

# TechCoach: Towards Technical Keypoint-Aware Descriptive Action Coaching

Yuan-Ming Li<sup>†</sup> An-Lan Wang<sup>†</sup> Kun-Yu Lin Yu-Ming Tang Ling-An Zeng  
Jian-Fang Hu Wei-Shi Zheng\*  
Sun Yat-sen University

{liym266, wanganlan}@mail2.sysu.edu.cn; wszheng@ieee.org

## Abstract

To guide a learner to master the action skills, it is crucial for a coach to 1) reason through the learner’s action execution and technical keypoints, and 2) provide detailed, understandable feedback on what is done well and what can be improved. However, existing score-based action assessment methods are still far from this practical scenario. To bridge this gap, we investigate a new task termed Descriptive Action Coaching (DAC) which requires a model to provide detailed commentary on what is done well and what can be improved beyond a quality score from an action execution. To this end, we construct a new dataset named EE4D-DAC. With an LLM-based annotation pipeline, our dataset goes beyond the existing action assessment datasets by providing the hierarchical coaching commentary at both keypoint and instance levels. Furthermore, we propose TechCoach, a new framework that explicitly incorporates keypoint-level reasoning into the DAC process. The central to our method lies in the Context-aware Keypoint Reasoner, which enables TechCoach to learn keypoint-related quality representations by querying visual context under the supervision of keypoint-level coaching commentary. Prompted by the visual context and the keypoint-related quality representations, a unified Keypoint-aware Action Assessor is then employed to provide the overall coaching commentary together with the quality score. Combining all of these, we build a new benchmark for DAC and evaluate the effectiveness of our method through extensive experiments. Data and code will be publicly available.

## 1. Introduction

Understanding how well an action is performed, also known as Action Quality Assessment (AQA), has recently attracted growing attention due to its potential applications [8, 29, 38, 45]. One of the most promising potentials of AQA is to build an AI action coach, guiding an action

learner toward gradually mastering the skill. While impressive progress has been achieved, current AQA methods are still far from real coaching and action-guiding scenarios, especially in their functionality and reasoning process:

- **Functionality.** In practical action-guiding scenarios, a coach must provide detailed and understandable feedback on *what is done well* and *what can be improved* so that the learner can be fully aware of the execution details and master the skills (see the upper part of Fig. 1). However, existing works pose AQA as a score-regression [28, 35, 50] or pairwise-ranking [9, 12, 55] problem, limiting the applicability of the models to more practical scenarios.

- **Reasoning process.** To provide precise feedback, a coach will keep the technical keypoints (e.g., *The player should extend the arms fully in Reverse Layup*) in mind and determine the keypoint-level action quality from action execution (see the lower part of Fig. 1). However, few existing works have incorporated such a keypoint-level reasoning process into AQA. While recent works [15, 39] propose to address this issue by recognizing the existence of keypoint-level mistakes, such a paradigm still limits deeper exploration of the connections between the action execution and the keypoint-level action quality (i.e., detailed strength/weakness on a technical keypoint).

To bridge the gap between the field of AQA and real-world action coaching scenarios, we investigate a new task termed *Descriptive Action Coaching (DAC)*, which requires the model to **provide detailed commentary on what is done well and what can be improved, beyond merely assigning a quality score to an action execution**. Such a task is challenging because to provide such a detailed commentary, the model not only needs to understand fine-grained action execution (e.g., *the player looks down when performing Reverse Layup*), but also build explicit connections between the execution with the action quality (e.g., *it is a weakness to look down at the ball as it will miss the target*).

To facilitate the studies on DAC, we construct EE4D-DAC, a new dataset that not only contains various action videos and quality scores but also features **hierarchical detailed coaching commentary on both keypoint and in-**

\*: Corresponding author. †: Equal contributions.




Figure 1. **An illustration of real-world action coaching.** **Upper:** Given an action demonstration, a human coach will provide coaching comments on *what is done well* and *what can be improved*. **Lower:** To provide precise feedback, the coach incorporates Keypoint-level Reasoning into the action coaching process, i.e., keep the technical keypoints (e.g., *The player should extend the arms fully as they bring the ball under the basket*) in mind and determine the keypoint-level action quality (e.g., *The athlete performs beautifully with the right arm extension*) of the action. Such a reasoning process motivates us to propose our TechCoach to address Descriptive Action Coaching.

**stance levels.** Specifically, we first source the action videos from the recently proposed EgoExo4D [10] dataset. Subsequently, an LLM-driven automatic annotation pipeline is proposed to progressively obtain the general technical keypoints and hierarchical coaching commentary.

The construction of the EE4D-DAC dataset allows us to build **Technical Keypoint-aware Descriptive Action Coach (TechCoach)**, a new DAC framework which explicitly **incorporates keypoint-level reasoning into the action coaching process**. The key idea of TechCoach is to imitate the real-world coaching scenario, where the coach first reasons the action quality on each technical keypoint, and then provides feedback by incorporating the keypoint-level reasoning results and visual context.

To this end, TechCoach includes a Context-aware Keypoint Reasoner, which queries the visual context with general technical keypoints to obtain keypoint-related quality representations. To ensure such representations carry the action quality information, a keypoint-level alignment loss is proposed to align the representations with the keypoint-level coaching commentary. After that, a Unified Keypoint-aware Action Assessor (KA2) is utilized to regress the action quality score and generate overall coaching commentary. In this process, a progressive action coaching attention mask is adopted to guide KA2 to integrate information starting with the visual context level, followed by the keypoint level, and ultimately the decision (i.e., score-prediction and commentary-generation) level.

Combining the EE4D-DAC dataset and TechCoach, we can construct a new benchmark to expand the field of AQA. Extensive experiments demonstrate that: 1) Our TechCoach achieves state-of-the-art performance among the compared methods, including task-specific models and

general MLLMs; 2) The Context-aware Keypoint Reasoner is a core design and cannot be simply replaced by other solutions (e.g., replacing the Keypoint-level Alignment with a classification-based solution that classify whether the execution shows strength or weakness on each keypoint).

In summary, the contributions of this work can be summarized as: 1) We construct a new dataset termed EE4D-DAC to address Descriptive Action Coaching. To our knowledge, EE4D-DAC is the first dataset that includes hierarchical coaching commentary on both keypoint level and instance level. 2) We develop TechCoach, a new method to address DAC by explicitly collaborating keypoint-level reasoning into the action coaching process. 3) We construct a new benchmark on DAC. Experiments not only evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed approach but also provide a starting point for future work in this field.

## 2. Related Works

**Action Quality Assessment (AQA)** [3, 15, 21, 22, 24, 27, 29, 30, 35, 43–45, 47, 50, 51, 54, 57] aims at evaluating how well an action is performed. Most existing works pose AQA as a score regression task, and approach this task in many ways, e.g., introducing new formulations [35, 43, 50], augmenting human-body representations [24, 47], exploring temporal structures [3, 44, 45], collaborating multi-modal information [29, 42, 51]. Although impressive progress has been achieved, regressing a single score is still far from real-world action coaching scenarios. While [27, 54] propose to generate commentary in addition to the score, the commentary comes from the live comment, focusing on *action* and *score* rather than skill guiding and coaching. Recently, considering it is crucial for a coaching model to reason through various technical keypoints, [15, 30, 39] pro-




Figure 2. An overview of the LLM-driven automatic annotation pipeline for the EE4D-DAC dataset. We first prompt the LLM to generate general technical keypoints for the given action task (Orange  $\rightarrow$ ). Subsequently, we ask the LLM to summarize the keypoint-level and instance-level commentary according to the general technical keypoints and the original expert commentary (Blue  $\rightarrow$ ). Information about various keypoints is highlighted in colors. Zoom in for best view.

pose to detect mistakes on various body parts or technical keypoints. [21, 22] introduce a scoring rubric to inject judging rules into the score prediction process. However, This branch of methods is still limited by the binary or score-only feedback. Notably, [23] incorporates multiple models together with judging rules to provide formatted feedback for diving judging, but requires complex manual design on a single task. Differently, our work focuses on generating free-from commentary on *what is done well* and *what can be improved*, which is more aligned with practical coaching scenarios. To achieve this, we construct a new dataset that features detailed coaching commentary on both keypoint and instance levels. Furthermore, we propose a new general framework that collaborates key-point reasoning into coaching process.

**Video Captioning** [17, 19, 34, 40, 46, 49] is a long-lasting task that requires a model to generate language caption with video frames as input. Early studies focus on designing stronger architectures [1, 17, 33, 40, 48] or utilizing video-language pretraining [2, 19, 32, 34, 49] to model relationships between video and language. Recently, Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) [7, 13, 14, 16, 20, 41] show strong generalization ability across various video-language tasks such as video content description and video question answering. In this paper, we focus on Descriptive Action Coaching, a rarely explored but challenging scenario that requires video-language models to collaborate fine-grained video content and domain knowledge to provide detailed coaching commentary. We provide a new testbed for today’s video-language models and show that they still struggle to handle such a practical scenario. Besides, we propose a new keypoint-guided coaching model and evaluate its effectiveness through extensive experiments.

### 3. EE4D-DAC Dataset

To enable studies on Descriptive Action Coaching, we construct a new dataset termed EE4D-DAC. Different from existing action assessment datasets, EE4D-DAC not only contains various action videos and quality scores but also features **hierarchical detailed coaching commentary on both keypoint level and instance level**. We will introduce the data source in Sec. 3.1, the annotation pipeline in Sec. 3.2, and provide comparisons with existing datasets in Sec. 3.3 respectively.

#### 3.1. Data Source

We source data from the recently proposed EgoExo4D [10] dataset. Except for various ego-exo action videos, EgoExo4D also contains execution rating (from 1 to 10) and time-aligned free-form spoken commentary (e.g. “*Yeah, see how she’s having to look down. You can’t see the basket here.*”) by domain experts. Such characteristics make the EgoExo4D dataset a great starting point for studying action coaching.

In our work, we focus on physical actions and select takes from EgoExo4D including the scenarios of *basketball*, *soccer*, and *bouldering*. After that, we segment each take into single instances with a fixed-size (8-second) window and filter those instances without meaningful commentary. By doing so, we obtain 4843 unique video instances, spanning about 10.8 hours.

#### 3.2. Annotation Pipeline

By going deeper into the expert commentary in EgoExo4D, it can be observed that: 1) The original expert commentary is highly colloquial and noisy, awaiting summarization before being used to build a coaching model. 2) The expert

| Datasets                                 | Years    | Data Sources   | Unique Instances | Unique Hours | KeyPoint Level Judgment |            |       | Instance Level Judgment |            |             |
|--|----------|----------------|------------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------|-------|-------------------------|------------|-------------|
|  |          |                |                  |              | Exists                  | Type       | Num   | Score                   | Commentary | Coach-Score |
| <i>Datasets w/o Language Annotations</i> |          |                |                  |              |                         |            |       |                         |            |             |
| MIT-Skate [31]                           | ECCV14   | Olympics       | 150              | 7.3h         | ×                       | -          | -     | ✓                       | ×          | -           |
| AQA-7 [26]                               | WACV19   | Olympics       | 1189             | 1.62h        | ×                       | -          | -     | ✓                       | ×          | -           |
| Rhythmic Gymnastics [52]                 | ACMMM20  | Olympics       | 1000             | 23.4h        | ×                       | -          | -     | ✓                       | ×          | -           |
| FineDiving [45]                          | CVPR22   | Olympics       | 3000             | 3.5h         | ×                       | -          | -     | ✓                       | ×          | -           |
| LOGO [53]                                | CVPR23   | Olympics       | 200              | 11.4h        | ×                       | -          | -     | ✓                       | ×          | -           |
| Skate-IRIS [22]                          | ACMIUI23 | MIT-Skate [31] | 150              | 7.3h         | ✓                       | Score      | 1050  | ✓                       | ×          | -           |
| CPR-Coach [39]                           | CVPR24   | Live Saving    | 1416             | 7.7h         | ✓                       | Binary     | 18.4k | ×                       | ×          | -           |
| <i>Datasets w/ Language Annotations</i>  |          |                |                  |              |                         |            |       |                         |            |             |
| MTL-AQA [27]                             | CVPR19   | Olympics       | 1412             | 1.7h         | ×                       | -          | -     | ✓                       | ✓          | 1.94        |
| MTL-NAE [54]                             | CVPR24   | MTL-AQA [27]   | 1412             | 1.7h         | ×                       | -          | -     | ✓                       | ✓          | 2.94        |
| EgoExo-Fitness [15]                      | ECCV24   | Daily Fitness  | 913              | 4.6h         | ✓                       | Binary     | 7.8k  | ✓                       | ✓          | 2.37        |
| EgoExo4D (Sports) [10]                   | CVPR24   | Daily Sports   | 1219             | 16.4h        | ×                       | -          | -     | ✓                       | ✓          | 3.44        |
| EE4D-DAC(Ours)                           |          | EgoExo4D [10]  | 4843             | 10.8h        | ✓                       | Commentary | 25.1k | ✓                       | ✓          | 4.33        |

Table 1. **Comparison to popular Action Assessment datasets.** Our EE4D-DAC dataset is the first dataset that contains detailed coaching commentary on both key-point level and instance level. Coach-Score: A metric that evaluates whether the provided commentary is suited for real-world coaching scenarios (See Sec. 3.3 for details).

commentary is highly associated with the general technical keypoints, making it possible to mine the relationships between the general technical keypoints and final coaching commentary.

Based on the observations, we propose an LLM-based automatic annotation pipeline to obtain general technical keypoints, and hierarchical coaching commentary on both keypoint level and instance level, which is shown in Fig. 2. We will bring more details as follows.

**- Collection of the General Technical Keypoints.** In the general coaching-learning scenario, a coach will provide several technical keypoints in advance so that the skill learner can learn to follow. Considering that completing a skilled physical action always requires cooperation across multiple body parts and objects, we define a technical keypoint as a language instruction on one of the seven dimensions, including six body parts (*e.g.*, *head & eyes*, *arms & hands*) and the *human-objects interaction*.

To obtain technical keypoints for each skilled action task, we treat the LLM (GPT-4O) as a general coach. As shown in the lower left part of Fig. 2, by providing the task name (*e.g.*, *Basketball Drills - Reverse Layup*) and detailed instructions to the LLM, we are able to obtain the general technical keypoints on the previously mentioned seven dimensions (*e.g.*, For the dimension of “*head & eyes*”, we have the keypoint: “*The player should keep the head up and eyes focused on the backboard and rim to accurately judge the distance and angle for the reverse layup.*”).

**- Collection of Hierarchical Coaching Commentary.** Subsequently, we further ask the LLM to mine the relationships between the technical keypoints and origin expert commentary and provide summarized hierarchical (*i.e.*, keypoint level and instance level) coaching commentary about *what is done well* and *what can be improved* in the action execution.

As shown in the right part of Fig. 2, in this phase, LLM is asked to finish two tasks: (1) Review the general technical keypoints and the original expert commentary, and then

summarize the *strength* and *weakness* in the execution corresponding to each keypoint. (2) Review the original expert commentary and the generated strengths and weaknesses, and then provide the overall commentary on the execution.

To sum up, with the annotation pipeline, for each unique instance, we construct rich language annotations including the General Technical Keypoints, Keypoint-level Commentary, and Instance-level Commentary. Moreover, for each instance we also obtain an average rating by averaging all the ratings provided by different experts.

**- Discussions.** Note that in some cases, an execution could reveal both the strength and weakness aspects on one keypoint, and some may just reveal one of them. Such a characteristic is inherited from EgoExo4D [10].

### 3.3. Comparison with existing datasets

We compare our dataset with related AQA datasets. As shown in Tab. 1, the detailed keypoint-level commentary allows us to separate our EE4D-DAC dataset from the other datasets [15, 22, 39] with keypoint-level annotations on both type and scale. Furthermore, we conduct an evaluation to show the guiding ability of the instance-level commentary given by different datasets. Specifically, we prompt the ChatGPT to rate the commentary from 0 to 5 as the Coach-Score. As shown in the last column in Tab. 1, commentary MTL-AQA [27] and MTL-NAE [54] is not suit for coaching scenario as the original text mainly focuses on the action and score rather than action guiding and skill improvement.

For more details about the prompts, the pre-defined body parts, the examples and dataset comparison strategies, please refer to the Appendix.

## 4. TechCoach

### 4.1. Problem Formulation

Given an action video  $v$ , the goal of Descriptive Action Coaching is to train a model that takes the video as input and predicts an overall action quality score together with a paragraph of detailed commentary about *what is done well*

and *what can be improved*.

## 4.2. Overview

An overview of the proposed **Technical Keypoint-aware Descriptive Action Coach** (TechCoach) is shown in Fig. 3. The key idea of TechCoach is to mimic the reasoning process of human coaches by incorporating keypoint-level reasoning into the action coaching pipeline. Our framework consists of three parts. Firstly, given an input video  $v$ , a **Visual Encoding Module** will extract the visual context embedding. After that, a **Context-aware Key-point Reasoner** is adopted to take the visual context embedding and general technical keypoints as input to perceive the action quality on each keypoints and provide the key-point quality embeddings. Finally, a **Unified Keypoint-aware Action Assessor** is utilized to collaborate the visual context and keypoint-aware quality embeddings, then predict the final quality score and generate coaching commentary.

**Discussions.** Note that our model is based on the assumption that the general technical keypoints are available. We want to argue that this assumption is reasonable because: 1) It is aligned with real-world coaching scenarios that a coach is well-informed about the keypoints and able to reason through the keypoints and learner’s executions. 2) Obtaining keypoints is not resource-intensive as we can prompt LLMs (*e.g.*, ChatGPT) to provide the keypoints.

## 4.3. Visual Encoding

Given a video  $v$ , we first divide the video into non-overlapping video clips and extract clip-level features with a well-pretrained backbone (*e.g.*, InternVideo2 [41]). After that, inspired by TimeSformer [5], we utilize a Transformer-based Spatial-Temporal Context Enhancer to enhance the spatial-temporal context across the clip-level features. This process produces the visual context embeddings  $f_v \in R^{T \times H \times W \times D}$  can be obtained, where  $T$ ,  $H$ ,  $W$ ,  $D$  indicate the temporal, height, width, and channel size, respectively. The details about the Spatial-Temporal Context Enhancer are presented in Appendix.

## 4.4. Context-aware Key-point Reasoner

To generate comprehensive coaching commentary for an action execution, an intuitive approach is to directly input the video (and the keypoint) features into the text generator. However, without explicit modeling, such an approach is unable to effectively perceive the relationship between visual context and the keypoints. To address this, TechCoach adopts a Context-aware Key-point Reasoner to learn keypoint-related quality embeddings by querying the video context embeddings under the supervision of the coaching commentary for each technical keypoint. An overview of Context-aware Keypoint Reasoner is shown in Fig. 4.

- **Keypoint Queries Construction.** Without loss of generality, given the  $N$  general technical keypoints correspond-

ing to the input video, we first extract the keypoint features  $f_{kp} \in R^{N \times D}$  with a pre-trained text encoder (*e.g.*, DeBERTa [11]) and a linear mapper. After that, we augment  $f_{kp}$  by introducing two types of learnable prompts. Specifically, we use a group of keypoint-type prompts  $f_{kt} \in R^{N \times D}$  to identify which dimension (*e.g.*, head & eyes, human-object interaction) each keypoint feature belongs to. Besides, we adopt two quality-related prompts  $f_q \in R^{2 \times D}$  to indicate the aspects of *strength* and *weakness*. Based on the definitions of the learnable prompts, the augmented keypoint features  $f_{kp}^* \in R^{N \times 2 \times D}$  are computed as:

$$f_{kp}^*[i, j] = f_{kp}[i] + f_{kt}[i] + f_q[j]. \quad (1)$$

Such an augmentation allows us to inject the keypoint and quality information into the keypoint queries.

- **Keypoint-driven Quality Reasoning.** Our goal here is to decouple the visual context features corresponding to the keypoints and quality aspects. To this end, we regard the augmented keypoint features  $f_{kp}^*$  as the *queries* and visual context features  $f_v$  as the *keys* and *values*, then utilize layers of multi-head cross attention module [36] to obtain the keypoint-related quality embeddings  $f_{kq} \in R^{N \times 2 \times D}$ .  $f_{kq}[i, j]$  indicates the action quality on keypoint  $i$  and aspect  $j$  (1 for the *strength* and 2 for the *weakness*).

To ensure  $f_{kq}$  carries the quality information related to the action execution on the technical keypoints, our idea is to align the keypoint-related quality embeddings  $f_{kq}$  with the features of the corresponding keypoint-level coaching commentary. To this end, a keypoint-level alignment loss is adopted, which can be written as:

$$L_{Align} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^2 w_{kc}[i, j] * D(\psi(f_{kq}[i, j]), f_{kc}[i, j]), \quad (2)$$

where  $f_{kc}$  indicates the features of keypoint-level commentary extracted by the text encoder;  $\psi$  is a linear mapper that projects the  $f_{kq}$  back to the dimension of the text features;  $w_{kc}[i, j]$  is a binary scalar to filter those cases where commentary on some aspects is not provided (see Discussions in Sec. 3.2);  $D(\cdot, \cdot)$  indicates a distance measurement between two features, and we use the L2 Distance by default.

## 4.5. Unified Keypoint-aware Action Assessor

After obtaining the visual context embeddings and the keypoint-related quality embeddings, we employ a Transformer-based Unified Keypoint-aware Action Assessor (KA2) to jointly predict the action quality score and generate the overall coaching commentary.

Specifically, the input sequence to the KA2 module is constructed by concatenating the following components: (1) The generated text tokens  $T_{1:i-1}$ ; (2) a learnable score-prediction token  $f_s$ ; (3) the flattened  $f_{kc}$  as keypoint tokens; (4) the flattened  $f_v$  as video tokens. For generating commentary, we follow [17, 54] by employing a Mask-Token Prediction supervision ( $L_{MTM}$ ) during training and using




Figure 3. **An overview of the proposed TechCoach.** Given an action video, TechCoach first extracts visual context embeddings with a pre-trained visual backbone and a Spatial-Temporal Context Enhancer. After that, a Context-aware Keypoint Reasoner is adopted to learn keypoint-related quality embeddings by querying visual context under the supervision of keypoint-level coaching commentary. Finally, prompted by the visual context and the keypoint-related quality embeddings, a unified Keypoint-aware Action Assessor is then employed to provide the overall coaching commentary together with the quality score. K.P.: Keypoints. Best viewed in color.




Figure 4. **An overview of the Context-aware Keypoint Reasoner.** Best viewed in color.

the Next-Token Prediction paradigm during inference. For score regression, the score-prediction token from the output layer is passed to a fully connected regressor, optimized using a Mean Squared Error (MSE) loss ( $L_{MSE}$ ).

Moreover, to guide the KA2 module in progressively integrating information in a sequence from low-level to high-level (*i.e.*, starting with visual context level, then keypoint level, and finally the decision level), a progressive action coaching attention mask is further adopted on the KA2, which is shown in the lower right part of Fig. 3. Specifically, each keypoint token independently attends to itself and the video tokens. Besides, the score-prediction token attends to itself and all the keypoint and video tokens. For commentary generation, KA2 integrates all information by attending to the generated text tokens, the score-prediction token, all the keypoint tokens, and the video tokens.

To sum up, we train the TechCoach with the following overall loss function:

$$L = L_{MTM} + \lambda_1 L_{MSE} + \lambda_2 L_{Align}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  are hyper-parameters.

## 5. Experiments

### 5.1. Dataset and Evaluation Metrics

- **Dataset.** We conduct experiments on EE4D-DAC to provide a new benchmark and evaluate the performance of the proposed TechCoach. Following the official split of EgoExo4D [10], we separate our EE4D-DAC into training and evaluation set (including 3769 and 1074 instances, respectively).

- **Evaluation Metrics.** For score prediction, we use the *Spearman's rank correlation coefficient* ( $\rho$ ) and *Relative-L2 Distance* (RL2) as the metrics. For natural language generation, we adopt NLP metrics, including *BERT* [56], *BLEU(B)*[25], *METEOR(M)*[4] and *CIDEr(C)* [37] scores. Moreover, for better comparison with open-source MLLMs, we design two more LLM-based Metrics: (1) a *Mention Score*(GPT-M) to evaluate whether the generated commentary mentions the same technical details as in the ground truth; (2) a *Quality Score*(GPT-Q) to evaluate whether the generated commentary shares the same praises or improvement opinions as in the ground truth on those both-mentioned technical details. For more details about the evaluation metrics, please refer to the Appendix.

### 5.2. Implementation Details

For each video instance, we sample frames and segment them into 32 8-frame clips. Subsequently, we use pretrained InternVideo2 [41] to extract clip features and adopt average pooling to reduce the spatial and temporal resolutions. obtaining video features with a size of  $16(T) \times 8(H) \times 8(W)$ . We use the pretrained DeBERTa-xlarge [11] as the text encoder. We use both the ego- and exo-centric (*best-exo* in

| Methods                                  | Years  | Score Regression |                  |
|--|--------|------------------|------------------|
|  |        | $\rho \uparrow$  | RL2 $\downarrow$ |
| <i>Models infer with single instance</i> |        |                  |                  |
| InternVideo2-MLP                         | -      | 69.75            | 4.70             |
| USDL [35]                                | CVPR21 | 70.81            | 4.51             |
| SwinBERT [17]                            | CVPR22 | 71.37            | 4.59             |
| PGMI [54]                                | CVPR24 | 70.93            | 4.38             |
| TechCoach(Ours)                          | -      | <b>72.46</b>     | <b>4.35</b>      |
| <i>Models infer with extra exemplars</i> |        |                  |                  |
| CoRe [50] w/ 10 Exem.                    | ICCV21 | 73.17            | 4.35             |
| TPT[3] w/ 10 Exem.                       | ECCV22 | 73.77            | 4.29             |

(a) Comparison with existing methods on score regression.

| Methods   | Years  | Commentary Generation |              |              |                 |                  |                  |
|---|--------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
|   |        | B $\uparrow$          | C $\uparrow$ | M $\uparrow$ | Bert $\uparrow$ | GPT-M $\uparrow$ | GPT-Q $\uparrow$ |
| <i>General Multimodal Large Language Models</i> |        |                       |              |              |                 |                  |                  |
| VideoLLaVA-7B [16]                              | ACL24  | 22.94                 | 1.79         | 9.80         | 53.76           | 16.62            | 14.82            |
| VideoChat2-7B [14]                              | CVPR24 | 23.07                 | 3.20         | 11.94        | 60.79           | 17.82            | 25.99            |
| InternVideo2-Stage3-8B [41]                     | ECCV24 | 27.52                 | 2.98         | 12.83        | 63.80           | 37.85            | 28.86            |
| InternVL2-8B [6]                                | 2024   | 12.51                 | 0.10         | 16.81        | 62.30           | 47.76            | 34.01            |
| <i>Task-Specific Models</i>                     |        |                       |              |              |                 |                  |                  |
| SwinBERT[17]                                    | CVPR22 | 36.11                 | 11.70        | 16.01        | 66.03           | 46.56            | 34.57            |
| PGMI [54]                                       | CVPR24 | 36.78                 | 14.00        | 16.24        | 66.42           | 49.02            | 37.04            |
| TechCoach(Ours)                                 | -      | <b>37.06</b>          | <b>14.62</b> | <b>16.39</b> | <b>66.89</b>    | <b>50.44</b>     | <b>38.15</b>     |

(b) Comparison with existing methods on coaching commentary generation.

Table 2. **Comparison with existing models.** Our TechCoach outperforms both the general MLLMs and Multi-Task Learning-based AQA models on coaching commentary generation. Besides, TechCoach shows strong score regression abilities with the highest performance among the methods using single instance for predicting the score. “w/ 10 Exem.”: We gray out models that infer with 10 extra exemplars for fair comparisons.

| $L_{MSE}$ | Variants  |             |   | Score           |                  | Commentary   |              |              |                 |
|-----------|-----------|-------------|---|-----------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
|           | $L_{MTM}$ | $L_{Align}$ |   | $\rho \uparrow$ | RL2 $\downarrow$ | B $\uparrow$ | C $\uparrow$ | M $\uparrow$ | Bert $\uparrow$ |
| ✓         |           |             |   | 70.78           | 4.45             | -            | -            | -            | -               |
|           | ✓         |             |   | -               | -                | 36.71        | 13.70        | 16.39        | 66.77           |
|           |           | ✓           |   | 70.23           | 4.77             | 36.42        | 14.26        | 16.09        | 65.72           |
| ✓         | ✓         |             | ✓ | <b>72.46</b>    | <b>4.35</b>      | <b>37.06</b> | <b>14.62</b> | <b>16.39</b> | <b>66.89</b>    |

Table 3. **Ablation studies on training losses.** The results show that keypoint-level alignment is a core design to achieve a better trade-off between score regression and coaching commentary generation.

| Variants     | Score           |                  | B $\uparrow$ | Commentary   |              |                 |
|--------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
|              | $\rho \uparrow$ | RL2 $\downarrow$ |              | C $\uparrow$ | M $\uparrow$ | Bert $\uparrow$ |
| w/o KP-Align | 70.23           | 4.77             | 36.42        | 14.26        | 16.09        | 65.72           |
| KP-CLS       | 72.13           | 4.45             | 36.78        | 13.69        | 16.19        | 64.69           |
| KP-Align     | <b>72.46</b>    | <b>4.35</b>      | <b>37.06</b> | <b>14.62</b> | <b>16.39</b> | <b>66.89</b>    |

Table 4. **Ablation studies on the alternative solutions of keypoint-level alignment.** The results show that the proposed keypoint-level alignment (KP-Align) cannot be simply replaced by the naive classification-based solution (KP-CLS).

EgoExo4D) videos as input. We concatenate the multi-view visual features on channel dimension and feed them into a linear projector before going through the Spatial-Temporal Context Enhancer. For more implementation details, please refer to the Appendix.

### 5.3. Main Results

We compare the proposed methods with two branches of baselines: (1) *Task-Specific Models*: We select AQA- and VideoCaption-specific baselines including USDL [35], CoRe [50], TPT[3], SwinBERT[17] and PGMI [54]. For fair comparisons, we evaluate all domain-specific models by using the same visual backbone (*i.e.*, InternVideo2) to extract features and the same fusion strategy on multi-view features. (2) *General Multi-modal Large Language Models*: We also select popular open-source MLLMs as the baselines, including VideoLLaVA [16], VideoChat2 [14], InternVideo2-Stage3 [41], and InternVL2 [6]. For more details about the baseline models, please refer to the Appendix. The comparison results are shown in Tab. 2 and we have the following observations:

| K.P.Text | Variants |         | Score           |                  | Commentary   |              |              |                 |
|----------|----------|---------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
|          | K.P.Type | Quality | $\rho \uparrow$ | RL2 $\downarrow$ | B $\uparrow$ | C $\uparrow$ | M $\uparrow$ | Bert $\uparrow$ |
|          | ✓        |         | 70.83           | 4.49             | 36.25        | 13.34        | 15.88        | 66.36           |
| ✓        |          |         | 71.96           | 4.47             | 35.99        | 13.24        | 15.95        | 66.51           |
| ✓        | ✓        |         | 72.00           | 4.39             | 36.43        | 12.57        | 16.07        | 66.72           |
| ✓        | ✓        | ✓       | <b>72.46</b>    | <b>4.35</b>      | <b>37.06</b> | <b>14.62</b> | <b>16.39</b> | <b>66.89</b>    |


Table 5. **Ablation studies on the impact of Keypoint Features Augmentation.** K.P.Text: Keypoint text features. K.P.Type: keypoint-type prompts. Quality: quality-related prompts.

| Variants | Score           |                  | B $\uparrow$ | Commentary   |              |                 |
|----------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|
|          | $\rho \uparrow$ | RL2 $\downarrow$ |              | C $\uparrow$ | M $\uparrow$ | Bert $\uparrow$ |
| Ego-Only | 69.31           | 4.75             | 36.87        | 13.79        | 16.16        | 66.13           |
| Exo-Only | 68.55           | 4.84             | <b>37.31</b> | 12.71        | 16.20        | 66.23           |
| Ego+Exo  | <b>72.46</b>    | <b>4.35</b>      | 37.06        | <b>14.62</b> | <b>16.39</b> | <b>66.89</b>    |

Table 6. **Comparison with Ego- and Exo-only variants.** By collaborating on both Ego and Exo videos, TechCoach achieves stronger performance, showcasing the complementary role across different views for descriptive action coaching.

**1) Score Regression:** Compared with Direct Regression-based (*i.e.*, InternVideo2-MLP and USDL) and Multi-Task Learning-based (*i.e.*, SwinBERT, PGMI) AQA methods, TechCoach achieves the best performance on score regression. Note that CoRe and TPT adopt a Contrastive Regression framework that utilizes 10 extra exemplars during inference, which brings stronger score regression ability.

**2) Coaching Commentary Generation:** Although recently proposed Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) show great visual context understanding and reasoning abilities, most of them [14, 16, 41] still struggle to handle realistic coaching scenarios (under-perform the task-specific models). Notably, the best among the evaluated MLLMs is the InternVL2 [6], which shows comparable performance with the task-specific models on LLM-based metrics. While InternVL2 is able to mention similar technical details as the ground truth (with a 47.76 GPT-M score), it falls short in providing precise guiding opinions (only 34.01 on the GPT-Q score). Among all the compared methods, our TechCoach achieves the best performance among all the metrics on coaching commentary generation.



**Ours:** The athlete demonstrates excellent footwork, knee bend, and good elevation, and effective shooting form. **the extension of the shooting arm and wrist action were also commendable.** However, improvements can be made by **ensuring the guide hand is properly positioned**, and ensuring the guide hand does not interfere with the shot. additionally, the athlete should focus on **maintaining a more balanced landing to enhance stability and overall balance during the shot.**

**Ground-Truth:** The athlete demonstrates **strong arm extension and proper wrist snap in their shooting technique**, which is beneficial for accurate shots. However, there are areas for improvement, such as **ensuring the guide hand remains open and unobstructive**, distributing weight evenly, avoiding left foot dependency, and **landing on the balls of the feet to maintain balance.** Additionally, jumping forward instead of back can prevent power loss. Addressing these elements can enhance overall shooting consistency and effectiveness.

Figure 5. **Qualitative results on the generated coaching commentary.** Our TechCoach generates precise and detailed coaching commentary on *what is done well* and *what can be improved* from the given action videos. Correctly matched parts are highlighted in colors.

## 5.4. Ablation Studies

**- Is keypoint-level alignment a necessary?** We study this question by gradually ablating the training losses illustrated in Eq. (3) from our full model. The results are shown in Tab. 3. By comparing Row 3 with Row 1-2, it can be clearly observed that the model achieves unstable performance when simply combining the  $L_{MSE}$  and  $L_{MTM}$ . This may be caused by the gap between the score regression and commentary generation tasks. However, when further combining the keypoint-level alignment loss (Row 4), we can see stable performance improvement on all the compared metrics. Hence, we can conclude that keypoint-level alignment is necessary for the trade-off of score regression and coaching commentary generation.

**- Does keypoint-level alignment equal to binary classification?** The main target of the keypoint-level alignment (KP-Align) is to ensure the Keypoint-related Quality Embeddings (see Fig. 3 and Sec. 4.4 for more details) carry the quality-related information. To achieve this, a simple solution is to perform binary classifications over the Keypoint-related Quality Embeddings (*i.e.*, classify whether the execution shows strengths or weaknesses on each keypoint), which we note as KP-CLS. To go deeper, we conduct a study on the influence of such an alternative solution. As shown in Tab. 4, by comparing Row 2 with Row 1, we observe such a solution strengthens the quality perception of the model, resulting in performance improvement on score regression metrics. However, without explicit alignment with the keypoint-level coaching commentary, Bi-CLS falls short in understanding deeper relationships between the action execution and keypoints, resulting in a clear performance gap between our keypoint-level alignment, especially on commentary generation.

**- Impacts of the Keypoint Query Augmentation.** As discussed in Sec. 4.4, we construct keypoint queries by aug-

menting the keypoint text features (K.P.Text) with keypoint-type prompts (K.P.Type) and quality-related prompts (Quality). As shown in Tab. 5, we gradually ablate the components from the augmentation process, and the performance deterioration shows the contribution of each component.

**- Impacts of videos from various views.** As discussed in Sec. 5.2, we train TechCoach with both Egocentric and Exocentric videos. Here we conduct an experiment on the influence of the training videos from different views. As shown in Tab. 6, Ego-Only and Exo-Only variants show case comparable performance. By combining videos from different views, TechCoach achieves stronger performance, which shows that egocentric and exocentric viewpoints are complementary for action coaching.

## 5.5. Qualitative Results

To further illustrate the effectiveness of the proposed TechCoach, we provide qualitative results on the generated coaching commentary. As shown in Fig. 5, TechCoach is able to understand various technical keypoints of different actions and provide detailed commentary on *what is done well* (*e.g.*, “the extension of the shooting arm and wrist action were also commendable”) and *what can be improved* (*e.g.*, “improvements are needed in core engagement to prevent being pulled from the wall”) from the given action videos. More qualitative results are shown in the Appendix.

## 6. Conclusion

In this paper, we investigate Descriptive Action Coaching, a novel task that focuses on providing coaching feedback on *what is done well* and *what can be improved* from an action execution. To achieve this, we propose TechCoach, a new framework that incorporates keypoint-level reasoning into the action coaching process, just as human coaches do. To support this task, we devise an automated pipeline for constructing the EE4D-DAC dataset which features clean and detailed



coaching commentary on both keypoint and instance levels. Extensive experiments highlight the strong performance of the proposed TechCoach and demonstrate the effectiveness and the necessity of the proposed keypoint-level reasoning. We expect the proposed new task, dataset, and method provide a new perspective for advancing current AQA to a more explainable and practical scenario.

## References

- [1] Nayyer Aafaq, Naveed Akhtar, Wei Liu, Syed Zulqarnain Gilani, and Ajmal Mian. Spatio-temporal dynamics and semantic attribute enriched visual encoding for video captioning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 12487–12496, 2019. 3
- [2] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:23716–23736, 2022. 3
- [3] Yang Bai, Desen Zhou, Songyang Zhang, Jian Wang, Er-rui Ding, Yu Guan, Yang Long, and Jingdong Wang. Action quality assessment with temporal parsing transformer. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 422–438. Springer, 2022. 2, 7, 13
- [4] Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. Meteor: An automatic metric for mt evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the acl workshop on intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation measures for machine translation and/or summarization*, pages 65–72, 2005. 6, 12
- [5] Gedas Bertasius, Heng Wang, and Lorenzo Torresani. Is space-time attention all you need for video understanding? In *ICML*, page 4, 2021. 5, 12
- [6] Zhe Chen, Weiyun Wang, Hao Tian, Shenglong Ye, Zhangwei Gao, Erfei Cui, Wenwen Tong, Kongzhi Hu, Jia-peng Luo, Zheng Ma, et al. Internvl2: Better than the best—expanding performance boundaries of open-source multimodal models with the progressive scaling strategy, 2024. 7, 13
- [7] Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Muyan Zhong, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 24185–24198, 2024. 3
- [8] Xinpeng Ding, Xiaowei Xu, and Xiaomeng Li. Sedskill: Surgical events driven method for skill assessment from thoracoscopic surgical videos. In *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*, pages 35–45. Springer, 2023. 1
- [9] Hazel Doughty, Walterio Mayol-Cuevas, and Dima Damen. The pros and cons: Rank-aware temporal attention for skill determination in long videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7862–7871, 2019. 1
- [10] Kristen Grauman, Andrew Westbury, Lorenzo Torresani, Kris Kitani, Jitendra Malik, Triantafyllos Afouras, Kumar Ashutosh, Vijay Baiyya, Siddhant Bansal, Bikram Boote, et al. Ego-exo4d: Understanding skilled human activity from first-and third-person perspectives. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 19383–19400, 2024. 2, 3, 4, 6, 12, 14, 19
- [11] Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. Deberta: Decoding-enhanced bert with disentangled attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.03654*, 2020. 5, 6, 12
- [12] Yifei Huang, Guo Chen, Jilan Xu, Mingfang Zhang, Lijin Yang, Baoqi Pei, Hongjie Zhang, Lu Dong, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, et al. Egoexolearn: A dataset for bridging asynchronous ego-and exo-centric view of procedural activities in real world. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 22072–22086, 2024. 1
- [13] KunChang Li, Yanan 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. 3
- [14] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yanan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Ping Luo, et al. Mvbench: A comprehensive multi-modal video understanding benchmark. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 22195–22206, 2024. 3, 7, 13
- [15] Yuan-Ming Li, Wei-Jin Huang, An-Lan Wang, Ling-An Zeng, Jing-Ke Meng, and Wei-Shi Zheng. Egoexo-fitness: Towards egocentric and exocentric full-body action understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08877*, 2024. 1, 2, 4
- [16] Bin Lin, Yang Ye, Bin Zhu, Jiayi Cui, Munan Ning, Peng Jin, and Li Yuan. Video-llava: Learning united visual representation by alignment before projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10122*, 2023. 3, 7, 13
- [17] Kevin Lin, Linjie Li, Chung-Ching Lin, Faisal Ahmed, Zhe Gan, Zicheng Liu, Yumao Lu, and Lijuan Wang. Swinbert: End-to-end transformers with sparse attention for video captioning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 17949–17958, 2022. 3, 5, 7, 12, 13
- [18] I Loshchilov. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*, 2017. 12
- [19] Huaishao Luo, Lei Ji, Botian Shi, Haoyang Huang, Nan Duan, Tianrui Li, Jason Li, Taroon Bharti, and Ming Zhou. Univl: A unified video and language pre-training model for multimodal understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.06353*, 2020. 3
- [20] 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. 3
- [21] Abrar Majeedi, Viswanatha Reddy Gajjala, Satya Sai Sri-nath Namburi GNVV, and Yin Li. Rica<sup>2</sup>: Rubric-informed, calibrated assessment of actions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.02138*, 2024. 2, 3

- [22] Hitoshi Matsuyama, Nobuo Kawaguchi, and Brian Y Lim. Iris: Interpretable rubric-informed segmentation for action quality assessment. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*, pages 368–378, 2023. 2, 3, 4
- [23] Lauren Okamoto and Paritosh Parmar. Hierarchical neurosymbolic approach for comprehensive and explainable action quality assessment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3204–3213, 2024. 3
- [24] Jia-Hui Pan, Jibin Gao, and Wei-Shi Zheng. Action assessment by joint relation graphs. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 6331–6340, 2019. 2
- [25] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, 2002. 6, 12
- [26] Paritosh Parmar and Brendan Morris. Action quality assessment across multiple actions. In *2019 IEEE winter conference on applications of computer vision (WACV)*, pages 1468–1476. IEEE, 2019. 4
- [27] Paritosh Parmar and Brendan Tran Morris. What and how well you performed? a multitask learning approach to action quality assessment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 304–313, 2019. 2, 4
- [28] Paritosh Parmar and Brendan Tran Morris. Learning to score olympic events. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 20–28, 2017. 1
- [29] Paritosh Parmar, Jaiden Reddy, and Brendan Morris. Piano skills assessment. In *2021 IEEE 23rd international workshop on multimedia signal processing (MMSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2021. 1, 2
- [30] Paritosh Parmar, Amol Gharat, and Helge Rhodin. Domain knowledge-informed self-supervised representations for workout form assessment. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 105–123. Springer, 2022. 2
- [31] Hamed Pirsiavash, Carl Vondrick, and Antonio Torralba. Assessing the quality of actions. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, Proceedings, Part VI 13*, pages 556–571. Springer, 2014. 4
- [32] Paul Hongsuck Seo, Arsha Nagrani, Anurag Arnab, and Cordelia Schmid. End-to-end generative pretraining for multimodal video captioning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 17959–17968, 2022. 3
- [33] Botian Shi, Lei Ji, Zhendong Niu, Nan Duan, Ming Zhou, and Xilin Chen. Learning semantic concepts and temporal alignment for narrated video procedural captioning. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM international conference on multimedia*, pages 4355–4363, 2020. 3
- [34] Chen Sun, Austin Myers, Carl Vondrick, Kevin Murphy, and Cordelia Schmid. Videobert: A joint model for video and language representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 7464–7473, 2019. 3
- [35] Yansong Tang, Zanlin Ni, Jiahuan Zhou, Danyang Zhang, Jiwen Lu, Ying Wu, and Jie Zhou. Uncertainty-aware score distribution learning for action quality assessment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9839–9848, 2020. 1, 2, 7, 13
- [36] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017. 5
- [37] Ramakrishna Vedantam, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. Cider: Consensus-based image description evaluation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4566–4575, 2015. 6, 12
- [38] Shunli Wang, Ding kang Yang, Peng Zhai, Qing Yu, Tao Suo, Zhan Sun, Ka Li, and Lihua Zhang. A survey of video-based action quality assessment. In *2021 International conference on networking systems of AI (INSAI)*, pages 1–9. IEEE, 2021. 1, 12
- [39] Shunli Wang, Shuaibing Wang, Ding kang Yang, Mingcheng Li, Haopeng Kuang, Xiao Zhao, Liuzhen Su, Peng Zhai, and Lihua Zhang. Cpr-coach: Recognizing composite error actions based on single-class training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18782–18792, 2024. 1, 2, 4
- [40] Teng Wang, Ruimao Zhang, Zhichao Lu, Feng Zheng, Ran Cheng, and Ping Luo. End-to-end dense video captioning with parallel decoding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 6847–6857, 2021. 3
- [41] Yi Wang, Kunchang Li, Xinhao Li, Jiashuo Yu, Yinan He, Guo Chen, Baoqi Pei, Rongkun Zheng, Jilan Xu, Zun Wang, et al. Internvideo2: Scaling video foundation models for multimodal video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15377*, 2024. 3, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13
- [42] Jingfei Xia, Mingchen Zhuge, Tiantian Geng, Shun Fan, Yuantai Wei, Zhenyu He, and Feng Zheng. Skating-mixer: Long-term sport audio-visual modeling with mlps. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 2901–2909, 2023. 2
- [43] Angchi Xu, Ling-An Zeng, and Wei-Shi Zheng. Likert scoring with grade decoupling for long-term action assessment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3232–3241, 2022. 2
- [44] Huangbiao Xu, Xiao Ke, Yuezhou Li, Rui Xu, Huanqi Wu, Xiaofeng Lin, and Wenzhong Guo. Vision-language action knowledge learning for semantic-aware action quality assessment. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 423–440. Springer, 2025. 2
- [45] Jinglin Xu, Yongming Rao, Xumin Yu, Guangyi Chen, Jie Zhou, and Jiwen Lu. Finediving: A fine-grained dataset for procedure-aware action quality assessment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2949–2958, 2022. 1, 2, 4

- [46] Jilan Xu, Yifei Huang, Junlin Hou, Guo Chen, Yuejie Zhang, Rui Feng, and Weidi Xie. Retrieval-augmented egocentric video captioning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13525–13536, 2024. [3](#)
- [47] Jinglin Xu, Sibao Yin, Guohao Zhao, Zishuo Wang, and Yuxin Peng. Fineparser: A fine-grained spatio-temporal action parser for human-centric action quality assessment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14628–14637, 2024. [2](#)
- [48] Kashu Yamazaki, Khoa Vo, Quang Sang Truong, Bhiksha Raj, and Ngan Le. Vltint: Visual-linguistic transformer-in-transformer for coherent video paragraph captioning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial intelligence*, pages 3081–3090, 2023. [3](#)
- [49] Antoine Yang, Arsha Nagrai, Paul Hongsuck Seo, Antoine Miech, Jordi Pont-Tuset, Ivan Laptev, Josef Sivic, and Cordelia Schmid. Vid2seq: Large-scale pretraining of a visual language model for dense video captioning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10714–10726, 2023. [3](#)
- [50] Xumin Yu, Yongming Rao, Wenliang Zhao, Jiwen Lu, and Jie Zhou. Group-aware contrastive regression for action quality assessment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 7919–7928, 2021. [1](#), [2](#), [7](#), [12](#), [13](#)
- [51] Ling-An Zeng and Wei-Shi Zheng. Multimodal action quality assessment. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 2024. [2](#)
- [52] Ling-An Zeng, Fa-Ting Hong, Wei-Shi Zheng, Qi-Zhi Yu, Wei Zeng, Yao-Wei Wang, and Jian-Huang Lai. Hybrid dynamic-static context-aware attention network for action assessment in long videos. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM international conference on multimedia*, pages 2526–2534, 2020. [4](#)
- [53] Shiyi Zhang, Wenxun Dai, Sujia Wang, Xiangwei Shen, Jiwen Lu, Jie Zhou, and Yansong Tang. Logo: A long-form video dataset for group action quality assessment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2405–2414, 2023. [4](#)
- [54] Shiyi Zhang, Sule Bai, Guangyi Chen, Lei Chen, Jiwen Lu, Junle Wang, and Yansong Tang. Narrative action evaluation with prompt-guided multimodal interaction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18430–18439, 2024. [2](#), [4](#), [5](#), [7](#), [12](#), [13](#)
- [55] Shao-Jie Zhang, Jia-Hui Pan, Jibin Gao, and Wei-Shi Zheng. Adaptive stage-aware assessment skill transfer for skill determination. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2023. [1](#)
- [56] Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675*, 2019. [6](#), [12](#)
- [57] Kanglei Zhou, Junlin Li, Ruizhi Cai, Liyuan Wang, Xingxing Zhang, and Xiaohui Liang. Cofinal: Enhancing action quality assessment with coarse-to-fine instruction alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13999*, 2024. [2](#)

## A. Appendix

In this appendix, we provide more details about the evaluation metrics, implementations, and qualitative results in Appendix B. Subsequently, more details about the EE4D-DAC dataset are introduced in Appendix C, including examples of general technical keypoints, hierarchical coaching commentary, prompts used for LLM-based annotation collection, and other details. Finally, we discuss the limitations and potential directions for future work in Appendix D.

## B. More Details about Experiments

### B.1. More Details about the Evaluation Metrics

**Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient** ( $\rho$ ) [38] is the most widely used metric to evaluate models in the field of AQA. It measures the correlation between the predicted score series and the ground-truth score series, which is defined as follows:

$$\rho = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N (x_i - \bar{x})^2 \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \bar{y})^2}}, \quad (4)$$

where  $x$  and  $y$  are the rankings of the two series.

**Relative-L2 Distance** (RL2) [50] evaluates the numerical differences between the predicted and ground-truth scores, which can be written as:

$$RL2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \left( \frac{|s_n - \hat{s}_n|}{s_{max} - s_{min}} \right)^2, \quad (5)$$

where  $s_n$  and  $\hat{s}_n$  indicate the ground-truth and predicted scores, respectively.  $s_{max}$  and  $s_{min}$  indicate the highest and lowest scores for an action instance.

**BLEU** [25] quantifies the overlap between the generated sentences and the reference sentences by comparing n-grams (contiguous word sequences) shared between them. In this work, we compute the 1-gram-based BLEU score to evaluate the models.

**METEOR** [4] improves upon BLEU by introducing flexible word matching (e.g., synonyms and stemming) to better capture meaning beyond exact matches. Additionally, it adopts a recall-oriented approach to ensure all reference words are considered, and incorporates word order penalties to evaluate fluency and coherence.

**CIDEr** [37] is originally proposed for image captioning task. It measures the similarity between generated and reference texts using n-gram overlap weighted by TF-IDF. This ensures important but less common phrases are emphasized, rewarding consensus among references while penalizing overly generic outputs.

**BERTScore** [56] evaluates natural language generation by comparing the semantic similarity between generated

and reference texts using contextual embeddings from pre-trained BERT-like models. Unlike traditional metrics that rely on n-gram overlap, BERTScore computes token-level similarity based on meaning, capturing nuances like synonyms and paraphrasing. In our work, we use the DeBERTa-xlarge [11] to extract token-level embeddings as it shows great correlation with human evaluation.

**GPT-M** and **GPT-Q** are the LLM-based metrics proposed to evaluate whether the generated commentary shares the same technical details and the same coaching opinions as the ground-truth commentary. We employ the GPT-4o-mini to determine the number of both-mentioned technical details (*i.e.*, keypoints) and the shared coaching opinions. Detailed prompts are provided in Fig. 6. After that, the GPT-M score is calculated as the averaged proportion of the both-mentioned technical details to those mentioned by ground truth across all testing instances. The GPT-Q score is calculated as the averaged proportion of the technical details sharing the same coaching opinions to the both-mentioned technical details.

### B.2. More Implementation Details

**Spatial-Temporal Context Enhancer.** As discussed in Sec. 4.3 of the main paper, inspired by TimeSformer [5], we adopt a Spatial-Temporal Context Enhancer to enhance the spatial-temporal context across the clip-level features. An overview of this module is shown in Fig. 7. Specifically, we use a linear projector to map the clip-level features  $F_{clip}$  to the hidden dimension  $D$ , and feed them into  $N_{st}$  Transformer blocks that include spatial- and temporal-attention layers along with the FFN layers. In our implementation, the  $N_{st}$  is set to 4.

**Other details of TechCoach.** The visual backbone and text encoder are initialized by the pretrained weights and frozen during training. For the visual backbone, we use the pretrained weights of InternVideo2-stage3 [41]. Following [17, 54], we employ AdamW [18] as the optimizer, and utilize a learning rate warm-up during the early 10% training steps followed by linear decay.  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  are set to 0.1 and 0.3, respectively. Due to the characteristics of EgoExo4D [10] and the annotation pipeline of EE4D-DAC, it is not possible to ensure each instance includes rounded commentary on every possible technical keypoints (*e.g.*, in some cases the coaching commentary would not mention the execution about the *head & eyes*). Therefore, we make some adjustments on the prompts or instructions for the compared models to guide the models to focus on those technical keypoints mentioned in the ground-truth Commentary. For TechCoach, we employ zero-masking on the keypoint-related quality embeddings corresponded to a specific keypoint only if both the strength and weakness on this keypoint are unmentioned in the ground truth. Note that such a design does NOT leak the action quality information, and

### Prompts for LLM-based Metrics Calculation

You are an intelligent chatbot for evaluating the correctness of generated expert commentary for action-comment pairs. Your task is to compare the generated commentary with the ground-truth commentary and determine if they match meaningfully. Here are some introduction and instructions on the task:

## INTRODUCTIONS & INSTRUCTIONS:

- The given commentary is about what is done well and what can be improved in a skill-related execution.
- Focus on the technical details to handle the skill.
- You need to analyze how many technical details are mentioned in the ground-truth commentary.
- You need to analyze, In these GT-mentioned details, how many of them are also mentioned in the generated commentary.
- You also need to analyze how many of the both-mentioned technical details share the same coaching opinion. For example, if the GT commentary mentions the athlete done well on some aspect but the generated commentary note that the athlete need to improve upon this aspect, these two commentary have different coaching opinion on this aspect.
- NOTE that the same technical detail may have different expressions, you need to reason through the given commentary and the knowledge you know.
- Your answer should include: 1) “GT-mentioned”: an integer number that indicates the number of technical details mention in the GT commentary. 2) “both-mentioned”: an integer number that indicates the number of technical details mentioned in both the GT and generated commentary. 3) “same opinion”: an integer number that indicates the number of both-mentioned technical details that share the same coaching opinion across the two commentary.
- Please generate the response in the form of a Python dictionary string with keys of “GT-mentioned”, “both-mentioned”, “same opinion”.

Ground-Truth Commentary: <Ground-Truth\_Commentary>

Generated Commentary: <Generated\_Commentary>

Figure 6. The detailed prompts for LLM-based evaluation. Zoom in for best view.




Figure 7. An overview of the Spatial-Temporal Context Enhancer. Here the  $\oplus$  indicates the element-level adding operation.

similar adjustments are applied on the compared models [6, 14, 16, 41, 54] for fair comparisons.

**Details about USDL [35].** USDL proposes to convert the score regression problem to a distribution prediction problem. We primarily follow the official implementation. We make adjustments on the output dimension to align with the score range in our experiments.

**Details about CoRe [50] and TPT [3].** These two methods adopt the Contrastive Regression paradigm to generate action quality scores by predicting the score differences between the query instance and multiple exemplar instances. Our experiments are conducted based on the official implementations of these methods. The exemplars are randomly selected from the training instances with the same action task (e.g., Reverse Layup) as the query instance. The number of selected exemplars is set to 10.

**Details about SwinBERT [17].** SwinBERT proposes a

general framework for video captioning. In addition to the modification of the visual backbone, we also modified the length of masking tokens during training to ensure consistency with our TechCoach. Additionally, following [54], we add an extra full-connected layer to regress the score.

**Details about PGMI [54].** PGMI is a prompt-guided framework for Multi-Task Learning AQA paradigm. Our experiments on PGMI are conducted using the official implementation. We adjust the number of score groups to 10 as the score range in our experiments is in [0, 10]. Besides, we modify the input templates for the text generator to include the score information and the technical dimensions that should be focused on. Specifically, the template is adjusted as follows:

“The player is practicing <Action\_Task>, and gets a score of <Predicted\_Score>. Pay attention to the execution of <Technical\_Dimensions>”,

where <Action\_Task> is the action task, <Predicted\_Score> indicates the predicted score by the model, and <Technical\_Dimensions> indicates the a list of technical dimensions (e.g., head & eyes, arms & elbows, and human-object interaction) whose corresponded technical keypoints are mentioned in the ground truth.

**Details about the Compared MLLMs [6, 14, 16, 41].** We follow the official guidelines to perform zero-shot evaluation on the compared MLLMs. A general language instruction for these methods is as follows:

“Suppose you are an <Action\_Task>coach. Watch the given video, and answer a paragraph of commentary about what is done well in the execution and what

can be improved. Your answer should be like: <Answer\_Example>. Pay attention to the execution of <Technical\_Dimensions>”,

where <Action\_Task> is the action task (e.g., Reverse Layup), <Answer\_Example> is an example of the answer (selected from training set), and <Technical\_Dimensions> indicates the a list of technical dimensions (e.g., *head & eyes*, *arms & elbows*, and *human-object interaction*) whose corresponded technical keypoints are mentioned in the ground-truth commentary.

### B.3. More Qualitative Results

As a supplement to Fig. 5 in the main paper, we present additional qualitative results on the generated coaching commentary in Fig. 8, further illustrating the effectiveness of our TechCoach. Moreover, Fig. 9 demonstrates that our TechCoach is capable of perceiving the action quality (i.e., *Strengths* and *Weaknesses*) of the same technical details on various action executions.

## C. More Details about EE4D-DAC Dataset

In this section, we show the examples of the obtained general technical keypoints, hierarchical coaching commentary, prompts for annotation collection, and other details.

**General Technical Keypoints.** Completing a skilled physical action typically requires coordination across multiple body parts and objects. Thus, we define technical keypoints as language instructions spanning seven technical dimensions: 1) *Head & Eyes*; 2) *Torso & Core*; 3) *Arms & Elbows*; 4) *Wrists & Hands*; 5) *Legs & Knees*; 6) *Feet & Heels*; and 7) *Human-Object Interaction*. Tab. 7, Tab. 8 and Tab. 9 provide examples of the general technical keypoints for specific action tasks.

**Hierarchical Coaching Commentary.** Our EE4D-DAC dataset features hierarchical coaching commentary on both keypoint level and instance level. Fig. 10 and Fig. 11 show examples of the hierarchical coaching commentary.

**Detailed Prompt for Annotation Collection.** As described in Sec. 3.2 of the main paper, we use LLM (GPT-4o) to generate general technical keypoints and hierarchical coaching commentary. Additionally, as mentioned in Sec. 3.3, we prompt the LLM (GPT-4o) to compute the Coach-Score for commentary provided by various datasets. The detailed prompts are illustrated in Fig. 12.

**Manual Check on Annotations.** After obtaining the annotations with LLM, we manually check the evaluation set to ensure the annotation quality.


## D. Limitations and Future Work

Although experiments showcase the effectiveness of the proposed TechCoach, some limitations remain and warrant

further exploration.


**Hierarchical Technical Keypoints.** In this work, for a given action task, we assume that each body part (or the dimension of human-object interaction) is associated with one paragraph of technical keypoints. While this assumption provides a general framework for the initial exploration of technical keypoint-aware DAC, technical keypoints could be further constructed hierarchically. For instance, when performing Mid-range Shooting, the shooting hand and guide hand play distinct roles in determining shooting accuracy and stability. Separating the technical keypoint for high-level body parts (e.g., *wrists & hands*) into finer subparts (e.g., *shooting hand* and *guide hand*) could further guide the model to focus on fine-grained and specific aspects in an action execution.

**Pose-Assisted DAC.** In this work, we focus on video-based DAC. While the Ego-Exo input enriches the visual context, there are cases where the egocentric video lacks sufficient visual information, and the human subject in the exocentric video appears relatively small. A valuable auxiliary modality to address this limitation is body pose. Since the original EgoExo4D [10] dataset provides frame-aligned 3D body pose data, incorporating pose sequences into the DAC process represents a promising direction for future research.



**Ours:** The athlete demonstrated good technique by using open-hand grips and effectively uses flagging techniques to aid in climbing. However, improvements are needed in core engagement to prevent being pulled from the wall, and maintaining a more controlled and controlled use of feet during dynamic moves. the athlete should focus on maintaining foot pressure to prevent slipping and ensure secure grip strength to prevent slipping. By refining foot placements and maintaining a smoother transitions, energy expenditure could be reduced.

**Ground-Truth:** The athlete excels at using a strong open-handed grip and employs effective techniques like flagging and heel hooks for stability. His ability to distribute weight during maneuvers is commendable. However, improvements can be made in maintaining spatial awareness, easing arm fatigue by engaging the core and legs more, and ensuring consistent grip pressure to avoid slips. More precise foot placements will also aid stability and energy conservation. Addressing these areas can enhance balance and efficiency during climbs.



**Ours:** the athlete demonstrates excellent footwork, body alignment, and arm extension, and follow-through, ensuring accurate targeting layups. the use of the backboard and good extension of the shooting arm and wrist snap are commendable. however, improvements can be made by ensuring the ball is higher during the layup, maintaining a lower athletic stance for better balance, and ensuring the ball doesn't come off the fingertips for better control. enhancing these aspects will enhance the execution and effectiveness of the reverse layup.

**Ground-Truth:** The athlete demonstrates strong fundamentals with effective footwork, eye focus on target, and good arm extensions. The follow-through and wrist work are well-executed, showing proficiency. Improvements can be made in maintaining a lower athletic stance for a stronger jump, keeping the ball high for control and security, and adjusting body positioning to gain better lift. Emphasizing these improvements will enhance overall execution efficiency and strength.



**Ours:** the athlete demonstrates good control with the ball, using the inside of the foot for ball control. however, improvements can be made by bending knees more for better agility, and using the balls of the feet for balance. the athlete should focus on keeping the ball closer to the body for better control and speed.

**Ground-Truth:** The athlete demonstrates good use of the inside foot for dribbling and maintains balance with the arms. However, improvements can be made by keeping a lower center of gravity and more knee bend to enhance agility and direction change. Better foot positioning, specifically keeping the heel up and precise touches, would improve ball control and speed. Avoiding wide and inefficient touches will aid in maintaining closer control of the ball during drills.

Figure 8. More qualitative results on the generated coaching commentary. Our TechCoach generates precise and detailed coaching commentary on *what is done well* and *what can be improved* from the given action videos. Correctly matched parts are highlighted in colors.




Figure 9. **More qualitative results on the generated coaching commentary.** Our TechCoach is capable of perceiving the action quality (i.e., *Strengths* and *Weaknesses*) of the same technical details (e.g., bending the knee) across various action executions. Correctly matched parts are highlighted in colors, and the corresponding regions are marked with dashed red circle. Some frames are zoomed in for better visibility.



| <b>Technical Dimensions</b> | <b>General Technical Keypoints</b>   |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Head & Eyes                 | The player should keep the head up and eyes focused on the basket to maintain good court awareness and accuracy.   |
| Torso & Core                | The player should engage the core to maintain balance and stability throughout the movement, allowing for smooth and controlled layups.                                      |
| Arms & Elbows               | The player should use the arms to alternate the ball from one hand to the other while keeping the elbows close to the body to ensure control and precision during the layup. |
| Wrists & Hands              | The player should use the wrists to flick the ball off the backboard and into the basket, ensuring a soft touch with the hands for better control.                           |
| Legs & Knees                | The player should bend the knees to generate power for jumping, using the legs to propel themselves upward for the layup.  |
| Feet & Heels                | The player should position the feet shoulder-width apart for balance, pushing off the heels to jump and land softly to maintain control.                                     |
| Human-Object Interaction    | The player should practice alternating layups from one side of the basket to the other, using the backboard as a guide to ensure the ball goes into the basket consistently. |

**Table 7. General Technical Keypoints for Basketball Drills - Mikan Layup.**

| <b>Technical Dimensions</b> | <b>General Technical Keypoints</b>  |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Head & Eyes                 | The climber should keep the head up and eyes focused on the next hold. Always plan your next few moves in advance and be aware of your surroundings to maintain good spatial awareness.         |
| Torso & Core                | The climber should engage the core to maintain balance and stability. A strong core helps in keeping the body close to the wall, reducing the effort needed from the arms.                      |
| Arms & Elbows               | The climber should keep the arms slightly bent rather than fully extended to prevent fatigue. Use the arms to pull the body upwards and keep movements controlled and deliberate.               |
| Wrists & Hands              | The climber should use an open hand grip when possible, conserving energy. Make sure to grip holds firmly and use your fingers to feel for secure positions on the rock.                        |
| Legs & Knees                | The climber should use the legs to push the body up the wall, which helps conserve energy in the arms. Keep the knees slightly bent to absorb movements and maintain flexibility.               |
| Feet & Heels                | The climber should place the feet carefully on holds, using the toes for precision. Heels can be used to hook onto holds for added stability when necessary.                                    |
| Human-Object Interaction    | The climber should always check the stability of holds before putting the full weight on them. Use both hands and feet to distribute weight evenly and move smoothly from one hold to the next. |

**Table 8. General Technical Keypoints for Rock Climbing.**

| <b>Technical Dimensions</b> | <b>General Technical Keypoints</b>   |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Head & Eyes                 | The player should keep the head up and eyes focused on the ball at all times. This helps in tracking the ball's movement and anticipating its next position.   |
| Torso & Core                | The player should engage the core muscles to maintain balance and stability. A strong core helps in controlling the body's movements and maintaining proper posture.   |
| Arms & Elbows               | The player should keep the arms slightly bent and relaxed at the sides to help maintain balance. The arms can be used to make minor adjustments to the body's position.  |
| Wrists & Hands              | The player should use the hands to help with balance but should avoid using them to touch the ball. The wrists should be relaxed to allow natural movement.  |
| Legs & Knees                | The player should keep the knees slightly bent to absorb the impact of the ball and to help with quick adjustments in positioning. This flexibility is crucial for maintaining control.                          |
| Feet & Heels                | The player should use the top of the feet to juggle the ball, aiming to keep it in the air with gentle, controlled touches. The heels should be lifted slightly off the ground to allow for quick movements.     |
| Human-Object Interaction    | The player should focus on making consistent, light touches with the ball to keep it in the air. Each touch should be calculated to keep the ball at a manageable height and within close proximity to the body. |

**Table 9. General Technical Keypoints for Soccer Drills - Juggling.**



### Keypoint-level Commentary

- Head & Eyes**  
 (Strength): The athlete moves her vision to the rim when not dribbling.  
 (Weakness): The athlete needs to keep her eyes up on the target and not look down at the ball while dribbling.
- Torso & Core**  
 (Strength): The athlete squares her body and maintains beautiful spacing during the lift and reverse layup.  
 (Weakness): N/A
- Arms & Elbows**  
 (Strength): The athlete extends her shooting arm with the guide arm balancing to protect from defenders.  
 (Weakness): N/A
- Wrists & Hands**  
 (Strength): The athlete smoothly transfers the ball from two hands to her right hand and guides the ball towards the backboard for a successful shot.  
 (Weakness): N/A
- Legs & Knees**  
 (Strength): The athlete demonstrates correct footwork by jumping off her left foot for a right-hand reverse layup.  
 (Weakness): N/A
- Feet & Heels**  
 (Strength): The athlete uses proper footwork ensuring a big step on the left foot followed by the right, with correct push-off mechanics.  
 (Weakness): N/A
- Human-Object Interaction**  
 (Strength): The athlete uses two hands to manage the ball effectively, lifts her knee, and uses her body to shield from defenders as she attempts the layup.  
 (Weakness): N/A

### Instance-level Commentary

The athlete excels in footwork, balancing, and effectively using her body to protect the ball during the reverse layup. She appropriately transfers the ball from both hands to her right hand and maintains proper shooting form. However, she should work on keeping her head and eyes focused on the target while dribbling, as she tends to look down at the ball, which affects her ability to execute better ball handling and passing options during her approach.

Figure 10. An example for hierarchical coaching commentary. Zoom in for best view.



### Keypoint-level Commentary

- Head & Eyes**  
 (Strength): The athlete's focus on the ball is good, maintaining attention on the contact point with the left foot.  
 (Weakness): N/A
- Torso & Core**  
 (Strength): N/A  
 (Weakness): The athlete could adjust his body to lean slightly more forward with hips and chest to enhance power and control.
- Arms & Elbows**  
 (Strength): N/A  
 (Weakness): The athlete could extend the right arm out and maintain the left arm by the side for better balance and forward momentum.
- Wrists & Hands**  
 (Strength): N/A  
 (Weakness): The athlete should focus on keeping wrists and hands relaxed to help maintain balance.
- Legs & Knees**  
 (Strength): The athlete has a decent knee position over the ball, helping to control the ball's upward motion.  
 (Weakness): The athlete needs to bend his knees and drop his hips more as he comes down to absorb the impact.
- Feet & Heels**  
 (Strength): The athlete locks the ankle and uses the laces to strike the ball effectively.  
 (Weakness): The non-kicking foot should be slightly further forward and positioned to guide the ball's direction.
- Human-Object Interaction**  
 (Strength): The athlete attempts to use the correct part of the foot and the right angle for contact.  
 (Weakness): The athlete should aim to strike the center of the ball and make higher contact for improved power

### Instance-level Commentary

The athlete shows good focus on the ball and effective use of his laces for contact. However, improvements in foot placement, more forward lean of the torso, arm positioning, and striking the center of the ball can enhance power and accuracy. Correcting these points will allow better control and capitalize on the player's natural balance and follow-through, leading to more effective penalty kicks.

Figure 11. An example for hierarchical coaching commentary. Zoom in for best view.

### Prompts for General Technical Keypoints Generation

Suppose you are a <Action\_Domain> coach. Now a student wants to learn the skill of <Action\_Task>. According to your knowledge, please providing technical instructions so that learners can follow during practicing <Action\_Task>. The task instructions are as follow.

#### ## INSTRUCTIONS

- To make the instructions more understandable, the instructions should be listed according to the body part.
- For each body part, incorporate the answer with few sentences. Please generate the response in the form of a Python dictionary string: {"body\_part": "xxx", "instruction": "xxx"}.
- The key "body\_part" indicates the body part the instruction is about, including "head and eyes", "torso and core", "arms and elbows", "wrists and hands", "legs and knees", and "feet and heels". The instructions should start with "the player".
- Also, provide instruction about "human-object interaction" if it is necessary.
- Do remember, you are providing technical instructions on <Action\_Task>.

### Prompts for Hierarchical Coaching Commentary Generation

Suppose you are a <Action\_Domain> coach. Now you are asked to evaluate a learner's execution of <Action\_Task>. Here are the information you will be given and the task instructions.

#### ## GIVEN INFORMATION

- Technical Instructions: You will be given a series of <Action\_Task> technical instructions for various body parts and human-object interaction in form of Python dict. For example, {{ body\_part: xxx, description: xxx }}.
- Expert Commentary: You will also be given a list of commentary given by other <Action\_Domain> coaches after watching the learner's execution.

#### ## TASK INSTRUCTION

- According to the Expert Commentary, evaluate the learner's execution by telling: 1) what is finished well in the execution; 2) what can be improved in the execution.
- Your answer should include a list of Python dictionary (noted as "keypoint\_evaluation") like: [{"body\_part": "xxx", "what\_is\_done\_well": "xxx", "what\_can\_be\_improved": "xxx"}]. The "body part" should be relevant to those keys in the given Technical Instructions.
- The value of "what\_is\_done\_well" and "what\_can\_be\_improved" should start with "The athlete". Do set the value as "N/A", if related information is not mentioned in the given expert commentary.
- Your answer for each body part must associate with the given technical instruction for corresponding body part.
- You should also provide another text answer (noted as "summarization") that contains the overall comment on the execution about what is performed well and what can be improved. The summarization should be less than 140 words.
- DO NOT make any comments not mentioned in the expert commentary.
- In summary, your answer should be like: {"keypoint\_evaluation": [{"keypoint\_evaluation": ""}], "summarization": ""}. DO NOT PROVIDE ANY OTHER ANSWER.

The technical instructions: <General\_Technical\_Keypoints>

The expert commentary: <Original\_Expert\_Commentary>

### Prompts for Coach-Score Evaluation

Suppose you are a sports coach. Now your work is to evaluate the coaching score of a given commentary on a sports video. The task instructions are as follows:

#### ## TASK INSTRUCTIONS:

- You will be given a paragraph of commentary on the execution of sports skill.
- You need to read the commentary and provide a coaching score (from 1 to 5).
- A higher coaching score indicates that the action executor can better understand what he/she has finished well and what can be further improved.
- For example, a coaching score five means the action executor can totally understand what is finished well and what can be further improved. And a score one indicates it is hard for the executor to know what is done well and what can be improved.
- Your answer should only include an integer score.

## The given commentary: <Given\_Commentary>

Figure 12. **The detailed prompts for generating General Technical Keypoints (Upper), Hierarchical Coaching Commentary (Middle), and Coach-Scores (Lower).** “<Action\_Domain>”: The action domain of the instance (e.g., Basketball, Soccer, Rock Climbing). “<Action\_Task>”: The action task of the instance (e.g., Reverse Layup). “<General\_Technical\_Keypoints>”: The generated general technical keypoints for a specific action task. “<Original\_Expert\_Commentary>”: The original expert commentary on the instance given by EgoExo4D [10]. Zoom in for best view.