
SALMONN + Video-ChatGPT	✓	✓	✓	58.71±0.24	53.16±0.17	64.26±0.31	55.10±0.16	53.44±0.14	56.76±0.19
SECap + Video-ChatGPT	✓	✓	✓	57.41±0.09	52.03±0.04	62.79±0.14	56.49±0.02	56.50±0.01	56.48±0.05
SECap + Chat-UniVi	✓	✓	✓	59.13±0.08	48.85±0.29	69.41±0.13	56.49±0.14	52.38±0.07	60.59±0.22
SALMONN + mPLUG-Owl	✓	✓	✓	59.77±0.05	51.77±0.01	67.76±0.11	55.94±0.21	51.74±0.19	60.14±0.23
SALMONN + Chat-UniVi	✓	✓	✓	59.47±0.08	51.62±0.00	67.31±0.15	57.54±0.06	51.65±0.06	63.42±0.06
EMER(Multi)	✓	✓	✓	80.05±0.24	80.03±0.37	80.07±0.10	85.20±0.03	87.09±0.00	83.31±0.05

3.2 Disambiguation and Translation

Disambiguation and translation deal with plain text data and these modules previously relied on GPT-3.5. To find its alternative, we test some typical open-source LLMs. Experimental results are shown in Table 2. We observe that if only the translation module is replaced with open-source LLMs, the performance drop is small. But if we replace both translation and disambiguation, the performance drop is obvious. These results show that for non-complex tasks (e.g., translation), the performance of open-source LLMs is close to GPT-3.5. But for complex tasks (e.g., disambiguation), there is still a gap between open-source LLMs and GPT-3.5. The reason may be that we do not test larger LLMs due to limited GPU memory. Generally, larger LLMs help solve more complex tasks, which is left for our future work. Meanwhile, we observe that Qwen2-7B performs better than LLaMA3-8B in translation. Therefore, we use Qwen2-7B for translation and GPT-3.5 for disambiguation. This replacement reduces the OpenAI API call cost and maintains the overall performance.

Finally, we use the above strategy to automatically annotate MER2024-SEMI [4]. These annotation results take into account all acoustic, visual, and lexical clues. Since these results have not been manually checked, there may be some inaccuracies. We call this dataset **EMER-Coarse**.

Table 2: Choice of open-source LLMs for translation and disambiguation. Since the combination of SALMONN and Chat-UniVi performs best (see Table 1), we conduct analysis on this combination.

Translate	Disambiguate	English			Chinese		
		Avg	Accuracy _s	Recall _s	Avg	Accuracy _s	Recall _s
GPT-3.5	GPT-3.5	59.47±0.08	51.62±0.00	67.31±0.15	57.54±0.06	51.65±0.06	63.42±0.06
LLaMA3-8B	GPT-3.5	57.13±0.27	49.63±0.32	64.64±0.22	55.50±0.02	50.85±0.19	60.15±0.16
LLaMA3-8B	LLaMA3-8B	55.50±0.09	49.91±0.04	61.08±0.22	52.59±0.74	47.03±0.42	58.15±1.05
Qwen2-7B	GPT-3.5	58.22±0.11	49.68±0.21	66.76±0.00	56.65±0.27	52.95±0.23	60.36±0.32
Qwen2-7B	Qwen2-7B	53.38±0.60	44.74±0.67	62.01±0.54	55.15±0.03	47.92±0.06	62.37±0.12

4 AffectGPT

Besides EMER-Coarse, we propose a two-stage framework AffectGPT. This section introduces this framework from three aspects: training process, model architecture, and experimental setup.

Training Process The first stage uses EMER-Coarse to learn a coarse alignment between multi-modal inputs and emotion-related outputs. The second stage uses EMER-Fine to better align with manually-checked results. Considering that EMER-Fine has more reliable labels, we evaluate the performance of different systems on it. However, the second stage is also trained on EMER-Fine, so we further split it into training and test sets. The statistics are shown in Table 3.

Model Architecture AffectGPT is borrowed from Video-LLaMA with some modifications. Considering that the origin framework trains audio and video branches separately but emotion recognition requires the integration of multimodal clues, we modify Video-LLaMA to support audio-video-text alignment training. Specifically, we input the audio, video, and subtitle simultaneously, and try to learn a mapping between multimodal inputs and emotion-related descriptions. The reason why we do not design more effective frameworks but use Video-LLaMA is that the main purpose of this paper is to study the effectiveness of EMER-Coarse and the two-stage training process. The impact of different model architectures is left to our future work.

Table 3: Dataset statistics.

Dataset	Split	# of samples
EMER-Coarse	-	115,595
EMER-Fine	train	266
	test	66
	whole	332

Experimental Setup AffectGPT is implemented with PyTorch. All training and inference processes are carried out with an 80G NVIDIA Tesla A100 GPU. During training, we set the maximum number of epochs to 100. Due to the different number of training samples in each stage, the first stage iterates 1000 times per epoch and the second stage iterates 88 times per epoch. Meanwhile, we set the batch size of each iteration to 3. Limited by our GPU memory capacity, we do not test a larger batch size. During training, we freeze the weights of the acoustic encoder, visual encoder, and LLM, and only train Q-Former to learn the mapping between unimodal encoders and LLM.

5 Results and Discussion

AffectGPT is a two-stage training framework. To verify its effectiveness, we perform ablation studies on each stage. Considering that Video-LLaMA provides pretrained Q-Formers, we first reveal their necessity and study whether AffectGPT can be trained directly on randomly initialized weights. Then, we study the impact of different LLMs and discuss the necessity of each stage. Finally, we show the performance of AffectGPT on the EMER task. For convenience, in this section, we abbreviate the first stage as *stage1* and the second stage as *stage2*.

During training, AffectGPT learns a mapping between audio-video-text inputs and emotion-related outputs. These outputs are in English and have already considered the disambiguation process (see Section 3). In the previous evaluation pipeline (see Table 1), we need additional translation and disambiguation operations, which increases the evaluation cost. To reduce the cost, in this section, we extract emotion labels directly from the output of AffectGPT for performance evaluation.

5.1 Ablation Study on Stage1

Choice of Evaluation Set Video-LLaMA provides pretrained Q-Formers. In this section, we try to analyze whether these weights can help the model converge and achieve better performance. Before comparing different initialization strategies, we need to determine which dataset should be used for evaluation. In this paper, we have three choices: the training set, the test set, and the entire EMER-Fine. In Figure 1, we present the results on different datasets. We observe that increasing the number of samples can reduce the fluctuation of accuracy and help us draw more reliable conclusions. Therefore, in *stage1*, we evaluate the performance on the entire EMER-Fine. It should be noted that further increasing the dataset size may obtain more stable results, therefore we plan to expand EMER-Fine in the future.




Figure 1: Ablation study on *stage1*. In these figures, we train models with different initialization strategies and report their results on different sets. Besides the original accuracy curve, we also add a smoothed curve. Meanwhile, we introduce two baselines without *stage1* training.

Import of Initialization Strategies Figure 2 reveals the impact of different initialization strategies. Figure 2(a) shows the curve of training loss. We observe that the model converges around 100 epochs, which proves the rationality of our choice of the maximum number of epochs. Meanwhile, different initialization strategies only have impacts in the initial epochs, and the model will eventually converge to a similar loss. Figure 2(b) shows the emotion recognition results. We observe that different initialization strategies have limited impacts, proving that our large-scale EMER-Coarse is sufficient to train the model from randomly initialized weights. Therefore, we can conclude that the initialization strategy has limited impact in *stage1* training.




Figure 2: Impact of different initialization strategies. We plot the curve of training loss and accuracy. As for accuracy, we evaluate the performance on the entire EMER-Fine.

Choice of LLMs This section analyzes the impact of different LLMs. The original Video-LLaMA uses Vicuna (a model based on LLaMA). We try to replace Vicuna with LLaMA-2-Chat (a model based on LLaMA-2) and study its impact. The pretrained Q-Former provided by Video-LLaMA is only used to connect encoders and Vicuna. If we replace the LLM, we cannot use these pretrained weights. For a fair comparison, all experiments adopt the random initialization strategy, and experi-

mental results are shown in Figure 3. Figure 3(a) shows the training loss and Figure 3(b) shows the emotion recognition results. Interestingly, we observe that the training loss of LLaMA-2 is lower than that of Vicuna, but Vicuna performs better than LLaMA-2 in emotion recognition. The reason may be that we fix the weights of LLMs and do not use LoRA for supervised fine-tuning, which may limit the performance of LLaMA-2 on downstream tasks. Meanwhile, these results also prove that there is no strong correlation between training loss and test accuracy. From another perspective, these results also show that LLMs affect the performance of AffectGPT. Therefore, we plan to explore the impact of other LLMs in the future.




Figure 3: Impact of different LLMs. We use the random initialization strategy and evaluate the performance on the entire EMER-Fine.

Effectiveness of Stage1 In Figures 1~3, we add two baselines, both of which rely on Video-LLaMA. Specifically, one uses a multi-step strategy, i.e., first extracts emotion-related descriptions from Video-LLaMA and then uses these descriptions to disambiguate subtitles. The other does not use a multi-step strategy, i.e., directly inputs audio-video-text clues into Video-LLaMA. From Figures 1~3, we can see that no matter which initialization strategy and which LLM are used, our AffectGPT always outperforms two baselines. These results demonstrate the effectiveness of *stage1*. That is, training on EMER-Coarse usually leads to performance improvements.

5.2 Ablation Study on Stage2

Choice of Evaluation Set In *stage1*, we choose the entire EMER-Fine for performance evaluation. But for *stage2*, which part of the dataset should we use? Figure 4 shows the results on different sets. In Figure 4(b), we observe that the training accuracy steadily improves with increasing epochs. These results prove that our model can well fit training data. It is not appropriate to use the training accuracy for performance evaluation. In Figure 4(c), we observe that the test accuracy fluctuates greatly. The reason may be that the test data is limited. Therefore, in subsequent analysis, we use the smoothed test accuracy for performance evaluation.




Figure 4: Ablation study on stage2. In these figures, we show the results on different subsets.

Necessity of Two-stage Training AffectGPT is a two-stage training framework. But can we only train on *stage2* and ignore *stage1*? This section attempts to study the necessity of each stage under different initialization strategies. Experimental results are shown in Figure 5. From the training loss (see Figures 5(a) and 5(c)), we observe that with the help of *stage1*, the model can obtain better initialization weights, so that it converges faster during *stage2*. From the test accuracy (see Figures 5(b) and 5(d)), we observe that the model with *stage1* usually performs better than the models without *stage1*. This phenomenon is more obvious under the random initialization strategy. From another perspective, we cannot ignore *stage1* and use the random initialization strategy at the same time. Limited EMER-Fine is not enough to train a well-performing model from scratch.




Figure 5: Necessity of two-stage training framework.

5.3 Main Results

In Table 4, we show the performance of AffectGPT on the test set of EMER-Fine under different initialization strategies. Compared with the original Video-LLaMA (w/o *stage1* and w/o *stage2*), training on EMER-Coarse and EMER-Fine remarkably improves the performance. These results reveal the quality of our EMER-Coarse dataset. Meanwhile, two-stage results are generally better than one-stage results, which further demonstrates the effectiveness of our two-stage framework.

Table 4: Performance of AffectGPT. We report results on the test set of EMER-Fine.

Stage1	Stage2	Pretrained Weights			Random Weights		
		Avg	Accuracy _s	Recall _s	Avg	Accuracy _s	Recall _s
–	–	28.64	32.22	25.05	05.87	07.58	04.17
–	best	61.75	62.03	61.46	58.22	59.60	56.84
50-epoch	–	53.82	48.04	59.60	50.06	42.36	57.76
50-epoch	best	62.78	63.11	62.45	65.08	64.29	65.86
100-epoch	–	56.65	47.53	65.78	48.04	40.51	55.56
100-epoch	best	64.56	64.49	64.62	62.88	65.91	59.85

6 Conclusion

EMER is a newly proposed task that aims to achieve reliable and accurate emotion recognition. To promote its development, we propose EMER-Coarse (a large-scale coarsely-labeled dataset) and AffectGPT (a two-stage training framework). Meanwhile, we reveal the impact of each module and study the influence of different initialization strategies and LLMs. Overall, this paper can serve as a complement to existing works on EMER.

References

- [1] Zheng Lian, Licai Sun, Yong Ren, Hao Gu, Haiyang Sun, Lan Chen, Bin Liu, and Jianhua Tao. Merbench: A unified evaluation benchmark for multimodal emotion recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03429*, 2024.
- [2] Paul Ekman and Dacher Keltner. Universal facial expressions of emotion. *California mental health research digest*, 8(4):151–158, 1970.
- [3] Zheng Lian, Licai Sun, Mingyu Xu, Haiyang Sun, Ke Xu, Zhuofan Wen, Shun Chen, Bin Liu, and Jianhua Tao. Explainable multimodal emotion reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15401*, 2023.
- [4] Zheng Lian, Haiyang Sun, Licai Sun, Zhuofan Wen, Siyuan Zhang, Shun Chen, Hao Gu, Jinming Zhao, Ziyang Ma, Xie Chen, et al. Mer 2024: Semi-supervised learning, noise robustness, and open-vocabulary multimodal emotion recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.17113*, 2024.
- [5] OpenAI. Chatgpt, 2022.
- [6] Yunfei Chu, Jin Xu, Xiaohuan Zhou, Qian Yang, Shiliang Zhang, Zhijie Yan, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-audio: Advancing universal audio understanding via unified large-scale audio-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07919*, 2023.
- [7] Jiaming Han, Kaixiong Gong, Yiyuan Zhang, Jiaqi Wang, Kaipeng Zhang, Dahua Lin, Yu Qiao, Peng Gao, and Xiangyu Yue. Onellm: One framework to align all modalities with language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03700*, 2023.
- [8] Yaoxun Xu, Hangting Chen, Jianwei Yu, Qiaochu Huang, Zhiyong Wu, Shi-Xiong Zhang, Guangzhi Li, Yi Luo, and Rongzhi Gu. Secap: Speech emotion captioning with large language model. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 19323–19331, 2024.
- [9] Changli Tang, Wenyi Yu, Guangzhi Sun, Xianzhao Chen, Tian Tan, Wei Li, Lu Lu, Zejun MA, and Chao Zhang. Salmonn: Towards generic hearing abilities for large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [10] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Liangyu Chen, Jinghao Wang, Jingkang Yang, and Ziwei Liu. Otter: A multi-modal model with in-context instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03726*, 2023.
- [11] KunChang Li, Yinan He, Yi Wang, Yizhuo Li, Wenhai Wang, Ping Luo, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Videochat: Chat-centric video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06355*, 2023.
- [12] Hang Zhang, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. Video-llama: An instruction-tuned audio-visual language model for video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02858*, 2023.
- [13] Bin Lin, Bin Zhu, Yang Ye, Munan Ning, Peng Jin, and Li Yuan. Video-llava: Learning united visual representation by alignment before projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10122*, 2023.
- [14] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yinan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Ping Luo, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Mvbench: A comprehensive multi-modal video understanding benchmark. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024.

- [15] Yanwei Li, Chengyao Wang, and Jiaya Jia. Llama-vid: An image is worth 2 tokens in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17043*, 2023.
- [16] Qinghao Ye, Haiyang Xu, Guohai Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Yiyang Zhou, Junyang Wang, Anwen Hu, Pengcheng Shi, Yaya Shi, et al. mplug-owl: Modularization empowers large language models with multimodality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14178*, 2023.
- [17] Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Rasheed, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Video-chatgpt: Towards detailed video understanding via large vision and language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05424*, 2023.
- [18] Peng Jin, Ryuichi Takanobu, Caiwan Zhang, Xiaochun Cao, and Li Yuan. Chat-univi: Unified visual representation empowers large language models with image and video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08046*, 2023.
- [19] OpenAI. Gpt-4v(ision) system card, 2023.
- [20] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08485*, 2023.
- [21] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigpt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592*, 2023.

A Details about MLLMs

In Table 5, we provide model cards for different MLLMs.

Table 5: Model cards for MLLMs.

Models	Support Modality	Link
Otter	Video, Text	https://github.com/Luodian/Otter
VideoChat	Video, Text	https://github.com/OpenGVLab/Ask-Anything/tree/main/video_chat
VideoChat2	Video, Text	https://github.com/OpenGVLab/Ask-Anything/tree/main/video_chat2
Video-LLaVA	Video, Text	https://github.com/PKU-YuanGroup/Video-LLaVA
Video-LLaMA	Video, Text	https://github.com/DAMO-NLP-SG/Video-LLaMA
Video-ChatGPT	Video, Text	https://github.com/mbzuai-oryx/Video-ChatGPT
LLaMA-VID	Video, Text	https://github.com/dvlab-research/LLaMA-VID
mPLUG-Owl	Video, Text	https://github.com/X-PLUG/mPLUG-Owl
Chat-UniVi	Video, Text	https://github.com/PKU-YuanGroup/Chat-UniVi
SALMONN	Audio, Text	https://github.com/bytedance/SALMONN
Qwen-Audio	Audio, Text	https://github.com/QwenLM/Qwen-Audio
SECap	Audio, Text	https://github.com/thuhcsi/SECap
OneLLM	Audio, Video, Text	https://github.com/csuhan/OneLLM
PandaGPT	Audio, Video, Text	https://github.com/yxuansu/PandaGPT

B Baseline Results on Different Subsets

In Tables 6~8, we report the results of different MLLMs on three subsets of EMER-Fine.

Table 6: Main results on the entire EMER-Fine (332 samples).

Model	L	V	A	English			Chinese		
				Avg	Accuracy _s	Recall _s	Avg	Accuracy _s	Recall _s
Audio + Subtitle									
Qwen-Audio [6]	✓	×	✓	40.23±0.09	49.42±0.18	31.04±0.00	43.53±0.04	53.71±0.00	33.34±0.09
OneLLM [7]	✓	×	✓	43.04±0.06	45.92±0.05	40.15±0.06	46.77±0.01	52.07±0.06	41.47±0.08
SECap [8]	✓	×	✓	46.94±0.10	54.52±0.15	39.37±0.05	47.09±0.15	55.55±0.23	38.64±0.08
SALMONN [9]	✓	×	✓	48.06±0.04	50.20±0.04	45.92±0.04	48.53±0.03	52.24±0.00	44.82±0.05
Video + Subtitle									
Otter [10]	✓	✓	×	44.40±0.09	50.71±0.10	38.09±0.09	46.92±0.04	52.65±0.16	41.18±0.08
VideoChat [11]	✓	✓	×	45.70±0.09	42.90±0.27	48.49±0.10	45.63±0.04	47.20±0.12	44.05±0.05
Video-LLaMA [12]	✓	✓	×	44.74±0.14	44.14±0.13	45.34±0.15	47.27±0.03	47.98±0.07	46.56±0.01
Video-LLaVA [13]	✓	✓	×	47.12±0.15	48.58±0.02	45.66±0.29	49.59±0.05	53.95±0.03	45.23±0.13
VideoChat2 [14]	✓	✓	×	49.60±0.28	54.72±0.41	44.47±0.15	49.90±0.06	57.12±0.08	42.68±0.04
OneLLM [7]	✓	✓	×	50.99±0.08	55.93±0.09	46.06±0.06	51.84±0.08	56.43±0.04	47.26±0.11
LLaMA-VID [15]	✓	✓	×	51.29±0.09	52.71±0.18	49.87±0.00	52.45±0.02	57.30±0.00	47.61±0.03
mPLUG-Owl [16]	✓	✓	×	52.79±0.13	54.54±0.13	51.04±0.13	51.43±0.03	56.40±0.11	46.47±0.18
Video-ChatGPT [17]	✓	✓	×	50.73±0.06	54.03±0.04	47.44±0.07	55.34±0.02	61.15±0.10	49.52±0.06
Chat-UniVi [18]	✓	✓	×	53.09±0.01	53.68±0.00	52.50±0.02	54.20±0.02	58.54±0.01	49.86±0.03
Audio + Video + Subtitle									
SECap + mPLUG-Owl	✓	✓	✓	57.71±0.05	50.05±0.23	65.38±0.33	55.22±0.22	51.65±0.27	58.79±0.16
SALMONN + Video-ChatGPT	✓	✓	✓	58.71±0.24	53.16±0.17	64.26±0.31	55.10±0.16	53.44±0.14	56.76±0.19
SECap + Video-ChatGPT	✓	✓	✓	57.41±0.09	52.03±0.04	62.79±0.14	56.49±0.02	56.50±0.01	56.48±0.05
SECap + Chat-UniVi	✓	✓	✓	59.13±0.08	48.85±0.29	69.41±0.13	56.49±0.14	52.38±0.07	60.59±0.22
SALMONN + mPLUG-Owl	✓	✓	✓	59.77±0.05	51.77±0.01	67.76±0.11	55.94±0.21	51.74±0.19	60.14±0.23
SALMONN + Chat-UniVi	✓	✓	✓	59.47±0.08	51.62±0.00	67.31±0.15	57.54±0.06	51.65±0.06	63.42±0.06
EMER(Multi)	✓	✓	✓	80.05±0.24	80.03±0.37	80.07±0.10	85.20±0.03	87.09±0.00	83.31±0.05

Table 7: Main results on the training set of EMER-Fine (266 samples).

Model	L V A	English			Chinese		
		Avg	Accuracy _s	Recalls _s	Avg	Accuracy _s	Recalls _s
Audio + Subtitle							
Qwen-Audio(a) [6]	✓ × ✓	40.62±0.14	50.03±0.22	31.22±0.06	44.90±0.06	55.40±0.00	34.40±0.11
OneLLM [7]	✓ × ✓	43.65±0.01	46.75±0.03	40.55±0.02	47.68±0.08	53.21±0.20	42.15±0.05
SECap [8]	✓ × ✓	45.49±0.03	52.82±0.00	38.17±0.06	45.10±0.19	53.14±0.29	37.05±0.10
SALMONN [9]	✓ × ✓	47.26±0.05	49.21±0.05	45.31±0.05	47.93±0.22	51.22±0.19	44.63±0.25
Video + Subtitle							
Otter [10]	✓ ✓ ×	46.06±0.12	52.82±0.13	39.30±0.11	48.40±0.11	54.47±0.20	42.34±0.02
VideoChat [11]	✓ ✓ ×	45.54±0.00	43.25±0.15	47.82±0.15	45.79±0.11	47.78±0.00	43.80±0.22
Video-LLaMA [12]	✓ ✓ ×	45.68±0.13	45.31±0.11	46.05±0.15	47.45±0.07	48.42±0.09	46.48±0.05
Video-LLaVA [13]	✓ ✓ ×	48.20±0.10	49.37±0.03	47.04±0.24	50.63±0.03	55.13±0.03	46.13±0.03
VideoChat2 [14]	✓ ✓ ×	51.03±0.39	56.08±0.51	45.97±0.27	50.31±0.05	57.45±0.09	43.16±0.00
OneLLM [7]	✓ ✓ ×	50.39±0.14	55.25±0.16	45.54±0.13	49.86±0.10	54.39±0.05	45.33±0.14
LLaMA-VID [15]	✓ ✓ ×	51.39±0.03	52.96±0.07	49.81±0.14	52.12±0.00	56.76±0.00	47.49±0.01
mPLUG-Owl [16]	✓ ✓ ×	53.78±0.13	56.08±0.19	51.47±0.07	51.72±0.12	57.42±0.20	46.03±0.03
Video-ChatGPT [17]	✓ ✓ ×	51.88±0.07	55.03±0.06	48.73±0.09	54.67±0.02	60.97±0.13	48.37±0.08
Chat-UniVi [18]	✓ ✓ ×	53.06±0.14	53.53±0.09	52.60±0.19	53.41±0.01	58.22±0.02	48.61±0.00
Audio + Video + Subtitle							
SECap + mPLUG-Owl	✓ ✓ ✓	56.07±0.02	48.11±0.38	64.02±0.35	54.27±0.21	50.73±0.18	57.81±0.24
SALMONN + Video-ChatGPT	✓ ✓ ✓	58.46±0.18	53.09±0.04	63.84±0.32	55.17±0.05	52.60±0.04	57.74±0.14
SECap + Video-ChatGPT	✓ ✓ ✓	57.16±0.02	52.13±0.00	62.18±0.05	56.84±0.11	57.76±0.06	55.91±0.16
SECap + Chat-UniVi	✓ ✓ ✓	58.82±0.08	48.22±0.20	69.42±0.03	54.74±0.03	51.03±0.10	58.44±0.05
SALMONN + mPLUG-Owl	✓ ✓ ✓	58.44±0.00	50.91±0.08	65.98±0.08	55.27±0.18	51.22±0.16	59.33±0.19
SALMONN + Chat-UniVi	✓ ✓ ✓	58.69±0.04	50.59±0.01	66.79±0.09	57.85±0.05	52.51±0.05	63.20±0.04
EMER(Multi)	✓ ✓ ✓	80.23±0.25	79.81±0.44	80.65±0.06	84.68±0.02	87.02±0.09	82.34±0.06

Table 8: Main results on the test set of EMER-Fine (66 samples).

Model	L V A	English			Chinese		
		Avg	Accuracy _s	Recalls _s	Avg	Accuracy _s	Recalls _s
Audio + Subtitle							
Qwen-Audio [6]	✓ × ✓	38.66±0.13	46.97±0.00	30.35±0.25	38.03±0.00	46.97±0.00	29.09±0.00
OneLLM [7]	✓ × ✓	40.56±0.32	42.55±0.38	38.56±0.25	43.09±0.35	47.47±0.51	38.70±0.19
SECap [8]	✓ × ✓	52.78±0.63	61.36±0.76	44.19±0.51	55.05±0.00	65.15±0.00	44.95±0.00
SALMONN [9]	✓ × ✓	51.28±0.00	54.17±0.00	48.38±0.00	50.93±0.76	56.31±0.76	45.56±0.76
Video + Subtitle							
Otter [10]	✓ ✓ ×	37.72±0.00	42.22±0.00	33.22±0.00	41.05±0.24	45.45±0.00	36.64±0.48
VideoChat [11]	✓ ✓ ×	46.34±0.45	41.49±0.77	51.19±0.13	44.98±0.62	44.90±0.61	45.06±0.64
Video-LLaMA [12]	✓ ✓ ×	40.97±0.15	39.44±0.18	42.50±0.13	46.55±0.13	46.25±0.00	46.84±0.25
Video-LLaVA [13]	✓ ✓ ×	42.75±0.35	45.38±0.20	40.13±0.51	45.44±0.38	49.24±0.00	41.64±0.76
VideoChat2 [14]	✓ ✓ ×	43.83±0.16	49.24±0.00	38.42±0.32	48.29±0.47	55.81±0.76	40.77±0.19
OneLLM [7]	✓ ✓ ×	53.40±0.19	58.65±0.19	48.14±0.19	59.84±0.00	64.65±0.00	55.03±0.00
LLaMA-VID [15]	✓ ✓ ×	50.90±0.60	51.69±0.63	50.11±0.57	53.78±0.06	59.47±0.00	48.08±0.13
mPLUG-Owl [16]	✓ ✓ ×	48.84±0.13	48.33±0.13	49.34±0.38	50.25±0.63	52.27±0.25	48.23±1.01
Video-ChatGPT [17]	✓ ✓ ×	46.12±0.00	50.00±0.00	42.25±0.00	58.02±0.00	61.87±0.00	54.17±0.00
Chat-UniVi [18]	✓ ✓ ×	53.20±0.54	54.29±0.38	52.11±0.69	57.37±0.06	59.85±0.00	54.90±0.13
Audio + Video + Subtitle							
SECap + mPLUG-Owl	✓ ✓ ✓	64.42±0.32	57.95±0.38	70.90±0.26	59.00±0.25	55.30±0.63	62.70±0.13
SALMONN + Video-ChatGPT	✓ ✓ ✓	59.71±0.47	53.48±0.69	65.93±0.25	54.82±0.63	56.82±0.88	52.83±0.38
SECap + Video-ChatGPT	✓ ✓ ✓	58.43±0.35	51.60±0.19	65.26±0.51	55.11±0.35	51.45±0.32	58.76±0.38
SECap + Chat-UniVi	✓ ✓ ✓	60.38±0.07	51.39±0.66	69.37±0.53	63.71±0.83	57.98±0.74	69.43±0.91
SALMONN + mPLUG-Owl	✓ ✓ ✓	65.15±0.26	55.28±0.26	75.03±0.26	58.57±0.35	53.78±0.32	63.36±0.38
SALMONN + Chat-UniVi	✓ ✓ ✓	62.64±0.22	55.84±0.06	69.44±0.38	56.25±0.11	48.17±0.09	64.33±0.13
EMER (Multi)	✓ ✓ ✓	79.31±0.19	80.91±0.13	77.70±0.25	87.29±0.19	87.37±0.38	87.20±0.00