

# STPro: Spatial and Temporal Progressive Learning for Weakly Supervised Spatio-Temporal Grounding

Aaryan Garg  
BITS Pilani

f20212222@pilani.bits-pilani.ac.in

Akash Kumar  
University of Central Florida

akash.kumar@ucf.edu

Yogesh S Rawat  
University of Central Florida  
yogesh@ucf.edu

## Abstract

*In this work we study Weakly Supervised Spatio-Temporal Video Grounding (WSTVG), a challenging task of localizing subjects spatio-temporally in videos using only textual queries and no bounding box supervision. Inspired by recent advances in vision-language foundation models, we investigate their utility for WSTVG, leveraging their zero-shot grounding capabilities. However, we find that a simple adaptation lacks essential spatio-temporal grounding abilities. To bridge this gap, we introduce **Tubelet Referral Grounding (TRG)**, which connects textual queries to tubelets to enable spatio-temporal predictions. Despite its promise, TRG struggles with compositional action understanding and dense scene scenarios. To address these limitations, we propose **STPro**, a novel progressive learning framework with two key modules: (1) Sub-Action Temporal Curriculum Learning (SA-TCL), which incrementally builds compositional action understanding, and (2) Congestion-Guided Spatial Curriculum Learning (CG-SCL), which adapts the model to complex scenes by spatially increasing task difficulty. STPro achieves state-of-the-art results on three benchmark datasets, with improvements of 1.0% on VidSTG-Declarative and 3.0% on HCSTVG-v1.*

## 1. Introduction

Spatio-temporal video grounding (STVG) seeks to detect and localize objects within video sequences across both space and time, guided solely by textual descriptions. This capability is crucial for applications like surveillance, autonomous navigation, and scene understanding. However, STVG presents significant challenges, requiring models to distinguish target objects from distractors over time and to identify precise temporal boundaries of actions. While

recent methods tackle STVG in fully-supervised settings [16, 43, 46], they rely on costly, labor-intensive frame-level annotations. In this work, we address these challenges through weakly supervised STVG (WSTVG), training models with high-level video descriptions and eliminating the need for detailed spatio-temporal labels.

Existing research in weakly supervised learning for grounding has focused primarily on image-based phrase [10, 27, 40] and referral grounding [14, 25, 26]. More recently, studies have extended weak supervision to the STVG task [8, 15, 18, 33]. However, these approaches are often complex, involving multiple hierarchical algorithms [18], additional modality information [8], and restricted object categories [8, 33]. To address these limitations, we propose a streamlined approach that relies solely on the vision modality and supports *free-form* text queries.

Recent advancements in vision-language foundation models (VFMs) have shown remarkable zero-shot grounding abilities in image-based referral tasks, driven by large-scale pretraining on diverse multimodal datasets [20, 24, 50]. These VFMs excel at associating visual entities with complex, free-form textual descriptions, making them highly effective in scenarios where image-based object localization must generalize across a variety of contexts. Grounding DINO (G-DINO) [24], one of the leading VFMs, has demonstrated robust zero-shot performance on numerous image-level grounding benchmarks. However, while recent work has adapted G-DINO for fully supervised video grounding [43], the potential of VFMs remains unexplored in weakly supervised spatio-temporal video grounding (WSTVG), where precise annotations are not available.

Applying image-based VFMs directly to videos introduces significant challenges. Unlike static images, videos often contain target subjects that are only visible in certain frames, with dynamic interactions that require an understanding of both spatial and temporal continuity. Simply

extending G-DINO to videos results in noisy training due to irrelevant frames and complex action sequences that it cannot accurately localize. To address these limitations, we introduce the **Tubelet Referral Grounding (TRG)** module, which adapts image-based VFMs to spatio-temporal contexts by linking textual queries with tubelets (spatio-temporal object proposals). While TRG provides a strong baseline for adapting VFMs to WSTVG, it has two main shortcomings: it struggles with complex free-form queries involving actor-action relationships and lacks an ability to handle dense scenes with ordered action compositions, limiting its effectiveness in complex scenarios.

To overcome these challenges, we propose **Spatial and Temporal Progressive Learning (STPro)**, a framework specifically designed to enhance VFMs for WSTVG tasks. STPro introduces two progressive learning strategies: (1) *Sub-Action Temporal Curriculum Learning (SA-TCL)*, which incrementally develops the model’s understanding of complex action sequences by gradually increasing task difficulty over time, and (2) *Congestion-Guided Spatial Curriculum Learning (CG-SCL)*, which focuses the model on progressively denser scenes. Together, these strategies help the model adapt to intricate actor-action relationships and noisy, free-form textual descriptions, significantly enhancing the VFM’s capability to handle spatio-temporal grounding in weakly supervised settings.

In summary, we make the following contributions:

- We introduce *Temporal Referral Grounding (TRG)* module, which adapts foundation models for the weakly supervised spatio-temporal video grounding task, providing a strong baseline for handling temporal and spatial contexts.
- We propose the *Sub-Action Temporal Curriculum Learning (SA-TCL)* paradigm, which improves the model’s temporal grounding capability by incrementally increasing the complexity of action sequences, enabling better handling of temporal dependencies in videos.
- We introduce *Congestion-Guided Spatial Curriculum Learning (CG-SCL)*, a novel approach that progressively adapts the model to more complex and dense scene structures, improving its ability to understand spatial relationships in challenging video scenarios.

We perform our experiments on three different benchmark datasets, ViDSTG and HCSTVG-v1 and HCSTVG-v2 demonstrating effectiveness of our proposed approach. STPro outperform previous state-of-the-art methods on WSTVG task by an absolute margin of 1.0% on VidSTG-Declarative and 3.0% on HCSTVG-v1.

## 2. Related Work

**Spatio-Temporal Video Grounding:** It requires grounding video tubes to textual queries, aligning both spatial and temporal dimensions. Traditional methods use a two-stage pipeline, separating spatial [30, 45] and temporal grounding

[11] but rely on fixed object categories, limiting adaptability for free-form queries. Recent multimodal approaches [16, 35, 46] combine image detectors, video encoders, and spatio-temporal decoders to address feature alignment and leverage both static and motion cues [12, 23]. However, these methods typically require extensive frame-level annotations. *In contrast*, we eliminate the need for spatio-temporal labels, significantly reducing annotation costs.

**Weakly Supervised Learning:** Grounding techniques can be classified into three categories. In the image domain, phrase grounding [10, 32] identifies objects from textual queries using methods like margin-based losses [10], contrastive learning [13], and reconstruction [32]. Referral grounding [25, 26] similarly relies on reconstruction and contrastive learning [14]. For temporal grounding in videos [6, 42], reconstruction methods generally outperform contrastive ones [21, 53, 54]. We combine contrastive methods for spatial grounding with reconstruction techniques for temporal grounding, *distinguishing* itself by incorporating referential grounding across both dimensions, enhancing contextual focus and improving visual-textual interaction.

**Foundation Models for Referral Grounding:** Recent research has explored grounding via large vision foundation models (VFMs), which can be categorized into two types: 1) Large Vision Language Models (LVLMs) [7, 20, 24, 39], combining representation learning with task-specific heads or sequence-to-sequence decoders, and 2) Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) [2, 22, 44, 49, 50], which project vision features into pre-trained LLMs with task-specific heads. Both can address multiple tasks or individual tasks. For our work, we focus on two key factors in selecting the object detector: 1) performance on image-referral grounding, where Grounding-DINO [24] excels on RefCOCO+ [17] and RefCOCOg [29], and 2) extensibility to WSTVG. While most MLLMs use causal generation for output, which is language-centric and less suitable for spatio-temporal grounding, Grounding-DINO provides a more effective feature extraction. *In contrast* to existing approaches, we extend Grounding-DINO, an image-based model, to the video setting for STVG.

**Curriculum Learning** aims to organize task difficulty from simple to complex during training [34, 41], mirroring human cognitive learning processes. This approach has been applied across various tasks, including image classification [36], object detection [19], and temporal grounding [54], among others. To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first to implement a curriculum-based training strategy from easy to hard for the WSTVG task.

## 3. Methodology

**Problem formulation** In WSTVG, the input consists of an untrimmed video  $V = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_L)$  with  $L$  frames, along with a descriptive query caption  $Q$  that specifies the primary

subject and activity within the video. The task aims to output a spatio-temporal tubelet for the target subject, denoted as  $A_R = \{a_r\}_{t_s}^{t_e}$ , where  $a_r$  represents the *target* subject mentioned in the query, and  $t_s$  and  $t_e$  indicate the activity’s start and end timestamps. Under weak supervision, only video-level text annotations are available during training, without any detailed spatio-temporal labels for guidance.

**Overview** Next, we describe our proposed approach. Firstly, we adapt G-DINO for STVG (Sec 3.1). We introduce a stronger baseline, TRG (Sec 3.2) over this naive adaptation. TRG struggles with comprehending dense spatio-temporal scenes and handling complex free-form queries. We propose STPro (Sec 3.3) to alleviate these issues in two steps: Firstly (Sec. 3.3.1), we breakdown complex query into simpler sub-queries and gradually train the model with increasing difficulty in query to induce better temporal grounding capability in TRG. Second, to understand dense spatio-temporal scenes, we develop a training paradigm (Sec. 3.3.2) that gradually increase scene complexity based on overlapping actor tubelets to improve TRG’s spatial grounding ability.

### 3.1. Preliminaries: Referral VFMs

Vision Foundation Models (VFMs) for image-based referral grounding take a textual query and an image as input to output the spatial location of the *target subject*. In this work, we adapt VFMs for WSTVG, a video grounding task. Specifically, we utilize a text-based query  $Q$  alongside video frames  $I_f = \{V_f\}_{f=1}^T$ , where  $T$  represents the video duration. Since VFMs are inherently image-based while STVG requires spatio-temporal detection, we adapt Grounding DINO (G-DINO) [24] for STVG task. This adaptation entails performing object detection on each frame. For spatio-temporal detection task, we need bounding boxes connected across frames (*tubelets*). To generate the tubelet from per-frame bounding boxes, we run a tracker algorithm [1] for each subject  $k$  to get the tubelet  $\mathcal{T}_{o_k}$ , with  $K$  indicating the total number of subjects in the video. This adapted model is termed weakly-supervised Grounding DINO (W-GDINO). To evaluate W-GDINO’s efficacy, we aggregate and average the confidence scores of each tubelet and select the one with the highest score. Although Table 1 shows competitive results, this naive extension won’t work for videos since the target subject may be absent from a majority of frames, rendering training extremely noisy. To address this issue, we introduce Tubelet Referral Grounding (TRG).

### 3.2. Tubelet Referral Grounding (TRG)

The TRG module adapts image-based foundational models for spatio-temporal detection by using contrastive training over tubelets, rather than frame-level detections. This approach compresses a video into a single frame, mitigating noisy training caused by frame dependencies. For the STVG




Figure 1. **Overview of TRG:** TRG contains two grounding modules namely, TRM and SRM. TRM predicts the temporal action boundary via cross-attention between vision and query features. SRM grounds the correct referral subject tubelet from a set of TRM selected candidates.

task, both temporal and spatial grounding are required. We introduce TRG as a two-stage process: the *Temporal Referral Module* (TRM), which identifies the start and end timestamps of the target’s actions, and the *Spatial Referral Module* (SRM), which locates the target based on the textual query. TRM filters out irrelevant tubelets, while SRM grounds the correct tubelet within the temporal bounds. The module uses visual and query encoders following prior works [14, 25, 26, 53, 54].

**Visual encoder:** We extract object level representations  $f_{o_k} = F_o(o_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times 256}$  from G-DINO (based on DETR [3]), where,  $F_o$  is object encoder model, and,  $o_k$  denotes  $k^{th}$  detected subject. We link these detections via a tracking [1] algorithm to generate subject tubelets for subject  $k$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_{o_k} = \{o_{k_t}\}_{t=s}^e$  where  $s$  and  $e$  denotes starting and ending timestamp of the subject in the video. Tubelet features for a video is represented by  $\mathcal{F}_T = \{f(\mathcal{T}_{o_k})\}_{k=1}^K \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times K \times 256}$ , where  $K$  denotes number of subjects present in a video. For video features, we utilize a video encoder,  $F_v$  (e.g. I3D [4]) to get clip-level features,  $f_c = F_v(\{V_t\}_{t=1}^C) \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times 1024}$ .  $C$  denotes the number of clips in the video.

**Query encoder:** The query  $Q$  is first deconstructed to  $Q_w = \{\text{Linear}(\{w_m\}_{m=1}^N)\} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 512}$  by linearly projecting pretrained GloVe embeddings ( $w_i \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 300}$ ) for each query word.  $N$  is the total query words. The word-level embeddings are enriched, to get  $Q_e = \text{SA}(\text{GRU}(Q_w)) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times 512}$  by a GRU followed by SA, a single self-attention layer. Finally, we combine word-level features using attention-




Figure 2. **Temporal limitations of TRG:** In TRM, the model resorts to shifting the temporal prediction arbitrarily when posed with a subset of an original query (see trim in the above figure). A model with compositional understanding would correctly shift the predicted temporal boundary to the left since the overall activity lasts a shorter duration of time, however TRM shifts its prediction to the right. When applied across HCSTVG-1, we see that in the majority of cases (both first and last action trimming) the model responds by performing a no shift or shift in the incorrect direction.




Figure 3. **Spatial limitations of TRG:** In the above figure, blue represents model prediction, while green represents the ground truth. While SRM performs well in cases with fewer candidates, in samples with a large number of candidate tubelets, SRM becomes more prone to errors when discerning both the type and the referred attributes of the subject. This indicates that training does not enforce learning either of the two cues sufficiently. weighted flattening to get a single representative query feature  $Q_f \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times 512}$ .

**Temporal Referral Module (TRM)** identifies the temporal boundaries of the target subject’s activity as specified in the textual query. Initial tubelet timestamps are often coarse, typically defined by the presence of the actor throughout the video, which complicates spatial localization and limits applicability to WSTVG. TRM refines this by filtering tubelets temporally, allowing the spatial module to focus on relevant video segments. Building on the effectiveness of reconstruction-based approaches for temporal grounding [21, 47, 53, 54], we adopt [53] as our baseline. It enforces semantic consistency between the target subject’s actions and the textual query through a temporal grounding loss,  $\mathcal{L}_t$  (see equation 1), where  $q_w$  denotes the individual word feature.

$$\mathcal{L}_t = - \sum_{m=1}^N \log \mathcal{P}(q_w | f'_c, \tilde{q}_{[0:m-1]}) \quad (1)$$

**Spatial Referral Module (SRM):** localizes the target subject from a set of candidate subjects within the temporal bounds predicted by TRM. We employ multimodal contrastive loss to align tubelet features and textual queries, building on [10, 13, 38, 40]. Adapting [14] for STVG, we compute the similarity between each candidate tubelet and the textual query, averaging the per-frame detection features

within a tubelet for improved spatial localization (see Table 5). To address background noise in the textual query, we extract noun phrases (POS) focusing on the target subject and its attributes, enhancing the model’s discriminative ability (shown in Table 3). The spatial loss,  $\mathcal{L}_s$ , is defined in equation 2.

$$\mathcal{L}_s = - \log \frac{\exp(\text{Sim}_{avg}(\mathcal{F}_{T_0}^i, Q_f^i)/\tau)}{\sum_{n=0}^N \sum_{j=0}^M \mathbb{1}_{(i=j \wedge n \neq 0)} \exp(\text{Sim}_{avg}(\mathcal{F}_{T_n}^j, Q_f^i)/\tau)} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Sim}_{avg}(\mathcal{F}_{T_k}, Q_f) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \text{sim}(f_{o_{k_i}}, Q_f), \quad (3)$$

where  $N$  and  $M$  are the number of contrastive negatives in the sample and in the batch respectively.

**Limitations of TRG:** While TRG establishes a strong baseline for STVG, it faces challenges in complex spatio-temporal scene comprehension, as shown in Fig. 2. Temporally, TRG struggles to accurately associate video segments with the target actor’s actions and fails to maintain action sequence order in multi-action queries, as demonstrated in the figure. This limitation stems from the model’s inability to capture actor-action relationships. Spatially, Fig. 2(b) reveals that as scene complexity increases, the model’s confidence and ability to ground the target actor decreases. This suggests that TRG struggles with complex free-form queries and dense scene understanding, particularly due to the inconsistent presence of multiple actors. To address these limitations, we propose STPro.

### 3.3. Spatio-Temporal Progressive Learning (STPro)

STPro consists of two components to address the challenges and enhance the model’s referral capabilities: Sub-Actions Temporal Curriculum Learning (SA-TCL) (Sec. 3.3.1) and Congestion-Guided Spatial Curriculum Learning (CG-SCL) (Sec. 3.3.2). SA-TCL improves action composition understanding by incrementally learning the constituent actions of compound queries in a staged temporal curriculum. It focuses solely on the temporal domain. To enhance spatial scene understanding, CG-SCL progressively increases scene complexity. Additionally, CG-SCL uses temporal



tubelet congestion as a signal for sample hardness to design a congestion-guided sampling technique, improving alignment between tubelet and query features. An overview of STPro is shown in Fig. 4.

### 3.3.1. Sub-Actions Temporal Curriculum Learning

**Motivation:** Effective temporal localization in STVG requires accurate identification of both the target subject and the actions they perform, as multiple actors may share similar actions over overlapping time spans. A strong understanding of action composition improves the model’s adaptability, enabling it to generalize to novel action sequences by recombining learned action subsets. Existing temporal grounding methods [6, 21, 42, 53, 54] lack referral capabilities, localizing all actions without distinguishing actor-specific actions.

To evaluate the action compositionality of TRM, we created test samples by trimming the first and last actions from the query, keeping the order of remaining actions intact. For example, for the query: “*The black man in white lifts the black parcel, then lifts the shoulder bag with his right hand, walks two steps forward, turns his head and looks at the man in red*”, the start-trimmed query becomes “*The black man lifts the shoulder bag with his right hand, walks two steps forward, turns his head and looks at the man in red*”, and the end-trimmed query becomes “*The black man in white lifts the black parcel, then lifts the shoulder bag with his right hand, walks two steps forward*”. We analyze how TRM handles these modified queries ( Fig. 2).

The model’s temporal prediction is ideally adjusted based on the trimmed actions: shifting the start time in the case of start-trimming and shifting the end time in the case of end-trimming. We compare the shift of the temporal midpoint in all three cases, expecting a right shift for start-trimming and a left shift for end-trimming. Our results show that in most cases, the model fails to adjust appropriately, incorrectly shifting the temporal boundary 65% of the time for start-trimming and 54% for end-trimming. This indicates that while the model captures some subtle query changes, it largely fails to understand the semantics of action composition, as shown in Fig. 2.

To mitigate this limitation, we propose **SA-TCL** to learn action composition via curriculum learning. We utilize a Large Language model (LLM) (for e.g. GPT 3.5-turbo) to break down queries into all constituent ordered action combinations i.e. we do not skip over any actions, as shown in Fig. 4. We increase the complexity of training by increasing the number of actions in each successive stage starting from single actions. Consider the original query - *The man puts down the pistol, then turns and raises his hand and talks*. The first stage comprises of captions containing only individual actions, such as: *The man puts down the pistol*. *The man raises his hand*. The second stage comprises coupled and ordered actions: *The man puts down the pistol, then turns*. *The man turns and raises his hand*. and so on for successive

stages (shown in Fig. 4 (a)). SA-TCL generates refined spatio-temporal tubelets via last stage model for SRM. More details regarding prompt and construction of training stages can be found in the supplementary.

### 3.3.2. Congestion Guided Spatial Curriculum Learning

**Motivation:** While the SA-TCL module enhances TRG’s temporal localization, the SRM still struggles with spatial scene comprehension. Given the POS-extracted textual query, SRM should ideally distinguish between actors throughout the video without being influenced by temporal cues (e.g., action sequences). However, two issues persist: *First*, as scene complexity increases and similar tubelets (e.g., multiple instances of man) appear, the model’s ability to focus on the target actor diminishes, leading to grounding failures. This suggests that relying solely on POS is insufficient due to the large variation in tubelets. *Second*, the presence of temporally overlapping and sparse tubelets confuses the model, causing it to struggle with differentiating between actors and background features.

To overcome these challenges, we propose: 1) **Soft-Label Filtering (SLF)**, which helps the model learn actor-type correspondence and focus on actor attributes for distinguishing similar actors in complex spatial scenarios, and 2) **Congestion Guided Sampling (CGS)**, a curriculum learning approach that gradually improves actor selection by promoting slower feature divergence. Details of each method are provided below.

**Soft-Label Filtering (SLF):** SLF leverages the zero-shot capabilities of G-DINO to filter tubelets by their dominant soft labels. Within each tubelet, we identify the most frequent soft label across detections, which helps determine the tubelet type. In cases of high variability in soft labels due to noisy frames (e.g., partial bodies or challenging poses), we treat these tubelets as “on-the-fence” and always include them for training. If the extracted subject is non-specific (e.g., “person”), we include all tubelets for training, regardless of their dominant soft-label.

**Congestion Guided Sampling (CGS):** CGS calculates the average temporal IoU across all tubelets in a video. Higher IoU indicates spatio-temporal congestion, helping the model differentiate between actors in similar backgrounds. The curriculum progresses from simple scenes with similar backgrounds to more complex scenes with dynamic backgrounds. This gradual approach improves the model’s ability to focus on actor features first, then on both actor and background features. The training scheme starts with easy scenes and advances to more challenging ones, as shown in Fig. 4.

## 4. Experiment Details

**Datasets:** In our experiments, we evaluate performance on three benchmark datasets: VidSTG [51], HCSTVG-v1 [37], and HCSTVG-v2 [37]. The VidSTG dataset comprises





Figure 4. **Overview of STPro:** STPro consists of two disjoint curriculum learning paradigms: 1) SA-TCL which promotes compositional understanding by learning to ground an original query by iteratively learning to ground combinations of its sub-parts and 2) CG-SCL: an easy to hard framework which capitalizes on tubelet temporal IoU to select easy and hard samples, it considers those samples with high temporal tubelet IoU as easy samples since the model can focus on differentiating between candidate actors while ignoring their common background and those with low IoU as hard-samples since the model is distracted by distinctive background features for each actor.

99,943 video-sentence pairs, with 44,808 declarative sentences and 55,135 interrogative ones, spanning a total of 10,303 videos across 80 object categories. The dataset is split into 80,684 training, 8,956 validation, and 10,303 test pairs, with 5,436, 602, and 732 unique videos in each subset, respectively. HCSTVG-v1 includes 4,500 training videos and 1,160 test videos, with descriptions focusing on human attributes and actions. HCSTVG-v2 extends the first version to include 16,544 videos, divided into 10,131 training, 2,000 validation, and 4,413 testing videos. As the test set for HCSTVG-v2 is not available, we report results on the validation set, in line with prior studies [12, 23, 46].

**Implementation details:** We divide this into three parts: (a) Detection And Tracking: We utilize G-DINO[24] with 0.4 threshold for both phrase and box threshold. We run the detector every 5th frame and extract features from the last decoder layer. We use BoTSORT tracker[1] algorithm to generate tubes; (b) TRG: We sample 32 frames equally indexed to get tubelet features. We extract video clip level features using I3D [4] model. (c) SA-TCL and CG-SCL: We use GPT-3.5 to extract parts-of-speech (POS) tags and *sub-action phrases* from the original captions. For CG-SCL, we perform five stages of training with upper bound on average pair-wise temporal IoU in linear increments of 0.2 between [0.0, 1.0]. In SA-TCL, we train over four stages by increasing the maximum number of actions in the extracted captions, in each stage. Each stage is trained for 50 epochs. More details about implementation are present in the supplementary.

**Inference:** Temporal localization module predicts the start ( $t_s$ ) and end ( $t_e$ ) time stamps for the target actor’s actions. We infer the subject with the highest attention from the spatial localization module within these temporal bounds to get the final tubelet  $\hat{a}$ .

**Evaluation Metrics:** We report performance using metrics established in previous studies [16, 46]: mean average spatio-temporal localization ( $m\_vIoU$ ) and mean temporal localization ( $m\_tIoU$ ).  $m\_vIoU$  and  $m\_tIoU$  are computed as  $\frac{1}{|S_u|} \sum_{t \in S_i} IoU(\hat{b}_t, b_t)$  and  $\frac{|S_i|}{|S_u|}$ , where  $S_i$  and  $S_u$  denote the

Methods	HCSTVG - v1		
	vIoU	vIoU@0.3	vIoU@0.5
<i>Two-stage pipelines</i>			
Grounder [ECCV16] [31]+LCNet [IEEE17] [48]	4.17	3.28	1.05
MATN [CVPR18] [52]+LCNet [IEEE17] [48]	4.41	3.53	1.12
Grounder [ECCV16] [31]+CPL [CVPR22] [54]	5.23	4.18	1.25
RAIR [CVPR21] [28]+CPL [CVPR22] [54]	6.88	4.87	1.36
<i>Single-stage pipelines</i>			
WSSTG [ACL19] [9]	6.52	4.54	1.27
AWGU [ACMMM20] [5]	8.20	4.48	0.78
Vis-CTX [CVPR19] [33]	9.76	6.81	1.03
WINNER [CVPR23] [18]	14.20	17.24	6.12
VCMA [ECCV24] [15]	<u>14.64</u>	<u>18.60</u>	5.75
W-GDINO (Ours-Baseline)	9.04	11.56	4.57
STPro (Ours)	<b>17.56</b>	<b>26.98</b>	<b>12.93</b>
	(+2.92)	(+8.38)	(+6.81)
<i>HCSTVG - v2</i>			
W-GDINO (Ours-Baseline)	<u>9.85</u>	<u>13.30</u>	<u>5.63</u>
STPro (Ours)	<b>19.99</b>	<b>31.70</b>	<b>14.55</b>
	(+10.14)	(+18.40)	(+8.92)

Table 1. Comparison with existing state-of-the-art weakly-supervised methods on HCSTVG-v1 and v2 datasets. **Bold** denotes best and underline denotes second best.

intersection and union, respectively, between the predicted and ground truth timestamps.  $IoU(\hat{b}_t, b_t)$  represents the spatial overlap between the predicted bounding box  $\hat{b}_t$  and the ground truth box  $b_t$  at frame  $t$ . Additionally,  $vIoU@R$  indicates the proportion of samples with a mean vIoU greater than R, and we present results for R values of 0.3 and 0.5, consistent with prior work [18, 46].

## 4.1. Results and comparisons

**Comparison with two-stage weakly-supervised** Tables 1 and 2 shows that our approach outperforms previous weakly-supervised approaches on all metrics against two-stage approaches on both HCSTVG-v1 and VidSTG. Looking into HCSTVG-v1 dataset, we outperform RAIR[28]+CPL[54], the best two-stage approach by a margin of 10.68%, 22.11% and 11.57% on mean vIoU, vIoU@0.3 and vIoU@0.5 respectively. On VidSTG dataset (Table 2), STPro outperforms RAIR[28]+CPL[54] by 6.85% on declarative and 4.88% on

Methods	Declarative Sentences			Interrogative Sentences		
	m_vIoU	vIoU@0.3	vIoU@0.5	m_vIoU	vIoU@0.3	vIoU@0.5
<i>Two-stage pipelines</i>						
GroundeR <sub>[ECCV16]</sub> [31]+LCNet <sub>[IEEE17]</sub> [48]	7.85	7.96	3.02	6.43	6.58	2.92
MATN <sub>[CVPR18]</sub> [52]+LCNet <sub>[IEEE17]</sub> [48]	8.16	8.03	3.59	6.97	6.64	3.05
GroundeR <sub>[ECCV16]</sub> [31]+CPL <sub>[CVPR22]</sub> [54]	8.28	8.35	3.68	7.16	7.28	3.23
RAIR <sub>[CVPR21]</sub> [28]+CPL <sub>[CVPR22]</sub> [54]	8.67	8.72	4.01	7.68	7.71	3.58
<i>Single-stage pipelines</i>						
WSSTG <sub>[ACL19]</sub> [9]	8.85	8.52	3.87	7.12	6.87	2.96
AWGU <sub>[ACMM20]</sub> [5]	8.96	7.86	3.10	8.57	6.84	2.88
Vis-CTX <sub>[CVPR19]</sub> [33]	9.34	7.32	3.34	8.69	7.18	2.91
WINNER <sub>[CVPR23]</sub> [18]	11.62	14.12	7.40	10.23	11.96	5.46
VCMA <sub>[ECCV24]</sub> [15]	<u>14.45</u>	<u>18.57</u>	<u>8.76</u>	<b>13.25</b>	<b>16.74</b>	<u>7.66</u>
W-GDINO (Ours-Baseline)	10.69	13.02	7.83	9.87	12.16	6.71
STPro (Ours)	<b>15.52</b>	<b>19.39</b>	<b>12.69</b>	<u>12.56</u>	<u>14.95</u>	<b>9.29</b>
	(+1.07)	(+0.82)	(+3.93)	(-0.69)	(-1.79)	(+1.63)

Table 2. Comparison with existing state-of-the-art weakly-supervised methods on VidSTG dataset. **Bold** denotes best and underline denotes second best.

SRM	TRM	POS	m_tIoU	m_vIoU	vIoU@0.3	vIoU@0.5
			17.97	9.04	11.56	4.57
✓			20.08	9.99	12.50	5.17
✓		✓	20.15	10.40	12.67	5.01
✓	✓	✓	<b>29.40</b>	<b>14.81</b>	<b>21.81</b>	<b>10.26</b>
TRG	CG-SCL	SA-TCL	m_tIoU	m_vIoU	vIoU@0.3	vIoU@0.5
			17.97	9.04	11.56	4.57
✓			29.40	14.81	21.81	10.26
✓		✓	<b>30.67</b>	15.31	22.84	10.34
✓	✓		29.35	17.15	26.55	12.16
✓	✓	✓	30.56	<b>17.56</b>	<b>26.98</b>	<b>12.93</b>
			(+12.59)	(+8.52)	(+15.42)	(+8.36)

Table 3. **Ablation study** on sub-modules of TRG module(upper) and different components of STPro (lower).

interrogative at mean vIoU.

**Comparison with single-stage weakly-supervised** Against single-stage, STPro outperforms previous weakly-supervised approaches on most of the metrics. On HCSTVG-v1 dataset, we outperform previous state-of-the-art, VCMA by a margin of 2.92%, 8.38% and 6.81% on mean vIoU, vIoU@0.3 and vIoU@0.5 respectively. Against foundation model baseline, W-GDINO, our model surpasses it by a margin of 8.52% and 12.59% on HCSTVG-v1 and 10.14% and 15.66% on HCSTVG-v2 dataset at mean vIoU and tIoU respectively. This corroborates to the fact that even though foundation model features are better, our approach boosts the performance significantly. VidSTG dataset is an extremely challenging dataset with less than 2% gain over the recent years. On VidSTG dataset (Table 2), we show competitive performance on VidSTG-Interrogative and outperforms previous approaches on VidSTG-Declarative.

## 4.2. Ablation study

We study the effectiveness of different components of STPro on HCSTVG-v1.

**Effectiveness of TRG sub-modules** In Table 3, we analyze the components of TRG, namely, SRM, POS and TRM. SRM boosts the score by 1% on mean vIoU against W-GDINO proving it’s discriminative capabilities spatially. Utilizing POS tags, instead of whole caption boosts the performance by a margin of 0.41% at mean vIoU. It supports the hypothesis that POS tags indeed helps model attend to target subject and its attributes. Finally, adding temporal module TRM, the score further improves by a margin of 4.41% at mean vIoU. At mean tIoU, the score boost with inclusion of TRM module is 9.25% proving the effectiveness of TRM being able to predict accurate timestamps relative to target subject.

**Impact of SA-TCL and CG-SCL** Table 3 studies the impact of CG-SCL and SA-TCL modules. To begin with, firstly, TRM outperforms W-GDINO on all metrics. Introducing SA-TCL boosts the performance by 0.6% at mean vIoU against TRM and 6.27% against W-GDINO. SA-TCL boost the mean tIoU by 1.47% on HCSTVG-v1. This shows increasing composition of action in each curriculum learning step for temporal grounding helps the model ground complex action given in textual query. CG-SCL standalone alongwith TRG improves the mean vIoU by 2.34%. Increasing the difficulty on tubelet congestion improve model’s spatial discriminatory abilities over time. Combining both CG-SCL and SA-TCL, we observe a boost of 2.75% and 8.52% on mean vIoU against TRG and W-GIDNO respectively. It proves both modules orthogonally helps TRG to improve spatio-temporal grounding capability. Furthermore, STPro is more effective at difficult metrics with 2x and 3x gains against W-GIDNO at higher metrics vIoU@0.3 and vIoU@0.5 respectively.

**Analysis on stages of Curriculum Learning** Fig. 6 shows increment of score for successive stages of SA-TCL and CG-SCL.

**Qualitative Analysis** In Fig. 5, we analyze the performance




Figure 5. Comparison of performance between TRG and STPro with increasing complex query for temporal grounding (left) and increasing scene complexity (number of tubelets) for spatial grounding (right).




Figure 6. Performance at successive stages of SA-TCL and CG-SCL.

Temporal Curriculum Learning				
Methods	tIoU	tIoU@0.1	tIoU@0.3	tIoU@0.5
TRM	32.96	77.65	56.95	23.55
Beta-Increment	33.35	77.48	57.29	23.30
Self-Advised	33.41	78.26	57.12	23.73
Sub-Actions (Ours)	<b>33.92</b>	<b>78.77</b>	<b>57.72</b>	<b>24.68</b>
Spatial Curriculum Learning				
Methods	m_vIoU	vIoU@0.1	vIoU@0.3	vIoU@0.5
SRM + POS	10.40	30.69	12.67	5.00
+ SLF	11.92	33.71	15.26	6.72
+ CGS	11.01	32.41	13.36	5.43
+(SLF + CGS)	<b>12.61</b>	<b>35.52</b>	<b>16.38</b>	<b>7.33</b>

Table 4. Comparison against different TCL (upper) and SCL (lower) approaches. TCL and SCL shows performance on standalone temporal and spatial metrics.

The man in red clothes puts the hat to his left hand, then pulls the womans hand and kisses, then puts the hat to his right hand.



Figure 7. **Qualitative analysis:** Green: ground truth; red:W-GDINO, and blue: STPro (darker shade represents temporal detection boundaries). W-GDINO suffers from temporal localization and imbalanced attention focusing on different subjects throughout the video. STPro overcomes these limitations and has better overlap with GT in both scenarios.

comparison between TRG and STPro with increasing challenges along both spatial and temporal grounding. Fig. 7 shows the effectiveness of our approach qualitatively.

## 5. Discussion and analysis

**Analysis on temporal curriculum** For TCL, we look into three different types of curriculum learning based on

Approach	Frame	Tubelet	m_vIoU	vIoU@0.1	vIoU@0.3	vIoU@0.5
TRG	✓		14.79	48.62	16.72	4.22
TRG		✓	14.81	37.41	21.81	10.26
STPro	✓		16.64	53.88	19.48	4.48
STPro		✓	17.56	41.90	26.98	12.93

Table 5. Comparison between frames and tubelets on TRG module and STPro (our approach).

CNM[53]: 1) Beta Increment: Increasing distance between positive and negative sample distribution, 2) Self-Advised: Use model reconstruction score to do easy to hard reconstruction, 3) Sub-actions: Learn composition of actions gradually. In Table 4, we compare on temporal grounding metrics, tIoU. Sub-actions outperforms other approaches supporting the hypothesis the model inherently doesn't have capability of compositionality understanding. This way of training induces the model with this capability and successively boosts model performance by 1% on tIoU.

**Analysis on spatial curriculum** Here, we analyze the impact of SLF and CGS approach on SRM module. Table 4 shows that both SLF and CGS boosts the performance standalone and jointly when applied in addition with SRM. It shows that both approaches provide orthogonal information which increases model's spatial discriminative ability.

**Tubelets vs Frames** STPro is a tubelet-based approach. Here, we ponder over why tubelets are more important than individual frames for WSTVG task. Table 5 shows the comparison of performance between utilizing frames vs tubelets on HCSTVG-v1. The better scores at vIoU@0.1 vs vIoU@0.3/vIoU@0.5 denotes that frame based approach is taking advantage of spatially overlapping predictions not localizing the correct thing. This supports the hypothesis that tubelets helps better spatio-temporal grounding than individual frames for video tasks.

## 6. Conclusion

This work addresses the challenging task of Weakly Supervised Spatio-Temporal Video Grounding (WSTVG). Leveraging recent advances in vision-language foundation models, we find that simple adaptations fail to provide essential spatio-temporal grounding. To bridge this gap, we introduce Tubelet Referral Grounding (TRG), linking textual queries



to tubelets for spatio-temporal predictions. However, TRG struggles with compositional action understanding and complex scenes. To overcome these, we propose STPro, a progressive learning framework with two modules: Sub-Action Temporal Curriculum Learning (SA-TCL) for compositional action understanding, and Congestion-Guided Spatial Curriculum Learning (CG-SCL) for adapting to complex scenes. STPro achieves state-of-the-art performance on three benchmark datasets, improving by 1.0% on VidSTG-Declarative and 3.0% on HCSTVG-v1.

## References

- [1] Nir Aharon, Roy Orfaig, and Ben-Zion Bobrovsky. Bot-sort: Robust associations multi-pedestrian tracking. *ArXiv*, abs/2206.14651, 2022. 3, 6
- [2] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-VL: A versatile vision-language model for understanding, localization, text reading, and beyond, 2024. 2
- [3] Nicolas Carion, Francisco Massa, Gabriel Synnaeve, Nicolas Usunier, Alexander Kirillov, and Sergey Zagoruyko. End-to-end object detection with transformers. *ArXiv*, abs/2005.12872, 2020. 3
- [4] João Carreira and Andrew Zisserman. Quo vadis, action recognition? a new model and the kinetics dataset. *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 4724–4733, 2017. 3, 6
- [5] Junwen Chen, Wentao Bao, and Yu Kong. Activity-driven weakly-supervised spatio-temporal grounding from untrimmed videos. *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2020. 6, 7
- [6] Long Chen, Yulei Niu, Brian Chen, Xudong Lin, Guangxing Han, Christopher Thomas, Hammad Ayyubi, Heng Ji, and Shih-Fu Chang. Weakly-supervised temporal article grounding. In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2022, 2022. 2, 5
- [7] Yen-Chun Chen, Linjie Li, Licheng Yu, Ahmed El Kholy, Faisal Ahmed, Zhe Gan, Yu Cheng, and Jingjing Liu. Uniter: Universal image-text representation learning. In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XXX*, page 104–120, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2020. Springer-Verlag. 2
- [8] Zhenfang Chen, Lin Ma, Wenhan Luo, and Kwan-Yee Kenneth Wong. Weakly-supervised spatio-temporally grounding natural sentence in video. *ArXiv*, abs/1906.02549, 2019. 1
- [9] Zhenfang Chen, Lin Ma, Wenhan Luo, and Kwan-Yee Kenneth Wong. Weakly-supervised spatio-temporally grounding natural sentence in video. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1884–1894, Florence, Italy, 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. 6, 7
- [10] Samyak Datta, Karan Sikka, Anirban Roy, Karuna Ahuja, Devi Parikh, and Ajay Divakaran. Align2ground: Weakly supervised phrase grounding guided by image-caption alignment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 2601–2610, 2019. 1, 2, 4
- [11] J. Gao, Chen Sun, Zhenheng Yang, and Ramakant Nevatia. Tall: Temporal activity localization via language query. *2017 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 5277–5285, 2017. 2
- [12] Xin Gu, Heng Fan, Yan Huang, Tiejian Luo, and Libo Zhang. Context-guided spatio-temporal video grounding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18330–18339, 2024. 2, 6
- [13] Tanmay Gupta, Arash Vahdat, Gal Chechik, Xiaodong Yang, Jan Kautz, and Derek Hoiem. Contrastive learning for weakly supervised phrase grounding. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 752–768. Springer, 2020. 2, 4
- [14] Lei Jin, Gen Luo, Yiyi Zhou, Xiaoshuai Sun, Guannan Jiang, Annan Shu, and Rongrong Ji. Refclip: A universal teacher for weakly supervised referring expression comprehension. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 2681–2690, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 4
- [15] Yang Jin and Yadong Mu. Weakly-supervised spatio-temporal video grounding with variational cross-modal alignment. In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2024: 18th European Conference, Milano, Italy, September 29–October 4, 2024*. 1, 6, 7
- [16] Yang Jin, Yongzhi Li, Zehuan Yuan, and Yadong Mu. Embracing consistency: A one-stage approach for spatio-temporal video grounding. *ArXiv*, abs/2209.13306, 2022. 1, 2, 6
- [17] Sahar Kazemzadeh, Vicente Ordonez, Mark Matten, and Tamara Berg. ReferItGame: Referring to objects in photographs of natural scenes. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 787–798, Doha, Qatar, 2014. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2
- [18] Mengze Li, Han Wang, Wenqiao Zhang, Jiayu Miao, Zhou Zhao, Shengyu Zhang, Wei Ji, and Fei Wu. Winner: Weakly-supervised hierarchical decomposition and alignment for spatio-temporal video grounding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 23090–23099, 2023. 1, 6, 7
- [19] Siyang Li, Xiangxin Zhu, Qin Huang, Hao Xu, and C-C Jay Kuo. Multiple instance curriculum learning for weakly supervised object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.09191*, 2017. 2
- [20] Fangjian Lin, Jianlong Yuan, Sitong Wu, Fan Wang, and Zhibin Wang. Uninext: Exploring a unified architecture for vision recognition. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, page 3200–3208, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery. 1, 2
- [21] Zhijie Lin, Zhou Zhao, Zhu Zhang, Qi Wang, and Huasheng Liu. Weakly-supervised video moment retrieval via semantic completion network. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 11539–11546, 2020. 2, 4, 5
- [22] Ziyi Lin, Chris Liu, Renrui Zhang, Peng Gao, Longtian Qiu, Han Xiao, Han Qiu, Chen Lin, Wenqi Shao, Keqin Chen, Jiaming Han, Siyuan Huang, Yichi Zhang, Xuming He, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Qiao. Sphinx: The joint mixing of weights,

- tasks, and visual embeddings for multi-modal large language models, 2023. 2
- [23] Z. Lin, C. Tan, J. Hu, Z. Jin, T. Ye, and W. Zheng. Collaborative static and dynamic vision-language streams for spatio-temporal video grounding. In *2023 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 23100–23109, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 2023. IEEE Computer Society. 2, 6
- [24] Siyi Liu, Zhaoyang Zeng, Tianhe Ren, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Jie Yang, Chun yue Li, Jianwei Yang, Hang Su, Jun-Juan Zhu, and Lei Zhang. Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for open-set object detection. *ArXiv*, abs/2303.05499, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 6
- [25] Xuejing Liu, Liang Li, Shuhui Wang, Zheng-Jun Zha, Dechao Meng, and Qingming Huang. Adaptive reconstruction network for weakly supervised referring expression grounding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 2611–2620, 2019. 1, 2, 3
- [26] Xuejing Liu, Liang Li, Shuhui Wang, Zheng-Jun Zha, Zechao Li, Qi Tian, and Qingming Huang. Entity-enhanced adaptive reconstruction network for weakly supervised referring expression grounding. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(3):3003–3018, 2022. 1, 2, 3
- [27] Yongfei Liu, Bo Wan, Lin Ma, and Xuming He. Relation-aware instance refinement for weakly supervised visual grounding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5612–5621, 2021. 1
- [28] Yongfei Liu, Bo Wan, Lin Ma, and Xuming He. Relation-aware instance refinement for weakly supervised visual grounding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5612–5621, 2021. 6, 7
- [29] Junhua Mao, Jonathan Huang, Alexander Toshev, Oana Camburu, Alan Yuille, and Kevin Murphy. Generation and comprehension of unambiguous object descriptions. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 11–20, 2016. 2
- [30] Anna Rohrbach, Marcus Rohrbach, Ronghang Hu, Trevor Darrell, and Bernt Schiele. Grounding of textual phrases in images by reconstruction. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2015. 2
- [31] Anna Rohrbach, Marcus Rohrbach, Ronghang Hu, Trevor Darrell, and Bernt Schiele. Grounding of textual phrases in images by reconstruction. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part I 14*, pages 817–834. Springer, 2016. 6, 7
- [32] Anna Rohrbach, Marcus Rohrbach, Ronghang Hu, Trevor Darrell, and Bernt Schiele. Grounding of textual phrases in images by reconstruction. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part I 14*, pages 817–834. Springer, 2016. 2
- [33] Jing Shi, Jia Xu, Boqing Gong, and Chenliang Xu. Not all frames are equal: Weakly-supervised video grounding with contextual similarity and visual clustering losses. In *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 10436–10444, 2019. 1, 6, 7
- [34] Petru Soviany, Radu Tudor Ionescu, Paolo Rota, and Nicu Sebe. Curriculum learning: A survey. *Int. J. Comput. Vision*, 130(6):1526–1565, 2022. 2
- [35] Rui Su, Qian Yu, and Dong Xu. Stvgbert: A visual-linguistic transformer based framework for spatio-temporal video grounding. In *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 1513–1522, 2021. 2
- [36] Ye Tang, Yu-Bin Yang, and Yang Gao. Self-paced dictionary learning for image classification. In *Proceedings of the 20th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, page 833–836, New York, NY, USA, 2012. Association for Computing Machinery. 2
- [37] Zongheng Tang, Yue Liao, Si Liu, Guanbin Li, Xiaojie Jin, Hongxu Jiang, Qian Yu, and Dong Xu. Human-centric spatio-temporal video grounding with visual transformers. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 32:8238–8249, 2020. 5
- [38] Liwei Wang, Jing Huang, Yin Li, Kun Xu, Zhengyuan Yang, and Dong Yu. Improving weakly supervised visual grounding by contrastive knowledge distillation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 14090–14100, 2021. 4
- [39] Peng Wang, An Yang, Rui Men, Junyang Lin, Shuai Bai, Zhikang Li, Jianxin Ma, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, and Hongxia Yang. Ofa: Unifying architectures, tasks, and modalities through a simple sequence-to-sequence learning framework. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 23318–23340. PMLR, 2022. 2
- [40] Qinxin Wang, Hao Tan, Sheng Shen, Michael Mahoney, and Zhewei Yao. MAF: Multimodal alignment framework for weakly-supervised phrase grounding. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2030–2038, Online, 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. 1, 4
- [41] X. Wang, Y. Chen, and W. Zhu. A survey on curriculum learning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(09):4555–4576, 2022. 2
- [42] Yuechen Wang, Jiajun Deng, Wen gang Zhou, and Houqiang Li. Weakly supervised temporal adjacent network for language grounding. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 24: 3276–3286, 2021. 2, 5
- [43] Syed Talal Wasim, Muzammal Naseer, Salman Khan, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Videogrounding-dino: Towards open-vocabulary spatio-temporal video grounding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18909–18918, 2024. 1
- [44] Fei Wei, Xinyu Zhang, Ailing Zhang, Bo Zhang, and Xiangxiang Chu. Lenna: Language enhanced reasoning detection assistant. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02433*, 2023. 2
- [45] Masataka Yamaguchi, Kuniaki Saito, Y. Ushiku, and Tatsuya Harada. Spatio-temporal person retrieval via natural language queries. *2017 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 1462–1471, 2017. 2
- [46] Antoine Yang, Antoine Miech, Josef Sivic, Ivan Laptev, and Cordelia Schmid. Tubedetr: Spatio-temporal video grounding

- with transformers. *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 16421–16432, 2022. [1](#), [2](#), [6](#)
- [47] Lijin Yang, Quan Kong, Hsuan-Kung Yang, Wadim Kehl, Yoichi Sato, and Norimasa Kobori. Deco: Decomposition and reconstruction for compositional temporal grounding via coarse-to-fine contrastive ranking. In *2023 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 23130–23140, 2023. [4](#)
- [48] Wenfei Yang, Tianzhu Zhang, Yongdong Zhang, and Feng Wu. Local correspondence network for weakly supervised temporal sentence grounding. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 30:3252–3262, 2021. [6](#), [7](#)
- [49] Yufei Zhan, Yousong Zhu, Zhiyang Chen, Fan Yang, Ming Tang, and Jinqiao Wang. Griffon: Spelling out all object locations at any granularity with large language models. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 405–422. Springer, 2025. [2](#)
- [50] Hao Zhang, Hongyang Li, Feng Li, Tianhe Ren, Xueyan Zou, Shilong Liu, Shijia Huang, Jianfeng Gao, Chunyuan Li, Jainwei Yang, et al. Llava-grounding: Grounded visual chat with large multimodal models. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 19–35. Springer, 2025. [1](#), [2](#)
- [51] Zhu Zhang, Zhou Zhao, Yang Zhao, Qi Wang, Huasheng Liu, and Lianli Gao. Where does it exist: Spatio-temporal video grounding for multi-form sentences. *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 10665–10674, 2020. [5](#)
- [52] Fang Zhao, Jianshu Li, Jian Zhao, and Jiashi Feng. Weakly supervised phrase localization with multi-scale anchored transformer network. In *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5696–5705, 2018. [6](#), [7](#)
- [53] Minghang Zheng, Yanjie Huang, Qingchao Chen, and Yang Liu. Weakly supervised video moment localization with contrastive negative sample mining. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2022. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [8](#)
- [54] Minghang Zheng, Yanjie Huang, Qingchao Chen, Yuxin Peng, and Yang Liu. Weakly supervised temporal sentence grounding with gaussian-based contrastive proposal learning. In *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 15534–15543, 2022. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)