

Semantic Residual for Multimodal Unified Discrete Representation

1st Hai Huang

School of Software Technology
Zhejiang University
Ningbo, China
haihuangcode@outlook.com

2nd Shulei Wang

School of Software Technology
Zhejiang University
Ningbo, China
shuleiwang@zju.edu.cn

3rd Yan Xia*

College of Computer Science and Technology
Zhejiang University
Hangzhou, China
xiayan.zju@gmail.com

Abstract—Recent research in the domain of multimodal unified representations predominantly employs codebook as representation forms, utilizing Vector Quantization(VQ) for quantization, yet there has been insufficient exploration of other quantization representation forms. Our work explores more precise quantization methods and introduces a new framework, Semantic Residual Cross-modal Information Disentanglement (SRCID), inspired by the numerical residual concept inherent to Residual Vector Quantization (RVQ). SRCID employs semantic residual-based information disentanglement for multimodal data to better handle the inherent discrepancies between different modalities. Our method enhances the capabilities of unified multimodal representations and demonstrates exceptional performance in cross-modal generalization and cross-modal zero-shot retrieval. Its average results significantly surpass existing state-of-the-art models, as well as previous attempts with RVQ and Finite Scalar Quantization (FSQ) based on these modals.

Index Terms—Multimodal Unified Representation, Information Disentanglement

I. INTRODUCTION

Different modalities contain distinctly different information; for example, sounds present in audio may not have corresponding visual sources in video. Many researchers have addressed how to learn a unified representation from these modalities, offering various solutions [1]–[3]. Some approaches employ modality-agnostic encoders to encode different modalities [4], [5], while others use contrastive learning to align representations across modalities [1], [6]. Beyond continuous representation spaces, some studies have opted for codebooks as unified representations for better interpretability [7]–[12], achieving notable results. However, discussions on the forms of unified representations remain superficial, with little exploration of quantization methods beyond VQ.

We begin with the most intuitive switch from VQ [13], [14] to RVQ [15], which has seen effective applications in many fields such as speech [16], image [15] and retrieval [17], yet is scarcely utilized in the research of multimodal unified representations. We also experiment with FSQ [18] that does not require a codebook, with detailed results presented in Section III. The findings suggest that neither RVQ nor FSQ improved the model’s performance, prompting the question:

Does a deeper, more precise quantization method not contribute to multimodal unification? We hypothesize that this is because any form of quantization inherently seeks more accurate quantization of the original data, which is suitable for unimodal representation tasks but not for multimodal unified representations. Excessive focus on precise quantization of modality ‘A’ could compromise the precise of quantization for modality ‘B’.

Consequently, we believe that RVQ’s approach of numerical residuals is not suitable for multimodal unified representations. We have decided to start with semantic residuals to achieve better multimodal representations. As shown in Fig. 1, if we consider mutual information minimize, results of general encoder and specific encoder in subplot (b) as a form of subtraction, quantized output and quantization residual in subplot (a), it becomes apparent that the structure of SRCID and RVQ are quite similar. However, RVQ deals with numerical residuals, meaning that q_2 lacks inherent semantics and only functions effectively when combined with q_1 . In contrast, SRCID addresses semantic residuals, extracting the remaining modal-general results g_2 from s_1 as a new, independent semantic entity.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We explore the impact of different quantization methods on constructing a unified representation space and demonstrate that quantization approaches focused on precision are not directly suitable for the multimodal unification domain.
- We introduce a new framework for multimodal unified discrete representation, named Semantic Residual Cross-modal Information Disentangling (SRCID), which, unlike the numerical residuals of RVQ, implements semantic residuals. This approach achieves results that significantly surpass those of RVQ and previous state-of-the-art (SOTA) models.

II. METHOD

As shown in Fig. 2, SRCID architecture is divided into two layers. The first layer utilizes mutual information to separate the primary modal-general results from modal-specific results. Building on the converged training of the first layer, the second layer further disentangles the modal-specific results obtained

*Corresponding Author




Fig. 1. (a) RVQ (b) Simplified diagram of SRCID

from the first layer, thus achieving semantic residuals. The core components of both layers involve minimizing mutual information between modal-general and modal-specific results within each modality using CLUB [19], and maximizing mutual information among modal-general results across different modalities using Cross-Modal CPC [20].

Given three paired modalities, $(\mathbf{x}_i^a, \mathbf{x}_i^b, \mathbf{x}_i^c)_{i=1}^N$, we employ three modal-specific encoders Ψ^a, Ψ^b, Ψ^c to extract modal-specific features $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_i^a, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_i^b, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_i^c$, and three modal-general encoders Φ^a, Φ^b, Φ^c to extract modal-general features $\mathbf{z}_i^a, \mathbf{z}_i^b, \mathbf{z}_i^c \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D}$ from modalities A, B, and C, respectively. To enhance the effectiveness of multimodal representations, SRCID extends this process to two layers, $m \in \{a, b, c\}$, $k \in \{1, 2\}$:

$$\mathbf{z}_{i,k}^m = \Phi_k^m(\mathbf{x}_{i,k}^m), \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{i,k}^m = \Psi_k^m(\mathbf{x}_{i,k}^m), \quad (1)$$

Furthermore, the input to all second-layer encoders is the output of the first-layer modal-specific results:

$$\mathbf{x}_{i,2}^m = \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{i,1}^m. \quad (2)$$

The latent codebook $\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times D \times K}$ is shared across modalities A, B, and C, where T, L, D, and K represent time, size of the discrete latent space, hidden dimension, and layer num of codebook, respectively. The dimension of $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{i,k}^a, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{i,k}^b, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{i,k}^c$ varies for different modalities. Apply vector quantized operation to map model-general feature $\mathbf{z}_{i,k}^a, \mathbf{z}_{i,k}^b, \mathbf{z}_{i,k}^c$ to discrete latent codes, $t \in [0, T)$:

$$\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{i,k,t}^m = VQ(\Phi_k^m(\mathbf{x}_{i,k}^m)) = VQ(\mathbf{z}_{i,k,t}^m) = e_{l,k}, \quad (3)$$

where $l = \underset{j}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|\Phi_k(x) - e_{j,k}\|_2$

Then, we combine $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{i,k}^m$ with $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{i,k}^m$ together to reconstruct original features:

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \left(\underbrace{\|\mathbf{x}_{i,k}^m - D(\hat{\mathbf{z}}_{i,k}^m; \bar{\mathbf{z}}_{i,k}^m)\|_2^2}_{\text{reconstruction loss}} + \underbrace{\|\operatorname{sg}[\phi_k^m(\mathbf{x}_{i,k}^m)] - \mathbf{e}\|_2^2}_{\text{VQ loss}} + \underbrace{\beta \|\phi_k^m(\mathbf{x}_{i,k}^m) - \operatorname{sg}[\mathbf{e}]\|_2^2}_{\text{commitment loss}} \right) \quad (4)$$

where sg denotes the stop gradient operation, and β is set to 0.25. We employ the Exponential Moving Average

(EMA) strategy to replace the VQ loss, and utilize MMEMA [11] to modify the commitment loss. The reconstruction loss ensures that the compressed latent codes e_l retain the general information of different modalities. Ideally, $\mathbf{z}_{i,k}^a, \mathbf{z}_{i,k}^b$, and $\mathbf{z}_{i,k}^c$, encoded from different modalities with the same semantics, should be mapped to the same discrete latent code. However, in the absence of effective supervision, the presence of a modality gap may lead to $\mathbf{z}_{i,k}^a, \mathbf{z}_{i,k}^b$, and $\mathbf{z}_{i,k}^c$ converging to distinct regions of the codebook [8], [10]. Therefore, we aim to minimize the mutual information between the general and specific results within a single modality and maximize the mutual information across the general results of different modalities.

Mutual Information Minimization: CLUB [19] could optimize the mutual information upper bound, demonstrating superior advantages in information disentanglement. Given two variables \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} , the objective function of CLUB is defined as:

$$I_{vCLUB}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) := \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})} [\log q_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})] - \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathbf{x})} \mathbb{E}_{p(\mathbf{y})} [\log q_\theta(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})], \quad (5)$$

where q_θ is the variational approximation of ground-truth posterior of \mathbf{y} given \mathbf{x} and can be parameterized by a network θ . We use CLUB to optimize the MI upper bound between the modal-general features $\mathbf{z}_{i,k}^m$ and modal-specific features $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{i,k}^m$:

$$\hat{I}_{vCLUB} = \frac{1}{N} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^K \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \log q_\theta(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{i,k}^m | \mathbf{z}_{i,k}^m) - \frac{1}{N} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \log q_\theta(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_{j,k}^m | \mathbf{z}_{i,k}^m) \right] \quad (6)$$




Fig. 2. SRCID Encoder Framework

Mutual Information Maximization: Contrastive Predictive Coding (CPC) [20] aims to maximize the mutual information between sequence items by predicting future samples using autoregressive models and is widely adopted in self-supervised learning. We utilize it to facilitate the alignment of modal-general information. Given the general features $\mathbf{z}^a, \mathbf{z}^b, \mathbf{z}^c \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D}$, a prediction horizon of R steps, and a random time moment $t \in (0, T-R]$, two single-layer unidirectional LSTMs are used to summarize the information of all $\mathbf{z}_{\leq t}^a, \mathbf{z}_{\leq t}^b, \mathbf{z}_{\leq t}^c$, yielding three context representations as $\mathbf{c}_t^m = \text{LSTM}(\mathbf{z}_{\leq t}^m \in \mathbb{R}^D, m \in a, b, c)$.

For modality M , we first select a set Z^n of $N-1$ random negative samples and one positive sample \mathbf{z}_{t+r}^n from modality N , then use \mathbf{c}_t^m to predict r -th future step \mathbf{z}_{t+r}^n in modality N , and the InfoNCE loss for all modality can be optimized as:

$$L_{cpc}^{m2n} = -\frac{1}{R} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{r=1}^R \sum_{k=1}^K \log \left[\frac{\exp(\mathbf{z}_{t+r,k}^n W_{r,k}^m \mathbf{c}_{t,k}^m)}{\sum_{\mathbf{z}_j \in Z_n} \exp(\mathbf{z}_{j,k}^n W_{r,k}^m \mathbf{c}_{t,k}^m)} \right], \quad (7)$$

The overall objective of SRCID is a combination of these loss functions across both layers:

$$L = L_{\text{recon}} + L_{\text{commit}} + L_{\text{cpc}} + L_{\text{cmcm}} + L_{\text{MI}}, \quad (8)$$

where L_{recon} is the reconstruction loss that merges the modal-specific and modal-general results for each modality and compares them with the original input using MSE loss, L_{commit} is the commitment loss that computes the MSE loss between the modal-general results and their quantized codes, L_{cpc} is the Contrastive Predictive Coding loss that enhances cross-modal alignment and inference by predicting future samples in one modality using information from another, L_{cmcm} is the objective loss proposed in [8], which also promotes the alignment among modalities, and $L_{\text{MI}} = \hat{I}_{v\text{CLUB}}$ represents the mutual information loss concerning the modal-specific and modal-general results within each modality. The VQ loss is replaced by MMEMA, so it does not appear in the final loss.

III. EXPERIMENT

A. Datasets and Tasks

Pre-train: The pretraining dataset uses the VGGsound-AVEL 40k [21], [22] with prompts provided by [11].

Downstream: The unified representation pre-trained models will be evaluated on several downstream tasks using different datasets. **Cross-modal event classification on AVE dataset:** [23] training on one modality (video) and evaluating on another (audio). **Cross-modal event localization on AVVP dataset:** [24] localizing events in one modality and transferring to the other. **Cross-dataset localization/classification:** training on classification in AVE and evaluating localization in AVVP, transferring across datasets. Cross-modal classification between UCF-101 [25] visual clips and VGGSound-AVEL audio clips. **Cross-modal Zero-shot Retrieval:** MSCOCO [26]; we adopt a process similar to the test set [27] consists of 1000 video-text pairs from MSRVT [28] to get 500 pairs.

This task tests the retrieval effectiveness between videos and text. Clotho [29]; assesses the zero-shot retrieval capability for audio-text alignment.

B. Implementation Details

We compare our method with recent unified representation approaches including DCID [11], CODISS [7], TURN [10], and CMCM [8]. These methods are implemented across our tasks, with their effectiveness assessed on four downstream tasks involving datasets such as AVE [23], VGGSound-AVEL [22], [30], and UCF101 [25], where precision is the evaluation metric. For the AVVP dataset [24], accuracy serves as the measure, while recall is utilized for evaluating cross-modal zero-shot retrieval.

The losses of SRCID are not suitable for full backpropagation initially. If subsequent layer losses participate in backpropagation before sufficient disentanglement is achieved by previous layers, this can lead to failure in aligning modal-general semantics from coarse to fine granularity across layers. We use a warm-start technique, applying only the preceding layer's loss during the initial epochs. The second layer's loss is activated once the first layer's MI loss approaches 0, signaling successful disentanglement. Only then are losses from subsequent layers introduced into the backpropagation. All results presented in Table I, II, III were obtained with a codebook size set to 400 and an embedding dimension set to 256. The backbone models used to extract features for video, audio, and text modalities are VGG19 [31], VGGish [32], and BERT [33], respectively.

C. Performance Analysis

Quantization: As shown in Table I, we experimented with different quantization methods on the SOTA discrete unified representation model, DCID [11], and found that for cross-modal tasks, the simplest method, vq, performed the best. Concurrently, observing the $m \rightarrow m$ results, we noted that FSQ and RVQ significantly outperformed VQ, confirming our hypothesis: improvements in quantization precision are specific to individual features and do not simultaneously enhance multimodal unified results. The closer the representation gets to modality 'A', the further it moves from modality 'B', leading to improvements in intramodal results but no enhancement or even a decline in cross-modal tasks.

Cross-Modal Generalization and Zero-shot Retrieval: We compare our model with leading methods on four downstream tasks. All models are pre-trained on same dataset sizes. It is worth mentioning that in localization tasks (avvp, ave \rightarrow avvp), each second of every audio-video can belong to multiple categories. In contrast, in the classification tasks discussed in this paper (ave, ucf(v) \rightarrow vgg(a)), the entire duration of each audio or video belongs to only one category. Therefore, localization tasks require finer granularity.

As shown in Table II, using only the first-layer modal-general results, SRCID achieves performance close to the SOTA across four tasks. When both layers of modal-general results are employed, SRCID clearly surpasses the SOTA. A

TABLE I

IMPACT OF DIFFERENT QUANTIZATION METHODS ON DCID [11]: GREY ROWS INDICATE RESULTS FOR THE TRAINING MODALITY OF THE PREVIOUS ROW AND THEIR AVERAGES EXCLUDE AVE→AVVP, WHILE AVERAGES FOR THE REMAINING ROWS INCLUDE EIGHT RESULTS. (AVE→AVVP’S $m \rightarrow m, m \in \{A, V\}$ SAME AS AVE)

Method	AVE		AVVP		AVE→AVVP		UCF(v)↔VGG(a)		Avg.
	V→A	A→V	V→A	A→V	V→A	A→V	V→A	A→V	
DCID(VQ)	54.1	55.0	63.4	71.0	53.0	52.4	67.1	60.6	59.58
$m \rightarrow m$	64.8	65.8	71.0	72.9	-	-	80.0	85.4	73.32
DCID(FSQ)	45.2	50.4	48.1	54.9	51.4	44.0	67.1	60.6	52.71
$m \rightarrow m$	76.5	78.2	65.8	72.1	-	-	98.5	92.2	80.55
DCID(RVQ-2)	49.3	55.0	58.4	66.9	57.4	54.2	68.9	63.5	59.20
DCID(RVQ-3)	47.6	53.2	59.9	67.2	54.3	53.0	68.5	62.4	58.26
DCID(RVQ-4)	48.5	55.5	58.7	68.6	56.3	54.7	69.4	64.3	59.50
$m \rightarrow m$	69.9	70.3	75.1	75.6	-	-	88.0	90.8	78.28

TABLE II

COMPARISON WITH SOTA METHODS ON FOUR AUDIOVISUAL DOWNSTREAM TASKS. (“ONLY1” REFERS TO USING ONLY THE FIRST LAYER TO OBTAIN MODAL-GENERAL RESULTS DURING THE INFERENCE PHASE OF SRCID)

Method	AVE		AVVP		AVE→AVVP		UCF(v)↔VGG(a)		Avg.
	V→A	A→V	V→A	A→V	V→A	A→V	V→A	A→V	
CODIS [7]	36.8	39.7	46.7	47.6	37.8	37.6	50.8	45.2	42.78
TURN [10]	37.6	39.2	48.4	50.2	36.6	38.4	49.4	46.1	43.24
CMCM [8]	46.3	45.8	57.1	58.2	44.1	45.2	51.2	48.3	49.53
DCID [11]	54.1	55.0	63.4	71.0	53.0	52.4	67.1	60.6	59.58
SRCID(only1)	49.4	53.5	60.4	77.2	53.4	52.9	70.6	59.5	59.61
SRCID	49.2	54.2	72.1	85.6	54.8	53.7	69.1	59.0	62.21

TABLE III

COMPARISON WITH SOTA METHODS ON THREE CROSS-MODAL ZERO-SHOT RETRIEVAL TASKS, ALL RESULTS ARE CALCULATED AS THE MEAN ACROSS TWO DIRECTIONS.

Method	MSCOCO(V↔T)			Clotho(A↔T)			Avg.
	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	
CMCM [8]	0.4	3.8	6.9	1.62	8.04	14.87	5.94
DCID [11]	0.5	4.5	7.8	2.06	9.00	16.70	6.76
SRCID	0.9	4.7	8.3	2.28	9.54	17.32	7.17

closer examination of the last two rows reveals that adding the second-layer modal-general results slightly reduces performance in classification-related tasks (ave, ucf(v)→vgg(a)), while significantly enhancing outcomes in localization-related tasks (avvp, ave→avvp). This indicates that the results extracted from the second layer are crucial for impacting fine-grained details. Similarly, SRCID’s performance on the AVE task is not optimal, mirroring results with RVQ. This suggests that there is room for improvement in our semantic residuals, which are not yet effectively separated by mutual information, unlike numerical subtraction which allows for complete disengagement.

As shown in Table III, we conducted zero-shot retrieval experiments for Video↔Text and Audio↔Text on the MSCOCO [26] and Clotho [29] datasets, respectively. The results demonstrate that SRCID continues to maintain its superiority.

Ablation Study: The two most critical losses in SRCID are the semantic disentanglements performed by the two layers of CLUB [19], as contrastive learning is almost essential for multimodal unified representations, and omitting it would undoubtedly result in a significant drop in model performance.




Fig. 3. Ablation of codebook size and club

Other losses have been proven effective in previous studies and will not be elaborated further here. Consequently, we conducted ablation experiments focusing on codebook size and CLUB effectiveness. As illustrated in Fig. 3, the model performs optimally with a codebook size of 400, displaying an initial increase followed by a decrease in performance. Both layers of CLUB contribute effectively, with the first layer having a more pronounced impact, as it contains the primary information.

IV. CONCLUSION

Previous works on multimodal unified discrete representations have not delved deeply into the forms of representation. Starting with RVQ and FSQ, we test more precise quantization methods to assess their applicability in multimodal unified representations and find that, although they perform better than VQ in unimodal scenarios, they do not aid in multimodal representation. Furthermore, inspired by the numerical residual concept of RVQ, we develop SRCID, a new framework that effectively utilizes mutual information to enhance the model’s representational capabilities.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark, *et al.*, “Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 8748–8763, PMLR, 2021.
- [2] H. Luo, L. Ji, M. Zhong, Y. Chen, W. Lei, N. Duan, and T. Li, “Clip4clip: An empirical study of clip for end to end video clip retrieval and captioning,” *Neurocomputing*, vol. 508, pp. 293–304, 2022.
- [3] H. Xu, G. Ghosh, P.-Y. Huang, D. Okhonko, A. Aghajanyan, F. Metze, L. Zettlemoyer, and C. Feichtenhofer, “Videoclip: Contrastive pre-training for zero-shot video-text understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.14084*, 2021.
- [4] H. Akbari, L. Yuan, R. Qian, W.-H. Chuang, S.-F. Chang, Y. Cui, and B. Gong, “Vatt: Transformers for multimodal self-supervised learning from raw video, audio and text,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 24206–24221, 2021.
- [5] H. You, L. Zhou, B. Xiao, N. Codella, Y. Cheng, R. Xu, S.-F. Chang, and L. Yuan, “Learning visual representation from modality-shared contrastive language-image pre-training,” in *Computer Vision–ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part XXVII*, pp. 69–87, Springer, 2022.
- [6] V. W. Liang, Y. Zhang, Y. Kwon, S. Yeung, and J. Y. Zou, “Mind the gap: Understanding the modality gap in multi-modal contrastive representation learning,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 17612–17625, 2022.
- [7] J. Duan, L. Chen, S. Tran, J. Yang, Y. Xu, B. Zeng, and T. Chilimbi, “Multi-modal alignment using representation codebook,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 15651–15660, 2022.
- [8] A. H. Liu, S. Jin, C.-I. J. Lai, A. Rouditchenko, A. Oliva, and J. Glass, “Cross-modal discrete representation learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.05438*, 2021.
- [9] J. Lu, C. Clark, R. Zellers, R. Mottaghi, and A. Kembhavi, “Unified-io: A unified model for vision, language, and multi-modal tasks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.08916*, 2022.
- [10] Y. Zhao, C. Zhang, H. Huang, H. Li, and Z. Zhao, “Towards effective multi-modal interchanges in zero-resource sounding object localization,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 38089–38102, 2022.
- [11] Y. Xia, H. Huang, J. Zhu, and Z. Zhao, “Achieving cross modal generalization with multimodal unified representation,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [12] H. Huang, Y. Xia, S. Ji, S. Wang, H. Wang, J. Zhu, Z. Dong, and Z. Zhao, “Unlocking the potential of multimodal unified discrete representation through training-free codebook optimization and hierarchical alignment,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05168*, 2024.
- [13] A. Van Den Oord, O. Vinyals, *et al.*, “Neural discrete representation learning,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 30, 2017.
- [14] S. Ji, Z. Jiang, W. Wang, Y. Chen, M. Fang, J. Zuo, Q. Yang, X. Cheng, Z. Wang, R. Li, *et al.*, “Wavtokenizer: an efficient acoustic discrete codec tokenizer for audio language modeling,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.16532*, 2024.
- [15] D. Lee, C. Kim, S. Kim, M. Cho, and W.-S. Han, “Autoregressive image generation using residual quantization,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 11523–11532, 2022.
- [16] S. Ji, J. Zuo, M. Fang, S. Zheng, Q. Chen, W. Wang, Z. Jiang, H. Huang, X. Cheng, R. Huang, *et al.*, “Controlspeech: Towards simultaneous zero-shot speaker cloning and zero-shot language style control with decoupled codec,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01205*, 2024.
- [17] M. Fang, S. Ji, J. Zuo, H. Huang, Y. Xia, J. Zhu, X. Cheng, X. Yang, W. Liu, G. Wang, *et al.*, “Ace: A generative cross-modal retrieval framework with coarse-to-fine semantic modeling,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.17507*, 2024.
- [18] F. Mentzer, D. Minnen, E. Agustsson, and M. Tschannen, “Finite scalar quantization: Vq-vae made simple,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15505*, 2023.
- [19] P. Cheng, W. Hao, S. Dai, J. Liu, Z. Gan, and L. Carin, “Club: A contrastive log-ratio upper bound of mutual information,” in *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1779–1788, PMLR, 2020.
- [20] A. v. d. Oord, Y. Li, and O. Vinyals, “Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748*, 2018.
- [21] H. Chen, W. Xie, A. Vedaldi, and A. Zisserman, “Vggsound: A large-scale audio-visual dataset,” in *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 721–725, IEEE, 2020.
- [22] J. Zhou, D. Guo, and M. Wang, “Contrastive positive sample propagation along the audio-visual event line,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2022.
- [23] Y. Tian, J. Shi, B. Li, Z. Duan, and C. Xu, “Audio-visual event localization in unconstrained videos,” in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pp. 247–263, 2018.
- [24] Y. Tian, D. Li, and C. Xu, “Unified multisensory perception: Weakly-supervised audio-visual video parsing,” in *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part III 16*, pp. 436–454, Springer, 2020.
- [25] K. Soomro, A. R. Zamir, and M. Shah, “Ucf101: A dataset of 101 human actions classes from videos in the wild,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.0402*, 2012.
- [26] T.-Y. Lin, M. Maire, S. Belongie, J. Hays, P. Perona, D. Ramanan, P. Dollár, and C. L. Zitnick, “Microsoft coco: Common objects in context,” in *Computer Vision–ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, Proceedings, Part V 13*, pp. 740–755, Springer, 2014.
- [27] Y. Yu, J. Kim, and G. Kim, “A joint sequence fusion model for video question answering and retrieval,” in *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pp. 471–487, 2018.
- [28] J. Xu, T. Mei, T. Yao, and Y. Rui, “Msr-vtt: A large video description dataset for bridging video and language,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 5288–5296, 2016.
- [29] K. Drossos, S. Lipping, and T. Virtanen, “Clotho: An audio captioning dataset,” in *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pp. 736–740, IEEE, 2020.
- [30] J. Zhou, L. Zheng, Y. Zhong, S. Hao, and M. Wang, “Positive sample propagation along the audio-visual event line,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 8436–8444, 2021.
- [31] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman, “Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [32] S. Hershey, S. Chaudhuri, D. P. Ellis, J. F. Gemmeke, A. Jansen, R. C. Moore, M. Plakal, D. Platt, R. A. Saurous, B. Seybold, *et al.*, “Cnn architectures for large-scale audio classification,” in *2017 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (icassp)*, pp. 131–135, IEEE, 2017.
- [33] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, “Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.