Moment Detection in Long Tutorial Videos - Supplementary Material

In this supplementary material we provide additional information and results for LONGMOMENT-DETR and our datasets. We begin by showing a visual representation of our pipeline, then some additional ablations (Sec. 2), following with some additional clarifications on several components (Sec. 3) along with more dataset details (BMD in Sec. 4 and YTC in Sec. 5).

1. Visual representation

In Fig. 1 you can see an overview of our system. Initially, we source our videos from the Behance platform. Once obtained, these videos undergo an automatic transcription process powered by the Azure speech recognition system. This raw transcript is then segmented, and split into segments. Then, we use GPT-3 to generate queries for the segments by summarizing the transcript corresponding to the segment time-span and finally we train our model.



Figure 1. System overview of LONGMOMENT-DETR. The process involves: 1) feature extraction, 2) Automatic transcript generation (ASR) using speech recognition, 3) Segment generation, 4) Summarization of transcripts for each segment, and 5) Training of model

2. Ablations

In this section, we provide additional ablations for our method, starting with extra results for the influence of different components.

2.1. Influence of different components

In Tab. 1, we present an overview of the influence of different components on the validation split for easier comparison (results on the testing split can be found in the main



Figure 2. **Performance vs amount of training data.** As it can be seen, the performance increases with the amount of data.

Component	Segments	Queries	$R1@0.5\uparrow$	$R1@0.7\uparrow$
Baseline [2]	No	No	$3.1_{\pm 0.4}$	$0.5_{\pm 0.2}$
Random seg	Random	No	$9.4_{\pm 1.6}$	$2.6_{\pm 0.8}$
ShotDetect	OSG	No	$13.4_{\pm 0.5}$	$6.3_{\pm 0.3}$
LONGMOMENT-DETR	OSG	GPT3	$16.8_{\pm 0.5}$	$9.2_{\pm 1.0}$

Table 1. Effect of different components on performance. Both the segment timing generation and query generation have a strong impact on performance. Hence, in the final model, we use OSG and GPT3, thus obtaining our final model LONGMOMENT-DETR. The results are presented on the validation split.

Model	Segments	Queries	$R1@0.5\uparrow$	$R1@0.7\uparrow$
Baseline	No	No	$0.9_{\pm 0.3}$	$0.4_{\pm 0.1}$
Random sed	Random	No	$2.0_{\pm 0.1}$	$0.5_{\pm 0.1}$
Query gen	Random	GPT3	$2.8_{\pm 0.9}$	$0.9_{\pm 0.2}$
ShotDetect	OSG	No	$4.8_{\pm 0.8}$	$2.0_{\pm 0.4}$
LONGMOMENT-DETR	OSG	GPT3	$5.0_{\pm 2.4}$	$2.2_{\pm 1.5}$

Table 2. **Zero shot results on YTC.** For the YTC dataset we observe that the biggest influence on performance comes from using an automatic video segmentation method like OSG. However, by using the queries obtained from GPT3 the performance further increases.

paper). We observe that both the segment timing generation and the query generation have a strong impact on performance (similar to what is presented in the main paper). We obtain the best results by combining the timing generation from OSG [5] with the GPT3 [1] query generation which are used by our method.

In Tab. 2, we present additional zero shot results of different models on the YTC dataset. We observed that both segment timing generation and query generation have an influence on the performance which is similarly to BMD. However, for YTC dataset the segment timing generation has a stronger influence. **BMD Query**: "The host starts sketching the rough outline of the face of the dog. The host adds the facial feature to the rough sketch of the face of the dog. The host placed the rough sketch in the left upper corner of the sketch layer."



Figure 3. Qualitative examples for BMD (A) and YTC (B). Along with the query, we show several video frames, the prediction results in orange and the ground truth in green. We also specify the overlap between the prediction and ground truth segments.



Transcript for a 25 min long segment

Figure 4. Visual comparison of transcript length (left side), query generation (upper right side) and human query (bottom right side). As it can be seen, the length of the transcript for a 25 min segment is significantly longer.

2.2. Quantity of data

For this experiment, we study how the quantity of training data affects performance. Fig. 2 indicates that the more data we have, the better. This aspect further validates our approach of automatically generating segment annotations without incurring a large annotation cost.

3. Additional information

In this section, we provide more details on various design choices, starting with how we generate random segments. Then, additional details about the low-level adaptations of Moment-DETR [2] are provided. Further, we present how we use LLMs to summarize the transcripts and present some statistics about the query length.

3.1. Video Segmentation-Random

In Sec. 5.2 from the main paper we compared against a random segmentation baseline. Now, we will provide further explanation on how we randomly split into segments each video. We start by choosing a random duration for the first segment between 800 and 3000 seconds and then we continue doing this for the rest of the video. By using this approach, we ended up with an average of around 5 non-overlapping segments per video.

3.2. Adjusting Moment-DETR

As stated in the main paper, we started from Moment-DETR [2] and made several technical adjustments for the model to process longer videos. The original code did not work "out of the box" for our videos, since it assumes the videos are shorter than 3 minutes. Firstly, we removed the original constraint to trim the video to three minutes. Fur-



Figure 5. YouTube Chapters example. We collected the chapter annotations from YouTube for some long tutorial videos.



Figure 6. **Histogram of transcript length.** We present the transcript length in number of sentences per video on the BMD dataset.



Figure 7. **Histogram of video duration YTC.** The majority of the videos from YTC have around 2 hours.



ther we changed the evaluation to consider longer segment durations. Another difference is accounting for a variable

Dataset	Avg sents	Avg words
BMD-Train	6.5	131.9
BMD-Eval	1.7	28.5
YTC	1.0	4.8
Transcript	330	4217

Table 3. **Query statistics.** It can be observed that the queries in YTC are very short containing only essential keywords.

sampling rate (which was originally hardcoded to 2). The sampling rate at which the videos features are extracted influences the loss and the training step of the model. Also, we opted to use the GPT2-xl [4] features for the text side, not CLIP [3] (we presented ablation studies in the main paper to justify this design choice). We will make the code available online along with the data.

3.3. Transcript usage with LLMs

As already stated, the transcript is very long, even for a segment proposal. Since the LLMs usually have an input length limit, in order to get a summary (which will act as the final query generation text), we have an iterative approach, where we split the transcript in several parts (that can be processed at once) and feed them independently through the LLM. In the end, the final query is obtained by concatenating all the subparts.

3.4. Query length

In Tab. 3 we present the average query length per segment in our BMD and YTC datasets. The chapter annotation in YTC are very short and contain around 5 words on average, while in BMD-Eval there are around 30 words on average per query.

3.5. Number of segments

The average number of segments per video in BMD-Train is around 4.5, while in YTC there are around 9.4 segments per video. The segments in BMD-Train where obtained by using OSG [5] with *scenes_count* = 5. The segments were then filtered to have an associated transcript and to be shorter than 1.5h. For YTC, the chapter annotations were extracted from YouTube and were manually added by the creator of the video.

Model	Pre-training	Training	$R1@0.5\uparrow$	$R1@0.7\uparrow$
CHAPTER-DETR	-	YTC	$12.6_{\pm 0.3}$	$5.8_{\pm 0.6}$
CHAPTER-DETR	BMD-val	YTC	$14.4_{\pm 0.3}$	$5.9_{\pm 0.7}$
CHAPTER-DETR	BMD-train	YTC	$16.1_{\pm 0.5}$	$6.6_{\pm 0.3}$

Table 4. **Results on YouTube-Chapters.** The best results are obtained by pre-training on our automatically curated BMD-train split.

4. BMD

In Fig. 3 we show some additional qualitative examples for LONGMOMENT-DETR. Moreover, in Fig. 6 we present the histogram of transcript lengths in our BMD dataset. As expected, the transcripts are considerable long and contain a lot of wide-ranging dialogue. A visual representation to better understand the difference between a transcript and a human query is presented in Fig. 4. The validation and testing split are manually annotated and have a variable number of scenes per videos. A histogram of number of segments per video for the validation and testing splits is presented in Fig. 8.

5. YTC

In Fig. 5 we present a visual example of a video from YTC. In Fig. 7 we present the histogram of the YTC videos duration. We observe that the majority of the videos from YTC are about 2 hours long.

Additionally, in Tab. 4 we present the performance of using the features obtained by training with supervised data from BMD validation split on the downstream task of YouTube chapter detection. As can be observed, using the BMD-val as pre-training for YTC slightly improves performance. However using our proposed automatically curated BMD-train, the increase in performance is greater.

References

- [1] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc'Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin, editors, Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual, 2020. 1
- [2] Jie Lei, Tamara L Berg, and Mohit Bansal. Detecting moments and highlights in videos via natural language queries. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 34:11846–11858, 2021. 1, 2

- [3] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2021, 18-24 July 2021, Virtual Event*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 3
- [4] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019. 3
- [5] Daniel Rotman, Dror Porat, and Gal Ashour. Robust and efficient video scene detection using optimal sequential grouping. In 2016 IEEE international symposium on multimedia (ISM), pages 275–280. IEEE, 2016. 1, 3