

Foundation Models for Video Understanding: A Survey

NEELU MADAN, Visual Analysis and Perception Lab, Aalborg University, Denmark

ANDREAS MØGELMOSE, Visual Analysis and Perception Lab, Aalborg University, Denmark

RAJAT MODI, Center for Research in Computer Vision, University of Central Florida, USA

YOGESH S. RAWAT, Center for Research in Computer Vision, University of Central Florida, USA

THOMAS B. MOESLUND, Visual Analysis and Perception Lab, Aalborg University, Denmark

Video Foundation Models (ViFMs) aim to learn a general-purpose representation for various video understanding tasks. Leveraging large-scale datasets and powerful models, ViFMs achieve this by capturing robust and generic features from video data. This survey analyzes over 200 video foundational models, offering a comprehensive overview of benchmarks and evaluation metrics across 14 distinct video tasks categorized into 3 main categories. Additionally, we offer an in-depth performance analysis of these models for the 6 most common video tasks. We categorize ViFMs into three categories: 1) Image-based ViFMs, which adapt existing image models for video tasks, 2) Video-Based ViFMs, which utilize video-specific encoding methods, and 3) Universal Foundational Models (UFMs), which combine multiple modalities (image, video, audio, and text etc.) within a single framework. By comparing the performance of various ViFMs on different tasks, this survey offers valuable insights into their strengths and weaknesses, guiding future advancements in video understanding. Our analysis surprisingly reveals that image-based foundation models consistently outperform video-based models on most video understanding tasks. Additionally, UFMs, which leverage diverse modalities, demonstrate superior performance on video tasks. We share the comprehensive list of ViFMs studied in this work at: https://github.com/NeeluMadan/ViFM_Survey.git

CCS Concepts: • **Computing methodologies** → *Large-scale Pretraining, Computer Vision.*

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Video Understanding, Large-scale Pretraining, Vision-language Models, Zero-shot Learning

ACM Reference Format:

Neelu Madan, Andreas Møgelmoose, Rajat Modi, Yogesh S. Rawat, and Thomas B. Moeslund. 2022. Foundation Models for Video Understanding: A Survey. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 1, 1 (May 2022), 48 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

The increasing availability of powerful computing resources and ever-growing datasets has fueled the development of foundation models [10, 24]. These versatile AI models, trained on massive amounts of data using self-supervised or semi-supervised learning, can be fine-tuned for various downstream tasks. Initial successes focused on static images [123, 238], with models like CLIP [238], and SAM [139] achieving impressive results. Recent research [322, 352] has extended this to video domain where several pretraining strategies have been developed for Video Foundational Models (ViFMs).

Authors' addresses: Neelu Madan, nema@create.aau.dk, Visual Analysis and Perception Lab, Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark; Andreas Møgelmoose, Visual Analysis and Perception Lab, Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark; Rajat Modi, rajatmodi@knights.ucf.edu, Center for Research in Computer Vision, University of Central Florida, Florida, USA; Yogesh S. Rawat, yogesh@crcv.ucf.edu, Center for Research in Computer Vision, University of Central Florida, Florida, USA; Thomas B. Moeslund, Visual Analysis and Perception Lab, Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2022 Association for Computing Machinery.

Manuscript submitted to ACM

Manuscript submitted to ACM

1




Fig. 1. Overview of recent research trends in video understanding. The **left bar chart** shows a significant increase in publications on this topic, based on data from prestigious conferences and journals. The figure presents statistics showcasing research focusing on generative, discriminative, and hybrid pretraining objectives, as depicted in the **center pie chart**. Specific pretraining objectives such as Masked Data Modeling (MDM), Masked Language Modeling (MLM), Vision-Text Contrastive (VTC), Vision-Audio Contrastive (VAC), Vision-Text Matching (VTM), Vision-Text Alignment (VTA), Captioning Loss (CAP), and Distillation Loss (Distill) are highlighted in the **right pie chart**. Best viewed in color.

While video analysis and generation has been of interest to the computer vision community for decades [19, 30, 134, 142, 278, 281], and the problem has largely been challenging due to complexity in tasks, additional time dimension, and volume of data. The initially developed approaches are mostly based on processing individual frames with standard image analysis techniques and additional temporal aspect on top [30, 80]. Alternatively, more advanced techniques were developed specifically designed for videos, such as 3D convolutions [338], recurrent networks, use of optical-flow, and transformers [7, 19], operating directly on videos providing better temporal modeling. Furthermore, there has been significant research exploring the role of multiple modalities to enhance video understanding [111, 245].

We see a similar trend in ViFMs and their evolution also follows extending images (Image-based ViFMs), separate video modeling (Video-based ViFMs), and incorporating additional modalities, e.g., Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) (Universal ViFMs).

Motivation and Contribution. The field of video understanding is undergoing significant advancement, as evidenced by the increasing number of research publications focused on various video understanding tasks (Figure 1). This growth coincides with the development of large-scale pretraining techniques. These techniques have demonstrated remarkable capabilities in adapting to diverse tasks, requiring minimal additional training with robust generalization. As a result, researchers are actively investigating the role of these foundational models to address a broad spectrum of video understanding challenges. To navigate this rapidly evolving research landscape (See Figure 2), a systematic review of video understanding models is essential. We attempt to fill this critical gap by providing a comprehensive analysis of foundational models employed in video understanding tasks. We hope that this survey helps to provide a roadmap for future research directions associated with video understanding. The main contributions of our survey are:

- This work presents the first comprehensive survey of foundational models (ViFMs) deployed for diverse video understanding tasks. Our survey categorizes ViFMs into three groups: i) *Image-based ViFMs*: Trained solely on image data. ii) *Video-based ViFMs*: Leveraging video data during training. iii) *Universal Foundation Models (UFMs)*: Combining various modalities (image, video, audio, text) during pretraining.
- We uniquely categorize video understanding tasks based on their involvement in the temporal aspect. We further provide an extensive list of datasets and evaluation metrics associated with each categorized task.
- We conduct a comprehensive comparison of ViFMs from each category, analyzing various research findings. This analysis reveals valuable insights regarding the most effective ViFMs for different video understanding tasks.




Fig. 2. Figure contrasts classical (separate feature extraction, model training) and deep learning (unified framework) approaches in computer vision. It also shows the progression of deep learning approaches for both image and video processing over time (best viewed in color).

- This survey further identifies crucial challenges faced by ViFMs, highlighting open problems that require further research attention. Additionally, we discuss promising future directions for ViFM development, paving the way for advancements in video understanding.

Related Surveys. While several surveys have delved into specific video understanding tasks [353, 366] or foundational models for images [10], with surveys such as Shiappa et al. [252], which offers an extensive review of self-supervised approaches for video understanding, the landscape has evolved significantly in recent years. With the rise of large-scale foundational models, there is a need for a comprehensive review specifically focused on these models in the context of video understanding. To the best of our knowledge, our survey is the first to provide such a comprehensive overview of foundation models for video understanding.

Paper Organization. In the first part of the paper (section 2), we cover a wide range of video analysis tasks ranging from video classification to generation. We discuss widely used architectures and loss functions, as well as datasets relevant for large-scale pre-training. Next, we explain the main categories of ViFMs namely: Image-based ViFMs (Sec 3), Video-based ViFMs (Sec 4), and Universal FMs (Sec 5) (See Figure 5 for the taxonomy). Finally (sections 6-7), we compare and discuss the performance of the presented models, as well as present challenges and future directions for the field.

2 PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we lay the groundwork for understanding this survey. We begin by defining the diverse tasks involved in video understanding, allowing the reader to grasp various goals and challenges associated with analyzing video data. Next, we delve into the major architectural styles adopted by different foundation models. Finally, we offer a concise overview of the large-scale pretraining process, the necessary datasets used for training, and the methods used to adapt these generic models for different video tasks.

2.1 Video Understanding Tasks

In this section, we discuss various tasks along with their popular corresponding benchmarks and evaluation metrics.

2.1.1 Video Content Understanding. Computer vision tasks for video understanding fall into three primary levels. *a) Abstract understanding* infers the video’s overall event (e.g., sports highlight, cooking tutorial). *b) Temporal understanding* zooms in, pinpointing the exact moments in a video (e.g., goal scored, ingredient added). *c) Spatio-temporal understanding* goes further, identifying both the when and where of events within video frames (e.g., player celebrating on the field, chef placing vegetables in the pan). By traversing this progression, deep models build a sophisticated comprehension of video content, similar to how humans gradually grasp information.

a) Abstract Understanding Tasks.

Classification or Recognition. The task is to assign a category to a video. Different benchmarks for activity classification are: Kinetic-400 [136], Kinetic-600 [28], Kinetic-700 [29], Something-Something-V1 (SSv1) [96], Something-Something-V2 (SSv2) [96], ActivityNet [27], HACS [356], HMDB51 [146], UCF-101 [264], TinyVIRAT [62], and Diving-48 [166]. This task is evaluated using Top-K accuracy as a metric.

Retrieval. The task involves finding videos containing specific actions, objects, or scenes. The common metric for evaluating this task is Recall at K (R@K), specifically R@1 meaning accuracy of the first retrieved result. This task exists in the literature with different names including: *i) Multi-Instance Retrieval (MIR):* MIR [8], focuses on both text-to-video (T2V) and video-to-text (V2T) retrieval. The common benchmark for this task is EPIC-Kitchen-100 [60], and the metrics are *mAP* for V2T retrieval and *normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain (nDCG)* for T2V retrieval. *ii) Paragraph-to-video (P2V) retrieval:* P2V retrieval [268] bridges the gap between language and video, finding videos relevant to a paragraph (several sentences). Different datasets to solve this task includes ActivityNet Captions [143], QuerYD [218], and CondensedMovie [12]. *iii) Text-to-video (T2V) retrieval:* T2V retrieval [334] finds videos using textual descriptions (single sentence). Different benchmarks for this task are Kinetic-Geb [301], MSRVT [325], DiDeMo [6], YouCook2 [364], LSMDC [245].

b) Temporal Understanding Tasks.

Temporal Action Localization (TAL). TAL [304] aims to pinpoint the exact moments within videos where specific actions occur. Common benchmarks for this tasks are THUMOS-14 [119], ActivityNet-v1.3 [27], HACS Segment [356], FineAction [186], BreakFast [145], Charades [259], Ikea-ASM [17]. The evaluation metric is the mean average precision (mAP) and the average precision (AP) [27, 119] for each action category.

Fine-grained Classification. This task extends the classification task for long-form videos [268], where COIN [272] and LVU [313] are the benchmarking datasets. COIN [272] proposes Procedural Activities Classification (PAC), where the task

is to divide complex actions into meaningful subactions and then learn the correct order and hierarchical-relationship among these subactions. LVU [313] proposes 9 tasks including content understanding (relationship, speaking style, scene/place) for the comprehensive video understanding. These fine-grained classification tasks thus require spatio-temporal understanding of videos.

c) Spatio-Temporal Understanding Tasks.

Spatiotemporal Action Localization (SAL). SAL aims to find both "when" and "where" specific actions unfold within a video[304]. Notable datasets for this particular category are UCF101-24 [264], JHMDB-22 [122], and UCF-MAMA[204]. These datasets contain annotation for each video frame. Datasets like Ava[99], Ava-Kinetics[153] contain box-annotations at 1Hz sampling frequency over a clip of 15 mins. Evaluation metric for this task is the f-mAP and video-mAP[69] measuring frame-level and video-level localization performance respectively. (mAP: mean average precision)

Tracking. The task aims at identifying and following the movement of objects throughout a video. KITTI [88], UA-DETRAC [247], LaSOT [74], MOT16/MOT17 [202], MOT20 [63], MOTSynth [73], BDD-100K [337], TAO [61], BURST [9], and LV-VIS [287] are popular benchmarking datasets; and HOTA [189], and Clear-MOT [18] are evaluation metrics for this task. Recently, a more fine-grained tracking approach known as *point tracking* has emerged, which tracks specific points on an object's surface regardless of pixel location. Datasets for point tracking include PointOdyssey [362], TAP-Vid-DAVIS [67] and CroHD [269], while evaluation focuses on Mean Trajectory Error (MTE) and position accuracy.

Referring Video Segmentation (RVS). RVS [315] segments the objects referred by either textual descriptions or first frame's segmentation. The benchmarks for RVS using textual description are RefCOCOg [213], Refer-Youtube-VOS [256], Refer-DAVIS [138], A2D-Sentences [70, 84], and JHMDB-Sentences [84]; and evaluation metrics for this task is meanAP and meanIoU. Whereas, The benchmarks for RVS using first frame's segmentation as reference are Youtube-VOS , DAVIS [230].

Video Object Detection (VOD). VOD typically aims to detect object across a video-stream. Videos typically contain a lot of redundant temporal information. This helps detectors detect an object in the current frame and *anticipate* it's position in the subsequent[184, 365]. Reported Metrics are generally mAP with results reported for different speed of motion of objects. Benchmark datasets are ImageNet-VID[248].

2.1.2 Descriptive Understanding Tasks. This section covers benchmarks and evaluation metrics associated with Video Question Answering (VQA), and Video Captioning tasks. Both VQA and Captioning tasks focus on understanding of the textual description of the video content.

Video question answering (VQA). VQA answers questions about the video content based on visual information and potentially textual queries. VQA is evaluated using Top-1, Top-K accuracy, DA score and ANLS as a metric[199, 314]. According to the literature, this task is sub-divided into three sub-categories: *i) Multiple-Choice (MC):* MC-VQA addresses multiple-choice question answering. Common benchmarks for this subtask are TGIF-Action and TGIF-Transition [121], MSRVTT-MC [341], and LSMDC-MC [279]. *ii) Open-Ended (OE):* OE-VQA answers subjective, creative, and logical questions. Common benchmarks for this subtask are TGIF-Frame [121], MSRVTT-QA [341], MSVD-QA [320], LSMDC-FiB [279], ActivityNet-QA [342]. *iii) Long-Form (LF):* LF-VQA [268] goes beyond single answers, generating




Fig. 3. Figure presents different video tasks. Task in first column: (a) Video Action Recognition, (b) Temporal Action Localization (TAL), and (c) Spatio-temporal Action Localization (STAL) require only video understanding. Tasks in second and third column: (d) Video-Text Retrieval, (e) VideoQA, and (f) Video Captioning requires both video and language understanding. Best viewed in color.

comprehensive explanations that understand video content, reason temporally, and adapt to diverse question types. Common benchmarks for this subtasks are ActivityNet-QA [342], How2QA [161] and VIOLIN [183].

Video Captioning. Video captioning generates textual descriptions of video content [334]. MSRVT [325], Youcook2 [364], and MSVD [39] are the common benchmarks to solve this task. The evaluation metric for this task are BLEU@4 [225], METEOR [15], ROUGE [171], and CIDEr [285].

2.1.3 Video Content Generation and Manipulation. This section covers benchmarks and evaluation metrics for various generative video tasks.

Video Prediction. This area of research encompasses two main sub-tasks: a) *Video future prediction (VFP)*: VFP predicts future frames, given an input video of variable length. Literature uses K600 [28] as a benchmarking dataset and FVD as an evaluation metric for this task; b) *Long-Term Anticipation (LTA)*: LTA [8] predicts next 20 actions given the current action (verb, noun). The common benchmark for this task is Ego4D [97] and the metric to evaluate the performance is *Edit Distance (ED)* [97].

Text-to-video (T2V) Generation. The process [142] involves generating video frames based on a textual prompt. Common benchmarks for this task are MSR-VTT [325] and UCF-101 [264], while using Fréchet Video Distance (FVD) [282], CLIP Similarity Score (CLIPSim) [311] and Inception Score (IS) [249] as evaluation metrics.

Video inpainting/outpainting. The task involves predicting the video with the contents filled-in on a masked video using SSv2 [96] as benchmarking dataset and FVD [282] as evaluation metrics.

Video stylization. This task involves generating a video whose style is governed by an additional modality such as text or optical flow[142]. Existing methods try to preserve high-level content of the video, and generating a temporally-consistent stylized version. Benchmark dataset and evaluation metrics for this task are DAVIS 2016 [230] and CLIPSim [311] respectively.




Fig. 4. Figure shows different architectures adopted by Video Foundation Models (ViFMs): Uni-modal ViFMs follows usually (a) Encoder-Decoder network, and multi-modal foundation model follows either (b) Joint-Encoder (c) Dual-Encoder ($n=2$) or Multi-Encoder ($n>2$), and (d) Mix-Encoder. Best viewed in color.

2.2 Architectures and Loss Functions

This section provides a brief description of the architectures and different training objectives adopted by ViFMs. Figure 4 illustrates different patterns adopted by ViFMs. These patterns can be broadly categorized based on modality (type of data processed) and loss function.

2.2.1 Architectures. Different architecture patterns in ViFMs can be broadly categorized as: *unimodal* and *multi-modal*. Multi-modal ViFM further show different patterns as discussed below.

Uni-Modal. Unimodal ViFMs [79, 292] focus on a single modality (e.g., video) and typically employ generative objectives like mask reconstruction. They often follow an *Encoder-Decoder* framework where the encoder extracts features from the input video, and the decoder reconstructs the masked or missing parts. The training process is guided by a reconstruction loss function that measures the difference between the original and reconstructed video.

Multi-Modal. Multi-modal ViFMs [115, 160] handle multiple modalities (e.g., video and text) and usually rely on contrastive learning objectives. They typically use encoder-only networks where separate encoders might be employed for each modality. Here, the focus is on learning representations that capture the relationships between different modalities. A contrastive loss function (*VTC*) is used during training to pull together similar representations and push apart dissimilar ones. Within multi-modal models, the encoding style for different modalities can be further classified into three categories: i) *Joint-Encoder* [91, 92, 289] utilizes a single encoder to process all modalities simultaneously. This is computationally efficient but may not capture modality-specific nuances. ii) *Dual/Multi-Encoder* [33, 77, 130, 238] employs separate encoders for each modality. While it allows for more specialized feature extraction, it increases computational complexity. Dual encoders are used for two modalities, while architectures handling more than two modalities are referred to as multi-encoders. iii) *Mixed-Encoder* [82, 115, 154, 326] offers a compromise between joint

and separate encoders. It first uses lightweight encoders to extract initial features from individual modalities. These features are then combined and processed by a shared encoder before reaching the final loss function. Both unimodal and multi-modal architectures often leverage transformer blocks as their basic building blocks.

2.2.2 Loss Functions. Video Foundation Models (ViFMs) rely on pre-training with specific objectives (loss functions) to learn effective representations. These objectives can be broadly categorized into two main approaches: generative and discriminative. This section delves into the details of each category and the specific objectives associated with them.

Discriminative. The most common objective functions for ViFMs pretraining are *Video-Text Contrastive (VTC)* [322] and *Video-Text Matching (VTM)* [154]. VTC pulls together similar representations and pushes apart dissimilar ones, while VTM aims to maximize the matching score between a given video-text pair. These objectives are well-suited for multi-modal architectures but might not be directly applicable to uni-modal architectures. However, contrastive objectives using data augmentation to generate positive pairs have been explored for uni-modal settings [47, 98, 224]. Notably, VIMPAC [270] leverages this approach for ViFMs pretraining.

Beyond VTC and VTM, several variants have been proposed. *Verb-Focused Contrastive (VFC)* [208] focuses on fine-grained verb alignment. *Video-Text Joint (VTJ)* [190] learns a joint representation from video and text (Figure 4 (d) for reference). *Multimodal Temporal Contrastive (MTC)* [268] expands contrastive learning to other modalities, while *Video Clip Contrastive (VCC)* [270] utilizes contrastive learning between video clips. Recent works explore *Tri-Modal Alignment (TMA)* [115] for simultaneous cross-modal alignment and fusion, as well as *Omni-Modality Video-Caption Contrastive (OM-VCC)* [45] and *Video-Caption Matching (OM-VCM)* [45] losses. Additionally, *Video-Audio Contrastive (VAC)* [3, 94] and *Attention-Guided Contrastive (AGC)* [227] objectives have been introduced.

The presence of the additional temporal dimension in video allows for significant flexibility in designing discriminative objectives. Several objectives aim to improve temporal modeling capabilities. *Multi-modal temporal relation exploration (MTRE)* [334] and *cross-modal moment exploration (CME)* [334] leverage text guidance to enhance the model’s ability to capture temporal context in video. *Time-Order Consistency Check (TOCC)* [11] ensures the correct order of events, while *Control Task (CT)* [11] enforces matching between video events and corresponding text descriptions. *Discriminative Video Dynamics Modeling (DVDM)* [306] specifically promotes nuanced temporal understanding. *Frame-Transcript Matching (FTM)* [346] matches video frames with their corresponding transcripts, and *Temporal Reordering (TR)* [346] predicts the correct order of scrambled video frames.

Generative. This category encompasses various objectives that focus on reconstructing masked information within the video data. Examples include *Masked Language Modeling (MLM)* for text data [82, 326], *Mask Video Modeling (MVM)* for videos [114, 292], *Mask Signal/Data Modeling (MDN, MSM)* for general signals [94], *Mask Frame Modeling (MFM)* for video frames [321], and *Mask Image Modeling (MIM)* for images [296]. The primary goal here is to reconstruct the masked parts, such as predicting a masked frame in MFM. Building upon these core objectives UniVL [190] proposes *Conditional MLM (CMLM)* [190], and *Conditional MFM (CMFM)* [190]. These objectives are primarily used for training unimodal architectures. However, for pre-training multi-modal architectures, generative objectives are often combined with a contrastive loss (acting as a discriminative objective). This combination leverages the strengths of both approaches: reconstructing masked information and learning relationships between modalities.

Beyond the aforementioned objectives, there are less commonly used generative approaches for multi-modal architectures. These include: *Auto-regressive training objectives* like Language Modeling (LM) [334], PrefixLM [334], and next (Image/Motion/Text) [129] token generation, which predicts the next element (token) in a sequence based

on the current one. *Captioning Loss* [329] predicts next token based on past video and text. VAST [45] modifies this concept with *Omni-Modality Video Caption Generation (OM-VCG)* loss. *Audio Video Continuation (AVCont)* [142] predicts next frame from audio, *Image Inpainting and Outpainting*, [142] *Text-to-Image/Video Generation* [142], *Video-to-Text Completion (VTC)* [83], and *Frame Prediction* [142].

Beyond general-purpose objectives, task-specific options exist. *Prompting Entity Modeling (PEM)* [154] focuses on fine-grained region-entity alignment and action understanding. *Multi-Grained Aligning (MGA)* [348] aligns visual concepts (objects) with text descriptions, while *Multi-Grained Localization (MGL)* [348] locates these concepts in images based on textual descriptions. *Multi-Choice Modeling (MCM)* [324] improves modality alignment and representation learning. *Distillation loss* [33, 351], where a student network mimics the representation of a stronger teacher network, is another common ViFM pretraining objective employed for knowledge transfer, particularly for training lightweight student networks.




Fig. 5. We need to kinda change the classification categories after the level 1(Type): **a) Adapting Image Models:** Post-pretraining (3.1), Adapters (3.2), and Prompt-tuning (3.3); **b) Direct Video Models:** Generative (4.1), Discriminative (4.2), and Hybrid (4.3) **c) Joint Image-Video Models:** Generative (5.1), Discriminative (5.2), Hybrid (5.3), **d) Generative (6.1) and Conversational (6.2)**

2.3 Training Strategy

This sections discusses various datasets involved with large-scale pretraining of foundation models. Moreover, this section also briefly mentions the recipe for deploying these models for different video tasks.

2.3.1 Self-supervised Pretraining Datasets. We discuss pretraining datasets for both unimodal and multi-modal architectures in ViFMs in this section.

Unimodal. Large-scale models in single modality mostly used a combination of action recognition dataset for self-supervised pre-training. K400 [136], K600 [28], K700 [29], SomethingSomethingV1 (SSv1) [96], and SomethingSomethingV2 (SSv2) [96] are few datasets used for such cases.

Multi-modal. Video-text dataset used for training multi-modal video foundation models are listed as: WebVid-2M [13], HowTo100M [201], EpicKitchen [60], Flinstones [103], Mugen [104]. As we have limited number of multi-modal (Vision-Language) dataset for the video domain. To fulfill this requirement, some foundation models [43, 81, 82, 154, 273, 291] used image-text dataset such CC3M [258], and CC12M [37], and SBU Captions [221] for the pretraining of multi-modal video foundation models. Moreover, few foundation models [45, 268, 326] further curates their own datasets such HD-VILA-100M [326] and LF-VILA-8M [326], and VAST-27M [45] in order to provide diverse and large-scale dataset for multi-modal pretraining.

2.3.2 Semi-supervised Pretraining Datasets. The recent trajectory of multimodal foundation model research reveals a compelling trend towards the development of increasingly generic models, capable of tackling a broad spectrum of tasks across both video and image domains [43, 92, 94, 142, 273, 289, 321, 323, 346, 367].

Combining Datasets The grounding task in the visual domain is not merely solved by self-supervised learning. Preparing large-scale annotated datasets is also a tedious task in such cases. Therefore, different models use a combination of datasets: Object365 [257], OpenImages [149], and COCO [176] for object detection; RefCOCO [340], RefCOCO+ [340], RefCOCOg [213], and VisualGenome [144] for visual grounding; LVIS [102], BDD [337] for tracking; YTVIS19 [332], YTVIS21 [217], RVOS [255] and OVIS [235] for video segmentation.

Pseudo-labelled Datasets The requirement for large-scale annotated data remains a challenge in computer vision. A recent trend involves leveraging a few powerful teacher models to provide high-quality labels associated with different visual tasks. This approach was pioneered by GRIT [229], which utilizes a teacher model to generate labels for grounding tasks. Following this success, SAM [140] proposes an active learning approach to generate high-quality labeled data specifically for the segmentation task. This approach resulted in the creation of a very large-scale dataset, SA-1B [140], containing 1 Billion high-quality annotations. Similarly, Distill VLM [361] leverages a teacher model to generate captions for existing video datasets like VideoCC [214] and InternVid [302]. This process creates two new pseudo-captioned datasets: VideoCC⁺, and InternVid⁺.

2.3.3 Deploying Foundation Models for Video Understanding. We can establish a foundation model trained on a large-scale dataset, but deploying it for video understanding tasks (Section 2.1) requires further steps.

Fine-Tuning. Fine-tuning a model remains a powerful technique for adapting it to specific video tasks [191, 271]. However, its capabilities extend beyond that. Fine-tuning can also be used to improve the model’s generic representation, meaning its overall ability to understand and handle various types of information. This type of fine-tuning is often referred to as *post-pretraining* [33, 160, 165, 329] because it essentially trains the model again to expand its knowledge base.

One approach to achieve this effective integration of visual modalities with LLMs is through a process called *instruction-tuning* [181]. This process involves fine-tuning the additional module, or sometimes the entire LLM, on an instructional dataset. The idea behind instruction-tuning was first introduced by InstructBLIP [181]. Instruction has become a common practice for both static images [58, 156, 280] and dynamic videos [193, 196].

Adapters. For video understanding, adapters [112] offer a powerful and efficient approach. These lightweight neural network modules are strategically integrated within large pre-trained models. Their key strength lies in requiring training only a limited number of parameters, significantly reducing the computational burden compared to fine-tuning




Fig. 6. Figures illustrate different methods for inflating image models for video understanding task: a) Post-pretraining (encoders are trainable), b) Adapters (encoders are frozen with few additional trainable parameters), and c) Prompt-tuning (trainable parameter at the input of the text encoder). Best viewed in color.

the entire model. This efficiency makes them ideal for video tasks, which often involve processing vast amounts of data. Adapters excel in this domain due to their dual functionality: 1) improving the model’s representation for specific tasks [75, 164, 223, 293, 333] and 2) extending its capabilities to enhance the overall understanding of videos [77, 179, 237, 299, 351], effectively creating a more generic video representation.

Prompt-Tuning. Similar to adapter networks, prompt-tuning [152] offers a computationally efficient approach for adapting large pre-trained models to new tasks. It achieves this by introducing a small number of additional trainable parameters at the model’s input, in the form of a prompt. This prompt essentially guides the pre-trained model towards the desired task by providing specific instructions or context. Similar to adapter, they are integrated with large-scale models to improve: 1) representation for specific task [71, 116, 307], and 2) extending the overall video understanding. [130, 336] Alternatively, we can design generic prompts that enhance the model’s overall performance on various tasks, e.g., “*image of object*” as used by CLIP [238]. By focusing on a small set of trainable parameters, prompt-tuning significantly reduce the computation complexity.

3 IMAGE-BASED VIDEO FOUNDATION MODELS

Image-based Video-Foundation Models (ViFMs) are constructed by leveraging pre-trained Image Foundation Models (IFMs) and inflating them for video tasks. This paper explores three primary approaches for inflating IFMs for video: post-pretraining (Section 3.1), adapters (Section 3.2), and prompt-tuning (Section 3.3). Each of these approaches can be employed to generate either a general-purpose ViFM (see Table 3) or a task-specific model tailored for video question answering (VQA), recognition, or captioning.

3.1 Inflation With Post-pretraining

Post-pretraining refines pre-trained IFMs on large video datasets, enhancing their capability for video-centric tasks. We explore both general-purpose ViFMs (detailed in Table 3) in Section 3.1.1 and specialized models in Section 3.1.2 obtained via inflating IFMs.

Table 1. Table shows the video foundation models (ViFMs) generated via inflating image models, further divided into sub-categories as: a) Post-pretraining (further fine-tuning on image-models), b) Adapters (introduce few trainable layers inside a pretrained image model), c) Prompt-Tuning (introduce few trainable parameters at the input of a pretrained model), d) Hybrid (using combination of mentioned techniques). These approaches depict two prominent architectural patterns namely: ED (Encoder-Decoder) and DE (Dual-Encoder). Additionally, the code corresponding to the approach can be followed through the hyperlink. The highlighted column shows that the method requires no additional pretraining.

	Method	Pretraining data		Pretraining Objectives	Architecture		Venue
		Dataset(s)	Size		Type	Base	
Post-pretraining	VideoCoCa [329]	VideoCC3M [214],	103M	VTC, Captioning	ED	ViT [68], Transformer [284]	arxiv'22
	UMT [160]	HowTo100M [201] K710 [159], WebVid-2M [13], CC3M [258], COCO [176], Visual Genome [144], SBU Captions [221], CC12M [37]	25M	VTC, MLM, MVM	DE	ViT [68], BERT [137], CLIP-ViT [238]	ICCV'23
	MaMMUT [148]	Web alt-text [124]	1.8B	ITC, Captioning	ED	TubeViT [68]	TMLR'23
	Harvest [165]	WebVid-10M [13]	10M	VTC, MLM	ED	UniformerV2 [159], Transformer [284], CLIP [238]	arxiv'23
	CLIP-ViT [327]	WebVid-2.5M [13], HD-VILA-100M [326]	102M	VTC	DE	ViT [68]	ICLR'23
	FitCLIP [33] Distill-VLM [361]	WebVid-2.5M [13] S-Mit [210], WebLI [51]	4M 400K	VTC, Distill VTC	DE DE	CLIP-ViT [238] Pali-3 [50], ViT-G [349], UL-2 [275]	BMVC'22 CVPR'24
Adapters	EVL [179]	CLIP Pretrained	-	VTC	DE	CLIP [238], Transformer [284]	ECCV'22
	DualPath [226]	CLIP Pretrained	-	VTC	DE	ViT [68], Transformer [284]	CVPR'23
	AG-Adapter [77]	CLIP Pretrained	-	VTC	DE	CLIP [238], LLM [280]	ICCV'23
	DiST [237]	Kinetics-710 [29]	0.5M	VTC	DE	CLIP-ViT [238]	ICCV'23
	RTQ [299]	BLIP Pretrained	-	VTC, VTM	DE	BLIP-ViT [156]	ACMMM'23
	TaCA [351] PaLM2-VAAdapter [319]	LAION-400M [254] WebLI [51], VIP [4], SMiT [210]	400M -	VTC, Distillation VTA	DE DE	ViT [68], BERT [137] CoCa [339], PaLM 2 [5]	arxiv'23 arxiv'24
Prompt-Tuning	ATP [26]	CLIP Pretrained	-	-	DE	CLIP [238]	CVPR'22
	P-Former [125]	LAION [253], COCO [176], Visual Genome [144], CC-3M [258], SBU Captions [221]	16M	ITC, ITM, ITG	ED	EVA-CLIP [267], LLM [354], Q-Former [155]	NeurIPS'23
	VideoPrompter [336]	CLIP Pretrained	-	-	DE	CLIP [238], GPT-3.5 [220], ViFi-Clip [244], AIM [333], Action-CLIP [294]	arxiv'23
Hybrid	Singularity [150]	COCO [176], VG [144], SBU Captions [221], CC3M [258], CC12M [37], WebVid-2M [13]	17M	VTC, MLM	DE	ViT [68], BERT [137]	ACL'23
	PromptCLIP [130] COSA [44]	CLIP Pretrained CC14M [43], WebVis-2.5M [13]	14M	VTC CITC, CITM, CMLM, CGM	DE DE	CLIP-ViT [238] ViT [68], BERT [137]	ECCV'22 ICLR'24

3.1.1 Generalist Models. In this section, we explore major trends in post-pretraining for video understanding, focusing on leveraging pre-trained image foundation models (IFMs). This approach involves adapting powerful image models to video tasks.

Several methods achieve this by directly applying pre-trained models to video frames. *ClipBERT* [151] utilizes CLIP [238] as the IFM, employing techniques like sparse sampling and end-to-end learning. Conversely, *VideoCoCa* [329] utilizes a pre-trained contrastive captioner (CoCa) [339] as the IFM, directly applying CoCa's functionalities to video frames. However, these methods didn't fully optimize video-pretraining. Addressing this, *Harvest* [165] focuses on post-training efficiency. It refined pre-trained image models like CLIP [238] through novel methods during post-training

on large datasets, significantly boosting training speed, fostering cross-modal fusion, and achieving state-of-the-art performance on diverse video-language tasks. Building on post-training efficiency, *CLIP-ViP* [327] proposes auxiliary captions to bridge the domain gap between images and videos. CLIP-ViP introduces video proxy tokens for efficient processing and Omnisource Cross-modal Learning to jointly learn from diverse data sources, significantly improving CLIP’s [238] video-text retrieval performance and providing valuable insights for effective post-pretraining strategies in video-text representation learning.

Student-Teacher Framework for Video Adaptation. *FitCLIP* [33] enables the student to learn from video-text pairs and distills knowledge from a pre-trained CLIP model (teacher). *Unmasked Teacher (UMT)* [160] trains the student model in two stages, aligning visible token representations with the teacher (a pretrained IFM) in Stage 1 and refining the student’s understanding in Stage 2 through text alignment and knowledge distillation. *Distill-VLM* [361] utilizes a two-stage training process to adapt the pre-trained IFM, effectively distilling knowledge for video tasks and generating high-quality, detailed video captions crucial for video understanding and various video-language tasks. This enables Distill-VLM [361] for generating pseudo-labels for large datasets like VideoCC+ (~10M Clips) and InternVid+ (~234M clips), which improves the representation [304, 361] when employed during the pretraining.

3.1.2 Specialist Models. We narrow our focus to instances where post-pretraining is employed to tailor IFMs for specific video tasks.

Post-pretraining for Retrieval and Captioning. Clip4Clip [191] and Clip4Caption [271] present empirical studies (involving feature pooling, and fine-tuning etc.) on video-text post-training’s efficiency and its impact on video-text representation for retrieval and captioning tasks. Clip2Caption [271] first post-pretrains CLIP [238] on a video dataset and then finetunes it for the captioning task. On the other hand, *CLIP4Clip* [191] surpasses state-of-the-art on various datasets by leveraging pre-trained CLIP [238] for video-text retrieval.

3.2 Inflation With Adapters

Instead of fine-tuning an entire pre-trained image model, we use lightweight adapter layers for temporal modeling. This adapts the model for video tasks without needing extra pre-training. The sections explores the method using adapters to inflate pretrained image models.

3.2.1 Generalist Models. These adapters integrate with pre-trained image foundation models (IFMs) using only a small number of additional parameters. This allows for efficient generic video representation learning while maintaining the power of pre-trained models. *DiST* [237] disentangles spatial and temporal learning. This framework leverages a pre-trained image recognition model for spatial understanding and a lightweight temporal encoder to capture dynamic changes, offering an efficient and effective solution for video understanding tasks. *RTQ* [299] clusters redundant tokens and refines redundant information. It further extends the method for complicated video understanding by modeling temporal relations using adapters and querying task-specific information. *EVL* [179] presents a framework that directly trains video models on frozen CLIP [238] features (powerful visual representations learned from image-text pairs). Unlike fine-tuning, EVL uses a lightweight Transformer decoder and a local temporal module to efficiently learn spatiotemporal features without retraining the image backbone. *DualPath* [226] employs two distinct paths: a) Spatial path, which encodes individual frame appearance with minimal tuning, using only a few frames at a low frame rate; and b) Temporal path, which captures dynamic relationships by constructing a grid-like frameset from consecutive low-resolution frames. It then introduces light adapters to both paths for inflating image models for videos. *AGAdapter*

[77] proposes two adapter modules: KaAdapter aligns the video-text representation, and PgAdapter employs prompt-tuning to leverage LLMs for captioning. *PaLM2-VAdapter* [319] proposes an adapter module that effectively aligns vision encoders and LLMs using a progressive training strategy, effectively integrating visual information into LLMs. Task-agnostic Compatible Adapter (TaCA) [351] enables seamless integration of new foundation models into existing frameworks without retraining, preserving model strengths through lightweight adapters.

3.2.2 Specialist Models. Adapters also illustrate a wide range of applications for inflating IFMs of specific video tasks. We show some distinguished examples in this section.

Adapters for Text-Video Retrieval. Adapters play a crucial role in text-video retrieval tasks, as demonstrated by various approaches such as PromptSwitch [64], Clip2Video [76], Cross-Modal Adapter [127], AdaCLIP [113], and CrossVTR [59]. *PromptSwitch* [64] introduces a "Prompt Cube" to CLIP's image encoder, capturing global video semantics efficiently, while *CrossVTR* [59] introduces a decoupled video-text cross-attention module to handle spatial and temporal multimodal information separately. *CLIP2Video* [76] simplifies the task into spatial representation and temporal relations, achieving state-of-the-art performance on retrieval benchmarks. Meanwhile, *Cross-Modal Adapter* [127] achieves significant parameter efficiency through adapter-based layers, facilitating realignment of CLIP's feature spaces. *AdaCLIP* [113] addresses the challenge of frame selection and aggregation, offering a tailored system for practical deployment on resource-constrained devices and cloud pipelines.

Adapters for VQA. Tem-Adapter [41] tackles Video Question Answering (VideoQA) challenges by bridging domain gaps in image-based pre-trained models. It introduces visual and textual aligners: the Visual Temporal Aligner predicts future states based on past video and textual cues, while the Textual Semantic Aligner refines textual embeddings using question-answer pairs and video sequences, enabling effective adaptation for VideoQA tasks.

Adapters for Video Action Recognition. While powerful, adapting pre-trained image models for video tasks can be expensive and prone to overfitting. *AIM* [333], *M²-CLIP* [293], *ST-Adapter* [223], and *ZeroI2V* [164] tackles this challenge using parameter-efficient adapter modules. *AIM* [333], *ST-Adapter* [223], and *M²-CLIP* [293] introduces *joint spatio-temporal adapters*, Temporal Enhancement and Difference modeling (*TED-Adapters*), and Spatio-Temporal Adapter (*ST-Adapter*) respectively into a pre-trained CLIP model. Different from these, *ZeroI2V* [164] provides a novel *zero-cost* transfer learning method and proposes a new *spatio-temporal attention* mechanism that captures video dynamics without extra effort.

Adapters for Temporal Action localization (TAL). To address challenges in Zero-shot temporal action detection (TAD), *ZEETAD* [232] introduces two key modules: 1) a dual-localization module pinpointing action-relevant regions and generating proposals using semantic embeddings; 2) a zero-shot proposal classification module using efficiently fine-tuned CLIP [238] models with adapters for better transferability to the video domain.

3.3 Inflation With Prompt-Tuning

Similar to adapters, prompt tuning improves efficiency by only fine-tuning a few additional parameters. These parameters however are incorporated at the input layer (See Fig. 7)

3.3.1 Generalist Models. Our review highlights the increasing use of prompt-tuning with large language models (LLMs) for video understanding. *Jian et al.* [126] propose a *Prompt-Transformer (P-Former)*, training solely on language data to predict optimal prompts for LLMs. This backward-decoupling approach (See Fig 7) significantly boosts performance across various tasks and architectures, making it adaptable and modality-agnostic. *VideoPrompter* [336] enhances zero-shot performance of existing VLMs by leveraging video-specific information. It employs LLMs with video-specific




Fig. 7. Figure shows three different approaches integrating X (can be image/video/audio) modality with LLMs namely: i) **End-to-end** (left) [13, 206]: First aligning the features using 'X→L Connector' and provide them as prompts, ii) **Forward-decoupled Training** (middle) [40, 155]: 'X→L Connector' is trained to extract relevant features, which are then provided directly to LLMs. iii) **Backward-decoupled Training** (right) [126]: First identify a reference frame for LLMs and then align feature using 'X→L Connector'. Image taken from [126]. Best Viewed in color.

prompts to generate detailed descriptions and attributes for each class, enriching their representation beyond just the name. This approach offers plug-and-play compatibility with existing VLMs and consistent performance improvements across various video understanding tasks.

A different approach, *Atemporal Probe (ATP)* [26] leverages pre-trained image-language models to extract a single key frame. This key frame then acts as a prompt for a pre-trained vision encoder. Interestingly, their results show that this approach can achieve strong performance on video tasks like question answering and retrieval, suggesting that some video understanding can be achieved by analyzing a single well-chosen frame.

3.3.2 Specialist Models. This subsection explores the approaches using prompt-tuning to inflate IFMs for specific video tasks.

Prompt Tuning for Retrieval. In text-video retrieval, *VoP* [116] proposes an efficient adaptation method with minimal parameters by introducing lightweight text and video prompts. These prompts guide the model towards relevant information while retaining zero-shot capabilities.

Prompt Tuning for Video Action Recognition. *Vita-CLIP* [307] freezes the pre-trained backbone to retain zero-shot capabilities and introduces learnable prompts on both vision and text sides. These prompts capture video-specific information, enhancing representation capabilities.

Prompt Tuning for VQA. *Q-ViD* [246] provides instruction prompts to *InstructBLIP* [58] for generating video captions, improving VQA. *ViTiS* [71] addresses the challenge of adapting large, pre-trained vision-language models to VideoQA under limited data, preserving generalization and minimizing parameters while empowering efficient task-specific fine-tuning with multimodal prompt learning and a visual mapping network.

3.4 Inflation With Hybrid Approaches

Some approaches either adapt [26, 44] or involve combinations [244, 295] of post-pretraining, adapters, and prompt-tuning to inflate IFMs into ViFMs. We discuss such approaches in this subsection.

3.4.1 Generalist Models. Some methods explore a combination of different inflating approaches for generic video understanding. *PromptCLIP* [130] efficiently adapts pre-trained models by learning prompt vectors instead of handcrafted ones. These capture video information and act as virtual tokens within the text encoder. PromptCLIP further introduces lightweight transformers (adapter) in the network to capture temporal dynamics. *Singularity* [150] consolidates video clips into single frames using a few additional attention layers, it further modifies the prompts in order to model the temporal relationships exist in videos. *COSA* [44] further supports this notion by constructing "pseudo long-form videos" from existing image-text data. This approach randomly combines multiple images, creating a sequence of static scenes with richer contexts and detailed captions. These "pseudo videos" allow powerful IFMs, primarily trained on images, to be repurposed for video tasks without explicit temporal modeling.

3.4.2 Specialist Models. We discuss approaches that combine inflating techniques (detailed in Figure 6) and methods that leverage visual prompting by adapting pre-trained *Segment Anything Model (SAM)* [139] for specific video tasks. **Inflating IFMs for Text-To-Video Retrieval.** CenterCLIP [358], X-Pool [95], and *MEME* [132] presents *clustering-based* approaches for the retrieval task. These approaches bridge the semantic gap between textual queries and video content by grouping similar data points together. *CenterCLIP* [358] identifies the most representative token, *X-Pool* [95] uses text as a condition to guide the aggregation of video tokens, and *MEME* [132] proposes graph patch spreading (GPS) to cluster similar patches together. *ProST* et al. [163] improves the retrieval performance by focusing on fine-grained visual objects (spatial) and interaction (temporal) among them during video-text pretraining and thus inflate IFMs for videos.

Inflating IFMs Video Action Recognition. IFMs are used as basis for multiple video action recognition approaches including: ViFi-CLIP [244], X-CLIP [215], Action-CLIP [294], Wang et al. [295], BIKE [317]. *ViFi-CLIP* [244] first fine-tune CLIP [238] on video data and thus implicitly captures temporal cues without additional modules. It further enhances the performance by learning prompts using a *bridge and prompt* approach in low-data settings. Wang et al. [295] captures motion cues through a two-stream adapter block, enriching video representations without sacrificing CLIP's generalization. Additionally, it generates dynamic, motion-aware prompts that describe actions more effectively, guided by captured motion cues. Finally, a pre-matching step aligns video and text representations before feeding them to CLIP, further boost performance. *BIKE* [317] utilizes a bidirectional knowledge exploration framework (T2V and V2T) from pre-trained IFMs and improves the representation for video recognition.

Adapting SAM [140] for Video Segmentation. Following the success of the SAM [139] for image segmentation, researchers are actively adapting it for video tasks. *SAM-Track* [55] empowers users to interactively segment and track objects through clicks, strokes, or text, while *TAM* [331] achieves high-performance interactive video tracking and segmentation with minimal clicks. For multi-object scenarios, *HQTrack* [368] utilizes SAM for segmentation followed by mask refinement, and *DEVA* [53] incorporates temporal coherency into per-frame SAM segmentation for improved consistency. In the unsupervised realm, *UVOSAM* [355] leverages SAM for video object segmentation without costly annotations. Additionally, *RefSAM* [168] refines SAM for referring video object segmentation (RVOS) by using multi-view information (text, different frames), and *SAM-PT* [240] employs point selection and propagation for zero-shot object tracking and segmentation. These diverse adaptations showcase SAM's potential for various video segmentation tasks, including interactive experiences, leveraging temporal information, and unsupervised learning, marking significant progress in the field.

Table 2. Table presents the ViFMs using video-based pretraining. These methods are divided into three categories based on the pretraining objective as: generative, discriminative, and hybrid (combining both generative and discriminative). The hyperlink in the approach points to the corresponding implementation.

Method	Pretraining data		Pretraining Objectives		Type	Architecture		Venue
	Dataset(s)	Size	Contrastive	Generative		Base		
Bevt [296]	IN-1K [66], K400 [31]	400M	-	MIM, MVM	ED	Video-Swin [188], VQ-VAE [283]	CVPR'22	
ST-MAE [79]	IN-1K [66], K400 [136], K600 [28], K700 [29]	710M	-	MVM	ED	ViT [68]	NeurIPS'22	
VideoMAE [278]	K400 [31], SSv2 [96]	400M	-	MVM	ED	ViT [68]	NeurIPS'22	
MAM ² [263]	K400 [31]	400M	-	MVM	ED	ViT [68], VQ-VAE [283]	arxiv'22	
MG-MAE [114]	SSv2 [96]	400M	-	MVM	ED	ViT [68]	ICCV'23	
AudVis MAE [90]	VGG Sound [42]	0.2M	-	MVM	ED	MAE [105]	ICCV'23	
LAVANDER [162]	WebVid-2M [13], CC3M [258]	5M	-	MLM	JE	Video-Swin [188], BERT-base [137]	CVPR'23	
MMVG [83]	EpicKitchen [60], Flintstones [103], Mugen [104]	0.5M	-	TVC	JE	VQ-VAE [283], CLIP-Tokenizer [238], VideoSWIN [188]	CVPR'23	
MVD [297]	K400 [31]	400M	-	MFEM	DD	ViT [68]	CVPR'23	
VideoMAEv2 [292]	Unlabeled Hybrid	135M	-	MVM	ED	ViT [68]	CVPR'23	
VideoComposer [300]	WebVid-10M [13], LAION-400M [254]	410M	-	GVM	ED	VLDM [109, 261], CLIP-ViT-H [238]	NeurIPS'23	
MATS [118]	K400 [31], SSv2 [96], UCF101 [264], HDMB51 [146], Ego4D [97]	>>400M	-	MIM, MVM	ED	ViT [68]	arxiv'23	
VideoBERT [265]	Web scraping	300k	-	MLM, MVM	JE	BERT [137], Transformer [284]	ICCV'19	
HierVL [8]	Ego4D [97]	3M	VTC	-	Mul-E	Frozen [13], DistillBERT [250]	arxiv'19	
TACT [11]	Synthetic Dataset	180M	TOCC, CT	-	-	VideoCLIP	ICLRW'23	
VFC [208]	SMT [211]	0.5M	VTC, VFC	-	DE	PaLM [56], CLIP-ViT [238]	ICCV'23	
LAVILA [360]	Ego4D [97], HowTo100M [201]	141M	VTC	-	DE	GPT-2 [239]	CVPR'23	
PAXION [306]	ActionBench	0.4M	VTC, DVDM	-	DE	InternVideo, CLIP-ViP, Singularity-temporal	arxiv'23	
ViCLIP [302]	InterVid [302]	234M	VTC	-	DE	ViT-L [68]	arxiv'23	
VideoCLIP [322]	HowTo100M [201]	136M	VTC	-	DE	ViT-L [68], Transformer [284]	EMNLP'21	
UniVL [190]	HowTo100M [201]	136M	VTJ, VTA	CMFM, CMLM, LM	ME	BERT [137], Transformer [284]	arxiv'20	
ALPRO [154]	WebVid-2M [13], CC3M [258]	5M	VTC, VTM, MLM	PEM	ME	TimeSformer [19]	CVPR'22	
HD-VILA [326]	HD-VILA-100M [326]	103M	VTC	MLM	ME	Bert [137]	CVPR'22	
LF-VILA [268]	LF-VILA-8M [268]	8M	VTC, VTM, MLM	MTC	ME	Transformer [284]	NeurIPS'22	
TVLT [274]	HowTo100M [201], YTTemporal180M [347]	316M	VAM	MSM	JE	MAE [105]	NeurIPS'22	
Vimpac [270]	HowTo100M [201]	136M	VCC	MTP	ED	BERT [137], SimCLR [47]	arxiv'22	
SimVTP [195]	WebVid-2M [13]	2M	VTC, VTM	MSM	ED	BERT [137], VideoMAE [278]	arxiv'22	
Violet [81]	YT-Temporal [347], WebVid-2.5M [13], CC-3M [258]	186M	VTM	MLM, MVM	ME	Video-Swin [188], LE [350], VQ-VAE [283]	arxiv'22	
All-in-One [291]	HowTo100M [201], CC3M [258], WebVid-2.5M [13]	110M	VTM	MLM	JE	ViT [284]	CVPR'23	
Hitea [334]	WebVid-2M [13], CC3M [258]	5M	VTC, VTM, MLM, PrefixLM	MTR, CME	ME	MViT-Base [167], BERT-Base [137]	CVPR'23	
Clover [115]	WebVid-2M [13], CC3M [258]	5M	TMA	MLM, MVM	ME	Video-Swin [188], BERT [137]	CVPR'23	
VindLu [52]	WebVid-10M [13], CC3M [258], CC12M [37]	25M	VTC, VTM	MLM, MVM	DE	ViT [68], BERT [137]	CVPR'23	
VioletV2 [82]	WebVid-2M [13], CC3M [258]	5M	VTM	MLM, MVM	ME	Video-Swin [188], LE [350], VQ-VAE [283], DPT-L [243], RAFT-L [277], SWIN-B [187], DALL-E [241], CLIP-ViT-B [238]	CVPR'23	
MuLTI [324]	WebVid-2M [13], CC-3M [258]	5M	VTM, VTC, MLM, MCM		ME	ViT [68], BERT [137]	arxiv'23	

4 VIDEO-BASED MODELS

Video-based models, trained on datasets containing videos, seek to generalize across various video understanding tasks. We classify these models into three primary categories based on their pretraining objectives: generative, discriminative, and hybrid. These categories are detailed in Table 2.

4.1 Generative Pretraining Objective

In this category we consider the foundation models with a generative objective, often mask-reconstruction. The generative objective encompasses MVM, MFM, MIM, and GVM. In mask modeling, applied masking schemes have evolved over time, transitioning from discrete token masking to random token masking, with some exploring even intelligent masking strategies. We classify approaches based their masking-scheme in this section.

Discrete Token Masking. Earlier approaches [263, 270, 296] in masked video modeling are based on the prediction of discrete tokens, where each discrete token corresponds to a visual cube from a video. These discrete tokens are generated using dVAE in VQGAN [72]. *Bevt* [296] jointly reconstructs discrete visual tokens within the image and video domains, facilitating the separation of spatial and temporal modeling. *MAM*² [263] propose an encoder-regressor-decoder network followed by two separate decoders to disentangle spatiotemporal modeling. The spatial and temporal decoders in this case reconstruct discrete mask tokens, and RGB difference respectively.

Random Masking. Due to the limitations imposed by the size of the visual codebook, these methods have been replaced by simpler approaches that directly reconstruct masked visual patches. *ST-MAE* [79] extends the concept of MAE [105] (for the image domain) to videos, where they propose reconstruction by randomly masking 90% of space-time patches as a challenging pretext task for videos. Different from that, *VideoMAE* [278] considers time as a third independent dimension and proposes masking cubes instead of space-time patches. *ST-MAE* [79] also observe that randomly masking 90% of video cubes results in effective representation learning. Building upon the *VideoMAE* [278] framework, *VideoMAEv2* [292] introduces a dual masking strategy that effectively removes cubes from both the encoder and decoder networks, significantly enhancing the model’s performance. Additionally, *VideoMAEv2* [292] expands its capabilities by incorporating data from multiple sources, further increasing its scale and pre-training efficiency. These approaches incorporate random masking, which might not always result in an optimal representation that can generalize across multiple tasks.

Intelligent Masking Schemes. Some approaches [114, 118] propose intelligent masking schemes resulting in an effective representation and reducing the computational complexity of the model. *MATS* [118] introduces motion-aware token selection using a pair of adjacent frames. Additionally, this approach introduces motion-aware adaptive frame sampling to further reduce computational complexity. *MGMAE* [116] introduce motion information while masking using optical flow and thus propose to generate temporally consistent masking/visible volume. Approaches like *MVD* [297] propose improving the representation by predicting the feature maps instead of raw pixel values. *MVD et al.* [297] propose a dual decoder architecture for efficient spatiotemporal modelling, where one decoder predicts the features of a pre-trained image backbone, and the second decoder predicts the features of a pretrained video backbone.

Large Multi-modal Modals (LMMs). Several recent works explore video understanding and generation using large language models (LLMs). *ChatVideo* [288] and *MM-VID* [174] convert videos into text for improved comprehension. *VideoChatGPT* [196] and *VideoChat* [158] enhance video-based conversations by integrating visual encoders with LLMs and instruction tuning. *Valley* [192] creates video assistants using curated instruction datasets and a projection module. *PaLM2-VAdapter* [319] progressively aligns vision and language features using a vision-language adapter module. *VideoDirectorGPT* [172] demonstrates LLMs’ potential in video generation tasks with a unique framework. It employs LLMs to plan video content and guide scene-specific video generation, showcasing the versatility of LLMs in both video understanding and creation.

So far, we discuss unimodal approaches and LMMs in this category. *LAVENDER* [160] and *AudVis MAE* [90] are two multimodal approaches based on generative pretraining objective. *LAVENDER* [160] employs text as additional modality and MLM as training objective, whereas *AudVis MAE* [90] proposed unified encoding of audio-visual modalities.

4.2 Discriminative Pretraining Objective

Multi-modal contrastive large-scale pretraining has emerged as a dominant trend, surpassing mask reconstruction approaches due to its superior ability to generalize models across different domains. This is because multi-modality incorporates information from multiple sources, such as text and vision, leading to richer and more versatile representations. Research [238, 322] shows that text is the most frequent modality used in conjunction with the visual domain for multi-modal contrastive pretraining. These models are often trained using VTA (discriminative) and VTC (discriminative) as a common pretraining objective. We discuss the research using different variants of discriminative objectives in this section.

Simple Approaches. Approaches like *ViClip* [302] and *VideoClip* [322], aim to create a video counterpart to CLIP [238] (Image-Text Contrastive). These methods rely on video-text contrastive learning as their primary objective. Notably, *ViClip* [302] further validates the impact of large and diverse training datasets on the quality of learned representations. However, video data poses a greater challenge compared to simpler image-text pretraining due to the additional temporal dimension inherent in video.

Introducing Temporal Consistency and Action Understanding. While simple video-text pretraining struggles with capturing the flow of time in videos, ViFMs like *TACT* [11], *PAXION* [306], *HierVL* [8] and *VFC* [208] offer promising solutions. *TACT* [11] and *PAXION* [306] focus on improving temporal understanding, with *TACT* enforcing correct event order and *PAXION* leveraging a knowledge patcher and a specific objective. *HierVL* [8], on the other hand, aims for comprehensive understanding by analyzing videos at different scales and summarizing both short clips and entire videos. Finally, Verb-focused Contrastive (VFC) [208] excels at capturing fine-grained action details through challenging contrastive examples and precise verb alignment.

Long-form Video Understanding. Long-form video understanding presents challenges due to the memory requirements and model capacities, with only a few attempts extending existing models for this purpose. *LaViLa* [360] investigates how pre-trained Large Language Models (LLMs) can be utilized. This method turns LLMs into "Narrators" by giving them visual inputs, enabling them to automatically create detailed descriptions of long videos. These descriptions are then used to train a video-language model. In a similar direction, *MovieChat* [262] combines ViFMs with LLMs using a Q-former and a projection layer. *MovieChat* tackles the challenge of processing lengthy videos by introducing a memory management mechanism that reduces complexity and cost while enhancing comprehension.

4.3 Hybrid Pretraining Objective

Hybrid pre-training combines generative tasks (like mask reconstruction) with discriminative tasks (like contrastive loss). By integrating both generative and discriminative objectives, these hybrid approaches aim to enhance the learned representations. We'll delve into an overview of such methodologies in this section.

Simple Approaches. *VIMPAC* [270] is a basic uni-modal approach. It combines a generative task (mask reconstruction) with a contrastive objective (VTC). During contrastive learning, clips from the same video are considered positive pairs, while clips from different videos are considered negative. Conversely, *VideoBERT* [265] represents another straightforward approach, leveraging the robust BERT [137] architecture to accommodate the temporal characteristics of video data.

Advanced Approaches. *UniVL* [190], and *Clover*, [115] takes a more advanced approach. Instead of naively combining objectives, *UniVL* employs stage-by-stage pre-training for both discriminative and generative tasks. Additionally, *UniVL* also innovates in masking by applying a 15% probability of masking the entire text during video generation. These advancements allow *UniVL* to excel in both video understanding and generation tasks. On the other hand, *Clover* employs an additional pre-training objective called Tri-Modal Alignment (TMA) to improve cross-modal understanding. It further leverages "pair-wise ranking loss" to ensure fine-grained discriminative ability.

Recent advancements extend ViFMs beyond basic video understanding tasks. For example, *MMVG* [83] tackles video storytelling by generating stories from textual prompts. It achieves this by treating videos as sequences of tokens, training the model on text-video relationships through an additional Text-to-Video Completion (TVC) objective. *HD-VILA* [326] focuses on versatility by leveraging a diversely sourced dataset (HD-VILA-100M) for pre-training, enhancing performance across different tasks. Finally, *TVLT* [274] explores understanding multimedia content by focusing solely on raw video and audio, eliminating the need for language.

Improving Action Understanding and Temporal Reasoning. Building on the limitations of basic video-text contrastive pre-training, recent advancements with the hybrid pretraining objective also strive to improve temporal understanding in ViFMs. Approaches like *ALPRO* [154] combine contrastive loss with specialized techniques (e.g., Prompting Entity Modeling (PEM)) for finer-grained video analysis. *Hitea* [334] delves deeper, capturing details of individual moments and their connection to text descriptions through methods like Cross-Modal Moment Exploration (CME). *LF-VILA* [268] tackles long-range dependencies and temporal relationships across modalities with its Multimodal Temporal Contrastive (MTC) and Hierarchical Temporal Window Attention (HTWA) mechanisms. These efforts showcase the ongoing push to strengthen ViFMs' ability to grasp the flow of time within videos and extract valuable action knowledge.

Efficient-Effective Approaches. Video Foundation Models (ViFMs) face a trade-off between efficiency and performance. ViFMs like *VIOLET* [81] and *VIOLETv2* [82] prioritize complex end-to-end transformer models (e.g., VideoSWIN [188]) for handling spatiotemporal dynamics, leading to higher computational cost. While *VIOLET* employs discrete token modeling as its pre-training objective, *VIOLETv2* expands upon this by incorporating eight additional pre-text tasks, increasing computational overhead.

To address this challenge, approaches like *All-in-One* [291], *SimVTP* [195] and *MuLTI* [324] address this trade-off with different strategies. *All-in-One* proposes a single, streamlined model that can simultaneously process raw video pixels and text tokens, eliminating separate encoders for better efficiency. It further introduces a "token rolling" operation for effective temporal encoding. *SimVTP* focuses on simplicity by utilizing masked autoencoders with high masking ratios (90% video, 75% text) within a single encoder network. This forces the model to develop robust video-text representations for reconstruction. Finally, *MuLTI* introduces a "MultiWay-Sampler" to condense textual features, enabling efficient computation. It also introduces a "Multiple Choice Modeling" pre-training task, leading to enhanced performance. These advancements exemplify the ongoing effort to create more efficient and effective VL-FMs for video-language tasks.

Optimizing and Evaluating ViFMs. In contrast to methods focused on specific aspects of pre-training, *VindLU* [52] offers a comprehensive roadmap for effective VL-FM pre-training. This work delves into architecture design, fusion techniques, pre-training objectives, data selection, training protocols, and scaling strategies, providing a valuable guide for researchers developing future VL-FMs. Furthermore, *MELTR* [141] presents a methodology for fine-tuning VL-FMs to enhance their generalizability across diverse downstream tasks. This approach addresses the challenge of adapting pre-trained models to new applications. *VideoGLUE* [343] establishes a standardized evaluation protocol for Video

Table 3. Table presents the Universal Foundational Models (UFM) combining multiple modalities other than video and text. These methods are divided into three categories based on the pretraining objective as: generative, discriminative, and hybrid (combining both generative and discriminative). The hyperlink in the approach points to the corresponding implementation.

Method	Dataset(s)	Pretraining data Size	Pretraining Objectives		Type	Architecture Base	Venue
			Contrastive	Generative			
VLM [321]	HowTo100M [201]	1.1M	-	MFM, MLM, MMM	JE	BERT [137]	ACL'21
MaskFeat [309]	IN-21K [66], K400 [136]	400M	-	MFP	ED	MViT [167]	CVPR'22
OmniVL [289]	IN-1K [66], Something-Something V2 [96],	1.4M	-	MDM	JE	BERT [137], TimeFormer [19]	NeurIPS'22
OmniMAE [91]	IN-1K [66], Something-Something V2 [96],	1.4M	-	MDM	JE	ViT [68]	CVPR'23
Video-LaVIT [129]	WebVid-10M [13], CC3M [258], CC12M [37], SBU-Captions [221], BLIP-Capfilt [156], RedPajama [57], Instructional data [180, 196]	103M	-	N(I/M/T)YTG	JE	EVA-CLIP-ViTg [267]	arxiv'24
VideoPoet [142]	Web Scraping	1.25B	-	T2V, T2I, FP, Central inpainting and out-painting, AVCont	MLE	LLM [276]	arxiv'24
VATT [3]	HowTo100M [201], AudioSet [89]	27M	VAC, VTC	-	MLE	Tranformers [284]	NeurIPS'21
VITO [227]	K400 [31]	400M	AGC	-	ED	ViT [68], VQ-VAE [283]	arxiv'22
GLEE [315]	Object365 [257], OpenImages [149], COCO [176], LVIS [102], BDD [337], YTVIS19 [332], YTVIS21 [217], OVIS [235], RefCOCO [340], RefCOCO+ [340], RefCOCOg [213], VisualGenome [144], RVOS [?], SA1B [140], GRIT [229]	5M	DIS, GRS, MOT, VIS, VPS	-	MLE	ResNet-50 [106], Swin-L [187], EVA-02-L [78]	arxiv'23
LanguageBind [367]	VIDAL-10M	10M	MMC	-	MLE	Open-CLIP [120]	arxiv'23
X ² VLM [348]	COCO [176], Visual-Gnome [144], SBU Captions [221], CC [258], Object365 [257], OpenImages [149], WebVid-2.5M [13], HowTo100M [201], Yt-Temporal [347]	28M	MGA, MGL	-	ME	Transformer [284]	arxiv'23
MERLOT [346]	YT-Temporal-180M [347]	6M	FTM, TR	MLM	DE	ViT [284], RoBERTa [185]	NeurIPS'21
InternVideo [305]	Kinetics-400 [136], WebVid-2M [13], WebVid-10M [13], HowTo100M [201], AVA [99], Something-Something V2 [96], Kinetics-710 [29]	12M	VTC	MVM	DE	ViT [284], Uni-formerV2 [159]	arxiv'22
ViC-MAE [107]	MiT [209], K400 [31]	1.2M	ITC	MIM	DE	ViT [68]	arxiv'22
Perciever-VL [273]	CC3M [258], WebVid-2.5M [13]	5M	VTM	MLM	JE	ViT [68], BERT [137]	WACV'23
Smaug [178]	COCO [176], Visual-Gnome [144], SBU Captions [221], CC3M [258], CC12M [37], WebVid-2M [13]	17M	VTM, VTC	MVM, MLM	ME	ViT [68]	CVPR'23
CAV-MAE [94]	AudioSet2M [89]	2M	VAC	MSM	ME	ViT [284]	arxiv'23
VAST [45]	VAST-27M [45]	27M	OM-VCC, OM-VCM	OM-VCG	ME	BERT [137], BEAT [46], EVAClip-ViT-G [267]	NeurIPS'23
mPLUG-2 [323]	MS-COCO [176], Visual Genome [144], CC12M [258], SBU Captions [222], WebVid-2M [13], WikiCorpus [137], Crawled data	30M	VTC, VTM	MLM	ME	BERT [137], Transformer [284]	arxiv'23
VALOR [43]	VALOR-1M [258], WebVid-2.5M [13], CC14M [258], HD_VILA_100M [326]	119M	MGA	MGC	MLE	BERT [137], CLIP [238], VideoSwin [188], AST [93]	arxiv'23
InternVideo2 [303]	K-Mash [303], MVID [303], WebVid [13], InternVid [304]	6B	Con, VTC	MLM	MLE	ViT [68], BERT [137], BEATs [46]	arxiv'24
VideoPrism [357]	Anonymous Corpus [357]	1.3B	VTC	MVM, distillation	JE	ViT [68], ViViT [7]	arxiv'24

Foundation Models (ViFMs). This benchmark dataset and suite of tasks enables researchers to compare the performance of different ViFMs. Finally, *Video-Bench* [216] provides a comprehensive benchmark and toolkit, which aims at evaluating the true potential of Video-LMMs towards achieving human-like comprehension and decision-making.

5 UNIVERSAL FOUNDATIONAL MODELS (UFMS)

Multi-modal foundation models [178, 304, 323] are aiming towards generalization by integrating additional modalities like audio and sensor data, apart from visual modalities. Table 3 contains a list of such approaches. We classify these approaches based on their pretraining objective (generative, discriminative, hybrid) in this section.

5.1 Generative Pretraining Objective

Similar to video-based ViFMs, UFMs primarily utilize mask reconstruction as a key pretraining objective for generative pretraining. A significant trend in this domain is moving towards unifying architectures and datasets. *VLM* [321] paves the way with a single, streamlined encoder that handles both video and text input in a task-agnostic manner. This simplified architecture, fueled by innovative masking techniques like Masked Modality Model (MMM), fosters robust cross-modal understanding without sacrificing individual modality capabilities. *OmniVL* [289] takes unification a step further by proposing a single architecture for both image-language and video-language tasks. This is achieved by first unifying the pre-training datasets and then employing a single encoder for the visual (image and video) domain. Novel contrastive and masked language modeling objectives further support this approach. Consequently, *OmniVL* excels in both visual-only tasks like image classification and cross-modal tasks like video question answering. *OmniMAE* [91] utilizes masked autoencoding to train a single encoder-decoder network for both images and videos. This approach could be easily generalized to other visual modalities such as thermal images and 3D point clouds. Noteworthy is *OmniVORE* [92], which combines various visual modalities in a similar manner but for supervised classification tasks. A different approach, *MaskFeat* [309] focuses on redefining the pretext task as masked feature prediction (MFP) to design a unified architecture for both image and video understanding, where features in this case are HOG (Histogram of Oriented Gradients).

LLM-based Approaches. Recent advancements have integrated multiple modalities, including image, video, text, and audio, into Large Language Models (LLMs), leading to the development of general-purpose large multimodal models (LMMs). Some approaches focus on combining different visual modalities such as image and video. *VideoLaVIT* [129] breaks down videos into keyframes and temporal motions, enabling unified pre-training across diverse modalities, including images and videos. Moving towards image-video understanding, *VideoLLaVA* [169] aligns visual representations from images and videos before projecting them onto the LLM, refining them through instruction tuning. Additionally, *Chat-UniVi* [128] proposes a unified approach for image and video understanding using dynamic visual tokens and a multi-scale architecture to efficiently represent and perceive semantics and details simultaneously.

On the other hand, some approaches focus on integrating the audio modality along with the visual modalities into LLMs. *Video-LLaMA* [352] pioneers the integration of visual and auditory information through separate Q-formers and pre-trained encoders. *FAVOR* [266] tailors a framework for audio-visual LLMs, incorporating a "Causal Q-Former" that considers causal relationships between video frames. Meanwhile,

The trend is now slightly moving towards combining all modalities, including image, video, audio, and text, using a single foundational model. *Macaw-LLM* [194] directly integrates visual, audio, and textual features, facilitating a unified understanding of videos. Conversely, *VideoPoet* [142] utilizes a decoder-only transformer architecture similar to LLMs for generating high-quality videos with matching audio based on textual input, particularly excelling in "zero-shot" scenarios. Advancements continue towards audio-visual grounding, with *PG-Video-LLaVa* [212] enhancing LLMs for video comprehension and object grounding by introducing pixel grounding capabilities through object tracking and audio transcription.

Large-scale Models for Generative Tasks. With the advent of large-scale pretraining, two main lines of video generation approaches have emerged: autoregressive transformers [25, 110, 142, 172, 300, 312, 344] and diffusion models [16, 20, 35, 49, 85, 108, 260]. Autoregressive transformers [135] generate sequences (like text or video) one element at a time, considering previously generated elements to predict the next. Some autoregressive approaches, like SORA [25], VideoPoet [142], and VideoDirectorGPT [172], demonstrate the ability to generalize across multiple video tasks (e.g., VideoQA, Video Generation) by incorporating autoregressive language models into their architectures. Diffusion models [109, 261], on the other hand, gradually add noise to a video sample and then learn to reverse the process to synthesize videos from this noise. Large-scale diffusion models achieve impressive results on specific video generation tasks such as video editing [35, 207, 234], video synthesis [21, 48], and text-to-video generation [20, 85, 260].

5.2 Discriminative Pretraining Objective

Universal models aim to achieve comprehensive understanding by processing different modalities (e.g., image, video, audio, text) together. *VITO* specifically targets the fusion of image and video modalities through attention-guided contrastive learning (AGC) and harnesses a large-scale video dataset known as *VideoNet*, akin to ImageNet but tailored for videos. Similarly, *VATT* [3] adopts a strategy of projecting and aligning different modalities—audio, video, and text—using a cross-modal encoder to facilitate multi-modal comprehension. In contrast, *X²VLM* [348] proposes a modular architecture that offers the flexibility to integrate additional modalities seamlessly without necessitating the retraining of the entire framework. Meanwhile, *LanguageBind* [367] addresses the expansion of modalities by leveraging language as a central anchor. It employs a pre-trained video-language model, preserving its language encoder while training new encoders for supplementary modalities like audio or depth through contrastive learning with a *multi-modal contrastive (MMC)* objective. This process aligns all modalities within a shared feature space, enhancing the model’s overall understanding. Notably, for object-centric video tasks, existing ViFMs may not be suitable. Recently, the introduction of GLEE [315], an object-centric foundation model, extends the scope of research in ViFMs for video tasks by incorporating visual prompts alongside vision-text input.

5.3 Hybrid Pretraining Objective

While generative pre-training objectives like masked modeling enhance the spatio-temporal understanding of videos, multi-modal contrastive learning improves the semantic understanding. Hybrid approaches aim to achieve the best of both worlds by combining these techniques during pre-training. *MERLOT* [346] exemplifies this by employing Frame-Transcript Matching (FTM) and Temporal Reordering (TR) to align video frames with their captions, alongside Masked Language Modeling (MLM) for deeper language grasp. *InternVideo* [305] takes a similar approach, leveraging Masked Video Modeling (MVM) to capture video actions and Multimodal Contrastive Learning (VLC) to create a shared semantic space for video and language. It further strengthens this representation with supervised action classification and cross-modal attention. Finally, *ViC-MAE* [107] utilizes Masked Autoencoders (MAEs) to capture local features in video patches for fine-grained understanding. It then employs contrastive learning and pooling across video frames to extract global features representing the entire video.

Efficient Approaches. Efficiency in pre-training video foundation models (ViFMs) is critical due to their computational expensiveness, especially with multiple or hybrid objectives. To tackle this challenge, researcher incorporates specialized attention mechanisms and strategies. For instance, *Perceiver-VL* [273] utilizes iterative latent attention, a technique that bypasses the computational bottleneck of standard self-attention in transformers, leading to significant efficiency gains. Additionally, *Smaug* [178] leverages masked autoencoders (MAEs) for efficient pre-training, masking both visual and

textual inputs to reduce costs and improve cross-modal alignment. It further employs a space-time token sparsification module to strategically select informative regions and frames, minimizing computational demands.

Effective Approaches. Recent advancements have pushed the boundaries of ViFMs by incorporating multiple modalities beyond just video. *VAST* [45] pioneers an "omni-modal symphony" by incorporating vision, audio, subtitles, and text, leveraging the VAST-27M dataset for comprehensive multimodal training. Similarly, *CAV-MAE* [94] extends the MAE paradigm to video, introducing audio reconstruction during pretraining and integrating both masked modeling and contrastive objectives for enhanced comprehension. Building on prior work, *InterVideo2* [303] introduces the audio modality and a progressive training approach to generalize across multiple video and audio interaction tasks. Pushing the boundaries of multimodal learning, *VALOR* [43] proposes vision-audio-language omni-perception models with discriminative and generative pretraining tasks, facilitating cross-modal connections and empowering the model for diverse tasks like retrieval and captioning. Meanwhile, *VideoPrism* [357] adopts a two-stage training process, refining spatio-temporal representations with video-text data and employing techniques like global-local distillation, yielding versatile representations for varied video understanding tasks.

Modular architectures, exemplified by *X²VLM* [348] and *mPLUG-2* [323], further enhance ViFM flexibility, with separate encoders for each modality and shared attention and contrastive learning modules, enabling tailored models for specific tasks and improved transferability across domains. This modular approach fosters collaboration while addressing the evolving needs of multimodal understanding in ViFMs.

6 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We compare state-of-the-art performance on six video understanding tasks: action recognition, zero-shot and open-vocabulary action recognition, text-to-video retrieval, video question answering, video captioning, and text-to-video generation (found in Tables 4, 5, 8, 6, and 9). Each table categorizes models as either generalist — capable of handling multiple tasks (further subdivided into image-based, video-only, and unified image-video types, as discussed in previous sections), or specialist — excelling at a single task.

6.1 Video Content Understanding

This section evaluates how well state-of-the-art ViFMs handle tasks involving video analysis and understanding. We compare their performance on video action recognition, multi-modal action recognition (including zero-shot and open vocabulary settings), spatio-temporal action localization, and text-to-video retrieval tasks.

6.1.1 Video Action Recognition. While state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance in video action recognition varies across datasets as shown in Table 4, highlighting the strengths of different model types, universal foundational models (UFM) like InternVideo [305] consistently achieve top-1 accuracy across K400 [136], HMDB51 [146], and SSv2 [96] datasets. On K400 [136], it surpasses UMT-L [160] (image-based ViFM) in top-1 accuracy, while UMT-L [160] excels in top-5. Similarly, InternVideo [305] outperforms All-in-one [291] (video-only) in top-1 accuracy on HMDB51 [146], while All-in-one [291] takes the top-5 spot. Notably, VideoCoCa [329] (image-based ViFM) dominates both top-1 and top-5 accuracy on UCF101 [264], showcasing the diverse capabilities of various foundation models. Finally, on SSv2 [96], InternVideo [305] retains its top-1 dominance, while VideoMAEv2-g [292] (video-only) emerges as the top-5 performer. This diverse landscape underscores the valuable contributions of different foundation model types (unified, image-based, and video-only) within video action recognition, with each demonstrating strengths depending on the specific task and evaluation metric.

Table 4. Comparing the finetuned performance of state-of-the-art (SOTA) generalist and specialist models for **video action recognition** on K400 [136], HMDB51 [146], UCF101 [264], and Ssv2 [96] datasets. The highlighted entries indicate the best performing methods in both fine-tuned and zero-shot settings.

	Method	Arch. Type	K400 [136]		HMDB51 [146]		UCF101 [264]		SSv2 [96]	
			Top-1	Top-5	Top-1	Top-5	Top-1	Top-5	Top-1	Top-5
Fine-Tune										
Generalist	VideoCoca [329]	Enc-Dec	72.0	90.5	58.7	84.5	86.6	98.4	-	-
	EVL [179]	Dual-Enc	82.9	-	-	-	-	-	61.7	-
	DualPath [226]	Dual-Enc	85.4	97.1	-	-	-	-	70.3	92.9
	UMT-B [160]	Dual-Enc	87.4	97.5	-	-	-	-	70.8	92.6
	UMT-L [160]	Dual-Enc	90.6	98.7	-	-	-	-	74.7	94.7
	All-in-One [291]	Joint-Enc	53.2	83.5	55.2	89.1	84.1	95.7	-	-
	BEVT [296]	Enc-Dec	80.6	-	-	-	-	-	70.6	-
	MAM ² [263]	Enc-R-Dec	85.3	96.7	-	-	-	-	71.3	93.1
	MG-MAE [114]	Enc-Dec	81.8	95.0	-	-	-	-	72.3	93.5
	ST-MAE [79]	Enc-Dec	81.3	94.9	-	-	-	-	72.1	93.9
	VATT [3]	Joint-Enc	79.9	94.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
	VideoMAE-B [278]	Enc-Dec	81.5	95.1	-	-	-	-	70.8	92.4
	VideoMAE-H [278]	Enc-Dec	86.1	97.3	-	-	-	-	75.4	95.2
	VideoMAEv2-H [292]	Enc-Dec	88.6	97.9	-	-	-	-	76.8	95.8
	VideoMAEv2-g [292]	Enc-Dec	90.0	98.4	-	-	-	-	77.0	95.9
	VIMPAC [270]	Enc-Only	77.4	-	-	-	-	-	68.1	-
	InternVideo [305]	Dual-Enc	91.1	-	89.3	-	-	-	77.2	-
	mPLUG-2 [323]	Mix-Enc	87.1	97.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MaskFeat-S [309]	Enc-Dec	82.2	95.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
	MaskFeat-L [309]	Enc-Dec	86.4	97.1	-	-	-	-	74.4	94.6
OmniMAE [91]	Joint-Enc	84.0	-	-	-	-	-	69.5	-	
OmniVL [289]	Joint-Enc	79.1	94.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	
VideoPrism-B [357]	Joint-Enc	84.2	-	-	-	-	63.6	-	-	
VideoPrism-g [357]	Joint-Enc	87.2	-	-	-	-	-	68.5	-	
Specialist	AIM [333]	Dual-Enc	84.7	96.7	-	-	-	-	69.1	92.2
	ActionCLIP [294]	Dual-Enc	83.8	97.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
	BIKE [316]	Dual-Enc	88.6	98.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Frozen [13]	Dual-Enc	50.5	80.7	54.3	88.0	81.3	94.3	-	-
	MIL-NCE [200]	Dual-Enc	-	-	53.1	87.2	82.7	-	-	-
	M ² -CLIP [293]	Dual-Enc	84.1	96.8	-	-	-	-	69.1	91.8
	ST-Adapter [223]	Dual-Enc	82.7	96.2	-	-	-	-	69.5	92.6
	Vita-CLIP [308]	Dual-Enc	82.9	96.3	-	-	-	-	48.7	-
	X-CLIP [215]	Dual-Enc	87.7	97.4	-	-	-	-	-	-

6.1.2 *Zero-shot and Open-vocabulary Action Recognition.* Table 5 compares Top-1 accuracy of ViFMs on zero-shot and harmonic-mean (HM) accuracy on base-to-novel (open-vocabulary) action recognition tasks. Most approaches report zero-shot results smaller size datasets like HMDB51 [146] and UCF101 [264]. The results show that IMP [2] (a UFM) integrates multiple modalities (text, image, video, and audio) via a unified encoder performs best on both datasets. Harmonic mean in case of base-novel generalization is computed by taking ahrmonic mean of accuracy of based classes and novel classes. The results shows that froster outperforms on K400 and UCF101 datasets whereas EZ-Clip (image-based) outperforms on JHMDB and Ssv2 datasets.

Table 5. Comparing the zero-shot and base-to-novel generalization performance of SOTA ViFMs for video action recognition on K400 [136], HMDB51 [146], UCF101 [264], and SSv2 [96] datasets. The highlighted entries indicate the best performing methods in both zero-shot and base-to-novel generalization settings.

Method	Arch. Type	HMDB51 Top-1	UCF101 Top-1	K400 HM	HMDB51 HM	UCF101 HM	SSv2 HM
		Zero-Shot		Base-To-Novel			
ActionCLIP [294]	Dual-Encoder	40.8	58.3	52.6	48.5	70.7	11.5
AIM [333]	Dual-Encoder	-	-	68.0	57.1	82.6	8.2
BIKE [316]	Dual-Encoder	52.8	80.8	-	-	-	-
EVA-CLIP [267]	Dual-Encoder	-	76.8	-	-	-	-
EZ-CLIP [1]	Dual-Encoder	55.2	82.6	66.3	66.3	85.4	14.8
FitCLIP [33]	Dual-Encoder	-	73.3	-	-	-	-
Froster [117]	Dual-Encoder	-	-	70.4	65.1	87.0	14.6
IMP [2]	Multi-Encoder	59.1	91.5	-	-	-	-
LSS [242]	Dual-Encoder	51.4	74.2	-	-	-	-
M ² -CLIP [293]	Dual-Encoder	47.1	78.7	-	-	-	-
MAXI [177]	Dual-Encoder	52.3	78.2	-	-	-	-
MOV [236]	Dual-Encoder	57.8	80.9	-	-	-	-
PromptCLIP [131]	Dual-Encoder	-	66.6	-	-	-	-
St-Adapter [223]	Dual-Encoder	-	-	67.3	55.9	80.9	8.8
ViFi-CLIP [244]	Dual-Encoder	51.3	76.8	67.9	61.9	78.3	13.9
Vita-CLIP [308]	Dual-Encoder	48.6	75.0	-	-	-	-
X-CLIP [215]	Dual-Encoder	44.6	72.0	64.0	55.0	71.2	7.4

Both zero-shot and base-to-novel action recognition requires video-text understanding. The low performance in most cases (except UCF101 dataset) indicate that multi-modal action recognition has a huge scope for improvement in performance. Especially SSv2 dataset, where the actions are more complicated (e.g. opening/closing doors).

Discussion. Overall, while ViFMs achieve very good fine-tuned performance on large datasets like Kinetics400 and Something-Something V2 (SSv2), limitations arise when dealing with smaller datasets like HMDB51 and UCF101. The significant size disparity makes fine-tuning large-scale models on these datasets challenging, resulting in a scarcity of reported results. Additionally, the zero-shot and base-to-novel performance on across most benchmarks leaves significant room for improvement. Techniques for constructing better representational spaces capable of capturing the crucial spatio-temporal context and vision-language semantics within videos are necessary for further progress.

Furthermore, only a few foundation models, like LaViLa [268] and Avion [359], are currently designed for action recognition on datasets like EpicKitchen [60] and Ego-4D [97]. These datasets pose a unique challenge due to their complexity. They involve longer videos and are captured from an egocentric perspective (first-person view), which significantly differs from the typical third-person perspective videos used during pre-training. Even highly generic foundation models like VideoPrism [357] struggle to adapt to this view translation, highlighting the need for models specifically designed to handle such complexities.

6.1.3 Retrieval. Table 6 compares state-of-the-art (SOTA) models for text-to-video retrieval, revealing a key insight: generalist models consistently outperform specialist models across diverse datasets (MSR-VTT [325], DiDeMo [6], and LSMDC [245]) and settings (fine-tuned and zero-shot).

Delving deeper, unified models that incorporate not just video and text, but potentially audio modalities as well, seem to be achieving superior performance across various datasets. For instance, VAST excels on MSR-VTT and DiDeMo benchmarks, while mPlug-2 (focusing on unified image-video) dominates on LSMDC under fine-tuned settings.

Table 6. Comparing the fine-tuned and zero-shot performance of state-of-the-art (SOTA) generalist and specialist models for **text-to-video retrieval** tasks on MSR-VTT [325], DiDeMo [6], and LSMDC [245] dataset. The highlighted indicate the best performing methods in both fine-tuned and zero-shot settings.

	Method	Arch. Type	MSR-VTT [325]			DiDeMo [6]			LSMDC [245]			
			R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	
Fine-Tune												
Generalist	PromptCLIP [131]	Dual-Enc	36.5	64.6	-	36.1	64.8	-	13.4	29.5	-	
	RTQ [299]	Dual-Enc	53.4	76.1	84.4	57.6	84.1	89.8	-	-	-	
	Singularity [150]	Dual-Enc	36.8	65.9	75.5	47.4	75.2	84.0	-	-	-	
	VideoCoca [329]	Enc-Dec	34.3	57.8	67.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	UMT-B [160]	Dual-Enc	51.0	76.5	84.2	61.6	86.8	91.5	32.7	54.7	63.4	
	UMT-L [160]	Dual-Enc	58.8	81.0	87.1	70.4	90.1	93.5	43.0	65.5	73.0	
	All-in-One [291]	Joint-Enc	37.9	68.1	77.1	32.7	61.4	73.5	-	-	-	
	ALPRO [154]	Mix-Enc	33.9	60.7	73.2	35.9	67.5	78.8	-	-	-	
	Clover [115]	Mix-Enc	40.5	69.8	79.4	50.1	76.7	85.6	24.8	44.0	54.5	
	HD-VILA [326]	Mix-Enc	35.6	65.3	78.0	28.8	57.4	69.1	17.4	34.1	44.1	
	Hitea [334]	Mix-Enc	44.4	69.3	78.9	51.8	79.1	85.3	27.1	46.2	54.5	
	LAVANDER [162]	Joint-Enc	37.8	63.8	75.0	47.4	74.7	82.4	22.2	43.8	53.5	
	SimVTP [195]	Enc-Dec	53.6	81.9	90.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Smaug [178]	Mix-Enc	44.0	70.4	78.8	55.6	80.8	88.4	-	-	-	
	VideoCLIP [322]	Dual-Enc	30.9	55.4	66.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	VindLU-L [52]	Dual-Enc	48.8	72.4	82.2	59.8	86.6	91.5	-	-	-	
	VIOLET [81]	Mix-Enc	34.5	63.0	73.4	32.6	62.8	74.7	16.1	36.6	41.2	
	InternVideo [305]	Dual-Enc	55.2	79.6	87.5	57.9	82.4	88.9	34.0	53.7	62.9	
	mPLUG-2 [323]	Mix-Enc	53.1	77.6	84.7	56.4	79.1	85.2	34.4	55.2	65.1	
	OmniVL [289]	Dual-Enc	47.8	74.2	83.8	52.4	79.5	85.4	-	-	-	
X ² VLM [348]	Mix-Enc	49.6	76.7	84.2	-	-	-	-	-	-		
VALOR [43]	Multi-Enc	54.4	79.8	87.6	57.6	83.3	88.8	31.8	52.8	62.4		
VAST [45]	Mixed-Enc	63.9	84.3	89.6	72.0	89.0	91.4	-	-	-		
Specialist	CAMoE [54]	Dual-Enc	47.3	74.2	84.5	43.8	71.4	79.9	25.9	46.1	53.7	
	Clip4Clip [191]	Dual-Enc	42.1	71.9	81.4	43.4	70.2	80.6	21.6	41.8	49.8	
	CrossTVR [59]	Mix-Enc	54.0	77.5	85.3	55.0	77.6	-	27.7	48.5	-	
	Frozen [13]	Dual-Enc	32.5	61.5	71.2	31.0	59.8	72.4	15.0	30.8	39.8	
	MCQ [86]	Dual-Enc	37.6	64.8	75.1	37.0	62.2	73.9	17.9	35.4	44.5	
	MILES [87]	Dual-Enc	37.7	63.6	73.8	36.6	63.9	74.0	17.8	35.6	44.1	
	ProST [163]	Dual-Enc	46.9	73.3	82.9	47.5	75.5	84.4	26.3	46.1	55.2	
	OA-Trans [290]	Dual-Enc	35.8	63.4	76.5	34.8	64.4	75.1	18.2	34.3	43.7	
	QB-Norm [23]	-	47.2	73.0	83.0	43.3	71.4	80.8	22.4	40.1	49.5	
	TMVM [170]	Dual-Enc	36.2	64.2	75.7	36.5	64.9	75.4	17.8	37.1	45.9	
	X-CLIP [215]	Dual-Enc	46.1	73.0	83.1	45.2	74.0	-	23.3	43.0	-	
	Zero-Shot											
	Mix	MCQ [86]	Dual-Enc	26.0	46.4	56.4	25.6	50.6	61.1	12.2	25.9	32.2
MILES [87]		Dual-Enc	26.1	47.2	56.9	27.2	50.3	63.6	11.1	24.7	30.6	
OA-Trans [290]		Dual-Enc	23.4	47.5	55.6	23.5	50.4	59.8	-	-	-	
UMT-B		Dual-Enc	35.2	57.8	66.0	41.2	65.4	74.9	19.1	33.4	42.2	
UMT-L		Dual-Enc	40.7	63.4	71.8	48.6	72.9	79.0	24.9	41.7	51.8	
FitCLIP [33]		Dual-Enc	33.8	59.8	69.4	28.5	53.7	64.0	-	-	-	
Frozen [13]		Dual-Enc	18.7	39.6	51.6	21.1	46.0	56.2	9.3	22.0	30.1	
ALPRO [154]		Mix-Enc	24.1	44.7	55.4	23.8	47.3	57.9	-	-	-	
Clover [115]		Mix-Enc	26.4	49.5	60.0	29.5	55.2	66.3	14.7	29.2	38.2	
VideoCLIP [322]		Dual-Enc	10.4	22.2	30.0	16.6	46.9	-	-	-	-	
UniVL [190]		Mix-Enc	21.2	49.6	63.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	
VIOLET [81]		Mix-Enc	25.9	49.5	59.7	23.5	49.8	59.8	-	-	-	
InternVideo [305]		Mix-Enc	40.0	65.3	74.1	31.5	57.6	68.2	17.6	32.4	40.2	
OmniVL [289]		Dual-Enc	34.6	58.4	66.6	33.3	58.7	68.5	-	-	-	
VAST [45]		Mixed-Enc	49.3	68.3	73.9	55.5	74.3	79.6	-	-	-	

Interestingly, when looking at zero-shot results, VAST remains the leader on MSR-VTT and DiDeMo, whereas unmasked teacher models, built by inflating image models, perform best on LSMDC. This suggests that datasets like LSMDC, containing movie descriptions, benefit from the strong spatio-temporal understanding provided by unmasked teacher models employing the MDM objective.

Overall, the findings highlight the general promise of unified image-video approaches in video understanding tasks, as evidenced by their consistent performance across various benchmarks. InternVideo’s [305] exceptional performance further emphasizes the potential of well-designed generalist models for tackling diverse video understanding challenges. **Discussion.** While ViFMs have achieved significant progress in recognition tasks, text-to-video retrieval remains a challenging area. This task inherently requires effective multi-modal architectures that can capture the interaction between video content and textual descriptions. While standard multi-modal setups can enhance semantic understanding within the video domain, aligning video content with textual descriptions presents a significant hurdle. The challenge lies in bridging the gap between complex structures present in videos (including spatio-temporal aspects) and simple structures of language.

As previously discussed, masked video modeling techniques like those employed in VideoMAE [278], ST-MAE [79] can significantly improve a model’s spatio-temporal understanding of videos. InternVideo takes this a step further by combining masked video modeling with a multi-modal contrastive objective using cross-model attention. This combined approach allows InternVideo to outperform most other approaches on text-to-video retrieval tasks by a substantial margin. However, despite this success, there’s still significant room for improvement in overall retrieval performance. We infer that ViFMs should not only focus on advanced techniques for modeling causal behavior and temporal reasoning within videos, but also prioritize effective alignment between such complex video components and their corresponding textual descriptions. This will lead to improved video-language interaction and ultimately enhance retrieval performance.

6.1.4 Spatio-temporal Video Understanding. Table 7 compares the performance of various foundation models on two action localization tasks: Temporal Action Localization (TAL) and Spatio-temporal Action Localization (STAL). The TAL evaluation utilizes the ActivityNet [27] and THUMOS14 [119] datasets, while the STAL evaluation employs the AVA [99] and AVA-Kinetics [153] datasets. As evident from the table, InternVideo [304] emerges as the clear leader, achieving the best performance across all tasks.

This observation highlights the scarcity of ViFMs specifically designed for action localization tasks. Notably, all existing approaches in Table 7 leverage masked data modelling (MDM) (Generative Objective) during pre-training. Specifically, MaskFeat [309], ST-MAE [79], and VideoMAE [278] are unimodal approaches built only upon mask modelling. Conversely, UMT [160], InternVideo [304], and VideoPrism [357] combine both mask modelling (generative objective) and video-text contrastive learning (discriminative objective) for improved performance.

Discussion. The dominance of MDM in pre-training the ViFMs presented in Table 7 highlights its effectiveness in modeling spatio-temporal interactions within videos. This capability is crucial for action localization tasks, allowing video-only models to achieve good performance. However, video-only models often struggle with capturing the semantic aspects of actions. Here, additional modalities like text can provide valuable semantic cues. While video-text interaction improves performance, it may still lack specific action knowledge as noted by Wang *et al.* [306]. Therefore, effectively combining generative and discriminative objectives, such as mask modelling and video-text contrastive learning, is crucial for achieving a comprehensive understanding of motion, temporality, and semantics within a video.

While the presented ViFMs demonstrate strong performance, it’s important to acknowledge the existence of additional action localization datasets like UCF24 [264] and JHMDB [146]. Our observations suggest that these existing ViFMs are not being evaluated on these benchmark datasets. We hypothesize that the smaller scale of these datasets may limit the effectiveness of fine-tuning large-scale models. Datasets like UCF-MAMA[204], VIRAT[62] are high resolution, contain multiple actors and actions happening at the *same* time : benchmarking existing models on those should give a

Table 7. Comparing the fine-tuned performance of state-of-the-art (SOTA) Vi-FMs on ActivityNet [27] for Temporal Action Localization (TAL) and AVA [99] and AVA-Kinetics [153] for Spatio-temporal action localization (STAL). The highlighted entries indicate the best performing methods.

Method	TAL		STAL	
	ActivityNet	THUMOS14	AVA	AVA-Kinetics
MaskFeat-L [309]	-	-	37.8	-
ST-MAE-L [79]	-	-	37.3	-
VideoMAE-L [278]	-	-	39.3	-
VideoMAEv2 [292]	-	69.6	42.6	43.9
UMT-B [160]	-	-	33.5	-
UMT-L [160]	-	-	39.8	-
InternVideo [302]	39.0	71.6	41.0	42.5
VideoPrism-B [357]	36.6	-	30.6	31.8
VideoPrism-g [357]	37.8	-	36.2	37.3

reasonable estimate of their ability to understand the arrow of time. Future research could explore strategies to adapt these models for optimal performance on diverse action localization tasks and datasets.

This subsection highlights that while our models achieve good performance on various action recognition benchmarks, action localization remains a significant challenge. Action localization involves recognizing action class as well as predicting a box around an actor. Recognition step presents a significant challenge since action-prediction is a higher level concept, and not simple perceptual recognition. Therefore, quantitative results on action-detection are observed to be lower in practice. Although unimodal models like VideoMAE v2 utilize masked data modeling (MDM) to capture spatio-temporal information, incorporating vision-language understanding can further improve performance. This is because multimodal approaches equip ViFMs with additional semantic understanding, leading to more robust action localization. Furthermore, such multimodal foundation models demonstrate the potential for extending action recognition towards open-vocabulary tasks, as evidenced by recent works [38, 328].

6.2 Descriptive Understanding Tasks

This section focuses on evaluating how well state-of-the-art ViFMs perform on tasks that rely on understanding video content through text descriptions. We compare their performance on Video Question Answering (VideoQA) and Video Captioning tasks.

6.2.1 Video Question Answering (VideoQA). Table 8 (Left column) compares the performance of different models on VideoQA (MSR-VTT [341], LSMDC [279], and MSVD [320] datasets) task. For VideoQA, different models are better depending on the type of question. LAVENDER [162] (a video-based ViFM) does better on multiple-choice (MC) and Fill-in-Blank (FiB) questions on both MSR-VTT [341] and LSMDC [279] datasets. On the other hand, Video-LLaVa [169] (a Large Multi-modal Model) is better at answering open-ended questions on both MSRVT [341] and MSVD [320] benchmarks.

We can infer from the table that video-based models like LAVENDER [162] excel at multiple-choice (MC) and fill-in-the-blank (FiB) questions. This is likely because these tasks require strong cross-modal understanding, which LAVENDER achieves by encoding both vision and text information within a single joint encoder. This allows the model to learn relationships between the modalities from the very beginning. Additionally, its Masked Language Modeling (MLM) pre-training objective closely resembles the FiB setting, further boosting performance. However, open-ended

Table 8. Comparing the fine-tuned performance of state-of-the-art (SOTA) generalist and specialist models for **VideoQA** (accuracy) on MSRVT [341], LSMDC [279], and MSVD [320] datasets, and **Zero-shot Video Captioning** (CIDEr) tasks on MSRVT [325], MSVD [39], and YouCook2 [364] datasets. The highlighted entries indicate the best performing methods.

Method	Arch. Type	VQA					Captioning			
		MSRVTT		LSMDC		MSVD	MSRVTT	MSVD	YouCook2	
		MC	QA	MC	FiB	QA				
Fine-Tuned										
Generalist	ClipBERT [151]	Dual-Enc	88.2	37.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
	RTQ [299]	Dual-Enc	-	42.1	-	-	-	69.3	123.4	-
	Singularity [150]	Dual-Enc	92.1	43.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
	UMT-B [160]	Dual-Enc	96.3	44.9	-	-	49.5	-	-	-
	UMT-L [160]	Dual-Enc	97.3	47.1	-	-	55.2	-	-	-
	VideoCoca [329]	Enc-Dec	-	46.3	-	-	56.9	73.2	-	128.0
	All-in-One [291]	Joint-Enc	92.3	46.8	84.4	-	48.3	-	-	-
	ALPRO [154]	Mix-Enc	-	42.1	-	-	46.3	-	-	-
	Clover [115]	Mix-Enc	95.2	44.1	83.7	54.1	52.4	-	-	-
	Hitea [334]	Mix-Enc	97.2	45.4	85.8	54.6	55.6	62.5	145.1	-
	LAVANDER [162]	Joint-Enc	97.4	45.0	87.0	57.1	56.6	60.1	150.7	-
	SimVTP [195]	Enc-Dec	93.6	44.7	83.7	-	48.9	-	-	-
	UniVL [190]	Mix-Enc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	127.0
	VindLU-L [52]	Dual-Enc	95.5	44.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
	VIOLET [81]	Dual-Enc	91.9	43.9	82.8	53.7	47.9	-	-	-
	mPLUG-2 [323]	Mix-Enc	-	48.0	-	-	58.1	80.3	165.8	-
	MaMMUT [148]	Dual-Enc	-	49.5	-	-	60.2	73.6	195.6	-
	MERLOT [346]	Dual-Enc	90.9	43.9	82.8	53.7	47.9	-	-	-
	OmniVL [289]	Dual-Enc	-	44.1	-	-	51.0	-	-	116.0
	Smaug [178]	Mix-Enc	92.9	44.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
	X ² VLM [348]	Mix-Enc	-	45.5	-	-	54.6	-	-	-
	VALOR [43]	Multi-Enc	-	49.2	-	-	60.0	74.0	178.5	-
	VAST [45]	Mixed-Enc	-	50.1	-	-	60.2	78.0	-	198.8
VideoChat [158]	LMM	-	45.0	-	-	56.3	-	-	-	
Video-LLaMA [352]	LMM	-	29.6	-	-	51.6	-	-	-	
Video-LLaVA [169]	LMM	-	59.2	-	-	70.7	-	-	-	
Video-ChatGPT [196]	LMM	-	49.3	-	-	64.9	-	-	-	
Special	Just-Ask [330]	Dual-Enc	-	41.5	-	-	46.3	-	-	-
	CLIP4Caption [271]	Dual-Enc	-	-	-	-	-	57.7	-	-
	SwinBERT [175]	Dual-Enc	-	-	-	-	-	53.8	120.6	-
	MV-GPT [255]	Dual-Enc	-	-	-	-	-	60.0	-	-
	Text-KG [101]	Mix-Enc	-	-	-	-	-	60.8	-	133
Zero-Shot										
Generalist	VideoCoca [329]	Enc-Dec	-	-	-	-	-	27.1	-	34.3
	Hitea [334]	Mix-Enc	-	21.7	-	-	37.4	-	-	-
	mPlug-2 [323]	Mix-Enc	-	43.8	-	-	55.3	-	-	-
	Distill-VLM [361]	LMM	-	24.4	-	-	-	48.2	-	-
	PaML2-VAdapter [319]	LMM	-	19.6	-	-	40.5	47.7	-	-
	VideoPrism-B [357] (w/PaLM-1B)	Dual-Enc	-	28.5	-	-	39.5	40.3	-	52.3
	VideoPrism-B [357] (w/PaLM-8B)	Dual-Enc	-	32.0	-	-	47.1	38.5	-	63.6

questions demand not only video-text interaction but also rich natural language understanding. Fortunately, modern LLMs demonstrate impressive language semantic knowledge. Combining these LLMs with video models leads to state-of-the-art performance on open-ended VideoQA tasks.

Discussion. Beyond question types (MC vs. open-ended), another crucial dimension in VideoQA is reasoning capability. This can be broken down into two categories: Factoid reasoning [32, 34, 320, 325] and Inference reasoning [157, 310, 318, 335]. Existing ViFMs primarily focus on Factoid questions [115, 162, 346], which involve retrieving factual information directly from the video. However, a gap remains in tackling Inference-based questions that require a deeper understanding of the video content, including both dense spatio-temporal relationships (how objects and actions unfold over time) and causal relationships (understanding cause-and-effect).

Overall, Multi-modal video tasks like retrieval and VQA remain far from achieving their full potential. A deeper analysis reveals a more critical issue: the limited scale of video-text datasets compared to image-text datasets. This data scarcity hinders effective learning for video foundation models. Further compounding the problem is the data quality of many video-text datasets, often generated by scraping online videos and text, which introduces significant noise. The presence of noisy data further complicates the already challenging task of multi-modal learning for video models.

6.2.2 Video Captioning. Table 8 (right column) compares video captioning performance on various datasets (MSRVTT [325], MSVD [39], and YouCook2 [364] datasets). The results show specialization: mPLUG-2 [323] (image-video-text) performs well on MSRVTT [325], MaMMUT [148] (image-video-text) excels on MSVD [39], and VAST [45] (video-audio-text) dominates YouCook2 [364] (cooking videos). This suggests the importance of incorporating relevant modalities for specific video content. Notably, VAST’s strong performance on YouCook2 highlights the informative nature of audio in video captioning. Overall, the superiority of *unified models* across datasets underscores the potential of exploring additional modalities for captioning tasks.

Discussion. While Table 8 focuses on video captioning [100, 286, 325], dense video captioning [36, 65], which generates multiple captions describing events throughout a video, remains an unsolved challenge. This task demands a deeper understanding of spatio-temporal relationships, an area where ViFMs are still under development.

6.3 Video Content Generation and Manipulation

We discuss Text-To-Video(T2V) generation tasks, generates video given its textual description. For T2V generation GANs, auto-regressive, and diffusion models are the dominant choice.

Table 9. Comparing the fine-tuned performance of state-of-the-art (SOTA) generalist and specialist models for zero-shot Text-To-Video Generation on MSR-VTT [325] and UCF-101 [264] dataset. The highlighted entries indicate the best performing methods.

	Method	MSR-VTT		UCF-101	
		ClipSIM (↑)	FVD (↓)	FVD (↓)	IS (↑)
Gen	InternVid [302]	0.2951	-	616.51	21.04
	Make-A-Video [260]	0.3049	-	367.23	33.00
	PYoCo [85]	-	-	355.19	47.76
	SVD [20]	-	-	242.02	-
	VideoPoet [142]	0.3049	213.00	355.00	38.44
	VideoLaVIT [129]	0.3010	169.51	274.96	37.96
	VideoLDM [22]	0.2929	-	550.61	33.45
	VideoComposer [300]	0.2932	580.00	-	-
Special	CogVideo [110]	0.2631	1294.00	702	25.27
	MagicVideo [363]	-	998.00	655	-
	VideoFactory [298]	0.3005	-	410	-

6.3.1 Text-To-Video Generation. Table 9 showcases the performance of different models on the Text-to-Video generation task, tested on MSR-VTT [325] and UCF101 [264] datasets.

Looking at the MSR-VTT [325] results, VideoPoet [142], a model utilizing a unified image-video framework, stands out by outperforming all others across both CLIPSim [311] and FVD [282] metrics. However, on UCF101, different strengths emerge. InternVid, another ViFM, takes the lead when using the IS [249] metric. Interestingly, for this dataset, SVD [20], a diffusion-based foundation model, surpasses its competitors in terms of FVD [282]. This indicates SVD’s [20] ability to generate videos with exceptionally high visual fidelity within the context of UCF101 [264].

Discussion. Despite significant progress in video generation over the past few years, real-world integration remains challenging. High computational complexity and time-consuming processes are major hurdles. Generating a single minute of video can take hours. However, generative models are continuously improving their ability to maintain temporal consistency. This paves the way for integration with existing ViFMs to enhance the representation space.




Fig. 8. Fine-tuning results of Image-based, Video-based, and Universal foundational models against Specialist models for **video action recognition** task on k400 [136] (left), JHMDB [146] (center) and SSv2 [96] (right) datasets.




Fig. 9. Fine-tuning results of Image-based, Video-based, and Universal foundational models against Specialist models for **video retrieval** task on MSR-VTT [325] (left), DIDE MO [6] (center) and LSMDC [245] (right) datasets.




Fig. 10. Fine-tuning results of Image-based, Video-based, and Universal foundational models against Specialist models for **video captioning** task on MSR-VTT [325] (left), MSVD [39] (center) and YouCook2 [364] (right) datasets.

6.4 Analysis of Results

Figure 8, 9, and 10 presents a general comparison of image-based foundational models, video-based models, unified-models and task-specific specialist models. Note that task-specific models are finetuned for a particular task being analyzed and have been shown by a separate color (red). Across all the tasks a *general* trend is being observed: i.e. Image based foundational models perform better than video based models. We attribute this to the fact that there is a large amount of pretraining data available for image-based models whereas video-based models significantly lag behind this aspect. A notable exception is video models performing better on SSV2 in Action Recognition: this might be because SSV2 contains challenging action classes whose definition changes with the order of frames and requires understanding the arrow of time. Video Modelling helps establish much needed temporal correspondance in this case.

Across all the tasks, unified models perform much better than both image/video based models: this shows that joint representational learning of image/video modalities helps achieve significant performance gains. Finally, we note that all unified models outperform task-specific models. This highlights a desirable generalization behaviour: we are able to train foundational models on massive datasets, outperform task-specific specialists, as well as *adapt* a given model for several downstream tasks with minimal compute.

7 CHALLENGES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Multi-modal video foundation models encounter challenges in accessing extensive training data, limiting their development compared to image-text models. Existing video-text datasets are often small and noisy, hindering robust representation learning. Future research must prioritize creating high-quality, large-scale video-text datasets and exploring data cleaning, augmentation, and alternative pretraining methods. Additionally, existing video foundation models struggle with temporal consistency, object-centric tasks, and adaptability to diverse contexts. However, recent advancements, such as the generative auto-regressive model SORA [25], offer insights into addressing temporal consistency issues. ViFMs can draw inspiration from such models to improve their performance. Integrating diverse self-supervised learning techniques [197] and adapter modules provides avenues for domain adaptation and various video understanding tasks. The subsequent subsections present possible future research directions in the domain of ViFMs.

7.1 Addressing Ethical Considerations.

As Video Foundation Models (ViFMs) find increasing application in real-world scenarios, akin to ChatGPT [219] and Amazon SageMaker [231], addressing ethical concerns becomes crucial. Future research should focus on mitigating biases through debiasing datasets and fairness metrics, promoting transparency and explainability to build trust, and establishing responsible use guidelines throughout the ViFM development lifecycle. By actively addressing these ethical considerations, we can ensure ViFMs are deployed responsibly, maximizing their positive impact on real-world applications.

7.2 Long-Form Video Understanding.

Achieving long-form video understanding [198] with ViFMs presents a significant challenge due to the extensive memory requirements for processing extended sequences. Recent efforts have recognized this hurdle and begun to explore solutions, such as memory consolidation mechanisms [14, 262] and memory-efficient attention [182]. However, to truly unlock the potential of ViFMs in this domain, integrating causal reasoning could be pivotal. By incorporating

causal reasoning [335] into ViFMs, we can enhance their ability to comprehend extended video content by enabling them to answer fundamental questions like "why," "what next," and "what if." This deeper understanding facilitated by causal reasoning could revolutionize long-form video understanding, allowing ViFMs to recognize event order, direction of causality, and detailed relationships between actors, actions, and objects. Moreover, integrating causal reasoning may enhance the robustness [251] of ViFMs and improve their ability to handle occlusions [205] and other challenges commonly encountered in real-world video data. Therefore, while addressing the memory constraints is crucial, integrating causal reasoning into ViFMs offers a promising avenue for achieving comprehensive long-form video understanding.

7.3 Viewpoint Invariance.

ViFMs excel in traditional video settings (i.e., third-person viewpoint), but limitations arise in understanding different viewpoints like egocentric [97] or birds-eye view [228]. Future research can delve into viewpoint-invariant representations for dynamic scenes. Inspired by the human ability to mentally rotate objects, neural representations like NeRF [203] can be explored to encode a continuous 3D representation within ViFMs. Additionally, methods that project an agent's limited view to a common reference frame [233] and establish correspondences across views hold promise for learning robust representations despite dynamic exploration. By pursuing these directions, ViFMs can be equipped to handle different viewpoints and varying camera paths, ultimately leading to significant advancements in action localization and a deeper understanding of dynamic video content.

7.4 Domain Adaptation

Domain adaptation refers to the ability of models to perform well in new environments (lighting, locations, etc.) or domains that differ from those they were trained on. Some studies [147, 252] provide directions to make traditional video models robust against such changes by suggesting augmentations [345] and specific tuning [133]. However, research in domain adaptation for foundation models is still lacking. To seamlessly integrate these powerful models into real-world applications, future work should explore methods to make ViFMs robust against domain shifts.

7.5 Improving Efficiency

Despite promising results, ViFM's resource demands pose a challenge for edge deployment. These models often have hundreds of millions to billions of parameters, leading to longer training and inference times. This consequently limits their deployment on edge devices for real-time inference. To address this challenge, a key future direction in the integration of video foundation models for edge devices involves developing efficient deployment strategies to overcome resource constraints and enable seamless inferencing at the edge, citing [173] as an example. This entails exploring novel approaches to optimize model architecture and reduce computational overhead, as well as investigating innovative techniques for model compression and quantization to facilitate deployment on resource-constrained edge devices without compromising performance. By addressing these challenges, researchers can pave the way for widespread adoption of video foundation models in edge computing environments, unlocking their potential to power a diverse range of high-impact applications across industries.

8 CONCLUSION

This survey offers a comprehensive and, to the best of our knowledge, the first-of-its-kind in-depth exploration of Video Foundation Models (ViFMs). We commenced by establishing a foundation with discussions on video understanding tasks,

relevant architectures, pretraining datasets, and approaches for ViFM pretraining. We categorize core methodologies for ViFM creation into three primary techniques: Inflating Image Models, Video-based models (focusing on video or video-text pretraining), and Unified Image-Video ViFMs (applicable to both image and video tasks). By comparing the performance of various ViFMs on video tasks and offering insights based on methodologies and results, we aim to equip the research community with a comprehensive overview of existing ViFMs, while also highlighting critical areas for future exploration. This, we believe, will foster further advancements in video modeling and unlock the full potential of ViFMs.

9 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project is funded by *Innovation Funds*, Denmark.

REFERENCES

- [1] Shahzad Ahmad, Sukalpa Chanda, and Yogesh S Rawat. 2023. EZ-CLIP: Efficient Zeroshot Video Action Recognition. *arXiv:2312.08010* (2023).
- [2] Hassan Akbari, Dan Kondratyuk, Yin Cui, Rachel Hornung, Huisheng Wang, and Hartwig Adam. 2024. Alternating gradient descent and mixture-of-experts for integrated multimodal perception. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*.
- [3] Hassan Akbari, Liangzhe Yuan, Rui Qian, Wei-Hong Chuang, Shih-Fu Chang, Yin Cui, and Boqing Gong. 2021. Vatt: Transformers for multimodal self-supervised learning from raw video, audio and text. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*. 24206–24221.
- [4] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. 2022. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*. 23716–23736.
- [5] Rohan Anil, Andrew M Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, et al. 2023. Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv:2305.10403* (2023).
- [6] Lisa Anne Hendricks, Oliver Wang, Eli Shechtman, Josef Sivic, Trevor Darrell, and Bryan Russell. 2017. Localizing moments in video with natural language. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 5803–5812.
- [7] Anurag Arnab, Mostafa Dehghani, Georg Heigold, Chen Sun, Mario Lučić, and Cordelia Schmid. 2021. Vivit: A video vision transformer. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 6836–6846.
- [8] Kumar Ashutosh, Rohit Girdhar, Lorenzo Torresani, and Kristen Grauman. 2023. HierVL: Learning Hierarchical Video-Language Embeddings. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 23066–23078.
- [9] Ali Athar, Jonathon Luiten, Paul Voigtlaender, Tarasha Khurana, Achal Dave, Bastian Leibe, and Deva Ramanan. 2023. Burst: A benchmark for unifying object recognition, segmentation and tracking in video. In *Proceedings of WACV*. 1674–1683.
- [10] Muhammad Awais, Muzammal Naseer, Salman Khan, Rao Muhammad Anwer, Hisham Cholakkal, Mubarak Shah, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. 2023. Foundational models defining a new era in vision: A survey and outlook. *arXiv:2307.13721* (2023).
- [11] Piyush Nitin Bagad, Makarand Tapaswi, and Cees G. M. Snoek. 2023. Do Video-Language Foundation Models have a Sense of Time?. In *Proceedings of ICLR-Workshop on Mathematical and Empirical Understanding of Foundation Models*.
- [12] Max Bain, Arsha Nagrani, Andrew Brown, and Andrew Zisserman. 2020. Condensed movies: Story based retrieval with contextual embeddings. In *Proceedings of ACCV*.
- [13] Max Bain, Arsha Nagrani, Gül Varol, and Andrew Zisserman. 2021. Frozen in time: A joint video and image encoder for end-to-end retrieval. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 1728–1738.
- [14] Ivana Balažević, Yuge Shi, Pinelopi Papalampidi, Rahma Chaabouni, Skanda Koppula, and Olivier J Hénaff. 2024. Memory Consolidation Enables Long-Context Video Understanding. *arXiv:2402.05861* (2024).
- [15] Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. 2005. METEOR: An automatic metric for MT evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the ACL-W*. 65–72.
- [16] Omer Bar-Tal, Hila Chefer, Omer Tov, Charles Herrmann, Roni Paiss, Shiran Zada, Ariel Ephrat, Junhwa Hur, Yuanzhen Li, Tomer Michaeli, et al. 2024. Lumiere: A space-time diffusion model for video generation. *arXiv:2401.12945* (2024).
- [17] Yizhak Ben-Shabat, Xin Yu, Fatemeh Saleh, Dylan Campbell, Cristian Rodriguez-Opazo, Hongdong Li, and Stephen Gould. 2021. The ikea asm dataset: Understanding people assembling furniture through actions, objects and pose. In *Proceedings of WACV*. 847–859.
- [18] Keni Bernardin and Rainer Stiefelhagen. 2008. Evaluating multiple object tracking performance: the clear mot metrics. *EURASIP Journal on Image and Video Processing* 2008 (2008), 1–10.
- [19] Gedas Bertasius, Heng Wang, and Lorenzo Torresani. 2021. Is space-time attention all you need for video understanding?. In *Proceedings of ICML*.
- [20] Andreas Blattmann, Tim Dockhorn, Sumith Kulal, Daniel Mendelevitch, Maciej Kilian, Dominik Lorenz, Yam Levi, Zion English, Vikram Voleti, Adam Letts, et al. 2023. Stable video diffusion: Scaling latent video diffusion models to large datasets. *arXiv:2311.15127* (2023).

- [21] Andreas Blattmann, Robin Rombach, Huan Ling, Tim Dockhorn, Seung Wook Kim, Sanja Fidler, and Karsten Kreis. 2023. Align your latents: High-resolution video synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 22563–22575.
- [22] Andreas Blattmann, Robin Rombach, Huan Ling, Tim Dockhorn, Seung Wook Kim, Sanja Fidler, and Karsten Kreis. 2023. Align your latents: High-resolution video synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 22563–22575.
- [23] Simion-Vlad Bogolin, Ioana Croitoru, Hailin Jin, Yang Liu, and Samuel Albanie. 2022. Cross modal retrieval with querybank normalisation. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 5194–5205.
- [24] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. 2021. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv* (2021).
- [25] Tim Brooks, Bill Peebles, Connor Holmes, Will DePue, Yufei Guo, Li Jing, David Schnurr, Joe Taylor, Troy Luhman, Eric Luhman, Clarence Ng, Ricky Wang, and Aditya Ramesh. 2024. Video generation models as world simulators. <https://openai.com/sora>.
- [26] Shyamal Buch, Cristóbal Eyzaguirre, Adrien Gaidon, Jiajun Wu, Li Fei-Fei, and Juan Carlos Niebles. 2022. Revisiting the "video" in video-language understanding. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 2917–2927.
- [27] Fabian Caba Heilbron, Victor Escorcia, Bernard Ghanem, and Juan Carlos Niebles. 2015. Activitynet: A large-scale video benchmark for human activity understanding. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 961–970.
- [28] Joao Carreira, Eric Noland, Andras Banki-Horvath, Chloe Hillier, and Andrew Zisserman. 2018. A short note about kinetics-600. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.01340* (2018).
- [29] Joao Carreira, Eric Noland, Chloe Hillier, and Andrew Zisserman. 2019. A short note on the kinetics-700 human action dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.06987* (2019).
- [30] Joao Carreira and Andrew Zisserman. 2017. Quo vadis, action recognition? a new model and the kinetics dataset. In *proceedings of CVPR*. 6299–6308.
- [31] Joao Carreira and Andrew Zisserman. 2017. Quo vadis, action recognition? a new model and the kinetics dataset. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 6299–6308.
- [32] Santiago Castro, Naihao Deng, Pingxuan Huang, Mihai Burzo, and Rada Mihalcea. 2022. In-the-Wild Video Question Answering. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Computational Linguistics (ICCL)*. 5613–5635.
- [33] Santiago Castro and Fabian Caba Heilbron. 2022. FitCLIP: Refining Large-Scale Pretrained Image-Text Models for Zero-Shot Video Understanding Tasks. *arXiv* (2022).
- [34] Santiago Castro, Ruoyao Wang, Pingxuan Huang, Ian Stewart, Oana Ignat, Nan Liu, Jonathan Stroud, and Rada Mihalcea. 2022. FIBER: Fill-in-the-Blanks as a Challenging Video Understanding Evaluation Framework. In *Proceedings of ACL*. 2925–2940.
- [35] Wenhao Chai, Xun Guo, Gaoang Wang, and Yan Lu. 2023. Stablevideo: Text-driven consistency-aware diffusion video editing. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 23040–23050.
- [36] Zhi Chang, Dexin Zhao, Huilin Chen, Jingdan Li, and Pengfei Liu. 2022. Event-centric multi-modal fusion method for dense video captioning. *Neural Networks* 146 (2022), 120–129.
- [37] Soravit Changpinyo, Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, and Radu Soricut. 2021. Conceptual 12m: Pushing web-scale image-text pre-training to recognize long-tail visual concepts. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 3558–3568.
- [38] Dibyadip Chatterjee, Fadime Sener, Shugao Ma, and Angela Yao. 2024. Opening the vocabulary of egocentric actions. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*.
- [39] David Chen and William B Dolan. 2011. Collecting highly parallel data for paraphrase evaluation. In *Proceedings of ACL:HLT*. 190–200.
- [40] Feilong Chen, Minglun Han, Haozhi Zhao, Qingyang Zhang, Jing Shi, Shuang Xu, and Bo Xu. 2023. X-llm: Bootstrapping advanced large language models by treating multi-modalities as foreign languages. *arXiv:2305.04160* (2023).
- [41] Guangyi Chen, Xiao Liu, Guangrun Wang, Kun Zhang, Philip HS Torr, Xiao-Ping Zhang, and Yansong Tang. 2023. Tem-adapter: Adapting Image-Text Pretraining for Video Question Answer. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 13945–13955.
- [42] Honglie Chen, Weidi Xie, Andrea Vedaldi, and Andrew Zisserman. 2020. Vggssound: A large-scale audio-visual dataset. In *Proceedings of ICASSP*. IEEE, 721–725.
- [43] Sihan Chen, Xingjian He, Longteng Guo, Xinxin Zhu, Weining Wang, Jinhui Tang, and Jing Liu. 2023. VALOR: Vision-Audio-Language Omni-Perception Pretraining Model and Dataset. *arXiv* (2023).
- [44] Sihan Chen, Xingjian He, Handong Li, Xiaojie Jin, Jiashi Feng, and Jing Liu. 2023. COSA: Concatenated Sample Pretrained Vision-Language Foundation Model. *arXiv* (2023).
- [45] Sihan Chen, Handong Li, Qunbo Wang, Zijia Zhao, Mingzhen Sun, Xinxin Zhu, and Jing Liu. 2023. VAST: A Vision-Audio-Subtitle-Text Omni-Modality Foundation Model and Dataset. *arXiv* (2023).
- [46] Sanyuan Chen, Yu Wu, Chengyi Wang, Shujie Liu, Daniel Tompkins, Zhuo Chen, Wanxiang Che, Xiangzhan Yu, and Furu Wei. 2023. BEATs: Audio Pre-Training with Acoustic Tokenizers. In *Proceedings of ICML*. 5178–5193.
- [47] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. 2020. Simclr: A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- [48] Tsai-Shien Chen, Chieh Hubert Lin, Hung-Yu Tseng, Tsung-Yi Lin, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. 2023. Motion-conditioned diffusion model for controllable video synthesis. *arXiv:2304.14404* (2023).
- [49] Weifeng Chen, Jie Wu, Pan Xie, Hefeng Wu, Jiashi Li, Xin Xia, Xuefeng Xiao, and Liang Lin. 2023. Control-a-video: Controllable text-to-video generation with diffusion models. *arXiv:2305.13840* (2023).
- [50] Xi Chen, Xiao Wang, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Jialin Wu, Paul Voigtlaender, Basil Mustafa, Sebastian Goodman, Ibrahim Alabdulmohsin, Piotr Padlewski, et al. 2023. Pali-3 vision language models: Smaller, faster, stronger. *arXiv:2310.09199* (2023).

- [51] Xi Chen, Xiao Wang, Soravit Changpinyo, AJ Piergiovanni, Piotr Padlewski, Daniel Salz, Sebastian Goodman, Adam Grycner, Basil Mustafa, Lucas Beyer, et al. 2022. Pali: A jointly-scaled multilingual language-image model. *arXiv:2209.06794* (2022).
- [52] Feng Cheng, Xizi Wang, Jie Lei, David Crandall, Mohit Bansal, and Gedas Bertasius. 2023. Vindlu: A recipe for effective video-and-language pretraining. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 10739–10750.
- [53] Ho Kei Cheng, Seoung Wug Oh, Brian Price, Alexander Schwing, and Joon-Young Lee. 2023. Tracking anything with decoupled video segmentation. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 1316–1326.
- [54] Xing Cheng, Hezheng Lin, Xiangyu Wu, Fan Yang, and Dong Shen. 2021. Improving video-text retrieval by multi-stream corpus alignment and dual softmax loss. *arXiv:2109.04290* (2021).
- [55] Yangming Cheng, Liulei Li, Yuanyou Xu, Xiaodi Li, Zongxin Yang, Wenguan Wang, and Yi Yang. 2023. Segment and Track Anything. *arXiv* (2023).
- [56] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. 2023. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *JMLR* 24, 240 (2023), 1–113.
- [57] Together Computer. 2023. RedPajama: an Open Dataset for Training Large Language Models. <https://github.com/togethercomputer/RedPajama-Data>
- [58] Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale Fung, and Steven Hoi. 2023. InstructBLIP: Towards General-purpose Vision-Language Models with Instruction Tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06500* (2023).
- [59] Zuo Zhuo Dai, Fangtao Shao, Qingkuo Su, Zilong Dong, and Siyu Zhu. 2023. Fine-grained Text-Video Retrieval with Frozen Image Encoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09972* (2023).
- [60] Dima Damen, Hazel Doughty, Giovanni Maria Farinella, Sanja Fidler, Antonino Furnari, Evangelos Kazakos, Davide Moltisanti, Jonathan Munro, Toby Perrett, Will Price, et al. 2018. Scaling egocentric vision: The epic-kitchens dataset. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 720–736.
- [61] Achal Dave, Tarasha Khurana, Pavel Tokmakov, Cordelia Schmid, and Deva Ramanan. 2020. Tao: A large-scale benchmark for tracking any object. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 436–454.
- [62] Ugur Demir, Yogesh S Rawat, and Mubarak Shah. 2021. Tinyvirat: Low-resolution video action recognition. In *Proceedings of ICPR*. 7387–7394.
- [63] Patrick Dendorfer, Hamid Reza Tofighi, Anton Milan, Javen Qinfeng Shi, Daniel Cremers, Ian D. Reid, Stefan Roth, Konrad Schindler, and Laura Leal-Taix'e. 2020. MOT20: A benchmark for multi object tracking in crowded scenes. *ArXiv* (2020).
- [64] Chaorui Deng, Qi Chen, Pengda Qin, Da Chen, and Qi Wu. 2023. Prompt Switch: Efficient CLIP Adaptation for Text-Video Retrieval. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 15648–15658.
- [65] Chaorui Deng, Shizhe Chen, Da Chen, Yuan He, and Qi Wu. 2021. Sketch, ground, and refine: Top-down dense video captioning. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 234–243.
- [66] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. 2009. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 248–255.
- [67] Carl Doersch, Ankush Gupta, Larisa Markeeva, Adria Recasens, Lucas Smaira, Yusuf Aytar, Joao Carreira, Andrew Zisserman, and Yi Yang. 2022. Tap-vid: A benchmark for tracking any point in a video. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*. 13610–13626.
- [68] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. 2020. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.11929* (2020).
- [69] Kevin Duarte, Yogesh Rawat, and Mubarak Shah. 2018. VideocapsuleNet: A simplified network for action detection. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*, Vol. 31.
- [70] Kevin Duarte, Yogesh S Rawat, and Mubarak Shah. 2019. CapsuleVos: Semi-supervised video object segmentation using capsule routing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 8480–8489.
- [71] Deniz Engin and Yannis Avrithis. 2023. Zero-Shot and Few-Shot Video Question Answering with Multi-Modal Prompts. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 2804–2810.
- [72] Patrick Esser, Robin Rombach, and Bjorn Ommer. 2021. Taming transformers for high-resolution image synthesis. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 12873–12883.
- [73] Matteo Fabbri, Guillem Brasó, Gianluca Mageri, Orcun Cetintas, Riccardo Gasparini, Aljoša Ošep, Simone Calderara, Laura Leal-Taixé, and Rita Cucchiara. 2021. MOTSynth: How Can Synthetic Data Help Pedestrian Detection and Tracking?. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 10849–10859.
- [74] Heng Fan, Liting Lin, Fan Yang, Peng Chu, Ge Deng, Sijia Yu, Hexin Bai, Yong Xu, Chunyuan Liao, and Haibin Ling. 2019. Lasot: A high-quality benchmark for large-scale single object tracking. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 5374–5383.
- [75] Han Fang, Pengfei Xiong, Luhui Xu, and Yu Chen. 2021. Clip2video: Mastering video-text retrieval via image clip. *arXiv:2106.11097* (2021).
- [76] Han Fang, Pengfei Xiong, Luhui Xu, and Wenhan Luo. 2022. Transferring image-clip to video-text retrieval via temporal relations. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* (2022).
- [77] Han Fang, Zhifei Yang, Yuhan Wei, Xianghao Zang, Chao Ban, Zerun Feng, Zhongjiang He, Yongxiang Li, and Hao Sun. 2023. Alignment and Generation Adapter for Efficient Video-Text Understanding. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 2791–2797.
- [78] Yuxin Fang, Quan Sun, Xinggang Wang, Tiejun Huang, Xinlong Wang, and Yue Cao. 2023. Eva-02: A visual representation for neon genesis. *arXiv:2303.11331* (2023).
- [79] Christoph Feichtenhofer, Yanghao Li, and Kaiming He. 2022. Masked autoencoders as spatiotemporal learners. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*, Vol. 35. 35946–35958.

- [80] Christoph Feichtenhofer, Axel Pinz, and Andrew Zisserman. 2016. Convolutional two-stream network fusion for video action recognition. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 1933–1941.
- [81] Tsu-Jui Fu, Linjie Li, Zhe Gan, Kevin Lin, William Yang Wang, Lijuan Wang, and Zicheng Liu. 2022. VIOLET: End-to-End Video-Language Transformers with Masked Visual-token Modeling. *arXiv* (2022).
- [82] Tsu-Jui Fu, Linjie Li, Zhe Gan, Kevin Lin, William Yang Wang, Lijuan Wang, and Zicheng Liu. 2023. An empirical study of end-to-end video-language transformers with masked visual modeling. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 22898–22909.
- [83] Tsu-Jui Fu, Licheng Yu, Ning Zhang, Cheng-Yang Fu, Jong-Chyi Su, William Yang Wang, and Sean Bell. 2023. Tell me what happened: Unifying text-guided video completion via multimodal masked video generation. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 10681–10692.
- [84] Kirill Gavriluk, Amir Ghodrati, Zhenyang Li, and Cees GM Snoek. 2018. Actor and action video segmentation from a sentence. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 5958–5966.
- [85] Songwei Ge, Seungjun Nah, Guilin Liu, Tyler Poon, Andrew Tao, Bryan Catanzaro, David Jacobs, Jia-Bin Huang, Ming-Yu Liu, and Yogesh Balaji. 2023. Preserve your own correlation: A noise prior for video diffusion models. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 22930–22941.
- [86] Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, Xihui Liu, Dian Li, Ying Shan, Xiaohu Qie, and Ping Luo. 2022. Bridging video-text retrieval with multiple choice questions. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 16167–16176.
- [87] Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, Xihui Liu, Jinpeng Wang, Jianping Wu, Ying Shan, Xiaohu Qie, and Ping Luo. 2022. Miles: Visual bert pre-training with injected language semantics for video-text retrieval. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 691–708.
- [88] Andreas Geiger, Philip Lenz, Christoph Stiller, and Raquel Urtasun. 2013. Vision meets robotics: The KITTI dataset. *International Journal of Robotics Research (IJRR)* 32 (2013), 1231 – 1237.
- [89] Jort F Gemmeke, Daniel PW Ellis, Dylan Freedman, Aren Jansen, Wade Lawrence, R Channing Moore, Manoj Plakal, and Marvin Ritter. 2017. Audio set: An ontology and human-labeled dataset for audio events. In *Proceedings of ICASSP*. 776–780.
- [90] Mariana-Iuliana Georgescu, Eduardo Fonseca, Radu Tudor Ionescu, Mario Lucic, Cordelia Schmid, and Anurag Arnab. 2023. Audiovisual masked autoencoders. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 16144–16154.
- [91] Rohit Girdhar, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, Mannat Singh, Kalyan Vasudev Alwala, Armand Joulin, and Ishan Misra. 2023. Omnimae: Single model masked pretraining on images and videos. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 10406–10417.
- [92] Rohit Girdhar, Mannat Singh, Nikhila Ravi, Laurens van der Maaten, Armand Joulin, and Ishan Misra. 2022. Omnivore: A single model for many visual modalities. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 16102–16112.
- [93] Yuan Gong, Yu-An Chung, and James Glass. 2021. Ast: Audio spectrogram transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.01778* (2021).
- [94] Yuan Gong, Andrew Rouditchenko, Alexander H. Liu, David Harwath, Leonid Karlinsky, Hilde Kuehne, and James Glass. 2023. Contrastive Audio-Visual Masked Autoencoder. *arXiv* (2023).
- [95] Satya Krishna Gorti, Noël Vouitsis, Junwei Ma, Keyvan Golestan, Maksims Volkovs, Animesh Garg, and Guangwei Yu. 2022. X-pool: Cross-modal language-video attention for text-video retrieval. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 5006–5015.
- [96] Raghav Goyal, Samira Ebrahimi Kahou, Vincent Michalski, Joanna Materzynska, Susanne Westphal, Heuna Kim, Valentin Haenel, Ingo Freund, Peter Yianilos, Moritz Mueller-Freitag, et al. 2017. The “something something” video database for learning and evaluating visual common sense. In *Proceedings of the ICCV*. 5842–5850.
- [97] Kristen Grauman, Andrew Westbury, Eugene Byrne, Zachary Chavis, Antonino Furnari, Rohit Girdhar, Jackson Hamburger, Hao Jiang, Miao Liu, Xingyu Liu, et al. 2022. Ego4d: Around the world in 3,000 hours of egocentric video. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 18995–19012.
- [98] Jean-Bastien Grill, Florian Strub, Florent Altché, Corentin Tallec, Pierre Richemond, Elena Buchatskaya, Carl Doersch, Bernardo Avila Pires, Zhaohan Guo, Mohammad Gheshlaghi Azar, et al. 2020. Bootstrap your own latent – a new approach to self-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*. 21271–21284.
- [99] Chunhui Gu, Chen Sun, David A Ross, Carl Vondrick, Caroline Pantofaru, Yeqing Li, Sudheendra Vijayanarasimhan, George Toderici, Susanna Ricco, Rahul Sukthankar, et al. 2018. Ava: A video dataset of spatio-temporally localized atomic visual actions. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 6047–6056.
- [100] Jiatao Gu, James Bradbury, Caiming Xiong, Victor OK Li, and Richard Socher. 2017. Non-autoregressive neural machine translation. *arXiv:1711.02281* (2017).
- [101] Xin Gu, Guang Chen, Yufei Wang, Libo Zhang, Tiejian Luo, and Longyin Wen. 2023. Text with knowledge graph augmented transformer for video captioning. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 18941–18951.
- [102] Agrim Gupta, Piotr Dollar, and Ross Girshick. 2019. Lvis: A dataset for large vocabulary instance segmentation. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 5356–5364.
- [103] Tanmay Gupta, Dustin Schwenk, Ali Farhadi, Derek Hoiem, and Aniruddha Kembhavi. 2018. Imagine this! scripts to compositions to videos. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 598–613.
- [104] Thomas Hayes, Songyang Zhang, Xi Yin, Guan Pang, Sasha Sheng, Harry Yang, Songwei Ge, Qiyuan Hu, and Devi Parikh. 2022. Mugen: A playground for video-audio-text multimodal understanding and generation. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 431–449.
- [105] Kaiming He, Xinlei Chen, Saining Xie, Yanghao Li, Piotr Dollár, and Ross Girshick. 2022. Masked autoencoders are scalable vision learners. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 16000–16009.
- [106] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. *IEEE TPAMI* 37, 3 (2016), 630–643.
- [107] Jefferson Hernandez, Ruben Villegas, and Vicente Ordonez. 2023. Visual Representation Learning from Unlabeled Video using Contrastive Masked Autoencoders. *arXiv* (2023).

- [108] Jonathan Ho, William Chan, Chitwan Saharia, Jay Whang, Ruiqi Gao, Alexey Gritsenko, Diederik P Kingma, Ben Poole, Mohammad Norouzi, David J Fleet, et al. 2022. Imagen video: High definition video generation with diffusion models. *arXiv:2210.02303* (2022).
- [109] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. 2020. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*. 6840–6851.
- [110] Wenyi Hong, Ming Ding, Wendi Zheng, Xinghan Liu, and Jie Tang. 2022. Cogvideo: Large-scale pretraining for text-to-video generation via transformers. *arXiv:2205.15868* (2022).
- [111] Chiori Hori, Takaaki Hori, Teng-Yok Lee, Ziming Zhang, Bret Harsham, John R Hershey, Tim K Marks, and Kazuhiko Sumi. 2017. Attention-based multimodal fusion for video description. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 4193–4202.
- [112] Neil Houlsby, Andrei Giurgiu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Bruna Morrone, Quentin De Laroussilhe, Andrea Gesmundo, Mona Attariyan, and Sylvain Gelly. 2019. Parameter-efficient transfer learning for NLP. In *Proceedings of ICML*. 2790–2799.
- [113] Zhiming Hu, Angela Ning Ye, Salar Hosseini Khorasgani, and Iqbal Mohamed. 2023. AdaCLIP: Towards Pragmatic Multimodal Video Retrieval. In *Proceedings of ACM-MM*. 5623–5633.
- [114] Bingkun Huang, Zhiyu Zhao, Guozhen Zhang, Yu Qiao, and Limin Wang. 2023. MGMAE: Motion Guided Masking for Video Masked Autoencoding. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 13493–13504.
- [115] Jingjia Huang, Yanan Li, Jiashi Feng, Xinglong Wu, Xiaoshuai Sun, and Rongrong Ji. 2023. Clover: Towards a unified video-language alignment and fusion model. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 14856–14866.
- [116] Siteng Huang, Biao Gong, Yulin Pan, Jianwen Jiang, Yiliang Lv, Yuyuan Li, and Donglin Wang. 2023. VoP: Text-Video Co-operative Prompt Tuning for Cross-Modal Retrieval. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 6565–6574.
- [117] Xiaohu Huang, Hao Zhou, Kun Yao, and Kai Han. 2023. FROSTER: Frozen CLIP is A Strong Teacher for Open-Vocabulary Action Recognition. In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- [118] Sunil Hwang, Jaehong Yoon, Youngwan Lee, and Sung Ju Hwang. 2023. Efficient Video Representation Learning via Motion-Aware Token Selection. *arXiv* (2023).
- [119] Haroon Idrees, Amir R Zamir, Yu-Gang Jiang, Alex Gorban, Ivan Laptev, Rahul Sukthankar, and Mubarak Shah. 2017. The thumos challenge on action recognition for videos “in the wild”. *CVIU* 155 (2017), 1–23.
- [120] Gabriel Ilharco, Mitchell Wortsman, Nicholas Carlini, Rohan Taori, Achal Dave, Vaishaal Shankar, Hongseok Namkoong, John Miller, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Ali Farhadi, and Ludwig Schmidt. 2021. OpenCLIP.
- [121] Yunseok Jang, Yale Song, Youngjae Yu, Youngjin Kim, and Gunhee Kim. 2017. Tgif-qa: Toward spatio-temporal reasoning in visual question answering. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 2758–2766.
- [122] Hueihan Jhuang, Juergen Gall, Silvia Zuffi, Cordelia Schmid, and Michael J Black. 2013. Towards understanding action recognition. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 3192–3199.
- [123] Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. 2021. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *Proceedings of ICML*. 4904–4916.
- [124] Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. 2021. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *Proceedings of ICML*. 4904–4916.
- [125] Yiren Jian, Chongyang Gao, and Soroush Vosoughi. 2023. Bootstrapping Vision-Language Learning with Decoupled Language Pre-training. *arXiv:2307.07063* (2023).
- [126] Yiren Jian, Chongyang Gao, and Soroush Vosoughi. 2023. Bootstrapping Vision-Language Learning with Decoupled Language Pre-training. *arXiv* (2023).
- [127] Haojun Jiang, Jianke Zhang, Rui Huang, Chunjiang Ge, Zanlin Ni, Jiwen Lu, Jie Zhou, Shiji Song, and Gao Huang. 2022. Cross-Modal Adapter for Text-Video Retrieval. *arXiv* (2022).
- [128] Peng Jin, Ryuichi Takanobu, Caiwan Zhang, Xiaochun Cao, and Li Yuan. 2023. Chat-UniVi: Unified Visual Representation Empowers Large Language Models with Image and Video Understanding. *arXiv* (2023).
- [129] Yang Jin, Zhicheng Sun, Kun Xu, Liwei Chen, Hao Jiang, Quzhe Huang, Chengru Song, Yuliang Liu, Di Zhang, Yang Song, et al. 2024. Video-LaVIT: Unified Video-Language Pre-training with Decoupled Visual-Motional Tokenization. *arXiv:2402.03161* (2024).
- [130] Chen Ju, Tengda Han, Kunhao Zheng, Ya Zhang, and Weidi Xie. 2022. Prompting visual-language models for efficient video understanding. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 105–124.
- [131] Chen Ju, Tengda Han, Kunhao Zheng, Ya Zhang, and Weidi Xie. 2022. Prompting Visual-Language Models for Efficient Video Understanding. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 105–124.
- [132] Seong-Min Kang and Yoon-Sik Cho. 2023. MEME: Multi-Encoder Multi-Expert Framework with Data Augmentation for Video Retrieval. In *Proceedings of SIGIR*. 475–484.
- [133] Simar Kareer, Vivek Vijaykumar, Harsh Maheshwari, Prithvijit Chattopadhyay, Judy Hoffman, and Viraj Prabhu. 2024. We’re Not Using Videos Effectively: An Updated Domain Adaptive Video Segmentation Baseline. *arXiv:2402.00868* (2024).
- [134] Andrej Karpathy, George Toderici, Sanketh Shetty, Thomas Leung, Rahul Sukthankar, and Li Fei-Fei. 2014. Large-scale video classification with convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 1725–1732.
- [135] Angelos Katharopoulos, Apoorv Vyas, Nikolaos Pappas, and François Fleuret. 2020. Transformers are rnns: Fast autoregressive transformers with linear attention. In *Proceedings of ICML*. 5156–5165.

- [136] Will Kay, Joao Carreira, Karen Simonyan, Brian Zhang, Chloe Hillier, Sudheendra Vijayanarasimhan, Fabio Viola, Tim Green, Trevor Back, Paul Natsev, et al. 2017. The kinetics human action video dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.06950* (2017).
- [137] Jacob Devlin Ming-Wei Chang Kenton and Lee Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT*. 4171–4186.
- [138] Anna Khoreva, Anna Rohrbach, and Bernt Schiele. 2019. Video object segmentation with language referring expressions. In *Proceedings of ACCV*. 123–141.
- [139] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C. Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, Piotr Dollar, and Ross Girshick. 2023. Segment Anything. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 4015–4026.
- [140] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C. Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, Piotr Dollár, and Ross Girshick. 2023. Segment Anything. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 4015–4026.
- [141] Dohwan Ko, Joonmyung Choi, Hyeong Kyu Choi, Kyoung-Woon On, Byungseok Roh, and Hyunwoo J. Kim. 2023. MELTR: Meta Loss Transformer for Learning to Fine-tune Video Foundation Models. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 20105–20115.
- [142] Dan Kondratyuk, Lijun Yu, Xiuye Gu, José Lezama, Jonathan Huang, Rachel Hornung, Hartwig Adam, Hassan Akbari, Yair Alon, Vighnesh Birodkar, et al. 2023. Videopoet: A large language model for zero-shot video generation. *arXiv:2312.14125* (2023).
- [143] Ranjay Krishna, Kenji Hata, Frederic Ren, Li Fei-Fei, and Juan Carlos Niebles. 2017. Dense-captioning events in videos. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 706–715.
- [144] Ranjay Krishna, Yuke Zhu, Oliver Groth, Justin Johnson, Kenji Hata, Joshua Kravitz, Stephanie Chen, Yannis Kalantidis, Li-Jia Li, David A Shamma, et al. 2017. Visual genome: Connecting language and vision using crowdsourced dense image annotations. *IJCV* 123 (2017), 32–73.
- [145] Hilde Kuehne, Ali Arslan, and Thomas Serre. 2014. The language of actions: Recovering the syntax and semantics of goal-directed human activities. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 780–787.
- [146] Hildegard Kuehne, Hueihan Jhuang, Estibaliz Garrote, Tomaso Poggio, and Thomas Serre. 2011. HMDB: a large video database for human motion recognition. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 2556–2563.
- [147] Akash Kumar, Ashlesha Kumar, Vibhav Vineet, and Yogesh Singh Rawat. 2023. Benchmarking self-supervised video representation learning. *arXiv:2306.06010* (2023).
- [148] Weicheng Kuo, AJ Piergiovanni, Dahun Kim, Benjamin Caine, Wei Li, Abhijit Ogale, Luowei Zhou, Andrew M Dai, Zhifeng Chen, Claire Cui, et al. 2023. MaMMUT: A Simple Architecture for Joint Learning for MultiModal Tasks. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* (2023).
- [149] Alina Kuznetsova, Hassan Rom, Neil Alldrin, Jasper Uijlings, Ivan Krasin, Jordi Pont-Tuset, Shahab Kamali, Stefan Popov, Matteo Mallocci, Alexander Kolesnikov, et al. 2020. The open images dataset v4: Unified image classification, object detection, and visual relationship detection at scale. *IJCV* 128, 7 (2020), 1956–1981.
- [150] Jie Lei, Tamara L. Berg, and Mohit Bansal. 2022. Revealing Single Frame Bias for Video-and-Language Learning. *arXiv* (2022).
- [151] Jie Lei, Linjie Li, Luowei Zhou, Zhe Gan, Tamara L Berg, Mohit Bansal, and Jingjing Liu. 2021. Less is more: Clipbert for video-and-language learning via sparse sampling. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 7331–7341.
- [152] Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. 2021. The Power of Scale for Parameter-Efficient Prompt Tuning. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*. 3045–3059.
- [153] A Li, M Thotakuri, DA Ross, J Carreira, A Vostrikov, and A Zisserman. 2005. The AVA-kinetics localized human actions video dataset (2020). *arXiv:2005.00214* (2005).
- [154] Dongxu Li, Junnan Li, Hongdong Li, Juan Carlos Niebles, and Steven CH Hoi. 2022. Align and prompt: Video-and-language pre-training with entity prompts. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 4953–4963.
- [155] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. 2023. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. *arXiv:2301.12597* (2023).
- [156] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. 2022. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *Proceedings of ICML*. 12888–12900.
- [157] Jiangtong Li, Li Niu, and Liqing Zhang. 2022. From representation to reasoning: Towards both evidence and commonsense reasoning for video question-answering. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 21273–21282.
- [158] KunChang Li, Yanan He, Yi Wang, Yizhuo Li, Wenhai Wang, Ping Luo, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. 2023. VideoChat: Chat-Centric Video Understanding. *arXiv* (2023).
- [159] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yanan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. 2022. Uniformerv2: Spatiotemporal learning by arming image vits with video uniformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09552* (2022).
- [160] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yanan He, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. 2023. Unmasked Teacher: Towards Training-Efficient Video Foundation Models. In *Proceedings of ICCV*.
- [161] Linjie Li, Yen-Chun Chen, Yu Cheng, Zhe Gan, Licheng Yu, and Jingjing Liu. 2020. Hero: Hierarchical encoder for video+ language omni-representation pre-training. *arXiv:2005.00200* (2020).
- [162] Linjie Li, Zhe Gan, Kevin Lin, Chung-Ching Lin, Zicheng Liu, Ce Liu, and Lijuan Wang. 2023. Lavender: Unifying video-language understanding as masked language modeling. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 23119–23129.
- [163] Pandeng Li, Chen-Wei Xie, Liming Zhao, Hongtao Xie, Jiannan Ge, Yun Zheng, Deli Zhao, and Yongdong Zhang. 2023. Progressive spatio-temporal prototype matching for text-video retrieval. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 4100–4110.

- [164] Xinhao Li and Limin Wang. 2023. Zero2V: Zero-Cost Adaptation of Pre-trained Transformers from Image to Video. *arXiv* (2023).
- [165] Yizhuo Li, Kunchang Li, Yanan He, Yi Wang, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, Yu Qiao, and Ping Luo. 2023. Harvest Video Foundation Models via Efficient Post-Pretraining. *arXiv* (2023).
- [166] Yingwei Li, Yi Li, and Nuno Vasconcelos. 2018. Resound: Towards action recognition without representation bias. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 513–528.
- [167] Yanghao Li, Chao-Yuan Wu, Haoqi Fan, Karttikeya Mangalam, Bo Xiong, Jitendra Malik, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. 2022. Mvitv2: Improved multiscale vision transformers for classification and detection. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 4804–4814.
- [168] Yonglin Li, Jing Zhang, Xiao Teng, and Long Lan. 2023. RefSAM: Efficiently Adapting Segmenting Anything Model for Referring Video Object Segmentation. *arXiv* (2023).
- [169] Bin Lin, Yang Ye, Bin Zhu, Jiayi Cui, Munan Ning, Peng Jin, and Li Yuan. 2023. Video-LLaVA: Learning United Visual Representation by Alignment Before Projection. *arXiv* (2023).
- [170] Chengzhi Lin, Ancong Wu, Junwei Liang, Jun Zhang, Wenhong Ge, Wei-Shi Zheng, and Chunhua Shen. 2022. Text-adaptive multiple visual prototype matching for video-text retrieval. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*. 38655–38666.
- [171] Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Proceedings of ACL-W*. 74–81.
- [172] Han Lin, Abhay Zala, Jaemin Cho, and Mohit Bansal. 2023. VideoDirectorGPT: Consistent Multi-scene Video Generation via LLM-Guided Planning. *arXiv* (2023).
- [173] Ji Lin, Hongxu Yin, Wei Ping, Yao Lu, Pavlo Molchanov, Andrew Tao, Huizi Mao, Jan Kautz, Mohammad Shoeybi, and Song Han. 2023. VILA: On Pre-training for Visual Language Models. *arXiv:2312.07533* (2023).
- [174] Kevin Lin, Faisal Ahmed, Linjie Li, Chung-Ching Lin, Ehsan Azarnasab, Zhengyuan Yang, Jianfeng Wang, Lin Liang, Zicheng Liu, Yumao Lu, Ce Liu, and Lijuan Wang. 2023. MM-VID: Advancing Video Understanding with GPT-4V(ision). *arXiv* (2023).
- [175] Kevin Lin, Linjie Li, Chung-Ching Lin, Faisal Ahmed, Zhe Gan, Zicheng Liu, Yumao Lu, and Lijuan Wang. 2022. Swinbert: End-to-end transformers with sparse attention for video captioning. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 17949–17958.
- [176] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. 2014. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 740–755.
- [177] Wei Lin, Leonid Karlinsky, Nina Shvetsova, Horst Possegger, Mateusz Kozinski, Rameswar Panda, Rogerio Feris, Hilde Kuehne, and Horst Bischof. 2023. Match, expand and improve: Unsupervised finetuning for zero-shot action recognition with language knowledge. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 2851–2862.
- [178] Yuanze Lin, Chen Wei, Huiyu Wang, Alan Yuille, and Cihang Xie. 2023. Smaug: Sparse masked autoencoder for efficient video-language pre-training. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 2459–2469.
- [179] Ziyi Lin, Shijie Geng, Renrui Zhang, Peng Gao, Gerard De Melo, Xiaogang Wang, Jifeng Dai, Yu Qiao, and Hongsheng Li. 2022. Frozen CLIP Models are Efficient Video Learners. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 388–404.
- [180] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. 2023. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. *arXiv:2310.03744* (2023).
- [181] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. 2023. Visual instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*.
- [182] Hao Liu, Wilson Yan, Matei Zaharia, and Pieter Abbeel. 2024. World Model on Million-Length Video And Language With RingAttention. *arXiv:2402.08268* (2024).
- [183] Jingzhou Liu, Wenhui Chen, Yu Cheng, Zhe Gan, Licheng Yu, Yiming Yang, and Jingjing Liu. 2020. VIOLIN: A large-scale dataset for video-and-language inference. In 2020 IEEE. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 13–19.
- [184] Xin Liu, Fatemeh Karimi Nejadasl, Jan C van Gemert, Olaf Booij, and Silvia L Pintea. 2023. Objects do not disappear: Video object detection by single-frame object location anticipation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 6950–6961.
- [185] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, Naman Goyal, Jingfei Du, Mandar Joshi, Danqi Chen, Omer Levy, Mike Lewis, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Veselin Stoyanov. 2019. Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach. *arXiv:1907.11692* (2019).
- [186] Yi Liu, Limin Wang, Yali Wang, Xiao Ma, and Yu Qiao. 2022. Fineaction: A fine-grained video dataset for temporal action localization. *IEEE TIP* 31 (2022), 6937–6950.
- [187] Ze Liu, Yutong Lin, Yue Cao, Han Hu, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Baining Guo. 2021. Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 10012–10022.
- [188] Ze Liu, Jia Ning, Yue Cao, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Han Hu. 2022. Video swin transformer. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 3202–3211.
- [189] Jonathon Luiten, Aljosa Osep, Patrick Dendorfer, Philip Torr, Andreas Geiger, Laura Leal-Taixé, and Bastian Leibe. 2021. Hota: A higher order metric for evaluating multi-object tracking. *IJCV* 129 (2021), 548–578.
- [190] Huaishao Luo, Lei Ji, Botian Shi, Haoyang Huang, Nan Duan, Tianrui Li, Jason Li, Taroon Bharti, and Ming Zhou. 2020. UniVL: A Unified Video and Language Pre-Training Model for Multimodal Understanding and Generation. *arXiv* (2020).
- [191] Huaishao Luo, Lei Ji, Ming Zhong, Yang Chen, Wen Lei, Nan Duan, and Tianrui Li. 2022. Clip4clip: An empirical study of clip for end to end video clip retrieval and captioning. *Neurocomputing* 508 (2022), 293–304.
- [192] Ruipu Luo, Ziwang Zhao, Min Yang, Junwei Dong, Da Li, Pengcheng Lu, Tao Wang, Linmei Hu, Minghui Qiu, and Zhongyu Wei. 2023. Valley: Video Assistant with Large Language model Enhanced ability. *arXiv* (2023).
- [193] Chenyang Lyu, Minghao Wu, Longyue Wang, Xinting Huang, Bingshuai Liu, Zefeng Du, Shuming Shi, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2023. Macaw-LLM: Multi-Modal Language Modeling with Image, Audio, Video, and Text Integration. *arXiv* (2023).

- [194] Chenyang Lyu, Minghao Wu, Longyue Wang, Xinting Huang, Bingshuai Liu, Zefeng Du, Shuming Shi, and Zhaopeng Tu. 2023. Macaw-LLM: Multi-Modal Language Modeling with Image, Audio, Video, and Text Integration. *arXiv* (2023).
- [195] Yue Ma, Tianyu Yang, Yin Shan, and Xiu Li. 2022. SimVTP: Simple Video Text Pre-training with Masked Autoencoders. *arXiv* (2022).
- [196] Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Rasheed, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. 2023. Video-ChatGPT: Towards Detailed Video Understanding via Large Vision and Language Models. *arXiv* (2023).
- [197] Neelu Madan, Nicolae-Cătălin Ristea, Kamal Nasrollahi, Thomas B Moeslund, and Radu Tudor Ionescu. 2024. CL-MAE: Curriculum-Learned Masked Autoencoders. In *Proceedings of WACV*. 2492–2502.
- [198] Karttikeya Mangalam, Raiymbek Akshulakov, and Jitendra Malik. 2023. Egoschema: A diagnostic benchmark for very long-form video language understanding. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*.
- [199] Minesh Mathew, Dimosthenis Karatzas, and CV Jawahar. 2021. Docvqa: A dataset for vqa on document images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*. 2200–2209.
- [200] Antoine Miech, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Lucas Smaira, Ivan Laptev, Josef Sivic, and Andrew Zisserman. 2020. End-to-end learning of visual representations from uncurated instructional videos. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 9879–9889.
- [201] Antoine Miech, Dimitri Zhukov, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Makarand Tapaswi, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. 2019. Howto100m: Learning a text-video embedding by watching hundred million narrated video clips. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 2630–2640.
- [202] Anton Milan, Laura Leal-Taixé, Ian Reid, Stefan Roth, and Konrad Schindler. 2016. MOT16: A benchmark for multi-object tracking. *arXiv* (2016).
- [203] Ben Mildenhall, Pratul P Srinivasan, Matthew Tancik, Jonathan T Barron, Ravi Ramamoorthi, and Ren Ng. 2020. NeRF: Representing Scenes as Neural Radiance Fields for View Synthesis. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 405–421.
- [204] Rajat Modi, Aayush Jung Rana, Akash Kumar, Praveen Tirupattur, Shruti Vyas, Yogesh Singh Rawat, and Mubarak Shah. 2022. Video action detection: Analysing limitations and challenges. *arXiv:2204.07892* (2022).
- [205] Rajat Modi, Vibhav Vineet, and Yogesh Rawat. 2024. On Occlusions in Video Action Detection: Benchmark Datasets And Training Recipes. *Proceedings of NeurIPS* (2024).
- [206] Ron Mokady, Amir Hertz, and Amit H Bermano. 2021. Clipcap: Clip prefix for image captioning. *arXiv:2111.09734* (2021).
- [207] Eyal Molad, Eliahu Horwitz, Dani Valevski, Alex Rav Acha, Yossi Matias, Yael Pritch, Yaniv Leviathan, and Yedid Hoshen. 2023. Dreamix: Video diffusion models are general video editors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01329* (2023).
- [208] Liliane Momeni, Mathilde Caron, Arsha Nagrani, Andrew Zisserman, and Cordelia Schmid. 2023. Verbs in action: Improving verb understanding in video-language models. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 15579–15591.
- [209] Mathew Monfort, Alex Andonian, Bolei Zhou, Kandan Ramakrishnan, Sarah Adel Bargal, Tom Yan, Lisa Brown, Quanfu Fan, Dan Gutfreund, Carl Vondrick, et al. 2019. Moments in time dataset: one million videos for event understanding. *IEEE TPAMI* 42, 2 (2019), 502–508.
- [210] Mathew Monfort, SouYoung Jin, Alexander Liu, David Harwath, Rogerio Feris, James Glass, and Aude Oliva. 2021. Spoken moments: Learning joint audio-visual representations from video descriptions. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 14871–14881.
- [211] Mathew Monfort, SouYoung Jin, Alexander Liu, David Harwath, Rogerio Feris, James Glass, and Aude Oliva. 2021. Spoken moments: Learning joint audio-visual representations from video descriptions. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 14871–14881.
- [212] Shehan Munasinghe, Rusiru Thushara, Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Abdul Rasheed, Salman Khan, Mubarak Shah, and Fahad Khan. 2023. PG-Video-LLaVA: Pixel Grounding Large Video-Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13435* (2023).
- [213] Varun K Nagaraja, Vlad I Morariu, and Larry S Davis. 2016. Modeling context between objects for referring expression understanding. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 792–807.
- [214] Arsha Nagrani, Paul Hongsuck Seo, Bryan Seybold, Anja Hauth, Santiago Manen, Chen Sun, and Cordelia Schmid. 2022. Learning audio-video modalities from image captions. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 407–426.
- [215] Bolin Ni, Houwen Peng, Minghao Chen, Songyang Zhang, Gaofeng Meng, Jianlong Fu, Shiming Xiang, and Haibin Ling. 2022. Expanding Language-Image Pretrained Models for General Video Recognition. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 1–18.
- [216] Munan Ning, Bin Zhu, Yujia Xie, Bin Lin, Jiayi Cui, Lu Yuan, Dongdong Chen, and Li Yuan. 2023. Video-Bench: A Comprehensive Benchmark and Toolkit for Evaluating Video-based Large Language Models. *arXiv* (2023).
- [217] Xu Ning, Yang Linjie, Yang Jianchao, Yue Dingcheng, Fan Yuchen, Liang Yuchen, and S. Huang. Thomas. 2021. Youtubevis dataset 2021 version. <https://youtube-vos.org/dataset/vis/>.
- [218] Andreea-Maria Oncescu, Joao F Henriques, Yang Liu, Andrew Zisserman, and Samuel Albanie. 2021. Queryd: A video dataset with high-quality text and audio narrations. In *Proceedings of ICASSP*. 2265–2269.
- [219] OpenAI. 2023. ChatGPT [Large language model]. <https://chat.openai.com/chat> Accessed: 2024-03-28.
- [220] OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. *arXiv:2303.08774* (2023).
- [221] Vicente Ordonez, Girish Kulkarni, and Tamara Berg. 2011. Im2Text: Describing Images Using 1 Million Captioned Photographs. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*, J. Shawe-Taylor, R. Zemel, P. Bartlett, F. Pereira, and K.Q. Weinberger (Eds.).
- [222] Vicente Ordonez, Girish Kulkarni, and Tamara Berg. 2011. Im2text: Describing images using 1 million captioned photographs. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*.
- [223] Junting Pan, Ziyi Lin, Xiatian Zhu, Jing Shao, and Hongsheng Li. 2022. St-adapter: Parameter-efficient image-to-video transfer learning. *Proceedings of NeurIPS* (2022), 26462–26477.

- [224] Tian Pan, Yibing Song, Tianyu Yang, Wenhao Jiang, and Wei Liu. 2021. Videomoco: Contrastive video representation learning with temporally adversarial examples. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 11205–11214.
- [225] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of ACL*. 311–318.
- [226] Jungin Park, Jiyoung Lee, and Kwanghoon Sohn. 2023. Dual-path Adaptation from Image to Video Transformers. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 2203–2213.
- [227] Nikhil Parthasarathy, SM Ali Eslami, Joao Carreira, and Olivier J. Henaff. 2023. Self-supervised video pretraining yields robust and more human-aligned visual representations. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*.
- [228] Lang Peng, Zhirong Chen, Zhangjie Fu, Pengpeng Liang, and Erkang Cheng. 2023. Bevsegformer: Bird’s eye view semantic segmentation from arbitrary camera rigs. In *Proceedings of WACV*. 5935–5943.
- [229] Zhiliang Peng, Wenhui Wang, Li Dong, Yaru Hao, Shaohan Huang, Shuming Ma, and Furu Wei. 2023. Kosmos-2: Grounding Multimodal Large Language Models to the World. *arXiv:2306.14824* (2023).
- [230] Federico Perazzi, Jordi Pont-Tuset, Brian McWilliams, Luc Van Gool, Markus Gross, and Alexander Sorkine-Hornung. 2016. A benchmark dataset and evaluation methodology for video object segmentation. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 724–732.
- [231] Valerio Perrone, Huibin Shen, Aida Zolic, Iaroslav Shcherbatyi, Amr Ahmed, Tanya Bansal, Michele Donini, Fela Winkelmolen, Rodolphe Jenatton, Jean Baptiste Faddoul, et al. 2021. Amazon sagemaker automatic model tuning: Scalable gradient-free optimization. In *Proceedings of SIGKDD*. 3463–3471.
- [232] Thanh Phan, Khoa Vo, Duy Le, Gianfranco Doretto, Donald Adjeroh, and Ngan Le. 2023. ZEETAD: Adapting Pretrained Vision-Language Model for Zero-Shot End-to-End Temporal Action Detection. *arXiv* (2023).
- [233] Jonah Philion and Sanja Fidler. 2020. Lift, splat, shoot: Encoding images from arbitrary camera rigs by implicitly unprojecting to 3d. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 194–210.
- [234] Chenyang Qi, Xiaodong Cun, Yong Zhang, Chenyang Lei, Xintao Wang, Ying Shan, and Qifeng Chen. 2023. Fatezero: Fusing attentions for zero-shot text-based video editing. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 15932–15942.
- [235] Jiyang Qi, Yan Gao, Yao Hu, Xinggang Wang, Xiaoyu Liu, Xiang Bai, Serge Belongie, Alan Yuille, Philip HS Torr, and Song Bai. 2022. Occluded video instance segmentation: A benchmark. *IJCV* 130, 8 (2022), 2022–2039.
- [236] Rui Qian, Yeqing Li, Zheng Xu, Ming-Hsuan Yang, Serge Belongie, and Yin Cui. 2022. Multimodal open-vocabulary video classification via pre-trained vision and language models. *arXiv:2207.07646* (2022).
- [237] Zhiwu Qing, Shiwei Zhang, Ziyuan Huang, Yingya Zhang, Changxin Gao, Deli Zhao, and Nong Sang. 2023. Disentangling Spatial and Temporal Learning for Efficient Image-to-Video Transfer Learning. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 13934–13944.
- [238] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *Proceedings of ICML*. 8748–8763.
- [239] Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. Language Models are Unsupervised Multitask Learners. *OpenAI blog* (2019).
- [240] Frano Rajić, Lei Ke, Yu-Wing Tai, Chi-Keung Tang, Martin Danelljan, and Fisher Yu. 2023. Segment Anything Meets Point Tracking. *arXiv* (2023).
- [241] Aditya Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. 2021. Zero-shot text-to-image generation. In *Proceedings of ICML*. 8821–8831.
- [242] Kanchana Ranasinghe and Michael S Ryoo. 2023. Language-based action concept spaces improve video self-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*.
- [243] René Ranftl, Alexey Bochkovskiy, and Vladlen Koltun. 2021. Vision transformers for dense prediction. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 12179–12188.
- [244] Hanoona Rasheed, Muhammad Uzair Khattak, Muhammad Maaz, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. 2023. Fine-tuned CLIP Models are Efficient Video Learners. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 6545–6554.
- [245] Anna Rohrbach, Marcus Rohrbach, Niket Tandon, and Bernt Schiele. 2015. A dataset for movie description. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 3202–3212.
- [246] David Romero and Tamar Solorio. 2024. Question-Instructed Visual Descriptions for Zero-Shot Video Question Answering. *arXiv:2402.10698* (2024).
- [247] Sitapa Rujikietgumjorn and Nattachai Watcharapinchai. 2017. Vehicle detection with sub-class training using R-CNN for the UA-DETRAC benchmark. *Proceedings of AVSS* (2017), 1–5.
- [248] Olga Russakovsky, Jia Deng, Hao Su, Jonathan Krause, Sanjeev Satheesh, Sean Ma, Zhiheng Huang, Andrej Karpathy, Aditya Khosla, Michael Bernstein, et al. 2015. Imagenet large scale visual recognition challenge. *International journal of computer vision* 115 (2015), 211–252.
- [249] Masaki Saito, Shunta Saito, Masanori Koyama, and Sosuke Kobayashi. 2020. Train sparsely, generate densely: Memory-efficient unsupervised training of high-resolution temporal gan. *IJCV* 128, 10-11 (2020), 2586–2606.
- [250] Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. 2019. DistilBERT, a distilled version of BERT: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108* (2019).
- [251] Madeline Chantry Schiappa, Naman Biyani, Prudvi Kamtam, Shruti Vyas, Hamid Palangi, Vibhav Vineet, and Yogesh S Rawat. 2023. A large-scale robustness analysis of video action recognition models. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 14698–14708.
- [252] Madeline C Schiappa, Yogesh S Rawat, and Mubarak Shah. 2023. Self-supervised learning for videos: A survey. *Comput. Surveys* 55, 13s (2023), 1–37.

- [253] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, et al. 2022. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*, Vol. 35. 25278–25294.
- [254] Christoph Schuhmann, Richard Vencu, Romain Beaumont, Robert Kaczmarczyk, Clayton Mullis, Aarush Katta, Theo Coombes, Jenia Jitsev, and Aran Komatsuzaki. 2021. Laion-400m: Open dataset of clip-filtered 400 million image-text pairs. *arXiv:2111.02114* (2021).
- [255] Paul Hongsuck Seo, Arsha Nagrani, Anurag Arnab, and Cordelia Schmid. 2022. End-to-end generative pretraining for multimodal video captioning. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 17959–17968.
- [256] Seonguk Seo, Joon-Young Lee, and Bohyung Han. 2020. URVOS: Unified Referring Video Object Segmentation Network with a Large-Scale Benchmark. In *Proceeding of the ECCV*. 208–223.
- [257] Shuai Shao, Zeming Li, Tianyuan Zhang, Chao Peng, Gang Yu, Xiangyu Zhang, Jing Li, and Jian Sun. 2019. Objects365: A large-scale, high-quality dataset for object detection. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 8430–8439.
- [258] Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, Sebastian Goodman, and Radu Soricut. 2018. Conceptual captions: A cleaned, hypernymed, image alt-text dataset for automatic image captioning. In *Proceedings of ACL*. 2556–2565.
- [259] Gunnar A Sigurdsson, Gül Varol, Xiaolong Wang, Ali Farhadi, Ivan Laptev, and Abhinav Gupta. 2016. Hollywood in homes: Crowdsourcing data collection for activity understanding. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 510–526.
- [260] Uriel Singer, Adam Polyak, Thomas Hayes, Xi Yin, Jie An, Songyang Zhang, Qiyuan Hu, Harry Yang, Oron Ashual, Oran Gafni, et al. 2022. Make-a-video: Text-to-video generation without text-video data. *arXiv:2209.14792* (2022).
- [261] Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Eric Weiss, Niru Maheswaranathan, and Surya Ganguli. 2015. Deep unsupervised learning using nonequilibrium thermodynamics. In *Proceedings of ICML*. 2256–2265.
- [262] Enxin Song, Wenhao Chai, Guanhong Wang, Yucheng Zhang, Haoyang Zhou, Feiyang Wu, Xun Guo, Tian Ye, Yan Lu, Jenq-Neng Hwang, and Gaoang Wang. 2023. MovieChat: From Dense Token to Sparse Memory for Long Video Understanding. *arXiv* (2023).
- [263] Yuxin Song, Min Yang, Wenhao Wu, Dongliang He, Fu Li, and Jingdong Wang. 2022. It Takes Two: Masked Appearance-Motion Modeling for Self-supervised Video Transformer Pre-training. *arXiv* (2022).
- [264] Khurram Soomro, Amir Roshan Zamir, and Mubarak Shah. 2012. UCF101: A dataset of 101 human actions classes from videos in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.0402* (2012).
- [265] Chen Sun, Austin Myers, Carl Vondrick, Kevin Murphy, and Cordelia Schmid. 2019. Videobert: A joint model for video and language representation learning. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 7464–7473.
- [266] Guangzhi Sun, Wenyi Yu, Changli Tang, Xianzhao Chen, Tian Tan, Wei Li, Lu Lu, Zejun Ma, and Chao Zhang. 2023. Fine-grained Audio-Visual Joint Representations for Multimodal Large Language Models. *arXiv:2310.05863* (2023).
- [267] Quan Sun, Yuxin Fang, Ledell Wu, Xinlong Wang, and Yue Cao. 2023. Eva-clip: Improved training techniques for clip at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15389* (2023).
- [268] Yuchong Sun, Hongwei Xue, Ruihua Song, Bei Liu, Huan Yang, and Jianlong Fu. 2022. Long-form video-language pre-training with multimodal temporal contrastive learning. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*. 38032–38045.
- [269] Ramana Sundararaman, Cedric De Almeida Braga, Eric Marchand, and Julien Pettre. 2021. Tracking pedestrian heads in dense crowd. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 3865–3875.
- [270] Hao Tan, Jie Lei, Thomas Wolf, and Mohit Bansal. 2021. Vimpac: Video pre-training via masked token prediction and contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.11250* (2021).
- [271] Mingkang Tang, Zhanyu Wang, Zhenhua Liu, Fengyun Rao, Dian Li, and Xiu Li. 2021. Clip4caption: Clip for video caption. In *Proceedings of ACM-MM*. 4858–4862.
- [272] Yansong Tang, Dajun Ding, Yongming Rao, Yu Zheng, Danyang Zhang, Lili Zhao, Jiwen Lu, and Jie Zhou. 2019. Coin: A large-scale dataset for comprehensive instructional video analysis. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 1207–1216.
- [273] Zineng Tang, Jaemin Cho, Jie Lei, and Mohit Bansal. 2023. Perceiver-vl: Efficient vision-and-language modeling with iterative latent attention. In *Proceedings of WACV*. 4410–4420.
- [274] Zineng Tang, Jaemin Cho, Yixin Nie, and Mohit Bansal. 2022. TVLT: Textless vision-language transformer. *Proceedings of NeurIPS* (2022), 9617–9632.
- [275] Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, Vinh Q Tran, Xavier Garcia, Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Hyung Won Chung, Dara Bahri, Tal Schuster, Steven Zheng, et al. 2022. Ul2: Unifying language learning paradigms. In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- [276] Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, Vinh Q Tran, Xavier Garcia, Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Hyung Won Chung, Dara Bahri, Tal Schuster, Steven Zheng, et al. 2022. Ul2: Unifying language learning paradigms. In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- [277] Zachary Teed and Jia Deng. 2020. Raft: Recurrent all-pairs field transforms for optical flow. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 402–419.
- [278] Zhan Tong, Yibing Song, Jue Wang, and Limin Wang. 2022. Videomae: Masked autoencoders are data-efficient learners for self-supervised video pre-training. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*. 10078–10093.
- [279] Atousa Torabi, Niket Tandon, and Leonid Sigal. 2016. Learning language-visual embedding for movie understanding with natural-language. *arXiv:1609.08124* (2016).
- [280] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv:2302.13971* (2023).

- [281] Du Tran, Lubomir Bourdev, Rob Fergus, Lorenzo Torresani, and Manohar Paluri. 2015. Learning spatiotemporal features with 3d convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 4489–4497.
- [282] Thomas Unterthiner, Sjoerd Van Steenkiste, Karol Kurach, Raphael Marinier, Marcin Michalski, and Sylvain Gelly. 2018. Towards accurate generative models of video: A new metric & challenges. *arXiv:1812.01717* (2018).
- [283] Aaron Van Den Oord, Oriol Vinyals, et al. 2017. Neural discrete representation learning. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*.
- [284] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*.
- [285] Ramakrishna Vedantam, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. 2015. Cider: Consensus-based image description evaluation. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 4566–4575.
- [286] Oriol Vinyals, Alexander Toshev, Samy Bengio, and Dumitru Erhan. 2016. Show and tell: Lessons learned from the 2015 mscoco image captioning challenge. *IEEE PAMI* 39, 4 (2016), 652–663.
- [287] Haochen Wang, Cilin Yan, Shuai Wang, Xiaolong Jiang, Xu Tang, Yao Hu, Weidi Xie, and Efstratios Gavves. 2023. Towards open-vocabulary video instance segmentation. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 4057–4066.
- [288] Junke Wang, Dongdong Chen, Chong Luo, Xiyang Dai, Lu Yuan, Zuxuan Wu, and Yu-Gang Jiang. 2023. Chatvideo: A tracklet-centric multimodal and versatile video understanding system. *arXiv:2304.14407* (2023).
- [289] Junke Wang, Dongdong Chen, Zuxuan Wu, Chong Luo, Luowei Zhou, Yucheng Zhao, Yujia Xie, Ce Liu, Yu-Gang Jiang, and Lu Yuan. 2022. Omnivl: One foundation model for image-language and video-language tasks. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*, Vol. 35. 5696–5710.
- [290] Jinpeng Wang, Yixiao Ge, Guanyu Cai, Rui Yan, Xudong Lin, Ying Shan, Xiaohu Qie, and Mike Zheng Shou. 2022. Object-aware video-language pre-training for retrieval. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 3313–3322.
- [291] Jinpeng Wang, Yixiao Ge, Rui Yan, Yuying Ge, Kevin Qinghong Lin, Satoshi Tsutsui, Xudong Lin, Guanyu Cai, Jianping Wu, and Ying Shan. 2023. All in one: Exploring unified video-language pre-training. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 6598–6608.
- [292] Limin Wang, Bingkun Huang, Zhiyu Zhao, Zhan Tong, Yinan He, Yi Wang, Yali Wang, and Yu Qiao. 2023. Videomae v2: Scaling video masked autoencoders with dual masking. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 14549–14560.
- [293] Mengmeng Wang, Jiazheng Xing, Boyuan Jiang, Jun Chen, Jianbiao Mei, Xingxing Zuo, Guang Dai, Jingdong Wang, and Yong Liu. 2024. M2-CLIP: A Multimodal, Multi-task Adapting Framework for Video Action Recognition. *arXiv:2401.11649* (2024).
- [294] Mengmeng Wang, Jiazheng Xing, and Yong Liu. 2021. Actionclip: A new paradigm for video action recognition. *arXiv:2109.08472* (2021).
- [295] Qiang Wang, Junlong Du, Ke Yan, and Shouhong Ding. 2023. Seeing in Flowing: Adapting CLIP for Action Recognition with Motion Prompts Learning. In *Proceedings of ACM Multimedia*. 5339–5347.
- [296] Rui Wang, Dongdong Chen, Zuxuan Wu, Yinpeng Chen, Xiyang Dai, Mengchen Liu, Yu-Gang Jiang, Luowei Zhou, and Lu Yuan. 2022. Bevt: Bert pretraining of video transformers. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 14733–14743.
- [297] Rui Wang, Dongdong Chen, Zuxuan Wu, Yinpeng Chen, Xiyang Dai, Mengchen Liu, Lu Yuan, and Yu-Gang Jiang. 2023. Masked video distillation: Rethinking masked feature modeling for self-supervised video representation learning. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 6312–6322.
- [298] Wenjing Wang, Huan Yang, Zixi Tuo, Huiguo He, Junchen Zhu, Jianlong Fu, and Jiaying Liu. 2023. VideoFactory: Swap Attention in Spatiotemporal Diffusions for Text-to-Video Generation. *arXiv:2305.10874* (2023).
- [299] Xiao Wang, Yaoyu Li, Tian Gan, Zheng Zhang, Jingjing Lv, and Liqiang Nie. 2023. RTQ: Rethinking Video-language Understanding Based on Image-text Model. In *Proceedings of ACM-MM*. 557–566.
- [300] Xiang Wang, Hangjie Yuan, Shiwei Zhang, Dayou Chen, Jiuniu Wang, Yingya Zhang, Yujun Shen, Deli Zhao, and Jingren Zhou. 2024. Videocomposer: Compositional video synthesis with motion controllability. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*.
- [301] Yuxuan Wang, Difei Gao, Licheng Yu, Weixian Lei, Matt Feiszli, and Mike Zheng Shou. 2022. Geb+: A benchmark for generic event boundary captioning, grounding and retrieval. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 709–725.
- [302] Yi Wang, Yinan He, Yizhuo Li, Kunchang Li, Jiashuo Yu, Xin Ma, Xinyuan Chen, Yaohui Wang, Ping Luo, Ziwei Liu, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. 2023. InternVid: A Large-scale Video-Text Dataset for Multimodal Understanding and Generation. *arXiv* (2023).
- [303] Yi Wang, Kunchang Li, Xinhao Li, Jiashuo Yu, Yinan He, Guo Chen, Baoqi Pei, Rongkun Zheng, Jilan Xu, Zun Wang, et al. 2024. InternVideo2: Scaling Video Foundation Models for Multimodal Video Understanding. *arXiv:2403.15377* (2024).
- [304] Yi Wang, Kunchang Li, Yizhuo Li, Yinan He, Bingkun Huang, Zhiyu Zhao, Hongjie Zhang, Jilan Xu, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Sen Xing, Guo Chen, Junting Pan, Jiashuo Yu, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. 2022. InternVideo: General Video Foundation Models via Generative and Discriminative Learning. *arXiv* (2022).
- [305] Yi Wang, Kunchang Li, Yizhuo Li, Yinan He, Bingkun Huang, Zhiyu Zhao, Hongjie Zhang, Jilan Xu, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Sen Xing, Guo Chen, Junting Pan, Jiashuo Yu, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. 2022. InternVideo: General Video Foundation Models via Generative and Discriminative Learning. *arXiv* (2022).
- [306] Zhenhailong Wang, Ansel Blume, Sha Li, Genglin Liu, Jaemin Cho, Zineng Tang, Mohit Bansal, and Heng Ji. 2023. Paxion: Patching Action Knowledge in Video-Language Foundations Models. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*.
- [307] Syed Talal Wasim, Muzammal Naseer, Salman Khan, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Mubarak Shah. 2023. Vita-CLIP: Video and text adaptive CLIP via Multimodal Prompting. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 23034–23044.
- [308] Syed Talal Wasim, Muzammal Naseer, Salman Khan, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Mubarak Shah. 2023. Vita-CLIP: Video and text adaptive CLIP via Multimodal Prompting. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 23034–23044.

- [309] Chen Wei, Haoqi Fan, Saining Xie, Chao-Yuan Wu, Alan Yuille, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. 2022. Masked feature prediction for self-supervised visual pre-training. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 14668–14678.
- [310] Bo Wu, Shoubin Yu, Zhenfang Chen, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Chuang Gan. 2021. Star: A benchmark for situated reasoning in real-world videos. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*.
- [311] Chenfei Wu, Lun Huang, Qianxi Zhang, Binyang Li, Lei Ji, Fan Yang, Guillermo Sapiro, and Nan Duan. 2021. Godiva: Generating open-domain videos from natural descriptions. *arXiv:2104.14806* (2021).
- [312] Chenfei Wu, Jian Liang, Lei Ji, Fan Yang, Yuejian Fang, Daxin Jiang, and Nan Duan. 2022. Nüwa: Visual synthesis pre-training for neural visual world creation. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 720–736.
- [313] Chao-Yuan Wu and Philipp Krahenbuhl. 2021. Towards long-form video understanding. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 1884–1894.
- [314] Jialin Wu, Xia Hu, Yaqing Wang, Bo Pang, and Radu Soricut. 2023. Omni-SMoLA: Boosting Generalist Multimodal Models with Soft Mixture of Low-rank Experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00968* (2023).
- [315] Junfeng Wu, Yi Jiang, Qihao Liu, Zehuan Yuan, Xiang Bai, and Song Bai. 2023. General Object Foundation Model for Images and Videos at Scale. *arXiv:2312.09158* (2023).
- [316] Jiannan Wu, Yi Jiang, Peize Sun, Zehuan Yuan, and Ping Luo. 2022. Language as queries for referring video object segmentation. In *Proceedings of the CVPR*. 4974–4984.
- [317] Wenhao Wu, Xiaohan Wang, Haipeng Luo, Jingdong Wang, Yi Yang, and Wanli Ouyang. 2023. Bidirectional cross-modal knowledge exploration for video recognition with pre-trained vision-language models. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 6620–6630.
- [318] Junbin Xiao, Xindi Shang, Angela Yao, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2021. Next-qa: Next phase of question-answering to explaining temporal actions. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 9777–9786.
- [319] Junfei Xiao, Zheng Xu, Alan Yuille, Shen Yan, and Boyu Wang. 2024. PaLM2-VAdapter: Progressively Aligned Language Model Makes a Strong Vision-language Adapter. *arXiv:2402.10896* (2024).
- [320] Dejing Xu, Zhou Zhao, Jun Xiao, Fei Wu, Hanwang Zhang, Xiangnan He, and Yueting Zhuang. 2017. Video question answering via gradually refined attention over appearance and motion. In *Proceedings of ACM-MM*. 1645–1653.
- [321] Hu Xu, Gargi Ghosh, Po-Yao Huang, Prahal Arora, Masoumeh Aminzadeh, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Florian Metze, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2021. VLM: Task-agnostic Video-Language Model Pre-training for Video Understanding. In *Proceedings of ACL-IJCNLP*. 4227–4239.
- [322] Hu Xu, Gargi Ghosh, Po-Yao Huang, Dmytro Okhonko, Armen Aghajanyan, Florian Metze, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. 2021. VideoCLIP: Contrastive Pre-training for Zero-shot Video-Text Understanding. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*. 6787–6800.
- [323] Haiyang Xu, Qinghao Ye, Ming Yan, Yaya Shi, Jiabo Ye, Yuanhong Xu, Chenliang Li, Bin Bi, Qi Qian, Wei Wang, Guohai Xu, Ji Zhang, Songfang Huang, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. mPLUG-2: A Modularized Multi-modal Foundation Model Across Text, Image and Video. *arXiv* (2023).
- [324] Jiaqi Xu, Bo Liu, Yunkuo Chen, Mengli Cheng, and Xing Shi. 2023. MuLTI: Efficient Video-and-Language Understanding with MultiWay-Sampler and Multiple Choice Modeling. *arXiv* (2023).
- [325] Jun Xu, Tao Mei, Ting Yao, and Yong Rui. 2016. Msr-vtt: A large video description dataset for bridging video and language. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 5288–5296.
- [326] Hongwei Xue, Tiankai Hang, Yanhong Zeng, Yuchong Sun, Bei Liu, Huan Yang, Jianlong Fu, and Baining Guo. 2022. Advancing high-resolution video-language representation with large-scale video transcriptions. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 5036–5045.
- [327] Hongwei Xue, Yuchong Sun, Bei Liu, Jianlong Fu, Ruihua Song, Houqiang Li, and Jiebo Luo. 2023. CLIP-ViP: Adapting Pre-trained Image-Text Model to Video-Language Representation Alignment. *arXiv* (2023).
- [328] Zihui Xue, Kumar Ashutosh, and Kristen Grauman. 2023. Learning Object State Changes in Videos: An Open-World Perspective. *arXiv:2312.11782* (2023).
- [329] Shen Yan, Tao Zhu, Zirui Wang, Yuan Cao, Mi Zhang, Soham Ghosh, Yonghui Wu, and Jiahui Yu. 2023. VideoCoCa: Video-Text Modeling with Zero-Shot Transfer from Contrastive Captioners. *arXiv* (2023).
- [330] Antoine Yang, Antoine Miech, Josef Sivic, Ivan Laptev, and Cordelia Schmid. 2021. Just ask: Learning to answer questions from millions of narrated videos. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 1686–1697.
- [331] Jinyu Yang, Mingqi Gao, Zhe Li, Shang Gao, Fangjing Wang, and Feng Zheng. 2023. Track Anything: Segment Anything Meets Videos. *arXiv* (2023).
- [332] Linjie Yang, Yuchen Fan, and Ning Xu. 2019. Video instance segmentation. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 5188–5197.
- [333] Taojiannan Yang, Yi Zhu, Yusheng Xie, Aston Zhang, Chen Chen, and Mu Li. 2022. AIM: Adapting Image Models for Efficient Video Action Recognition. In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- [334] Qinghao Ye, Guohai Xu, Ming Yan, Haiyang Xu, Qi Qian, Ji Zhang, and Fei Huang. 2023. Hitea: Hierarchical temporal-aware video-language pre-training. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 15405–15416.
- [335] Kexin Yi, Chuang Gan, Yunzhu Li, Pushmeet Kohli, Jiajun Wu, Antonio Torralba, and Joshua B Tenenbaum. 2019. CLEVRER: Collision Events for Video Representation and Reasoning. In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- [336] Adeel Yousaf, Muzammal Naseer, Salman Khan, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Mubarak Shah. 2023. Videoprompter: an ensemble of foundational models for zero-shot video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15324* (2023).
- [337] Fisher Yu, Haofeng Chen, Xin Wang, Wenqi Xian, Yingying Chen, Fangchen Liu, Vashisht Madhavan, and Trevor Darrell. 2020. Bdd100k: A diverse driving dataset for heterogeneous multitask learning. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 2636–2645.

- [338] Haonan Yu, Jiang Wang, Zhiheng Huang, Yi Yang, and Wei Xu. 2016. Video paragraph captioning using hierarchical recurrent neural networks. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 4584–4593.
- [339] Jiahui Yu, Zirui Wang, Vijay Vasudevan, Legg Yeung, Mojtaba Seyedhosseini, and Yonghui Wu. 2022. Coca: Contrastive captioners are image-text foundation models. *arXiv:2205.01917* (2022).
- [340] Licheng Yu, Patrick Poirson, Shan Yang, Alexander C Berg, and Tamara L Berg. 2016. Modeling context in referring expressions. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 69–85.
- [341] Youngjae Yu, Jongseok Kim, and Gunhee Kim. 2018. A joint sequence fusion model for video question answering and retrieval. In *Proceedings of ECCV*. 471–487.
- [342] Zhou Yu, Dejing Xu, Jun Yu, Ting Yu, Zhou Zhao, Yueting Zhuang, and Dacheng Tao. 2019. Activitynet-qa: A dataset for understanding complex web videos via question answering. In *Proceedings of AAAI*. 9127–9134.
- [343] Liangzhe Yuan, Nitesh Bharadwaj Gundavarapu, Long Zhao, Hao Zhou, Yin Cui, Lu Jiang, Xuan Yang, Menglin Jia, Tobias Weyand, Luke Friedman, et al. 2023. VideoGLUE: Video General Understanding Evaluation of Foundation Models. *arXiv:2307.03166* (2023).
- [344] Zhengqing Yuan, Ruoxi Chen, Zhaoxi Li, Haolong Jia, Lifang He, Chi Wang, and Lichao Sun. 2024. Mora: Enabling Generalist Video Generation via A Multi-Agent Framework. *arXiv:2403.13248* (2024).
- [345] Giacomo Zara, Victor Guilherme Turrissi da Costa, Subhankar Roy, Paolo Rota, and Elisa Ricci. 2024. Simplifying open-set video domain adaptation with contrastive learning. *CVTU* (2024), 103953.
- [346] Rowan Zellers, Ximing Lu, Jack Hessel, Youngjae Yu, Jae Sung Park, Jize Cao, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2021. Merlot: Multimodal neural script knowledge models. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*. 23634–23651.
- [347] Rowan Zellers, Ximing Lu, Jack Hessel, Youngjae Yu, Jae Sung Park, Jize Cao, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. 2021. Merlot: Multimodal neural script knowledge models. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*. 23634–23651.
- [348] Yan Zeng, Xinsong Zhang, Hang Li, Jiawei Wang, Jipeng Zhang, and Wangchunshu Zhou. 2023. X²-VLM: All-In-One Pre-trained Model For Vision-Language Tasks. *arXiv* (2023).
- [349] Xiaohua Zhai, Alexander Kolesnikov, Neil Houlsby, and Lucas Beyer. 2022. Scaling vision transformers. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 12104–12113.
- [350] Bill Zhang. 2016. Google’s neural machine translation system: Bridging the gap between human and machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.08144* (2016).
- [351] Binjie Zhang, Yixiao Ge, Xuyuan Xu, Ying Shan, and Mike Zheng Shou. 2023. TaCA: Upgrading Your Visual Foundation Model with Task-agnostic Compatible Adapter. *arXiv* (2023).
- [352] Hang Zhang, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. 2023. Video-LLaMA: An Instruction-tuned Audio-Visual Language Model for Video Understanding. *arXiv* (2023).
- [353] Hao Zhang, Aixin Sun, Wei Jing, and Joey Tianyi Zhou. 2023. Temporal sentence grounding in videos: A survey and future directions. *IEEE TPAMI* (2023).
- [354] Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. 2022. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv:2205.01068* (2022).
- [355] Zhenghao Zhang, Zhichao Wei, Shengfan Zhang, Zuozhuo Dai, and Siyu Zhu. 2023. UVOSAM: A Mask-free Paradigm for Unsupervised Video Object Segmentation via Segment Anything Model. *arXiv* (2023).
- [356] Hang Zhao, Antonio Torralba, Lorenzo Torresani, and Zhicheng Yan. 2019. Hacs: Human action clips and segments dataset for recognition and temporal localization. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 8668–8678.
- [357] Long Zhao, Nitesh B Gundavarapu, Liangzhe Yuan, Hao Zhou, Shen Yan, Jennifer J Sun, Luke Friedman, Rui Qian, Tobias Weyand, Yue Zhao, et al. 2024. VideoPrism: A Foundational Visual Encoder for Video Understanding. *arXiv:2402.13217* (2024).
- [358] Shuai Zhao, Linchao Zhu, Xiaohan Wang, and Yi Yang. 2022. CenterCLIP: Token Clustering for Efficient Text-Video Retrieval. In *Proceedings of SIGIR*. 970–981.
- [359] Yue Zhao and Philipp Krähenbühl. 2023. Training a large video model on a single machine in a day. *arXiv:2309.16669* (2023).
- [360] Yue Zhao, Ishan Misra, Philipp Krähenbühl, and Rohit Girdhar. 2023. Learning Video Representations from Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of CVPR*. 6586–6597.
- [361] Yue Zhao, Long Zhao, Xingyi Zhou, Jialin Wu, Chun-Te Chu, Hui Miao, Florian Schroff, Hartwig Adam, Ting Liu, Boqing Gong, et al. 2024. Distilling vision-language models on millions of videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06129* (2024).
- [362] Yang Zheng, Adam W Harley, Bokui Shen, Gordon Wetzstein, and Leonidas J Guibas. 2023. Pointodyssey: A large-scale synthetic dataset for long-term point tracking. In *Proceedings of ICCV*. 19855–19865.
- [363] Daquan Zhou, Weimin Wang, Hanshu Yan, Weiwei Lv, Yizhe Zhu, and Jiashi Feng. 2022. Magicvideo: Efficient video generation with latent diffusion models. *arXiv:2211.11018* (2022).
- [364] Luowei Zhou, Chenliang Xu, and Jason Corso. 2018. Towards automatic learning of procedures from web instructional videos. In *Proceedings of AAAI*.
- [365] Qianyu Zhou, Xiangtai Li, Lu He, Yibo Yang, Guangliang Cheng, Yunhai Tong, Lizhuang Ma, and Dacheng Tao. 2022. TransVOD: end-to-end video object detection with spatial-temporal transformers. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* (2022).
- [366] Tianfei Zhou, Fatih Porikli, David J Crandall, Luc Van Gool, and Wenguan Wang. 2022. A survey on deep learning technique for video segmentation. *IEEE TPAMI* 45, 6 (2022), 7099–7122.

- [367] Bin Zhu, Bin Lin, Munan Ning, Yang Yan, Jiayi Cui, HongFa Wang, Yatian Pang, Wenhao Jiang, Junwu Zhang, Zongwei Li, Wancai Zhang, Zhifeng Li, Wei Liu, and Li Yuan. 2023. LanguageBind: Extending Video-Language Pretraining to N-modality by Language-based Semantic Alignment. *arXiv* (2023).
- [368] Jiawen Zhu, Zhenyu Chen, Zeqi Hao, Shijie Chang, Lu Zhang, Dong Wang, Huchuan Lu, Bin Luo, Jun-Yan He, Jin-Peng Lan, Hanyuan Chen, and Chenyang Li. 2023. Tracking Anything in High Quality. *arXiv* (2023).