

Multimodal Fusion and Coherence Modeling for Video Topic Segmentation

Hai Yu, Chong Deng, Qinglin Zhang, Jiaqing Liu, Qian Chen, Wen Wang

Speech Lab, Alibaba Group

{yuhai.yu, w.wang}@alibaba-inc.com

Abstract

The video topic segmentation (VTS) task segments videos into intelligible, non-overlapping topics, facilitating efficient comprehension of video content and quick access to specific content. VTS is also critical to various downstream video understanding tasks. Traditional VTS methods using shallow features or unsupervised approaches struggle to accurately discern the nuances of topical transitions. Recently, supervised approaches have achieved superior performance on video action or scene segmentation over unsupervised approaches. In this work, we improve supervised VTS by thoroughly exploring **multimodal fusion** and **multimodal coherence modeling**. Specifically, (1) we enhance multimodal fusion by exploring different architectures using cross-attention and mixture of experts. (2) To generally strengthen multimodality alignment and fusion, we pre-train and fine-tune the model with multimodal contrastive learning. (3) We propose a new pre-training task tailored for the VTS task, and a novel fine-tuning task for enhancing multimodal coherence modeling for VTS. We evaluate the proposed approaches on educational videos, in the form of lectures, due to the vital role of topic segmentation of educational videos in boosting learning experiences. Additionally, we introduce a large-scale Chinese lecture video dataset to augment the existing English corpus, promoting further research in VTS. Experiments on both English and Chinese lecture datasets demonstrate that our model achieves superior VTS performance compared to competitive unsupervised and supervised baselines¹.

1 Introduction

The proliferation of digital video content over the last few decades has underscored the importance of efficient content navigation and comprehension.

¹The code and model checkpoints will be released upon acceptance

As the unstructured nature of videos poses significant challenges for users seeking to quickly grasp or reference specific topics, Video Topic Segmentation (VTS) has emerged as a vital tool in addressing these demands. By delineating videos into coherent non-overlapping topics, VTS not only facilitates intuitive understanding of video content but also enables swiftly pinpointing and accessing topics of interest. This is particularly pertinent for the furtherance of various video understanding tasks, where VTS serves as a foundational component.

Traditional VTS techniques predominantly hinge on shallow features (Gandhi et al., 2015; Soares and Barrère, 2018b; Ali et al., 2021) and unsupervised methods (Gupta et al., 2023) due to the scarcity of labeled data. These methods often fall short in capturing the semantic cues that signal topical shifts in video streams, hence suffer from limited precision. Recent advancements in supervised learning paradigms, benefiting from the availability of large-scale labeled data, have achieved notable performance improvements in various video segmentation tasks, such as video action segmentation (Zhou et al., 2018; Tang et al., 2019), scene segmentation (Huang et al., 2020; Islam et al., 2023), and topic segmentation (Wu et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023; Xing et al., 2024), surpassing unsupervised methods. Performance can be further enhanced by pre-training on vast volumes of unlabeled data (Xu et al., 2021; Mun et al., 2022) or initializing models from pre-trained models (Yan et al., 2023) and then fine-tuning the model. Hence, in this work, we focus on further improving supervised methods for VTS.

Compared to text topic segmentation (Koshorek et al., 2018; Xing and Carenini, 2021; Yu et al., 2023), videos contain rich and diverse multimodal contextual information. Fully utilizing multimodal information, such as visual cues and textual data (e.g., screen text and subtitles), could facilitate more detailed content understanding and in turn

more accurate semantic segmentation than relying on text only. Also, coherence is essential for understanding logical structures and semantics. Enhancing coherence modeling has achieved significant improvements in long document topic segmentation (Yu et al., 2023). Therefore, we improve supervised VTS methods by thoroughly exploring **multimodal fusion** and **multimodal coherence modeling**. We enhance multimodal fusion from the perspectives of model architecture and pre-training and fine-tuning tasks. Specifically, we compare various multimodal fusion architectures built upon Cross-Attention and Mixture-of-Experts (MoE). We investigate the effect of multi-modal contrastive learning for general pre-training and fine-tuning for strengthening cross-modal alignment. For enhancing multimodal coherence modeling, we propose a new pre-training task tailored for the VTS task, and a novel fine-tuning task by elevating intra-topic multimodal feature similarity and inter-topic multimodal feature differences. The proposed approaches are extensively evaluated on educational videos, in the form of lectures, due to the pivotal contributions of topic segmentation of educational videos in bolstering the learning experiences.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows.

- We propose a supervised multimodal sequence labeling model for VTS, denoted **MMVTS model**. We compare various multimodal fusion architectures. In addition to applying multimodal contrastive learning for strengthening cross-modal alignment, we propose a new self-supervised pre-training task tailored to the VTS task and a novel fine-tuning task for enhancing multimodal coherence modeling.
- We introduce a large-scale **Chinese Lecture Video Topic Segmentation** dataset (**CLVTS**) to promote the research of VTS.
- Experiments show that our model sets new state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance on both English and Chinese lecture video datasets, outperforming competitive unsupervised and supervised baselines. Comprehensive ablation study further confirms the effectiveness of our approaches.

2 Related Work

Text Topic Segmentation The objective of text topic segmentation is to automatically partition text into topically consistent, non-overlapping segments (Hearst, 1994). By automatically mining

clues of topic shifts from large amounts of labeled data (Koshorek et al., 2018; Arnold et al., 2019), contemporary supervised models (Lukasik et al., 2020; Somasundaran et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2023) have demonstrated superior performance compared to unsupervised approaches (Riedl and Biemann, 2012; Solbiati et al., 2021). Notably, supervised models that excel at modeling long sequences (Zhang et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2023) are capable of capturing longer contextual nuances and thereby achieve better topic segmentation performance, compared to models that model local sentence pairs or block pairs (Wang et al., 2017; Lukasik et al., 2020). In addition, recent works (Somasundaran et al., 2020; Xing et al., 2020; Yu et al., 2023) have demonstrated that strengthening coherence modeling can improve the topic segmentation performance. Therefore, in this work, we explore enhancing coherence modeling for video topic segmentation under the multimodal configurations.

Video Topic Segmentation Distinct from text topic segmentation, video topic segmentation is inherently characterized by its multimodal data context; hence, comprehensive utilization of the multimodal information could improve semantic understanding capabilities of a model. Specifically, Gupta et al. (2023) introduce an unsupervised method that employs the TWFINCH algorithm (Sarfraz et al., 2021) to cluster video clips into distinct topics based on learned visual and text features, which are derived from self-supervised tasks of matching the narration with the temporally aligned visual content. Wang et al. (2023) simply concatenate the sampled encoded visual features and text embedding as the input to a pre-trained language model, which may cause inferior fine-tuning due to the discrepancy between the pre-training stage of the language model and the fine-tuning stage combining textual and visual inputs. Other works related to VTS are summarized and compared in Appendix A.

3 The CLVTS Dataset

Collection Procedure The CLVTS dataset is primarily sourced from Public Video Platforms²³. Videos are first transcribed by a competitive automatic speech recognition (ASR) system⁴. We then ask annotators to combine visual and textual

²<https://study.163.com/>

³<https://www.bilibili.com/v/knowledge>

⁴<https://tingwu.aliyun.com/home>

Dataset	Videos	Hours	Topics/Video	Clips/Topic	Tokens/Clip	Seconds/Clip	Language
NPTTEL10 (Gandhi et al., 2015)	12	-	-	-	-	-	English
Videoaula (Soares and Barrère, 2018a)	44	26.4	-	-	-	-	Portuguese
CS80 (Soares and Barrère, 2019)	80	-	-	-	-	-	English
MOOC100 (Das and Das, 2019)	100	100	6.9	-	-	-	English
Coursera37 (Chand and Oğul, 2021)	37	2.8	16.5	-	-	-	English
AVLecture (Gupta et al., 2023)	350	297.5	5.4	46.2	26.6	12.3	English
CLVTS (Ours)	510	395	10.1	35.7	31.2	7.7	Chinese

Table 1: Comparison between our CLVTS and existing course video datasets for video topic segmentation.




Figure 1: Statistics of the CLVTS dataset.

(ASR 1-best) information to mark the timestamp (in seconds) of the end of each topic. We ensure high accuracy and reliability of annotations from three aspects, including **annotator training**, **hierarchical topic labeling**, and a **multi-annotator strategy**. Details of these strategies and the rigorous quality assessment and quality control we conduct can be found in Appendix B.

Dataset Statistics To measure the extent of consensus for VTS annotations, following (Shou et al., 2021), we compute the $F_1@k$ score (described in Appendix D) based on the absolute distance between two topic boundary sequences, varying the threshold k from 0 to 8 seconds with a step size of 2 seconds, where 8 seconds are approximately the average duration of a clip. By averaging the F_1 scores across all three pairs of annotated topic boundaries from three annotators on the same video, we obtain the consistency score. The more similar the annotations from all annotators on the same video are, the higher the consistency score is. Figure 1a shows that the consistency scores of the majority of videos exceed 0.5, indicating a decent degree of consensus for VTS annotations (Shou et al., 2021).

Table 1 compares our CLVTS dataset against existing VTS datasets. Among annotated videos in CLVTS, 47% are presentations showing slides, 34% are blackboard demonstrations, and 19% are miscellaneous types. We also collect 1027 hours of unlabeled videos from the same sources for pre-training. Besides the linguistic distinctness,

CLVTS is characterized by its natural and uninterrupted long videos, a stark contrast to the English lecture dataset, AVLecture (Gupta et al., 2023), since nearly two-thirds of AVLecture are reassembled pre-segmented short videos. Figure 1b and 1c show a diverse distribution of video and topic durations and a broad spectrum of subjects in CLVTS.

4 Methodology

Figure 2 depicts the architecture of our VTS model. Section 4.1 presents the problem definition of multimodal VTS and the overall architecture. We enhance multimodal fusion from the perspectives of model architecture, pre-training, and fine-tuning tasks. Specifically, we compare different architectures built upon Merge- and Cross-Attention, and Mixture-of-Experts for multimodal fusion (Section 4.1). We explore multimodal contrastive learning for cross-modality alignment and propose a new pre-training task tailored for VTS (Section 4.2). For fine-tuning, we also propose a novel task for multimodal coherence modeling (Section 4.3).

4.1 Multi-Modal Video Topic Segmentation

Overall Architecture Following prior works (Zhang et al., 2021; Wu et al., 2023), we define video topic segmentation as a clip-level sequence labeling task and propose our **MultiModal Video Topic Segmentation (MMVTS)** model. As illustrated in Figure 2a, we apply unimodal pre-trained encoders for each modality and




Figure 2: Overall model architecture and four distinct Multimodal Fusion Layer architectures. The visual encoder, including the 2D, 3D and OCR feature extractors, is frozen during our pre-training and fine-tuning. The blue dotted line in l_{mcssl} module denotes the topic boundary. The green solid line in Figure 2a represents the features being brought closer together, while the red dashed line signifies push the features apart.

then fuse multimodal information at the intermediate representation level (i.e., ‘middle fusion’ (Xu et al., 2023)) through **Multimodal Fusion Layers**. Given a video, we transcribe it with a competitive automatic speech recognition (ASR) system⁵ and use ASR 1-best as the text modality. We then divide the video into n clips (c_i^v, c_i^t) $_{i=1}^n$, with clips segmented at the sentence boundaries predicted on ASR 1-best. $c_i^v = \{f_1^i, \dots, f_k^i\}$ denotes evenly sampled k frames from the i -th clip and is fed to a visual encoder E_v to extract visual features. $c_i^t = \{w_1^i, \dots, w_{\|s_i\|+1}^i\}$ denotes the sequence of words from ASR 1-best within the i -th clip, where w_1^i is the inserted special token [BOS] and $\|s_i\|$ denotes the number of words of i -th clip. c_i^t is fed to a text encoder E_t for extracting textual features. After extracting unimodal features, we first apply trainable projection matrices W_v and W_t to convert unimodal features into the same dimension, as visual feature sequence $v = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ and textual feature sequence $t = \{t_1, \dots, t_n\}$ (Eq. 1). Then we fuse the multimodal information with M Multimodal Fusion Layers MFL_M and obtain the updated visual features $h^v = \{h_1^v, \dots, h_n^v\}$ and textual features $h^t = \{h_1^t, \dots, h_n^t\}$ (Eq. 2),

which are then concatenated into the multimodal features $m = \{m_1, \dots, m_n\}$ (Eq. 3). Finally, the multimodal features m are fed into the predictor composed of a linear layer W_p to obtain the probability of binary classification $p = \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$ (Eq. 4), where p_i indicates whether the i -th clip is at the boundary of the topic that it belongs to. We use the standard binary cross-entropy loss (Eq. 5) to train the model, where $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$ is the label. The last clip is excluded from loss computation.

Compared to ‘late fusion’ where no cross-modal interaction happens until after the classifiers, middle fusion and ‘early fusion’ are found to generally outperform late fusion (Nagrani et al., 2021), probably because early and middle fusion aligns better with human perception where multimodal fusion happens early in sensory processing. On the other hand, compared to early fusion, middle fusion yields superior or comparable performance (Nagrani et al., 2021) and is much less computationally expensive since we could freeze partially strong pre-trained unimodal encoders and only train a small number of parameters in the Multimodal Fusion Layers.

$$\begin{aligned} v &= W_v \cdot E_v(\{c_1^v, \dots, c_n^v\}) \\ t &= W_t \cdot E_t(\{c_1^t, \dots, c_n^t\}) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

⁵<https://tingwu.aliyun.com/home>

$$\mathbf{h}^v; \mathbf{h}^t = \mathbf{MFL}_M(\mathbf{v}; \mathbf{t}) \quad (2)$$

$$m_i = h_i^v; h_i^t \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{p} = W_p \cdot \mathbf{m} \quad (4)$$

$$l_{vts} = - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} [y_i \ln p_i + (1-y_i) \ln(1-p_i)] \quad (5)$$

Multimodal Fusion Layer (MFL) We compare four different cross-modal interaction mechanisms for multimodal fusion layers. We investigate the Merge-Attention and Co-Attention multimodal fusion layers proposed in (Dou et al., 2022; Yang et al., 2023). With *Merge-Attention* (Figure 2b), features from unimodal encoders are sequentially concatenated and then input into a standard transformer encoder layer (Vaswani et al., 2017), which shares attention parameters across modalities. A feed forward layer is added on top to produce the final output representation. In contrast, with *Co-Attention* (Figure 2c), features from each unimodal encoder first go through self-attention with modality-specific attention parameters, then we perform **symmetrical cross-attention** to integrate information from all other modalities to enhance the representation of the considered modality, followed by a feed forward layer.

Inspired by (Mustafa et al., 2022), which interleaves MoE encoder layers and standard dense encoder layers for image-text multimodal models, we also investigate two new architectures by replacing the traditional single feed-forward layers in Figure 2b and 2c with a **Mixture-of-Experts (MoE)** (Shazeer et al., 2016; Lepikhin et al., 2020) module respectively, depicted by Figure 2d and 2e. The motivation is that adding MoE on top of the fused representations may *facilitate deeper cross-modal integration of information and improve model capacity without a proportional increase in computational complexity*. Specifically, *experts* are MLPs activated depending on the input. Firstly, we concatenate fused features output from self-attention or cross-attention. Then, we implement the Noisy Top-k Gating mechanism (Shazeer et al., 2016) to select K experts from a total of E candidates (Eq. 6 - 8), where $SN()$ denotes standard normal distribution, W_n denotes tunable Gaussian noise to help load balancing, W_g is a trainable weight matrix, K and E are hyper-parameters. Finally, the outputs of the K activated experts are linearly combined according to the learned gating weights (Eq. 9). For the MoE training objective, we sum *importance* loss and *load* loss (Shazeer et al., 2016) to balance expert utilization as Eq. 10.

$$G(x) = \text{Softmax}(\text{KeepTopK}(H_x, k)) \quad (6)$$

$$H(x)_i = (W_g \cdot x)_i + SN() \cdot \text{Softplus}((W_n \cdot x)_i) \quad (7)$$

$$\text{KeepTopK}(x, k)_i = \begin{cases} x_i & \text{if } x_i \text{ is in top-}k. \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

$$\text{MoE}(x) = \sum_{e=1}^K G(x)_e \cdot \text{MLP}_e(x) \quad (9)$$

$$l_{\text{balance}} = l_{\text{importance}} + l_{\text{load}} \quad (10)$$

4.2 Pre-training with Unlabeled Data

Prior works have demonstrated that standard self-supervised denoising pre-training (even using only the downstream task data) (Amos et al., 2023) or pre-training adapted to the downstream task (Gururangan et al., 2020) often perform substantially better than randomly initializing the parameters. Therefore, to better initialize the parameters of the Multimodal Fusion Layers, we explore pre-training with unlabeled video data before fine-tuning on the labeled training set. Firstly, we introduce a **general cross-modality alignment pre-training task** to learn the multi-modal representation. We use contrastive learning loss to adjust the features learned by the model fusion layer, by maximizing the cosine similarity of the visual features and textual features of the same clip, while reducing the similarity of the modality features between different clips, as show in Eq. 11, where ϵ is used to prevent division by 0 and τ is a temperature hyper-parameter to scale the cosine similarity.

$$l_{\text{cma}} = - \frac{1}{n} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n e^{\text{sim}(h_i^v, h_i^t)}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n e^{\text{sim}(h_i^v, h_j^t)} + \epsilon} \quad (11)$$

$$\text{sim}(x_1, x_2) = \frac{x_1^T \cdot x_2}{\|x_1\| \cdot \|x_2\|} / \tau \quad (12)$$

Secondly, we introduce a **novel pre-training task tailored for the downstream VTS task**, focusing on utilizing unlabeled data for learning pseudo topic boundaries and also enhancing modality alignment. Initially, a Kernel Density Estimation (KDE) (Davis et al., 2011) model is employed to approximate the topic duration distribution of the training set; then, videos are split into segments matching durations sampled from the KDE-derived distribution. Subsequently, for every resulting segment, we undertake one of three actions with an equal probability: inserting segments randomly selected from other videos either before or after the current segment, replacing the current segment with a segment randomly selected from

Model			Modality	AVLecture					CLVTS				
				F_1	$BS@30$	$F_1@30$	$mIoU$	Avg	F_1	$BS@30$	$F_1@30$	$mIoU$	Avg
UnsupAVLS (Gupta et al., 2023)			V+T	-	56.00	-	70.86	-	-	-	-	-	-
BaSSL (Mun et al., 2022)			V	-	43.94	-	46.95	-	-	-	-	-	-
LongFormer (Yu et al., 2023)			T	52.91	69.25	60.38	67.54	62.52	34.42	52.19	47.77	52.87	46.81
LongFormer _{cssl} (Yu et al., 2023)			T	<u>54.02</u>	<u>71.56</u>	62.40	68.39	<u>64.09</u>	<u>34.77</u>	53.07	47.51	53.15	47.12
Llama-3-8B _{Generative}			T	40.00	57.55	56.52	62.8	54.22	27.50	40.58	43.71	50.38	40.54
Llama-3-8B _{Discrete}			T	39.27	68.8	<u>62.55</u>	70.43	60.26	31.47	<u>60.40</u>	54.64	58.86	51.34
SWST _{seq} (Wang et al., 2023)			V+T	53.45	70.95	59.73	65.21	62.33	34.55	52.77	48.08	52.67	47.02
PT	FT-Coh	MMVTS Model	Modality										
×	×	Baseline ₁	V+T	55.19	71.76	61.19	66.39	63.63	<u>37.32</u>	49.75	47.07	50.51	46.16
×	✓	Baseline ₂		56.72	<u>72.56</u>	63.03	67.97	65.07	37.29	48.48	47.62	51.73	46.28
✓	✓	Baseline ₃		<u>58.77</u>	72.55	<u>67.26</u>	<u>71.52</u>	<u>67.52</u>	36.54	<u>50.67</u>	<u>48.81</u>	<u>52.56</u>	<u>47.15</u>
✓	✓	Merge-Attn	V+T	57.36	74.96	65.30	70.15	66.94	38.17	55.52	50.69	54.84	49.80
✓	✓	Co-Attn		60.01	73.88	67.27	72.32	68.37	38.49	57.23	50.59	54.47	50.20
✓	✓	Merge-Attn with MoE		57.54	73.48	64.36	70.43	66.45	38.77	61.05	51.10	54.41	<u>51.33</u>
✓	✓	Co-Attn with MoE		59.84	75.62	67.69	72.21	68.84	39.98	58.96	<u>51.41</u>	<u>54.71</u>	51.27

Table 2: Performance of baselines and our MMVTS models on AVLecture and CLVTS test sets. **V** and **T** under **Modality** denote Visual and Textual modality, respectively. MMVTS Baseline_{1,2,3} denote our MMVTS model w/o Multimodal Fusion Layers. Attn denotes Attention. **PT** denotes pre-training the model on unlabeled data (Section 4.2 Eq. 13) before fine-tuning. **FT-Coh** denotes adding the two auxiliary multimodal coherence modeling tasks during fine-tuning (Section 4.3 Eq. 15); w/o FT-Coh refers to fine-tuning with the standard l_{vts} (Eq. 5). For each metric, the best result among all models is bold faced while the best result in each group is underscored.

other videos, or no change. The resulting segments within the modified video are then treated as distinct topics, thereby enabling the model to learn pseudo topic boundaries during pre-training. This task-adaptive pre-training task has the same l_{vts} objective as shown in Eq. 5. The overall pre-training objective is shown in Eq. 13, where α and β are hyper-parameters to adjust the loss weights.

$$l_{pretrain} = l_{vts} + \alpha l_{cma} + \beta l_{balance} \quad (13)$$

4.3 Fine-tuning with Multimodal Coherence Modeling

For fine-tuning, we introduce two auxiliary tasks to enhance multimodal coherence modeling. The cross modal alignment task is the same task in Eq. 11 used in pre-training. This continuity ensures that the modalities retain their coherence through both pre-training and fine-tuning, fostering a consistent interplay between different modalities. In addition, we adapt the Contrastive Semantic Similarity Learning (CSSL) task proposed by Yu et al. (2023), which leverages the inherent characteristics of topic-related coherence, to the multimodal context. We adopt the same strategy for selecting positive and negative sample pairs (Yu et al., 2023), but extend the features to the multimodal representations, as shown in Eq. 14, where k_1 and k_2 are hyper-parameters that determine the number of positive and negative pairs. For each clip’s multimodal representation m_i , $m_{i,j}^+$ denotes the multimodal representation of the j -th similar clip in the same topic as clip i , while $m_{i,j}^-$ denotes the multimodal

representation of the j -th dissimilar clip in a different topic from clip i . We hypothesize that this extension could improve multimodal representation learning by identifying relative consistency relations within and across topics.

$$l_{mcssl} = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k_1} e^{sim(m_i, m_{i,j}^+)}}{\sum_{j=1}^{k_1} e^{sim(m_i, m_{i,j}^+)} + \sum_{j=1}^{k_2} e^{sim(m_i, m_{i,j}^-)}} \quad (14)$$

The overall fine-tuning objective combines Eq. 5, 10, 11, and 14, as shown in Eq. 15, where σ , θ , and γ are hyper-parameters to adjust loss contribution. When the multimodal fusion layer does not contain MoE structure, β in Eq. 13 and σ are set to zero.

$$l_{finetune} = l_{vts} + \sigma l_{balance} + \theta l_{mcssl} + \gamma l_{cma} \quad (15)$$

5 Experiments

5.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets We partition the labeled data within AVLecture into 70% for training, 10% for validation, and 20% for test sets. We also split the CLVTS dataset into train, validation, and test sets with identical ratios. The unlabeled data of AVLecture and CLVTS are used for pre-training on each dataset, respectively.

Baselines We carefully select the following representative baselines:

- **UnsupAVLS** (Gupta et al., 2023) is an unsupervised approach that clusters video clips into discrete topics based on visual and text embeddings

learned from matching the narration with temporally aligned visual content. The actual number of topics is used as the desired number of clusters.

- **Visual-only BaSSL** (Mun et al., 2022) is initially proposed for *video scene segmentation*. We use their released checkpoints to initialize our model and fine-tune on the VTS task to evaluate the performance of a visual-only model.
- **Text-only LongFormer** is evaluated on long document topic segmentation by Yu et al. (2023). We fine-tune LongFormer and LongFormer_{cssl} in (Yu et al., 2023) to evaluate the performance of a text-only model on the VTS task.
- **Llama-3-8B**⁶ Our pre-training (Section 4.2) is conducted on the relatively limited unlabeled videos of AVLectures and CLVTS datasets. To investigate the effect of fine-tuning a powerful pre-trained text large language model (LLM) on VTS, we fine-tune Llama-3-8B with two prompting methods (see Appendix F for details).
- **SWST_{seq}** is our adapted version of the multimodal video scene and topic segmentation model (Wang et al., 2023) to the sequence labeling VTS task, for comparing performance between their early fusion and our middle fusion strategy on VTS. SWST_{seq} uses a pre-trained LongFormer (Beltagy et al., 2020) as backbone.

Evaluation Metrics We adopt four commonly used metrics for VTS, including positive F_1 (Zhang et al., 2021)(denoted as F_1 to simplify notations), **BS@k** (Gupta et al., 2023), **mIoU** (Mun et al., 2022), and $F_1@k$. Definitions of the four metrics are in Appendix D. We follow Gupta et al. (2023) and set k to 30 seconds. Additionally, we use the average score (*Avg*) of these four metrics to measure the overall performance of a model.

Implementation Details We use the same maximum sequence length 2048 as Yu et al. (2023) for a fair comparison with the text-only models. All results are the mean values over three runs with different random seeds. More implementation details are in Appendix C.

5.2 Results and Analysis

Table 2 reports the performance of baselines (the first group) and our MMVTS model variants (the second and third group) on the AVLecture and CLVTS test sets.

Unimodal performance. The text-only Longformer (Row3) substantially outperforms the

visual-only BaSSL (Row2) on BS@30 by a large gain (+25.31), and also surpasses the unsupervised approach UnsupAVLS by a notable gain (+13.25). Such results are expected since the textual modality inherently conveys more precise and richer information than the visual modality for VTS.

Multimodal performance. As can be seen from Table 2, *Avg* of SWST_{seq} closely aligns with that of the text-only LongFormer, suggesting that more data may be necessary to mitigate the discrepancy between fine-tuning with early fusion and pre-training the language model, in order to fully exploit the potential of the early fusion strategy. Our MMVTS Baseline_{1,2,3} simply concatenate unimodal features to predict topic boundaries. Without pre-training on unlabeled data (PT, Eq. 13) and the two auxiliary fine-tuning tasks to enhance multimodal coherence modeling (FT-Coh, Eq. 15), on F_1 , MMVTS Baseline₁ outperforms the text-only Longformer by 2.28 and 2.90 on AVLecture and CLVTS respectively, while on *Avg* score, MMVTS Baseline₁ outperforms Longformer by 1.1 on AVLecture yet slightly underperforms Longformer by 0.65 on CLVTS. These results suggest that *simply concatenating unimodal features to predict topic boundaries does not bring consistent gains over unimodality*. The third group in Table 2 compares the four Multimodal Fusion Layer architectures with pre-training (PT) and fine-tuning (FT-Coh). **Overall, compared to all the competitive unsupervised and supervised baselines, after pre-training and fine-tuning, our MMVTS model using Co-Attention with MoE as Multimodal Fusion Layers achieves the best *Avg*, BS@30, and $F_1@30$ results and sets new SOTA on AVLecture, and achieves the best F_1 and a *Avg* score comparable to the best result on CLVTS.** The gains on *Avg* from our Co-Attention MoE with PT and FT-Coh over LongFormer_{cssl} and MMVTS Baseline₁ are statistically significant (p-values are less than 0.05). It is also notable that the performance of models on CLVTS is generally much lower than that on AVLecture, with the best *Avg* score between AVLecture and CLVTS differing by 17.50 (68.84 versus 51.34), indicating a greater challenge posed by our CLVTS dataset than the AVLecture dataset.

Table 2 also shows that on CLVTS, fine-tuning the powerful pre-trained Llama-3-8B with our *Discrete* prompt achieves the best *Avg* score 51.34, although very close to the performance of MergeAttn with MoE and Co-Attn with MoE after PT and

⁶<https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3-8B>

PT	Model	F_1	$BS@30$	$F_1@30$	$mIoU$	Avg
×	Merge-Attn	56.56	73.28	64.03	70.06	65.98 _{0.90}
×	Co-Attn	57.71	72.20	65.40	70.20	66.38 _{1.29}
×	Merge-Attn with MoE	56.80	72.26	63.44	69.65	65.54 _{1.64}
×	Co-Attn with MoE	57.71	74.30	65.53	71.45	67.25 _{0.56}
✓	Merge-Attn	57.36	74.96	65.30	70.15	66.94 _{0.60}
✓	Co-Attn	60.01	73.88	67.27	72.32	68.37 _{0.52}
✓	Merge-Attn with MoE	57.54	73.48	64.36	70.43	66.45 _{0.14}
✓	Co-Attn with MoE	59.84	75.62	67.69	72.21	68.84 _{0.93}

Table 3: Ablation studies of the pre-training tasks on the AVLecture dataset. The two auxiliary coherence modeling tasks are added in fine-tuning (Eq. 15). The subscript of Avg score is its standard deviation.

FT-Coh. However, on AVLecture, the performance of fine-tuning Llama-3-8B is much lower than Multimodal Fusion Layer with PT and FT-Coh; particularly, F_1 on both AVLecture and CLVTS are much lower because the model’s predicted boundaries often have a clip offset, but its $F_1@30$ and $mIoU$ results are still best on CLVTS.

We conduct ablation studies and analysis to validate effectiveness of the proposed multimodal fusion layers, pre-training and fine-tuning tasks.

(1) Effect of Multimodal Fusion Layers. Comparing the third group and Baseline₃ in Table 2 shows that with the same pre-training and fine-tuning, the best performing architecture using Multimodal Fusion Layers always substantially outperforms Baseline₃. Specifically, with PT and FT-Coh, on AVLecture, both Co-Attention and Co-Attention with MoE notably outperform MMVTS Baseline₃ by 1.32 on Avg ; on CLVTS, all four Multimodal Fusion Layer architectures achieve remarkable gains on Avg over MMVTS Baseline₃, from 2.65 to 4.18. These results demonstrate that **deep cross-modal interaction has notable advantage for multimodal fusion over simple unimodal feature concatenation for VTS**. Moreover, adding MoE on top consistently improves Co-Attention on both AVLecture and CLVTS, by 0.47 and 1.07 on Avg ; whereas, the effect of MoE on top of Merge-Attention is inconsistent, with a slight degradation on AVLecture and 1.53 gain on Avg on CLVTS. In addition, we conduct more analysis of the effect of Co-Attn with MoE with different numbers of multimodal fusion layers in Appendix G.

(2) Effect of Pre-training tasks. Table 2 shows that for simple concatenation of unimodal features, pre-training before fine-tuning (as Baseline₃) outperforms Baseline₂ (w/o PT). We conduct ablation studies of the proposed pre-training and fine-tuning tasks on the AVLecture dataset. We apply the same fine-tuning with multimodal coherence modeling

Model	F_1	$BS@30$	$F_1@30$	$mIoU$	Avg
Co-Attn with MoE	59.84	75.62	67.69	72.21	68.84
w/o l_{cma}	58.96	74.62	67.39	72.17	68.29
w/o l_{mcssl}	59.47	74.53	66.74	72.24	68.25
w/o l_{cma} & l_{mcssl}	60.57	73.36	66.52	70.42	67.72

Table 4: Ablation studies of the two auxiliary coherence modeling fine-tuning tasks on the AVLecture dataset. Models are initialized from pre-training (Eq. 13).

(FT-Coh, Eq. 15) and compare (a) random initialization of parameters of Multimodal Fusion Layers (w/o pre-training) (b) pre-training the model on unlabeled data. Table 3 shows that w/o pre-training, Co-Attn slightly improves Avg over Merge-Attn by 0.4 pts, and MoE further improves Avg by 0.87 pts. **Pre-training improves the performance on all four Multimodal Fusion Layer architectures, with the average Avg score increased by 1.36 pts (66.29 \rightarrow 67.65).** Pre-training also **improves stability of a model** as the standard deviations of all w/ PT experiments are less than 1. Table 6 in Appendix further compares the fine-tuning performance after applying different pre-training tasks. Compared to using both pre-training tasks, removing loss l_{cma} or l_{vts} leads to Avg reduction of 0.4 and 1.64 respectively, indicating that the pretraining task more closely aligned with the downstream task, i.e., l_{vts} , yields greater benefits.

(3) Effect of Fine-tuning tasks. Table 4 compares the efficacy of different fine-tuning tasks after pre-training. Compared to the standard l_{vts} , adding the two auxiliary losses l_{cma} and l_{mcssl} notably improves Avg by 1.12 pts, while decreases F_1 by 0.73. These results suggest that **while multimodal coherence modeling may slightly compromise the precision of exact matches, it enhances the overall contextual comprehension of a model for VTS**. Adding l_{cma} or l_{mcssl} individually improves Avg by 0.53 and 0.57 respectively, with improvements mainly on $BS@30$ and $mIoU$, suggesting that feature alignment at different granularities may improve fuzzy matching of a model.

6 Conclusion

In conclusion, we propose a supervised MultiModal Video Topic Segmentation (MMVTS) model to advance VTS by meticulously investigating multimodal fusion and coherence modeling, coupled with an innovative pre-training task tailored for VTS. Furthermore, we introduce a large-scale Chinese Lecture Video Topic Segmentation (CLVTS) dataset to promote research in VTS.

Limitations

It is essential to acknowledge that our methodology solely capitalizes on the multimodal information derived from visual and textual data, with the parameters of the visual encoder fixed due to consideration about computational complexity. This specific limitation potentially results in a less-than-optimal exploitation of the vast visual information contained within the dataset. Concurrently, features from additional modalities, such as audio, are not incorporated. Additionally, we will conduct more investigations and study approaches to make Co-Attn with MoE more stable in future work. Finally, the integration of general multimodal pre-trained models and large language models could be investigated, offering a more holistic and effective exploration of multimodal information for VTS.

References

- Mohammed Mahmood Ali, Mohammad S Qaseem, and Altaf Hussain. 2021. Segmenting lecture video into partitions by analyzing the contents of video. In *2021 International Conference on Data Analytics for Business and Industry (ICDABI)*, pages 191–196. IEEE.
- Ido Amos, Jonathan Berant, and Ankit Gupta. 2023. Never train from scratch: Fair comparison of long-sequence models requires data-driven priors. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Sebastian Arnold, Rudolf Schneider, Philippe Cudré-Mauroux, Felix A Gers, and Alexander Löser. 2019. Sector: A neural model for coherent topic segmentation and classification. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:169–184.
- Iz Beltagy, Matthew E Peters, and Arman Cohan. 2020. Longformer: The long-document transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05150*.
- Dipesh Chand and Hasan Oğul. 2021. A framework for lecture video segmentation from extracted speech content. In *2021 IEEE 19th World Symposium on Applied Machine Intelligence and Informatics (SAMII)*, pages 000299–000304. IEEE.
- Ananda Das and Partha Pratim Das. 2019. Automatic semantic segmentation and annotation of mooc lecture videos. In *International Conference on Asian Digital Libraries*, pages 181–188. Springer.
- Richard A Davis, Keh-Shin Lii, and Dimitris N Politis. 2011. Remarks on some nonparametric estimates of a density function. *Selected Works of Murray Rosenblatt*, pages 95–100.
- Zi-Yi Dou, Yichong Xu, Zhe Gan, Jianfeng Wang, Shuohang Wang, Lijuan Wang, Chenguang Zhu, Pengchuan Zhang, Lu Yuan, Nanyun Peng, et al. 2022. An empirical study of training end-to-end vision-and-language transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18166–18176.
- Ankit Gandhi, Arijit Biswas, and Om Deshmukh. 2015. Topic transition in educational videos using visually salient words. *International Educational Data Mining Society*.
- Anchit Gupta, CV Jawahar, Makarand Tapaswi, et al. 2023. Unsupervised audio-visual lecture segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 5232–5241.
- Suchin Gururangan, Ana Marasović, Swabha Swayamdipta, Kyle Lo, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Noah A Smith. 2020. Don’t stop pretraining: Adapt language models to domains and tasks. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 8342–8360.
- Marti A Hearst. 1994. Multi-paragraph segmentation expository text. In *32nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 9–16.
- Edward J Hu, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, Weizhu Chen, et al. 2021. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Qingqiu Huang, Yu Xiong, Anyi Rao, Jiaye Wang, and Dahua Lin. 2020. Movienet: A holistic dataset for movie understanding. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part IV 16*, pages 709–727. Springer.
- Md Mohaiminul Islam, Mahmudul Hasan, Kishan Shamsundar Athrey, Tony Braskich, and Gedas Bertasius. 2023. Efficient movie scene detection using state-space transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18749–18758.
- Omri Koshorek, Adir Cohen, Noam Mor, Michael Rotman, and Jonathan Berant. 2018. Text segmentation as a supervised learning task. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 469–473.
- Dmitry Lepikhin, HyoukJoong Lee, Yuanzhong Xu, Dehao Chen, Orhan Firat, Yanping Huang, Maxim Krikun, Noam Shazeer, and Zhifeng Chen. 2020. Gshard: Scaling giant models with conditional computation and automatic sharding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.

- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2016. Sgdr: Stochastic gradient descent with warm restarts. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2017. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*.
- Michal Lukasik, Boris Dadachev, Kishore Papineni, and Gonçalo Simões. 2020. Text segmentation by cross segment attention. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 4707–4716.
- Jonghwan Mun, Minchul Shin, Gunsoo Han, Sangho Lee, Seongsu Ha, Joonseok Lee, and Eun-Sol Kim. 2022. Bassl: Boundary-aware self-supervised learning for video scene segmentation. In *Proceedings of the Asian Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4027–4043.
- Basil Mustafa, Carlos Riquelme, Joan Puigcerver, Rodolphe Jenatton, and Neil Houlsby. 2022. Multimodal contrastive learning with limoe: the language-image mixture of experts. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:9564–9576.
- Arsha Nagrani, Shan Yang, Anurag Arnab, Aren Jansen, Cordelia Schmid, and Chen Sun. 2021. Attention bottlenecks for multimodal fusion. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:14200–14213.
- 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 *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR.
- Martin Riedl and Chris Biemann. 2012. Topictiling: a text segmentation algorithm based on lda. In *Proceedings of ACL 2012 student research workshop*, pages 37–42.
- Saqib Sarfraz, Naila Murray, Vivek Sharma, Ali Diba, Luc Van Gool, and Rainer Stiefelhagen. 2021. Temporally-weighted hierarchical clustering for unsupervised action segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 11225–11234.
- Noam Shazeer, Azalia Mirhoseini, Krzysztof Maziarz, Andy Davis, Quoc Le, Geoffrey Hinton, and Jeff Dean. 2016. Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Mike Zheng Shou, Stan Weixian Lei, Weiyao Wang, Deepti Ghadiyaram, and Matt Feiszli. 2021. Generic event boundary detection: A benchmark for event segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 8075–8084.
- Eduardo R Soares and Eduardo Barrére. 2018a. Automatic topic segmentation for video lectures using low and high-level audio features. In *Proceedings of the 24th Brazilian Symposium on Multimedia and the Web*, pages 189–196.
- Eduardo R Soares and Eduardo Barrére. 2018b. A framework for automatic topic segmentation in video lectures. In *Anais Estendidos do XXIV Simpósio Brasileiro de Sistemas Multimídia e Web*, pages 31–36. SBC.
- Eduardo R Soares and Eduardo Barrére. 2019. An optimization model for temporal video lecture segmentation using word2vec and acoustic features. In *Proceedings of the 25th Brazilian Symposium on Multimedia and the Web*, pages 513–520.
- Alessandro Solbiati, Kevin Heffernan, Georgios Damaskinos, Shivani Poddar, Shubham Modi, and Jacques Cali. 2021. Unsupervised topic segmentation of meetings with bert embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.12978*.
- Swapna Somasundaran et al. 2020. Two-level transformer and auxiliary coherence modeling for improved text segmentation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7797–7804.
- 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 the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1207–1216.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Liang Wang, Sujian Li, Yajuan Lü, and Houfeng Wang. 2017. Learning to rank semantic coherence for topic segmentation. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1340–1344.
- Yuxuan Wang, Zilong Zheng, Xueliang Zhao, Jinpeng Li, Yueqian Wang, and Dongyan Zhao. 2023. Vstar: A video-grounded dialogue dataset for situated semantic understanding with scene and topic transitions. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5036–5048.
- Haoqian Wu, Keyu Chen, Haozhe Liu, Mingchen Zhuge, Bing Li, Ruizhi Qiao, Xiujun Shu, Bei Gan, Liangsheng Xu, Bo Ren, et al. 2023. Newsnet: A novel dataset for hierarchical temporal segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10669–10680.

- Linzi Xing and Giuseppe Carenini. 2021. Improving unsupervised dialogue topic segmentation with utterance-pair coherence scoring. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the Special Interest Group on Discourse and Dialogue*, pages 167–177.
- Linzi Xing, Brad Hackinen, Giuseppe Carenini, and Francesco Trebbi. 2020. Improving context modeling in neural topic segmentation. In *Proceedings of the 1st Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 10th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 626–636.
- Linzi Xing, Quan Tran, Fabian Caba, Franck Dernoncourt, Seunghyun Yoon, Zhaowen Wang, Trung Bui, and Giuseppe Carenini. 2024. Multi-modal video topic segmentation with dual-contrastive domain adaptation. In *International Conference on Multimedia Modeling*, pages 410–424. Springer.
- Hu Xu, Gargi Ghosh, Po-Yao Huang, Dmytro Okhonko, Armen Aghajanyan, Florian Metze, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. 2021. Video-clip: Contrastive pre-training for zero-shot video-text understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6787–6800.
- Peng Xu, Xiatian Zhu, and David A Clifton. 2023. Multimodal learning with transformers: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*.
- Shen Yan, Xuehan Xiong, Arsha Nagrani, Anurag Arnab, Zhonghao Wang, Weina Ge, David Ross, and Cordelia Schmid. 2023. Unloc: A unified framework for video localization tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 13623–13633.
- Ziyi Yang, Yuwei Fang, Chenguang Zhu, Reid Pryzant, Dongdong Chen, Yu Shi, Yichong Xu, Yao Qian, Mei Gao, Yi-Ling Chen, et al. 2023. i-code: An integrative and composable multimodal learning framework. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 37, pages 10880–10890.
- Hai Yu, Chong Deng, Qinglin Zhang, Jiaqing Liu, Qian Chen, and Wen Wang. 2023. Improving long document topic segmentation models with enhanced coherence modeling. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5592–5605.
- Qinglin Zhang, Qian Chen, Yali Li, Jiaqing Liu, and Wen Wang. 2021. Sequence model with self-adaptive sliding window for efficient spoken document segmentation. In *2021 IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*, pages 411–418. IEEE.
- Luowei Zhou, Chenliang Xu, and Jason Corso. 2018. Towards automatic learning of procedures from web instructional videos. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32.

A Related Work to VTS

Wu et al. (2023) utilized visual, audio and textual information, and focus on hierarchical modeling techniques to simultaneously learn the boundaries of scenes, stories and topics, which suggests that the segmentation can be benefited by introducing the hierarchical structures of videos. Nevertheless, their approach did not delve into optimizing the integration of multimodal information, which is one of the motivations of our work. The integration of audio features represents a direction for our future work. Xing et al. (2024) encode the image and text sequences with respective encoders and use an *asymmetric* cross-modal cross-attention mechanism to produce text-aware visual representations, followed by a BiLSTM, to fuse multimodal features. Our approaches are drastically different from Xing et al. (2024) as we investigate **symmetric** Cross-Modal Cross-Attention and also Mixture-of-Experts mechanism to fuse multimodal information. Xing et al. (2024) also investigate cross-modal and sentence level intra-modal contrastive learning to empower unsupervised domain adaptation, whereas we explore extending the topic level Contrastive Semantic Similarity Learning (CSSL) task proposed by Yu et al. (2023) to the multimodal setting.

B Details of Annotations for the CLVTS Dataset

For the CLVTS dataset, we ensure high accuracy and reliability of annotations from three aspects. Firstly, before the actual annotation process, the annotators take two rounds of training. Each annotator needs to annotate 5 videos in each round; at the end of each round, we assess the annotation quality, provide feedback, and ensure that the annotators address the issues and understand the annotation guideline clearly at the end of training. Secondly, during annotation, to help the annotators thoroughly understand the course content, we ask the annotators to annotate topics hierarchically, that is, they label both coarse-grained topic (large topic) and fine-grained topic (small topic) boundaries while the large topic boundaries are a subset of the small topic boundaries. We take the small topic boundaries as the final topic boundary labels. Thirdly, we employ a multi-annotator strategy. All data is annotated in batches, with two annotators annotating each sample independently. The third annotator reviews the annotations by the first two

Model	Numbers
Baseline _{1,2,3}	154M
Merge-Attn	161M
Co-Attn	173M
Merge-Attn with MoE	175M
Co-Attn with MoE	192M

Table 5: Number of trainable parameters of our MMVTS models. M is the abbreviation for million.

annotators, rectifies errors, and provides the final annotations. After the annotations of each batch, we randomly select 5% of a batch for quality assessment. If the unacceptable rate (the proportion of the wrongly annotated topic boundaries) is less than 10%, the data are deemed satisfactory and accepted; otherwise, after communicating quality assessment results and possible reasons for errors, the annotators are requested to re-annotate the batch based on the feedback. This quality control process is repeated until the unacceptable rate is lower than 10% for all batches; in this work, we could finish quality control within 3 iterations.

C Training Details

Our experiments are implemented with *transformers* package⁷. For video with the number of clips greater than the max sequence length, we use sliding window and take the last clip of the prior sample as the start clip of the next sample. All supervised models use a threshold strategy, where clips with scores above a threshold 0.5 are predicted as topic boundaries. Following (Gupta et al., 2023), for each video clip, we extract three visual feature types: *OCR*, *2D* and *3D*. Specifically, the *OCR* feature is derived by encoding the textual output obtained from the *OCR API*⁸ of the clip’s central image. This encoding task is performed using the BERT-based sentence transformer model⁹, where *all-mpnet-base-v2* and *paraphrase-multilingual-mpnet-base-v2* models are employed for English and Chinese language experiments, respectively. The *3D* feature are extracted using the same video feature extraction pipeline as in Gupta et al. (2023), while the *2D* feature is extracted by visual encoder of CLIP (Radford et al., 2021) which is pre-trained to predict if an image and a text snippet are paired together. Specifically, the images

⁷<https://github.com/huggingface/transformers>

⁸<https://help.aliyun.com/zh/viapi/developer-reference/api-sy75xq>

⁹https://www.sbert.net/docs/sentence_transformer/pretrained_models.html

Model	F_1	$BS@30$	$F_1@30$	$mIoU$	Avg
Co-Attn with MoE	59.84	75.62	67.69	72.21	68.84
w/o l_{vts}	57.19	74.64	66.04	70.91	67.20
w/o l_{cma}	60.23	73.54	67.86	72.12	68.44

Table 6: Ablation experiments of pre-training task on AVLecture. The model parameters derived from these distinct pre-training tasks served as the initial parameters for subsequent fine-tuning of the model. Additionally, the coherence modeling tasks are incorporated during the fine-tuning phase.

from AVLecture and CLVTS are processed to extract 2D features using $CLIP_{ViT-B/16}$ ¹⁰ and $CN-CLIP_{ViT-B/16}$ ¹¹, respectively.

After extracting the visual features, we concatenate them as shown in Eq. 16 to get v_i , which then will be fed into following projection layer. During pre-training and fine-tuning, the parameters of visual encoders are kept fixed. The learning rate is $5e-5$ and dropout probability is 0.1. AdamW (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2017) is used for optimization. The batch size is 8 and the epoch for pre-training and fine-tuning is 1 and 5, respectively. The loss weight α and γ for l_{cma} is 0.5, β and σ for $l_{balance}$ is 1.0 when MoE is in multimodal fusion layer. θ for l_{mcssl} is 0.5. k_1 and k_2 of Eq. 14 is 1 and 3 following Yu et al. (2023). We select one multimodal fusion layer to comprehensively compare different types of fusion structure. We also investigate the performance of different number of multimodal fusion layer in Figure 3. As for the MoE layer in multimodal fusion layer, we choose 4 candidate experts and activate 2 experts for each input feature, the intermediate size of expert is 3072. Therefore, the total number of trainable parameters is shown in Table 5.

$$v_i = v_i^{2d}; v_i^{3d}; v_i^{ocr} \quad (16)$$

D Evaluation Metrics

F_1 is a metric used to evaluate the accuracy of text topic segmentation (Lukasik et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021), which focus on the performance of exact matching of the positive class and balances precision and recall rate.

$BS@k$ (Gupta et al., 2023) is the average number of predicted boundaries matching with the ground truth boundaries within a k second interval, which can be regard as the recall rate based on fuzzy matching.

¹⁰<https://github.com/openai/CLIP>

¹¹<https://github.com/OFA-Sys/Chinese-CLIP>




Figure 3: Avg performance of fine-tuning model w/ or w/o pre-training and coherence modeling tasks on AVLecture with different numbers of multimodal fusion layers, where the fusion type is Co-Attention with MoE.

$F_1@k$ denotes the F_1 score calculated based on matching predicted and ground truth boundaries within k seconds. Considering subjectivity and uncertainty in VTS annotations, we introduce $F_1@k$ as a supplement to $BS@k$ to enabling a more comprehensively assessment of model performance in dealing with ambiguously defined boundaries.

$mIoU$ is commonly used in video action segmentation (Zhou et al., 2018) and video scene segmentation (Mun et al., 2022). While the F_1 , $BS@k$ and $F_1@k$ focus on the accuracy of positive predictions (either exact match or fuzzy match), the $mIoU$ measures the overlapping area between predicted and ground truth segments, providing a generalized assessment of how well the model’s predicted segments match the actual segments in the segmentation task.

Our implementation of $BS@30$ draws upon the code published by Gupta et al. (2023)¹², while the approach to implement $mIoU$ is guided by Mun et al. (2022)¹³. We have relied on the *scikit-learn* package¹⁴ to compute F_1 , following the implementation by Yu et al. (2023). The definitions provided in the aforementioned sources also inform our implementation of $F_1@k$.

E Artifact Use Consistent With Intended Use

All of our use of existing artifacts is consistent with their intended use, provided that it was specified.

¹²<https://github.com/Darshansingh11/AVLectures/>

¹³<https://github.com/kakaobrain/bass1>

¹⁴<https://scikit-learn.org/stable/>

For the CLVTS data set we created, its license will be for research purpose only.

F Fine-tune Llama-3-8B for Video Topic Segmentation

Considering the computational complexity and data volume, we employ LoRA (Hu et al., 2021) for fine-tuning Llama-3-8B¹⁵ with a maximum sequence length of 2048. Our training configuration includes a batch size of 32 and a total of 6 epochs, utilizing a learning rate of $5e-5$ and *cosine* scheduler (Loshchilov and Hutter, 2016). Table 7 shows two prompts we used to fine-tuning Llama-3-8B on text data of VTS. We first try the *Generative* type that Yu et al. (2023) has experimented with due to the better zero-shot and one-shot performance than the *Discriminative* type. However, compared with Longformer, the Avg score of *Generative* prompting Llama-3-8B is lower 8.3 and 6.27 on AVLecture and CLVTS respectively. We suspect that this is due to the issue of sparse labels in binary classification, leading us to refine the *Discriminative* into the *Discrete* prompt as outlined in the Table 7. Although the F_1 on AVLecture and CLVTS is much lower (the prediction boundary of the model usually has a clip offset), the Avg score of Llama-3-8B on AVLecture is merely 2.26 points behind Longformer. Moreover, Llama-3-8B_{Discrete} secures the highest Avg score on CLVTS, surpassing Longformer by 4.53 points. which suggests that the *Discrete* prompt is more suitable for stimulating Llama-3-8B and future work can further explore how to better use large language models for VTS.

G Performance of MFLs across varied layer numbers

Utilizing Co-Attention with Mixture of Experts (MoE) as the multimodal fusion layer, we investigated the Avg performance of models featuring various numbers of Multimodal Fusion Layers (MFLs) on AVLecture, as depicted in Figure 3. The findings indicate that when the model is fine-tuned directly on labeled data, a single MFL yields the best performance, surpassing the no-layer configuration by 2.34 points. However, adding more layers leads to diminished performance and training instability, particularly noticeable with three layers. By incorporating a pre-training phase followed by fine-tuning through a coherence modeling task, perfor-

¹⁵<https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Meta-Llama-3-8B>

Type	Prompts for text topic segmentation
<i>Generative</i>	<p>Please identify several topic boundaries for the following document and each topic consists of several consecutive utterances. please output in the form of {topic i:[], ... ,topic j:[]} with json format, where the elements in the list are the index of the consecutive utterances within the topic, and output even if there is only one topic.</p> <p>document: [0]: s_1 [1]: s_2 ... [$n - 1$]: s_n</p> <p>Please give the result directly in json format: output: {"topic_0": [0, 1, 2, ..., k-1], "topic_1": [k, k+1, ...], ... }</p>
<i>Discrete</i>	<p>Please identify several topic boundaries for the following document. please output in the form of {topic_segment_ids:[xxx]} with json format, where the elements in the list are the index of the last sentence of every topic, if there is only one topic then the array is empty.</p> <p>document: [0]: s_1 [1]: s_2 ... [$n - 1$]: s_n</p> <p>Please give the result directly in json format: output: {"topic_segment_ids": [x, x, x]}</p>

Table 7: Prompts for fine-tuning Llama-3-8B on text data of video topic segmentation. n denotes the number of sentences and s_i denotes i -th sentence in the document.

mance enhancements of 4.0, 2.87, 2.37, and 13.51 points are observed, respectively. These results clearly demonstrate the substantial benefits of our pre-training and coherence modeling strategies in boosting the model’s effectiveness. Notably, they facilitate the convergence of a model with three layers, achieving optimal results that marginally exceed the performance of a single-layer model by 0.1 points.