# Leveraging topic models for video hyperlinking

# in the context of the MediaEval and TRECVid benchmarking initiatives

### Anca Şimon

NGEDA Pascale Sébillot & Guillaume Gravier & Rémi Bois & Ronan Sicre



Sien Moens









# Video Hyperlinking



Beyond search,

#### anchor detection + hyperlinking = organizing a collection

for analytics based on interaction with the data

# Video Hyperlinking



#### MediaEval benchmarking initiative: Search and Hyperlinking task



# A search & hyperlinking scenario

#### Query

things to see in london

Search results:

<u>Video</u>	<u>Start</u>	End
video1	05:20	06:30
video2	03:00	04:45
•••		
videon	12:30	15:00











#### London -10 Things You Need To Know - Hostelworld Video

by Hostelworld 6 years ago • 1,683,538 views 'Find out how to get around, save money and see all the best attractions. Book a Hostel in London today: http://hwrld.cm/1oJoee2 ... CC

#### London 10 Quirky Places

Q

by Chris Lawson 5 years ago • 776,411 views An alternative sightseeing trip round **London**, taking a **look at** some of it's quirkier sights. From the Mandella Tank to the Traffic ...

HD

#### Free Fun In London - what to do and where to go

by Julian Heald 3 years ago • 59,438 views We put together this video to show you what can be seen in London for FREE. And there certainly is a lot! Museums, markets ...

HD





#### Travel Tips : List of Top Things to See in London by eHow C 5 years ago • 45,211 views

When traveling to **London**, some of the top sightseeing **attractions** include Buckingham Palace, Westminster Abbey and the Tower...



# A search & hyperlinking scenario



### An overview of the state of the art



## An overview of the state of the art

### A two-step approach:

1. Segmentation

- -Fixed-length segments -Video shots -Topic segments
  - -Utterances





### 2. Target selection



### Direct comparison in vector space with cosine similarity!

Targets very similar to the anchor

- near duplicates
- timeline events
- ... but no diversity and no serendipity

### Direct comparison in vector space with cosine similarity!

Targets very similar to the anchor

- near duplicates
- timeline events
- ... but no diversity and no serendipity

Solution: Indirect comparison



+ link anchor-target pairs with few words in common

### Direct comparison in vector space with cosine similarity!

Targets very similar to the anchor

- near duplicates
- timeline events
- ... but no diversity and no serendipity

<u>Solution 1</u>: Indirect comparison via a hierarchy of topic models



- + link anchor-target pairs with few words in common
- + control diversity
- + link justification

### Direct comparison in vector space with cosine similarity!

Targets very similar to the anchor

- near duplicates
- timeline events
- ... but no diversity and no serendipity

Solution 2: Indirect comparison via a cross-modal topic models



- + link anchor-target pairs with few words in common
- + control diversity
- + link justification
- + talk about what is shown or show things that are discussed 5

### LDA model

### <u>Key idea:</u> there exist latent topics which uncover how words in documents have been generated



Steyvers and Griffiths, 2010

### LDA model

### <u>Key idea:</u> there exist latent topics which uncover how words in documents have been generated



Steyvers and Griffiths, 2010

### LDA model

# Key idea: there exist latent topics which uncover how words in documents have been generated



- > Each topic: a probability distribution over words
- Each document: a mixture of topics

### Indirect link



### Leverage LDA for hyperlinking

Create a hierarchy of topics:

 $K \in \{50, 100, 150, 200, 300, 500, 700, 1000, 1500, 1700\}$ 

- ▶ Level 1,  $K_1 = 50$ , broad topics  $z_i^1, i \in [1, K_1]$
- ▶ Level 10,  $K_{10} = 1700$ , fine-grained topics  $z_i^{10}, i \in [1, K_{10}]$

### Leverage LDA for hyperlinking

Create a hierarchy of topics:

 $K \in \{50, 100, 150, 200, 300, 500, 700, 1000, 1500, 1700\}$ 

- ► Level 1,  $K_1 = 50$ , broad topics  $z_i^1, i \in [1, K_1]$
- ▶ Level 10,  $K_{10} = 1700$ , fine-grained topics  $z_i^{10}, i \in [1, K_{10}]$

broad	fine-grained	_1	_1		_1		
z <sub>3</sub> <sup>1</sup> , K <sub>1</sub> =50	$z_{50}^{10}, K_{10}$ =1700	$Z_1$	$Z_2$	Z <sub>3</sub>	Z <sub>50</sub>		
People	Referendum	$z_1^2$	$z_2^2$	$z_{3}^{2}$	$z_{50}^{2}$	$Z_{100}^{2}$	
Government	Minister	1	- 2	- J	30	100	
Тах	Scotland						
Minister	Independence	10	10	10	10	10	10
Party	Alexander	$Z_1^{10}$	$Z_2^{ro}$	$Z_3^{10}$	$(Z_{50}^{10})$	$ Z_{100}^{10}$	$ z_{1700}^{10}$

### Changing the representation space



>New representation of an anchor/target segment

$$x_l = (p(x | z_1^l) ... p(x | z_{K_l}^l))$$

## Changing the representation space



New representation of an anchor/target segment

$$x_l = (p(x | z_1^l) ... p(x | z_{K_l}^l))$$

1<sup>st</sup> strategy: independent topic levels (IT)
 2<sup>nd</sup> strategy: hard and soft links between topics

### Independent levels

Anchor segment x  $x_l = (p(x | z_1^l)...p(x | z_{K_l}^l))$ Target segment y  $y_l = (p(y | z_1^l)...p(y | z_{K_l}^l))$ 

Similarity(x, y) = 
$$\sum_{l} \alpha_{l} \log(x_{l} \cdot y_{l})$$

 $\begin{array}{ll} \mathsf{IT}_k \ \mbox{only level } k & \alpha_{\mathsf{k}} = 1, \alpha_{\mathsf{i} \neq \mathsf{k}} = 0 \\ \mathsf{IT}_{=} \ \mbox{equal weights} & \alpha_{\mathsf{k}} = 0.2, \forall k \in \{1,3,5,7,9\} \\ \mathsf{IT}_{<} \ \mbox{general} < \mbox{specific} & \alpha_1 = 0.1, \alpha_3 = 0.15, \alpha_5 = 0.2, \alpha_7 = 0.25, \alpha_9 = 0.3 \\ \mathsf{IT}_{>} \ \mbox{specific} < \mbox{general} & \alpha_1 = 0.3, \alpha_3 = 0.25, \alpha_5 = 0.2, \alpha_7 = 0.15, \alpha_9 = 0.1 \\ \end{array}$ 

### Data

### 2013 & 2014 Search & Hyperlinking data

- ➢ BBC broadcast videos
- ➤automatic speech transcripts (LIMSI)

### Task considered: reranking targets

➤Targets proposed by all the participants!

➢ Relevance judgments provided by turkers (AMT)

year	#hours of video	#anchors	avg. anchor duration (95% interval)	#targets (% relevant)	avg. target duration (95%interval)
2013	1,335	30	32.2 [13.4,51]	9,973 (29.9%)	83.38 sec. [82.58,84.18]
2014	2,686	30	22.9 [11.1,34.8]	12,340 (15.3%)	58.85 sec. [58.1,59.58]

#### Watch 2 video segments and say whether the second video is related to the first one according to the given description

Please first follow the instructions on the left and then answer the questions on the right side of the screen.

1) Please watch the first video clip shown below.



 Imagine a person watched this *first video clip* on a site like YouTube and wishes to see more video clips with the following *description*:

> I would like to watch more mafia clips; or something about links between mafia and other singers/famous people.

 Please watch the following second video clip to see whether it satisfies the wish of the person.



5) Please write 1-3 sentences in the box below that explain your decision.

after having watched the first video clip?

○ Yes ○ No



6) Please write 3-5 meaningful words spoken in each of the video clip.

first video clip	second video clip	
	1	

NOTES: Please note that in doing this HIT you are taking part in an academic research study. Our review process involves many manual steps. We are also a small team. For this reason, there might be a delay in the approval of your work. We do our best to keep this delay to 2-3 days at the very maximum.

4) Based on the description, would the person be satisfied watching the second video clip

NOTES: It is important that before you submit the HIT you take one more look at the answer that you provided. We ask you to double check that you have written 2-3 complete sentences and that your grammar is OK. We also ask you to check to make sure that the relationship between your sentences and the videos themselves is very clear.

When you are finished with answering the questions, don't forget to click the "Submit" button at the bottom of the page.

#### Thank you very much for your work!

### Relevance assessment

Baseline: direct cos-similarity (DirectH)
Measures: relevance (P@10);

tolerance to irrelevance (P@10\_tol)

	2013		2014	
method	P@10	P@10_tol	P@10	P@10_tol
DirectH	0.61	0.25	0.41	0.19
$IT_{50}$	0.65	0.44*	0.26	0.18
$IT_{150}$	0.57	0.34*	0.37	0.25*
<i>IT</i> <sub>300</sub>	0.61	0.35*	0.34	0.26*
$IT_{700}$	0.64	0.34*	0.31	0.21
$IT_{1500}$	0.59	0.32*	0.32	0.24
IT <sub>Comb=</sub>	0.66	0.35*	0.27	0.22
$IT_{Comb<}$	0.67	0.37*	0.27	0.21
IT <sub>Comb&gt;</sub>	0.65	0.35*	0.29	0.22

\* Statistical significant values (paired t-test, p<0.05)

### Indirect linking



<u>Solution 1</u>: Indirect comparison via a hierarchy of topic models

- + link anchor-target pairs with few words in common
- + control diversity
- + link justification

#### Solution 2: Indirect comparison via a cross-modal topic models

- + link anchor-target pairs with few words in common
- + control diversity
- + link justification
- + talk about what is shown or show things that are discussed

## Bilingual LDA model

# <u>Key idea:</u> discover the latent cross-lingual topics that describe a given bilingual document collection



- Each pair of comparable documents share the same distribution of topics
- Each topic is modeled as a distribution over vocabulary words in each language

Vulić et al., 2014

# Leverage bimodal LDA for video hyperlinking

✓ We use audio and visual information as two different languages and build cross-modal topics
 *Video<sub>i</sub>*



# Leverage bimodal LDA for video hyperlinking

✓ We use audio and visual information as two different languages and build cross-modal topics
 *Video<sub>i</sub>*



K=700	Audio	Visual
Торіс 3	love, home, feel, life, baby	singer, microphone, sax, concert, flute
Topic 7	food, bit, chef, cook, kitchen	fig, acorn, pumpkin, guava, zucchini
Topic 25	years, technology, computer key, future	tape-player, computer, equipment, machine, appliance

# Leverage bimodal LDA for video hyperlinking

> By learning the cross-modal topics, we can apply

- ✓ the usual topic similarities (i.e. audio  $\rightarrow$  audio or visual  $\rightarrow$  visual)
- ✓ cross-modality similarities (i.e. audio  $\rightarrow$  visual or visual  $\rightarrow$  audio):

seeing more about what is said and hearing more about what is shown



### Relevance assessment

#### 1) Reranking targets proposed by all participants in 2014

Method	Audio->Audio	Audio->Visual	Visual->Visual	Visual->Audio
P@10	25.3	21	30	24

#### 2) TRECVid results in 2015

(100 anchors)	Minimum	25%	50%	75%	Maximum
P@10	0.017	0.198	0.275	0.524	0.608
Direct Visual similarity	0.207				
Visual->Audio	0.224				

### **Diversity assessment**

#### Success of a hyperlinking system:

cover potential (idiosyncratic) user interest & enable serendipity

Solution 1

#### Links differ between systems

System 1	System 2	% difference	
		2013	2014
$IT_{700}$	DirectH	93	86
<i>IT</i> <sub>700</sub>	IT <sub>Comb&gt;</sub>	82	90
<i>IT</i> <sub>700</sub>	Hierarchy	98	93
IT <sub>Comb=</sub>	Hierarchy	94	95

Solution 2

**Cross-modal topics** 

➢ Share <7.4% of top 10 targets</p>

#### Direct Visual Vs. with Visual->Visual

Share 30.3% of top 10 targets

## Diversity assessment

### Success of a hyperlinking system:

cover potential (idiosyncratic) user interest & enable serendipity

Solution 1

#### Links differ between systems

System 1	System 2	% difference	
		2013	2014
$IT_{700}$	DirectH	93	86
<i>IT</i> <sub>700</sub>	IT <sub>Comb&gt;</sub>	82	90
<i>IT</i> <sub>700</sub>	Hierarchy	98	93
IT <sub>Comb=</sub>	Hierarchy	94	95

Solution 2

**Cross-modal topics** 

➢ Share <7.4% of top 10 targets</p>

#### Direct Visual Vs. with Visual->Visual

Share 30.3% of top 10 targets

AMT evaluation scenario at MediaEval

- 1 judgement/anchor-target pair
- yes/no relevance assessment
- description of potential targets

### Diversity in the links

Design a new evaluation scenario:

>At least 3 assessments per anchor-target pair

Each participant should do 5 tests

> Test for: relevance (same topic, related topic, same show);

unexpectedness;

interestingness;

Anchor:



Two video clips (B and C) that could be linked to video A are recommended to you that should encourage this further exploration. Please watch the two videos and answer the guestions.





Targets:

### Results for the new scenario



#### ➢Very similar targets:

same program/series and same topic (91% expected; 9% possibly)
 most expected

#### ➤Specific topics:

same topic (47% expected; 53% possibly)
 less expected

## Lessons learned

#### From taking part in the challenges:

- Evaluation is challenging (resource constraints; subjectivity of the task)
- ✓ Easy to score points with very similar targets (near duplicates)
- ✓ Yes/No relevance assessment is not enough
- ✓ One judgment per anchor-target pair is not enough
- ✓ Each year it improves based on the feedback from participants

#### > From the survey evaluation:

- ✓ Large disagreement between participants
- ✓ The task should not take a lot of time
- ✓ Difficult to define questions about the topical relations

#### From using topic models:

- ✓ Increase diversity
- ✓ Offer more control over link creation and justification
- ✓ Cross-modal topics don't work on some anchors

### Perspectives

### ✓ User-centric evaluation

- ✓ Diverse targets to evaluate for the same anchor
- -> user can choose the type of target to follow on
- ✓ Add link justification
- -> this link is proposed because...

✓ Improve/refine the models proposed
 ✓ Use a hierarchy of cross-modal topics
 ✓ Design a survey that evaluates the translation between modalities