

Metric Learning with Progressive Self-Distillation for Audio-Visual Embedding Learning

Donghuo Zeng*
 KDDI Research, Inc.
 Saitama, Japan
 do-zeng@kddi-research.jp

Kazushi Ikeda
 KDDI Research, Inc.
 Saitama, Japan
 kz-ikeda@kddi-research.jp

Abstract—Metric learning projects samples into an embedded space, where similarities and dissimilarities are quantified based on their learned representations. However, existing methods often rely on label-guided representation learning, where representations of different modalities, such as audio and visual data, are aligned based on annotated labels. This approach tends to underutilize latent complex features and potential relationships inherent in the distributions of audio and visual data that are not directly tied to the labels, resulting in suboptimal performance in audio-visual embedding learning. To address this issue, we propose a novel architecture that integrates cross-modal triplet loss with progressive self-distillation. Our method enhances representation learning by leveraging inherent distributions and dynamically refining soft audio-visual alignments—probabilistic aligns between audio and visual data that capture the inherent relationships beyond explicit labels. Specifically, the model distills audio-visual distribution-based knowledge from annotated labels in a subset of each batch. This self-distilled knowledge is used to automatically generate soft audio-visual alignments for the remaining audio-visual samples. These soft-alignment labels are used to construct soft cross-modal triplets, which in turn are employed to fine-tune the model’s parameters. Experimental results on two audio-visual benchmark datasets demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed method in the cross-modal retrieval task, achieving state-of-the-art performance with improvements of 2.13% and 1.82% on the AVE and VEGAS datasets, respectively, in terms of average MAP metrics.

Index Terms—Triplet loss, self-distillation, audio-visual learning, cross-modal retrieval.

I. INTRODUCTION

Metric learning [8], [10], [12], [13], [15], [19], [20], [22], [23] is a powerful approach for learning representations by comparing sample similarities and dissimilarities based on annotated labels, such as triplet loss [6]. This technique projects samples into an embedded space, where the relationships between samples are quantified according to their learned representations, which can significantly improve tasks such as audio-visual embedding for cross-modal retrieval [26], [29], [30]. However, metric learning often has a heavy reliance on annotations, which limits the effectiveness and scalability of the approach, as obtaining high-quality annotations is often labor-intensive and costly. Furthermore, the simplicity of these annotations means that label-guided representation learning often cannot achieve acceptable performance on its own, as it may not capture the complex, latent features of the data.




Fig. 1: The standard triplet loss pulls the positives closer to the anchor (a_1) and pushes the negatives away but struggles with limited data. AADML [27] enhances dependencies between similar samples but overlooks the latent information inherent in the distributions beyond labels. Our approach addresses this by generating soft audio-visual alignments, enhancing embeddings for cross-modal tasks like retrieving *baby crying* visuals from the audio on the VEGAS [32] and improving its average precision (AP).

Existing methods [28], [31] attempt to mitigate these issues by focusing on selecting impactful data samples for the representation learning on embedding space. However, these approaches fail to fully explore the space due to the limited training data, resulting in an incomplete representation of samples. The state-of-the-art (SOTA) model, AADML [27], addresses this issue by discovering the potential correlations among similar samples to enhance the quality of representations (see Fig. 1). Nonetheless, AADML does not effectively take into account the valuable latent features and potential relationships inherent in the data distributions. Specifically, when determining positive and negative samples using fixed annotations, this approach treats all positives and negatives with equal importance. Consequently, it neglects the distributional nuances of the data, which are essential for more accurately identifying and differentiating between positive and negative samples.

* Corresponding author

To address this issue, we propose a novel architecture that integrates cross-modal triplet loss with progressive self-distillation. The goal is to iteratively refine the model’s knowledge to soften rigid annotations and capture nuanced relationships in the data. Our method improves the learning process by efficiently utilizing inherent data distribution and dynamically refining soft audio-visual alignments—probabilistic associations that capture relationships beyond explicit label constraints. Each batch is partitioned into two subsets: the first is used to project audio-visual data into a common feature space by minimizing the distance between learned features and ground truth labels. The model then generates soft-alignment labels for the second subset, which are used to create soft cross-modal triplets by identifying positive and negative samples for loss optimization. To preserve the original pairs, we reduce cross-modal dependency by minimizing the distance between paired audio and visual representations. As training progresses, the partitioning rate decreases, allowing the teacher model to generate soft-alignment labels for progressively larger portions of each batch, gradually transforming the model into its own teacher.

To validate the effectiveness of our approach, we conduct experiments on two datasets. The results demonstrate the superior performance of our method, with significant improvements over SOTA. Specifically, our approach achieves a 2.13% increase in mean average precision (MAP) on the AVE [18] dataset and a 1.82% increase on the VEGAS [32] dataset in audio-visual cross-modal retrieval (AV-CMR).

II. RELATED WORK

A. Audio-visual Embedding Learning

Audio-visual embedding learning creates a shared feature space for audio and visual data, preserving semantic relationships and enabling effective cross-modal retrieval [28]. CCA [2] and its variants, including K-CCA [11], Cluster-CCA [16], DCCA [1] and C-DCCA [24]. These methods often struggle to capture complex non-linear relationships. Deep learning excels in audio-visual embedding by aligning matched samples using neural networks. Models like CCTL [28], and EICS [29] capture intricate audio-visual relationships to advance retrieval tasks. Inspired by AADML [27], we introduce a novel metric learning that leverages latent features and potential relationships beyond annotation through self-knowledge distillation.

B. Self-knowledge Distillation

Knowledge distillation (KD) [7] typically involves a large teacher model guiding a smaller student model. In cross-modal tasks, KD [4] transfers knowledge from a pre-trained model on one modality to a student model with a new modality, often using paired samples. Various methods [4] enhance performance using paired samples, contrastive loss, and modality hallucination. Despite its success in visual recognition, cross-modal knowledge transfer struggles with modality gaps and paired sample availability. We introduce progressive self-distillation to iteratively refine the model’s knowledge, and

soften constraints to capture transferable cross-modal representations.

III. APPROACH

To address the issue of overlooking inherent distribution beyond annotations, we propose a model that progressively distills its own knowledge to generate soft-alignment labels and enabling more transferable representations for cross-modal triplet learning, as seen in Fig. 2.

A. Preliminaries

Consider an audio-visual dataset comprising n videos, denoted as $\mathcal{D} = \{(a_i, v_i)\}_{i=0}^{n-1}$, where each video pair (a_i, v_i) is represented as (a_i, v_i) . The $a_i \in R^{128}$ denotes the audio feature extracted using a VGGish model, and $v_i \in R^{1024}$ denotes the visual features extracted using an Inception V3 model. Each pair is associated with a binary semantic label vector $Y_i \in \{0, 1\}^c$, where c is the number of categories, 1 indicates that the video pair (a_i, v_i) belongs to the corresponding class, while 0 indicates otherwise. The goal of our model is to train encoders f_a for audio data and f_v for visual data such that for a given semantically similar instance pairs $(f_a(a_i), f_v(v_j))$ with the same label get closer together while dissimilar instance pairs with different labels push farther apart.

B. Soft Cross-modal Triplet

A cross-modal triplet (e.g., (a_i, v_i^+, v_i^-)) is composed of a sample (audio a_i) as the anchor from one modality and two samples as positive (visual v_i^+) and negative (visual v_i^-) from another modality. The purpose of a cross-modal triplet is to ensure that the positive visual sample v_i^+ is closer to the anchor a_i than the negative visual sample v_i^- within a common feature space, thereby improving the model’s ability to differentiate relevant from irrelevant content across modalities. In relatively large batch settings, relying solely on annotated labels to determine positive and negative samples will overlook the varying degrees of similarity and dissimilarity between the audio and visual samples. This is because such an approach fails to capture potential relationships beyond the labels, making it difficult to accurately define v_i^+ and v_i^- . To address this issue, our approach generates soft-alignment labels for audio-visual data by capturing latent features and potential relationships beyond explicit annotations. This process allows the teacher model to iteratively refine the classification of samples by adjusting the identification of soft positives \hat{v}_i^+ and soft negatives \hat{v}_i^- based on the learned distributions. The soft-alignment labels guide the model in distinguishing subtle variations in semantic relationships, leading to improved matching and overall performance.

Soft-alignment labels are generated by the teacher model trained on a subset of every batch. The teacher model consists of audio and visual encoders $f_a(\cdot)$ and $f_v(\cdot)$, the output logits $\hat{\mathbf{A}} = \{\hat{a}_i\} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 128}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{V}} = \{\hat{v}_i\} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 1024}$ used to produce soft-alignment label distributions \mathbf{L}^a and \mathbf{L}^v , which defined as:

$$\mathbf{L}^a = \sigma(\hat{\mathbf{V}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{A}}^T) \text{ and } \mathbf{L}^v = \sigma(\hat{\mathbf{A}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{V}}^T) \quad (1)$$




Fig. 2: The overview of our approach. The batch is divided into annotated instances (light blue background) and unannotated instances (light grey background) in the above three matrices by the hyper-parameter r . The teacher network is trained on annotated instances using the cross-modal triplet loss. The teacher estimates soft-alignment labels for the unannotated data, which are then used to supervise the student network. As training progresses and the teacher’s representations become more reliable, the proportion of soft-alignment labels provided to the student increases.

where $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the softmax function to transform raw logits into probability. The soft label distributions are used to construct soft cross-modal triplets by incorporating the adjacency matrix A and the adjacency-not matrix \bar{A} into the loss calculation. They are defined as:

$$A_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \operatorname{argmax}(\mathbf{L}_j^a) = \operatorname{argmax}(\mathbf{L}_i^v) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

$$\bar{A}_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \operatorname{argmax}(\mathbf{L}_j^a) \neq \operatorname{argmax}(\mathbf{L}_i^v) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where the L_i^a refers to the i -th column of L^a and L_j^v corresponds to the j -th row of L^v . Incorporate these matrices into the triplet loss to identify the positive visual $v_i^+ = \hat{v}_j$ ($A_{ij} = 1$) and the negative visual $v_i^- = \hat{v}_k$ ($\bar{A}_{ik} = 1$) for a_i . By using the $AA(\cdot)$ proxy [27] for each representation to enhance the correlation between positive samples, our final cross-modal triplet loss can be formulated as:

$$l_{cross} = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \max\{0, d(AA(a_i), AA(v_i^+)) - d(AA(a_i), AA(v_i^-)) + \alpha\} \quad (3)$$

where $d(\cdot)$ are the normalized Euclidean distance, N is the batch size.

C. Progress Self-distillation

Self-knowledge distillation [3]–[5] allows a student network to act as its own teacher, cutting computational costs compared to traditional methods. Progressive self-knowledge distillation enhances this by gradually evolving the student into its own teacher during training, leading to a more dynamic and efficient learning process. Our progressive self-distillation

process begins with a batch of N samples, which is randomly partitioned into two subsets: $N_1 = \lfloor r \cdot N \rfloor$ samples with ground-truth labels and $N_2 = N - \lfloor r \cdot N \rfloor$ samples without labels. Initially, the subset N_1 is used to train the teacher network with ground truth pairings. The teacher network then generates soft-alignment labels for the subset N_2 , which are used to supervise its own student model.

To enhance the teacher’s influence on learning, we progressively reduce r . This gradual decrease ensures that the student network increasingly relies on its own predictions over time. We use a step-wise schedule to adjust r from a specified start value (1.0) to an end value (0.2), as this method has proven more effective for our model than other strategies, such as linear or cosine-annealing schedule [14].

By incorporating this progressive self-distillation approach, our model dynamically evolves and improves its representational capabilities. In addition, we reduce the cross-modal dependency of exact audio-visual pairs while preserving the original alignment, achieved by l_{dis} loss. The final objective loss is defined as follows:

$$Loss = l_{lab} + l_{cross} + l_{dis}$$

$$l_{lab} = \frac{1}{n} \|f_a(a_i) - Y(a_i)\|_F + \frac{1}{n} \|f_v(v_i) - Y(v_i)\|_F \quad (4)$$

$$l_{dis} = \frac{1}{n} \|f_a(a_i) - f_v(v_i)\|_F$$

where $\|\cdot\|_F$ signifies the Frobenius norm, $f(x)$ represents the projected feature in the shared label space and $Y(\cdot)$ denotes the label representations. The final objective loss is optimized using the stochastic gradient descent (SGD) [17].

TABLE I: Comparison of MAP between our approach and existing methods (The best in bold and second-best underlined)

Models	AVE Dataset			VEGAS Dataset		
	A→V	V→A	Avg.	A→V	V→A	Avg.
Random	0.127	0.124	0.126	0.110	0.109	0.109
CCA [2]	0.190	0.189	0.190	0.332	0.327	0.330
DCCA [1]	0.221	0.223	0.222	0.478	0.457	0.468
C-CCA [16]	0.228	0.226	0.227	0.711	0.704	0.708
TNN-CCCA [30]	0.253	0.258	0.256	0.751	0.738	0.745
CCTL [28]	0.328	0.267	0.298	0.766	0.765	0.766
V-Adviser [21]	-	-	-	0.825	0.819	0.822
EICS [29]	0.337	0.279	0.308	0.797	0.779	0.788
TLCA [25]	0.410	0.451	0.431	0.822	0.838	0.830
AADML [27]	0.890	0.883	0.887	0.901	0.891	0.896
Ours	0.909	0.907	0.908	0.918	0.910	0.914

IV. EXPERIMENTS

A. Datasets and Metrics

Our model effectively performs the AV-CMR task by leveraging the assumption that audio and visual modalities share identical semantic information. We use two audio-visual datasets, VEGAS [32] and AVE [18], where the VEGAS includes 28,103 videos with 10 labels, and the AVE comprises 1,955 videos with 15 labels. We follow the same data partitioning and feature extraction methods as detailed in prior work [30]. We adopt the mean average precision (MAP) used in related works [28], [29] as the evaluation metric.

B. Implementation Settings

Our model incorporates three fully connected (FC) layers and a prediction layer for audio and visual inputs. Each FC layer has 1024 hidden units with a dropout rate of 0.1 to prevent overfitting. The dimensionality of the projected features matches the number of labels: 15 for AVE and 10 for VEGAS, aligning audio and visual features in a common space. The model is trained with batch sizes of 400 for both VEGAS and AVE, over 1,000 epochs. The triplet loss function is optimized using margin values of 1.2. We utilized the Adam optimizer [9] with default parameters, setting the learning rate at 0.0001 for all training procedures. These settings are consistent with the baselines in Table I. Our experiments were conducted using the PyTorch and run on an Ubuntu Linux 22.04.2 system with an NVIDIA GeForce 3080 (10 GB) GPU.

C. Results

To evaluate our method, we compared it with 9 algorithms: CCA-variants and deep learning (DL)-based methods. CCA-variants includes CCA [2], and TNN-C-CCA [30]. DL-based methods contain EICS [29], VideoadViser [21], CCTL [28], TLCA [25], and AADML [27]. We applied our approach to the AV-CMR task and compared it against the aforementioned methods on two audio-visual datasets shown in Table I. Our method outperforms the others in all MAPs on both datasets, achieving gains of 1.9%, 2.4%, and 2.1% on AVE, and 1.7%, 1.9%, and 1.8% on VEGAS in terms of A2V, V2A, and Average, respectively. These results demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed model.




Fig. 3: Comparison of loss and MAP over epochs on the AVE dataset between ours and AADML in triplet and hard triplet.

TABLE II: Comparison of MAP of our method and its variations on the AVE dataset, with the highest scores in bold.

Model	A→V	V→A	Average
Ours (Loss cf. Eq.4)	0.909	0.907	0.908
Loss without l_{dis}	0.899	0.893	0.896
Loss without self-dis	0.884	0.885	0.884
Loss without AA	0.881	0.880	0.881
Loss without l_{dis} and AA	0.856	0.867	0.862
Loss (linear)	0.896	0.902	0.899
Loss (cosine-annealing)	0.901	0.903	0.902

D. Ablation Studies

1) *Triplet Selection Strategy*: The triplet selection strategy significantly affects model performance by influencing the quality and diversity of training triplets. We compare the *triplet* strategies, which use all triplets within a batch, with the *hard triplet* strategy, which selects only the hardest triplet for model training. We evaluate these strategies with progressive self-distillation and compare their effectiveness to AADML, as shown in Fig. 3. The results demonstrate that progressive self-distillation improves the performance of triplet-based methods over AADML in both training and testing.

2) *Impact of Different Components*: To elucidate the process for identifying the best model, we analyze several key factors and conduct a performance comparison. These factors include eliminating cross-modal dependency during training, the usage of AA proxy [27] for the sample representation, and the strategies for decreasing the r gradually. As shown in Table II, the best model incorporates cross-modal dependency elimination, the AA proxy, and a step-wise strategy for decreasing r . We observe that cross-modal dependency elimination (l_{dis}) enhances performance with progressive self-distillation, but has a lesser effect without it. Compared to Table I, the AA proxy significantly improves the performance in the AADML model, but our method achieves nearly the best performance even without it. Finally, the step-wise strategy yields the best performance among the other strategies.

V. CONCLUSION

Our approach overcomes the limitations of label-guided representation learning in existing metric learning methods by integrating cross-modal triplet loss with progressive self-distillation, enabling more robust audio-visual embedding learning. Our experiments demonstrate substantial improvements over existing methods in cross-modal retrieval tasks. Future work will extend this approach to other multimodal scenarios and explore real-world applications.

REFERENCES

- [1] Galen Andrew, Raman Arora, Jeff Bilmes, and Karen Livescu. Deep canonical correlation analysis. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume Vol.28 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages pp.1247–1255, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 17–19 Jun 2013. PMLR.
- [2] Hardoon David, R., Szedmák Sándor, and Shawe-Taylor John. Canonical correlation analysis: An overview with application to learning methods. *Neural Computation.*, Vol.16(no.12):pp.2639–2664, 2004.
- [3] Tommaso Furlanello, Zachary Lipton, Michael Tschannen, Laurent Itti, and Anima Anandkumar. Born again neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1607–1616. PMLR, 2018.
- [4] Jianping Gou, Baosheng Yu, Stephen J Maybank, and Dacheng Tao. Knowledge distillation: A survey. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 129(6):1789–1819, 2021.
- [5] Sangchul Hahn and Heeyoul Choi. Self-knowledge distillation in natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.01851*, 2019.
- [6] Alexander Hermans, Lucas Beyer, and Bastian Leibe. In defense of the triplet loss for person re-identification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.07737*, 2017.
- [7] Geoffrey Hinton. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*, 2015.
- [8] Elad Hoffer and Nir Ailon. Deep metric learning using triplet network. In *Similarity-Based Pattern Recognition: Third International Workshop, SIMBAD 2015, Copenhagen, Denmark, October 12-14, 2015. Proceedings 3*, pages 84–92. Springer, 2015.
- [9] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- [10] Brian Kulis et al. Metric learning: A survey. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 5(4):287–364, 2013.
- [11] Pei Ling Lai and Colin Fyfe. Kernel and nonlinear canonical correlation analysis. *Int. J. Neural Syst.*, Vol.10(no.5):pp.365–377, 2000.
- [12] Jung-Eun Lee, Rong Jin, and Anil K Jain. Rank-based distance metric learning: An application to image retrieval. In *2008 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2008.
- [13] Pandeng Li, Yan Li, Hongtao Xie, and Lei Zhang. Neighborhood-adaptive structure augmented metric learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 1367–1375, 2022.
- [14] Tianhong Li, Jianguo Li, Zhuang Liu, and Changshui Zhang. Few sample knowledge distillation for efficient network compression. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 14639–14647, 2020.
- [15] David G Lowe. Similarity metric learning for a variable-kernel classifier. *Neural computation*, 7(1):72–85, 1995.
- [16] Nikhil Rasiwasia, Dhruv Mahajan, Vijay Mahadevan, and Gaurav Agarwal. Cluster canonical correlation analysis. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages pp.823–831, Reykjavik, Iceland, 2014. JMLR.org.
- [17] Sebastian Ruder. An overview of gradient descent optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.04747*, 2016.
- [18] Yapeng Tian, Jing Shi, Bochen Li, Zhiyao Duan, and Chenliang Xu. Audio-visual event localization in unconstrained videos. In *Computer Vision - ECCV 2018 - 15th European Conference*, volume Vol.11206 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages pp.252–268, Munich, Germany, 2018. Springer.
- [19] Shashanka Venkataramanan, Bill Psomas, Ewa Kijak, Laurent Amsaleg, Konstantinos Karantzas, and Yannis Avrithis. It takes two to tango: Mixup for deep metric learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.04990*, 2021.
- [20] Lucas Vinh Tran, Yi Tay, Shuai Zhang, Gao Cong, and Xiaoli Li. Hyperml: A boosting metric learning approach in hyperbolic space for recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on web search and data mining*, pages 609–617, 2020.
- [21] Yanan Wang, Donghuo Zeng, Shinya Wada, and Satoshi Kurihara. Videoadviser: Video knowledge distillation for multimodal transfer learning. *IEEE Access*, 2023.
- [22] Kilian Q Weinberger, John Blitzer, and Lawrence Saul. Distance metric learning for large margin nearest neighbor classification. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 18, 2005.
- [23] Eric Xing, Michael Jordan, Stuart J Russell, and Andrew Ng. Distance metric learning with application to clustering with side-information. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 15, 2002.
- [24] Yi Yu, Suhua Tang, Kiyoharu Aizawa, and Akiko Aizawa. Category-based deep cca for fine-grained venue discovery from multimodal data. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, Vol.30(no.4):pp.1250–1258, 2019.
- [25] Donghuo Zeng and Kazushi Ikeda. Two-stage triplet loss training with curriculum augmentation for audio-visual retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.13451*, 2023.
- [26] Donghuo Zeng and Keizo Oyama. Learning joint embedding for cross-modal retrieval. In *International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*, pages pp.1070–1071, Beijing, China, 2019. IEEE.
- [27] Donghuo Zeng, Yanan Wang, Kazushi Ikeda, and Yi Yu. Anchor-aware deep metric learning for audio-visual retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 2024 International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval*, pages 211–219, 2024.
- [28] Donghuo Zeng, Yanan Wang, Jianming Wu, and Kazushi Ikeda. Complete cross-triplet loss in label space for audio-visual cross-modal retrieval. In *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Multimedia (ISM)*, pages 1–9. IEEE, 2022.
- [29] Donghuo Zeng, Jianming Wu, Gen Hattori, Rong Xu, and Yi Yu. Learning explicit and implicit dual common subspaces for audio-visual cross-modal retrieval. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications and Applications*, vol.19(no.2s):pp.1–23, 2023.
- [30] Donghuo Zeng, Yi Yu, and Keizo Oyama. Deep triplet neural networks with cluster-cca for audio-visual cross-modal retrieval. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications and Applications*, vol.16(no.3):pp.1–23, 2020.
- [31] Wenzhao Zheng, Zhaodong Chen, Jiwen Lu, and Jie Zhou. Hardness-aware deep metric learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 72–81, 2019.
- [32] Yipin Zhou, Zhaowen Wang, Chen Fang, Trung Bui, and Tamara L. Berg. Visual to sound: Generating natural sound for videos in the wild. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages pp.3550–3558, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA, 2018. IEEE.