

StepFormer: Self-supervised Step Discovery and Localization in Instructional Videos

Nikita Dvornik¹ Isma Hadji¹ Ran Zhang¹ Konstantinos G. Derpanis^{1,2}
Animesh Garg³ Richard P. Wildes^{1,2} Allan D. Jepson¹

¹Samsung AI Centre Toronto, ²York University ³University of Toronto and Vector Institute

dvornik.nikita@gmail.com, garg@cs.toronto.edu,
{kosta, wildes}@eecs.yorku.ca,
{isma.hadji, ran.zhang, allan.jepson}@samsung.com

Abstract

Instructional videos are an important resource to learn procedural tasks from human demonstrations. However, the instruction steps in such videos are typically short and sparse, with most of the video being irrelevant to the procedure. This motivates the need to temporally localize the instruction steps in such videos, i.e. the task called key-step localization. Traditional methods for key-step localization require video-level human annotations and thus do not scale to large datasets. In this work, we tackle the problem with no human supervision and introduce StepFormer, a self-supervised model that discovers and localizes instruction steps in a video. StepFormer is a transformer decoder that attends to the video with learnable queries, and produces a sequence of slots capturing the key-steps in the video. We train our system on a large dataset of instructional videos, using their automatically-generated subtitles as the only source of supervision. In particular, we supervise our system with a sequence of text narrations using an order-aware loss function that filters out irrelevant phrases. We show that our model outperforms all previous unsupervised and weakly-supervised approaches on step detection and localization by a large margin on three challenging benchmarks. Moreover, our model demonstrates an emergent property to solve zero-shot multi-step localization and outperforms all relevant baselines at this task.

1. Introduction

Observing someone perform a task (e.g. cooking, assembling furniture or changing a tire) is a common approach for humans to acquire new skills. Instructional videos provide an excellent large-scale resource to learn such procedural activities for both humans and AI agents. Consequently, instructional video datasets [25, 35, 42] have recently received




Figure 1. **StepFormer for instruction step discovery and localization.** StepFormer is a transformer decoder trained to discover instruction steps in a video, supervised purely from video subtitles. At inference, it only needs the video to discover an ordered sequence of step slots and temporally localize them in the video.

significant attention and been used for various video understanding tasks, e.g. [1, 5, 13, 24, 29, 39, 40]. A potential impediment with using instructional videos from the web is that they tend to be long and noisy, i.e. a limited number of frames in the video correspond to the instruction steps, while the remaining video segments are unrelated to the task (e.g. title frames, close-ups of people talking and product advertisements). Thus, a major challenge with instructional videos is filtering out the uninformative frames and focusing only on the task-relevant segments, i.e. the key-steps. For instance, in a procedure of making a cake the key-steps could be “crack eggs”, “add sugar”, “add flour”, then “mix”, etc. As a result, many recent efforts tackle the problem of instruction key-step localization, e.g. [9, 10, 24, 25, 35, 42].

Most previous work aiming at temporally localizing key-steps from instructional videos rely on some form of supervision. Fully supervised approaches require start and end times of each step [35, 41]. Weakly supervised approaches either rely on knowledge of steps present in the video in the form of a set [21], ordered steps transcript [2, 9] or partially ordered steps captured with a flow graph [10]. Unsupervised approaches aim at directly detecting and localizing key-steps without a priori knowledge of instruction steps comprising videos [11, 15, 18, 31]. Conceptually, these approaches are appealing for applications with large datasets, as they eschew the need for expensive and ambiguous labeling efforts. In practice, previous unsupervised approaches rely on knowing the video-level task label at training time [11, 18, 31], and thus are not fully unsupervised. Moreover, so far they have been only applied to small instructional video datasets (up to 3K videos), as their task-specific models are not designed to handle large databases. As a result, state-of-the-art procedure learning methods are not deployable at scale and without human supervision.

To address these challenges, we present StepFormer, a novel self-supervised approach that simultaneously discovers and temporally localizes procedure key-steps in long untrimmed videos, as illustrated in Figure 1. StepFormer takes a video as input and outputs an ordered sequence of step slots, capturing instruction key-steps as they happen in the video. Notably, it does not rely on any human annotations at training or inference time. Instead, we train our model on a large instructional video dataset and use the accompanying narrations obtained from automated speech recognition (ASR) [30, 31] as the only source of supervision. StepFormer is implemented as a transformer decoder with learnable input queries. Similar to the learnable object queries in DETR [3], StepFormer’s queries learn to attend to informative video segments and thus can be viewed as step proposals. To enforce the output step slots to follow the temporal order, we use an order-aware loss based on temporal alignment of the learned steps and video narrations. Since video narrations tend to be noisy and do not always describe visually groundable steps, we use a flexible sequence-to-sequence alignment algorithm, Drop-DTW [9], which allows for non-alignable narrations to be dropped. To localize the predicted step slots in the video, we explicitly use their learned temporal order. Precisely, Drop-DTW aligns informative step slots with the video, and outputs start and end times for every detected step.

We train our system on HowTo100M [25], a large instructional video dataset with no human annotations. For evaluation, we use three standard instructional videos benchmarks, *i.e.* CrossTask [42], ProceL [11] and COIN [35]. Empirically, for unsupervised step localization, our self-supervised method outperforms all weakly- and unsupervised baselines on all three downstream datasets, with-

out any dataset-specific adaption. Additionally, we demonstrate an emergent property of our model to perform zero-shot key-step localization from a text prompt (*i.e.* without finetuning on the target dataset), where it also outperforms all relevant baselines.

Contributions. The contributions of our paper are three-fold. **(i)** We present StepFormer, a novel self-supervised approach to key-step discovery and localization in instructional videos. **(ii)** We model the temporal order of steps explicitly, and use it to design effective training and inference methods. **(iii)** We supervise StepFormer only with video subtitles on a large instructional video dataset, and successfully transfer the model to three downstream datasets without any finetuning. On all three datasets, StepFormer establishes a new state of the art on unsupervised step localization, outperforming unsupervised and weakly-supervised baselines. We are committed to releasing our code.

2. Related work

Step localization in instructional videos. Instruction step localization entails detecting and temporally localizing task-relevant video segments [4, 8–10, 16, 22, 24, 28, 42]. Work tackling this task can be largely split into three classes based on the type of supervision. Fully supervised approaches [12, 23, 35, 41] are not ideal as they require expensive labelling efforts of key-step temporal endpoints in each video. Alternatively, weakly supervised approaches relax training efforts by either relying on unordered [21] or ordered step sequences [4, 8, 9, 16, 28, 42]. Nevertheless, relying on knowledge of steps still entails the labour intensive process of watching all videos to determine the steps present. More recent work goes a step further to reduce labelling efforts by relying on task-level recipes [10]. Here, a general purpose recipe describing a given task is converted into a graph that captures the partial order of steps and is used to temporally localize the steps in videos. However, this approach still requires human annotation for video task labels and creating the flow graphs.

More closely related to our work are unsupervised approaches that aim at discovering procedure step prototypes at training [11, 18]. A common drawback of such methods is that they rely solely on the video signal to discover the step prototypes, completely ignoring the readily available complementary information present in the subtitles, which leads to subpar results. More recent work trains for step localization by aligning video and narrations [31]. The important distinction from our work is that it does not explicitly tackle the target task of step detection and localization. Instead, their model only finetunes the video features via video to text alignment. To discover and localize the steps, they perform ad-hoc K-means clustering of the video features at test time. In contrast, StepFormer is designed to discover

individual instruction steps present in the video and localize them with an alignment procedure, which leverages the temporal structure of the process. Crucially, all the above “unsupervised” methods actually rely on video-level task labels for guidance during training [11, 18, 31]; therefore, we refer to them as weakly-supervised in this paper. Finally, the above methods can only be trained and evaluated on the same dataset, as the models they learn are task-specific. In contrast, our StepFormer is a task-agnostic solution for step detection that can generalize across datasets; it only relies on videos and their accompanying narrations for training.

Learning from visual-textual information. In the era of open world learning [17] and large scale datasets (*e.g.* [25, 27]), the ability to learn with minimal supervision is becoming vital. For this reason, recent work strongly relies on the complementarity between visual and textual information as a natural source of supervision [22, 24, 27]. This complementarity is especially appealing when dealing with narrated videos, such as instructional videos [35, 41, 42]. A large body of work uses this multimodal data for representation learning, thereby yielding strong representations enabling various downstream tasks [15, 22, 24]. In this work, we build on these strong representations and further rely on weak temporal alignment between modalities to directly tackle the problem of automatic key-step discovery and temporal localization.

Sequence-to-sequence alignment. Alignment between sequences has seen a recent surge of interest with many approaches relying on it either as a proxy task for representation learning [2, 7, 14, 15, 24], or more closely related to our work, for learning to localize steps [4, 9, 10, 31]. Most previous work uses alignment in a weakly supervised setting, where knowledge of the sequence of steps is assumed [2, 4, 6, 9] or the video-level task label is used for clustering [31] or to build a task-level flow graph [10]. In contrast, we do not make use of step order or video-label information. Instead, we train a model to discover steps conditioned on video content and align those discovered steps to narrations in a completely self-supervised manner. Notably, unlike other work using alignment [9, 10, 15], we devise a method that only requires both modalities at training time, while only requiring video at inference time to automatically discover and localize key steps.

3. Technical approach

In this section, we present our approach to self-supervised procedure step detection and localization in video. We first introduce StepFormer’s architecture and our data preparation pipeline (Section 3.1). Next, we describe the adopted sequence-to-sequence alignment method (Section 3.2), which we use for both training and inference. We

then describe our training (Section 3.3) and inference (Section 3.4) procedures. Finally, we describe the implementation details in Section 3.5.

3.1. StepFormer

StepFormer is our model for procedure step discovery in instructional videos. Given an N second long video as input, StepFormer returns K step slots, \mathbf{s} – a sequence of vectors capturing ordered instruction steps in the video. We train StepFormer on a large dataset of instructional videos without any supervision by temporally aligning step slots with the narrations that accompany the video. Our full training pipeline is presented in Figure 2.

Data. To train StepFormer, we assume access to a large dataset of instructional videos, with *no annotations*. Our method is self-supervised; it relies on videos and their accompanying narrations. To use the narration for learning, we transform the speech into text using YouTube’s ASR, and then follow the text processing pipeline proposed in previous work [31]. More precisely, we run the subtitles through punctuation [36] and co-reference resolution [33] modules, followed by a dependency parser to discover verb-phrases of the form *verb+(prt)+obj+(prep+obj)*. As a result, we transform long subtitle text into an ordered sequence of L verb phrases, some of which describe groundable actions and procedure steps occurring in the video. Examples of extracted verb phrases are given in supplement.

We extract features from video and phrases using UniVL, a self-supervised pre-trained video-language model [22], such that verb phrases are mapped to a sequence of L feature vectors, $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$, and an N second video is mapped to a sequence of N vectors, $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$. Importantly, our approach relies on the fact that UniVL maps video clips and language into a shared embedding space, *e.g.* a video of cutting a tomato and the phrase “cutting a tomato” map to similar vectors. Starting with video and text features sharing a common embedding space makes training StepFormer feasible, despite the noise in the narrations.

While we derive supervision from the verb phrases, it is important to stress that in instructional videos, much of the audio narration contains irrelevant content, and only a small portion of the verb phrases are relevant to the instruction steps. Thus, one of the challenges that we address in this work is identifying the relevant phrases for training. We describe how we leverage such noisy sequential targets to supervise our step slots in Section 3.2.

Architecture. We implement StepFormer as a multi-layer transformer decoder [37], \mathcal{T} , that receives K learnable queries, $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times d}$, as input, and attends to the video features (with added sinusoidal positional embeddings [37]), $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$, at every decoder layer. Notably, while the length of the videos, N , can vary, the number of learned




Figure 2. **StepFormer training overview.** (left) We first embed an untrimmed instructional video with a frozen UniVL encoder [22]. Next, we attend to the video with our StepFormer with learned step queries to extract step slots. (right) To form the training targets, we take the corresponding video subtitles, extract a sequence of verb phrases, and embed them with the UniVL text encoder [22]. (middle) To supervise StepFormer, we find a matching subsequence between the step slots and verb phrases via seq-to-seq alignment with outlier rejection [9]; the green entries in the alignment matrix denote correspondences. The resulting alignment is used to define a contrastive loss.

queries and corresponding step slots, K , is fixed. The output of StepFormer is a sequence of K contextualized vectors, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times d}$, that we term step slots, *i.e.* $\mathbf{s} = \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{q})$. Intuitively, different step slots bind to different segments of the video; so, each step slot potentially represents a different instruction step. We enforce step slots to be temporally ordered, *i.e.* a video segment captured by \mathbf{s}_i would happen before the segment captured by \mathbf{s}_j , if $i < j$. To achieve the temporal ordering of step slots, we employ an order-aware sequence-to-sequence loss, described in Section 3.3.

3.2. Sequence-to-sequence alignment

A key feature of our StepFormer model is the *temporal order* among the predicted step slots. We take full advantage of the temporal order in subtitles to supervise our system. Also, it enables us to localize the step slots in the video and respect their temporal order. To infer the relationship between the elements of two sequences, we extensively use sequence-to-sequence alignment, which forms the basis of our method.

Aligning two sequences entails computing the optimal pairwise correspondence between the sequence elements, while preserving their match orderings. Thus, given an ordered sequence of narrations for training, sequence-to-sequence alignment is a natural choice to supervise the corresponding step slots and enforce their temporal order. Similarly, at inference, given a sequence of step slots and video frames that both follow the temporal order, it is natural to tackle step localization by aligning those sequences and finding correspondence between video frames and predicted step slots. For sequence alignment, we choose the recent Drop-DTW [9] algorithm for its following properties. **(i)** It operates on sequences of continuous vectors, such as video and text embeddings. **(ii)** It automatically detects outliers and allows to drop them from one or both sequences, essentially aligning only relevant sequence elements. **(iii)** It supports both one-to-one (needed for training) and many-to-one (needed for inference) matching.

In Drop-DTW’s formulation, matching or dropping elements incurs some cost. The cost of matching two elements typically is defined as their negative cosine similarity, while a drop cost is often defined as some percentile of the match cost distribution. The alignment is then computed such that the total cost is minimized. In this work, we are interested in the correspondence between elements, established by Drop-DTW through sequence alignment. That is, given two vector sequences, $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$ and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times d}$, Drop-DTW returns a binary alignment matrix, \mathbf{M} of size $K \times N$, indicating that elements z_i and x_j are matched if $M_{ij} = 1$. As described next, given the correspondence matrix, we can both formulate a self-supervised training objective and segment a video into steps at inference time.

3.3. Training

To train our system, we rely on a combination of losses, enforcing temporal alignment of step slots with narrations, and learning discriminative step slots, as well as additional training regularizers. Below, we elaborate on each component of our training objective.

Local step contrastive loss. We supervise the output of StepFormer, *i.e.* the sequence of step slots, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times d}$, with the sequence of verb phrase embeddings, $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$. We first align the step slots, \mathbf{s} , with phrase embeddings, \mathbf{p} , using Drop-DTW. This process allows verb phrases and step slots that do not have a strong match to be dropped from further consideration, and enforces only one-to-one correspondences between the elements that are a good match, *i.e.* a single step slot can match with a maximum of one phrase, and vice versa. The resulting correspondence matrix, \mathbf{M} , is used to construct positive and negative pairs, which we use in a contrastive training setting. An example of such a correspondence matrix, \mathbf{M} , is given in Figure 2 (middle), with correspondences highlighted in green. Specifically, every step slot, \mathbf{s}_i , and phrase embedding, \mathbf{p}_j , matched by Drop-DTW (*i.e.* $M_{ij} = 1$) forms a positive training pair,

and all other non-matching pairs (*i.e.* $M_{ij} = 0$). are used as negative examples. To learn from such correspondences we use the Info-NCE [26] loss, a contrastive objective that promotes the similarity between positive pairs, and pushes the negatives away from each other:

$$\ell_{\text{NCE}}(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{p}) = -\log \frac{f(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{p}_{j^*})}{f(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{p}_{j^*}) + \sum_{j \neq j^*} f(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{p}_j)}, \quad (1)$$

where $f(x, z) = \exp(\cos(x, z)/\gamma)$, γ is a scaling temperature and j^* is the index of \mathbf{s}_i 's positive pair. The full sequence-to-sequence alignment loss, \mathcal{L}_{seq} , is defined as a combination of two Info-NCE losses, one contrasting the step slots and the other contrasting the phrases:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{seq}} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \ell_{\text{NCE}}(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{p}) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^L \ell_{\text{NCE}}(\mathbf{p}_j, \mathbf{s}). \quad (2)$$

Global video-step contrastive loss. The local step contrastive loss, (2), learns from positive and negative examples that all come from the same video; however, it is known that contrastive learning can greatly benefit from a large and diverse set of negative examples [26, 32]. Thus, we introduce an additional contrastive loss that forms negative pairs from phrases and step slots that come from different videos. The intuition behind this loss is that, given a video, some of the extracted step slots must match with some phrases, regardless of the order, while at the same time, the slots and phrases coming from different videos should be different.

To realize the global contrastive loss, we use a contrastive multiple-instance-learning objective, MIL-NCE [24], that promotes the similarity between sets of step slots and phrases coming from the same video, and contrasts them with the signal coming from different videos. Formally, the global contrastive loss is defined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{glob}} = -\log \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_i} f(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{p}_j)}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_i} f(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{p}_j) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}_i} f(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{p}_j)}, \quad (3)$$

where $f(x, z) = \exp(\cos(x, z)/\gamma)$, γ is a scaling temperature, $M = K \cdot B$ is the total number of step slots across the batch of size B , \mathcal{P}_i is the set of indexes j that form a positive pair with \mathbf{s}_i , *i.e.* the \mathbf{p}_j coming from the same video, and \mathcal{N}_j indexes the negative pairs, coming from different videos. An additional benefit of this global loss is that step slots representing non-procedural steps, commonly appearing across different videos, will be discouraged. As we show in the experiments, this loss greatly improves the learned step slots.

Regularization. To improve the training and introduce prior knowledge in the system, we use two additional regularizers acting on the step slots.




Figure 3. **Step localization inference.** Given a video, StepFormer first extracts a sequence of step slots. The step slots can be interpreted as temporally ordered key-step candidates. Next, it aligns the sequence of step slots with the video sequence, using Drop-DTW [9]. This step puts the elements of the two sequences in correspondence, while identifying outliers. Here, the step slots and video frames of the same color are matched by Drop-DTW, while the white slots and frames are dropped from the alignment. The colored video segments represent the final step localization result.

The first regularizer enforces diversity among step slots. Indeed, the main objective functions described so far do not encourage the step slots predicted from one video to be significantly different, which results in numerous duplicate steps capturing the same part of the video. To counter this limitation, we introduce a regularization term, \mathcal{L}_{div} , that encourages low cosine similarity among step slots of the same video and thereby make predicted step slots more diverse.

The second regularizer enforces attention smoothness. Due to natural video continuity, we expect the attention of step slots in the video to change smoothly, and be similar for close frames. Thus, we add a regularization term, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{smooth}}$, that, for all step slots, enforces their attention in the video to be similar for neighboring frames and different for distant frames. Both regularizers improve discovered step and segmentation quality, as we show in the experiments. Please see supplement for the exact loss definitions.

Finally, to train our system we optimize the weighted sum of four losses,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{seq}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{global}} + \alpha \mathcal{L}_{\text{div}} + \beta \mathcal{L}_{\text{smooth}}, \quad (4)$$

where the α and β scalars are chosen using cross validation.

3.4. Step localization inference

At inference time, StepFormer detects and localizes key-steps without requiring narrations. StepFormer's inference procedure is illustrated in Figure 3. It takes an instructional video as input and returns an ordered sequence of K step slots conditioned on this video. Each step slot corresponds to a procedural key-segment in the video and carries its semantics. However, given that we use a large fixed number of K step slots for all videos, some step slots may be

duplicates or have weak binding with the video segment. For this reason, we need select a subset of the step slots that concisely describe the given video. A simple approach would be to use hard attention of step slots in the video directly [20, 31] and get some meaningful step segments. While viable, this solution can not properly handle the duplicates, and more importantly, it completely ignores the order present in step slots, which is a useful source of information for step localization [4, 9].

Instead, we rely on sequence-to-sequence alignment as our inference procedure for step localization. Specifically, for each input video, we first extract the corresponding K step slots using StepFormer. We then use Drop-DTW [9] to align the step slot embeddings, \mathbf{s} , to the video embeddings, \mathbf{v} , allowing outliers to be dropped from both sequences. Notably, here, we use the formulation of Drop-DTW that allows many-to-one correspondences, so it can assign multiple video frames to a single step slot, which effectively segments the video into steps.

The ability to drop irrelevant step slots for individual videos, and the ability to take the order of steps into account explicitly leads to improved segmentation quality, as we later validate empirically. Notably, alignment of step slots and video is possible in the first place, because the video and text features used for training share a common embedding space. Thus, step slots, which were trained using procedure text should align with video too.

3.5. Implementation details

We implement StepFormer using a Pre-LN Transformer decoder [38] with six layers, and fix the number of step slots to be $K = 32$. We train the model for a total of 60 epochs, starting with three epochs of warm-up from 0 to $3e-4$, followed by cosine decay to $1e-6$. We use weight decay of $1e-4$ and 0.1 dropout [34] in the intermediate layers. In our sequence-to-sequence alignment loss, we use Drop-DTW with 0.8 percentile drop cost [9]. We set the regularizer weights to $\alpha = 0.3$ and $\beta = 0.02$. All the hyper-parameters are set using cross-validation. It takes about two days to train one model using eight Tesla T4 GPUs.

4. Experiments

In this section, we evaluate StepFormer on unsupervised step detection and localization (Section D), and its emergent property to address zero-shot step localization (Section 4.3). Finally, we perform an ablation study of our approach (Section E).

4.1. Evaluation protocol

Datasets. Given that our approach is trained entirely in a self-supervised manner, we train our model on the largest instructional video dataset, HowTo100M [25], that comes with no annotations. Following previous work [31], we

evaluate our proposed method on the CrossTask [42] and ProceL [11] datasets. CrossTask contains 2750 videos, depicting 18 different tasks, while ProceL covers 12 different tasks with 60 videos for each task. In addition, given that our approach does not require any finetuning, we also report results on the largest annotated instructional video dataset, *i.e.* COIN [35], which includes 11827 videos, covering 778 procedures. For all evaluations, the same model pre-trained on HowTo100M is used directly, without finetuning or adaptation to the downstream task.

Evaluation metrics. Following previous work [31], we use precision, recall, F1 score and Mean over Frames (MoF) for evaluation. Precision highlights the percentage of frames correctly predicted as belonging to key-steps, while recall emphasizes the model’s ability to detect frames belonging to key-steps. F1 score balances the two previous metrics by calculating their harmonic mean and is therefore the most informative metric. MoF is a less strict metric calculating the percentage of correctly predicted frames, including the background ones (*i.e.* non key-steps).

Baselines. We compare our method to previous weakly-supervised baselines [11, 18, 31], which only use the video task label as supervision. Precisely, Kukleva et al. [18] and Elhamifar et al. [11] train a model purely from video, to discover global step prototypes in the training set, while Shen et al. [31] extract prototypes from a video on the fly and supervises them with text subtitles. In this work, we adapt the methods of Kukleva et al. and Shen et al. to completely unsupervised training (*i.e.* without video labels), and perform a more direct comparison to our unsupervised StepFormer. All the baseline methods must be trained and tested on the same dataset, and cannot generalize to new data, unlike StepFormer. The supplement provides additional details about our baselines.

4.2. Unsupervised step discovery and localization

The goal of this experiment is to evaluate our model’s ability to automatically discover task-relevant steps and localize them. Thus, the model does not have access to ground-truth key-steps in this experiment. Instead, for each video, we predict K step slots with our StepFormer, and let our inference procedure select only the task-relevant steps among them (see Section 3.4). To do so, we temporally align a video with its corresponding step slots while allowing both “outlier” step slots and frames to be dropped. To achieve this end, we use Drop-DTW [9], which performs temporal sequence alignment while dropping interspersed outliers in both sequences. The output of this alignment is a sequence of K' step slots ($K' \leq K$) and corresponding video segments, which our model highlights as corresponding to key, *task-relevant*, steps.

Supervision	Method	CrossTask				ProceL				COIN			
		F1	Prec.	Rec.	MoF	F1	Prec.	Rec.	MoF	F1	Prec.	Rec.	MoF
Weak	Kukleva et al. [18]	15.9	10.3	37.2	28.5	19.4	14.1	34.3	30.4	28.5	21.5	48.6	8.2
	Elhamifar et al. [11]	17.2	10.9	41.7	41.7	15.5	11.3	27.3	27.3	28.4	20.6	52.0	30.2
	Shen et al. [31]	22.3	16.2	37.5	41.0	20.3	17.4	26.7	35.4	30.1	25.9	39.8	35.6
Unsupervised	Kukleva et al. [18]	18.1	12.0	39.8	29.4	17.2	12.8	30.0	28.9	27.9	21.8	45.0	13.6
	Shen et al. [31]	16.0	11.7	23.1	37.1	18.0	13.6	22.8	33.1	18.8	16.5	25.1	32.7
	StepFormer (ours)	28.3	22.1	42.0	41.9	21.9	18.3	28.1	40.9	32.1	27.1	42.5	38.6

Table 1. Dataset-level unsupervised step detection and localization results on the CrossTask, ProceL and COIN datasets.

To evaluate the quality of the extracted key-steps, we follow previous work [11, 18, 31] to associate predicted steps to ground-truth segments using clustering and Hungarian matching. Specifically, we start by accumulating the extracted key-steps of all videos corresponding to a given task (e.g. making pancake, changing a car tire, etc.). Next, we cluster all extracted steps using K-means, setting the number of clusters, K_c , to be the ground-truth number of key-steps in the task according to the dataset. In each cluster, we only keep 60% of the step slots that are the closest to the cluster center and label the rest of the steps as background, as done in previous work [31]. Finally, we use Hungarian matching to find a global one-to-one matching between the video segment associated with each cluster and the ground-truth segments. We evaluate the resulting corresponding segments using the metrics defined in Section 4.1.

Table 1 compares our performance to the baselines [11, 18, 31], which all use a video task label for training. We report baseline results under their original settings, where they use video task label for training, which we refer to as weak supervision. Additionally, we compare to [18, 31] adapted to the fully unsupervised setting (i.e. we train a single model for all tasks). The results summarized in Table 1 speak decisively in favor of our approach, which outperforms all baselines in both the weak and unsupervised settings with sizeable margins. This pattern is despite the fact that the baselines are trained and tested on the same data distribution, whereas our model generalizes to the target dataset without any finetuning. The results (i) highlight StepFormer’s capability to automatically discover key-steps even while being completely unsupervised and having no access to the datasets used for evaluation during training and (ii) also show that our method yields better localization, as highlighted in the qualitative results in Figure 4.

4.3. Zero-shot key-step localization

In this experiment, the goal is to show that the step slots learned by our StepFormer can be used directly for key-step localization in a zero-shot setting. The task of zero-shot step localization is defined as temporally localizing a sequence of procedure steps in the video, given their natural text description (e.g. “break egg”, “add sugar”, “add flour”, etc.) without any training or finetuning on the target data.




Figure 4. **Qualitative comparison of temporal localization.** Comparison of our self-supervised StepFormer with the weakly-supervised baselines [11, 18, 31] on CrossTask.

To tackle this task, we use each video in the target dataset as input to our StepFormer and extract the corresponding K step slots. These slots are then aligned to the embeddings of the ground-truth steps. We use Drop-DTW [9] to compute an alignment between the K step slots and ground-truth steps while allowing unmatched slots to be dropped. Next, we align the remaining step slots, corresponding to ground-truth steps, with the video (again using Drop-DTW) to automatically identify the start and end times of each ground-truth step. Notably, to address this task successfully, the step slots must align well with both text and video features simultaneously. Thus, we use this evaluation as an opportunity for a deeper investigation on our model’s capability.

Table 2 summarizes our results under these settings, while comparing to a state-of-the-art method for step detection and localization [31] in both weakly supervised (i.e. separate model for each task) and unsupervised (a single model for all tasks) settings. Note that out of all available baselines, we compare only to Shen et al. [31], as it is the only method extracting video clusters alignable with text using subtitle text supervision. The results show the superiority of our method and highlight the quality of the learned step slots, which are better able to capture procedure steps given the sequence of ground-truth text descriptions.

We include an additional baseline, dubbed “GT text features”, where we directly use embedded ground-truth step text to localize the key-steps in the video, using Drop-DTW to align the text and video features. This is a strong baseline as it relies on aligning UniVL video and text features, that were trained to be alignable in the first place. Interestingly, StepFormer outperforms this baseline as well. We attribute this performance improvement to two key aspects of our

Supervision	Method	CrossTask				ProceL				COIN			
		IoU	Prec.	Rec.	MoF	IoU	Prec.	Rec.	MoF	IoU	Prec.	Rec.	MoF
Weak	Shen et al. [31]	16.3	27.2	26.2	67.2	12.1	16.0	19.0	30.7	20.8	31.3	33.7	40.5
	GT text features	18.6	32.2	29.2	67.9	12.6	20.2	21.1	36.1	24.4	38.1	35.3	50.6
Unsupervised	Shen et al. [31]	12.8	25.2	19.9	66.9	10.5	13.8	14.7	24.2	11.7	18.3	24.3	29.2
	Ours	23.7	32.9	43.1	67.1	18.1	36.3	24.8	36.9	27.1	42.8	37.9	48.4

Table 2. Zero-shot key-step localization on the the CrossTask, ProceL and COIN dataset. GT denotes ground-truth.




Figure 5. **Visualization of step attention in the video for zero-shot multi-step localization.** (top row) The attention of the step slots in the video, with different colors capturing different steps. (middle row) Multi-step localization results obtained from the above attention. (bottom row) The corresponding ground-truth step localization. Notably, the step slot attention (column 3) even outperforms the attention of GT text descriptions (column 4) at step localisation, without ever being trained to do so.

Method	Unsup. Segmentation				Zero-shot Localization			
	F1	Prec.	Rec.	MoF	IoU	Prec.	Rec.	MoF
Ours w/o \mathcal{L}_{seq}	17.3	18.4	20.5	63.5	4.6	5.9	6.3	69.8
Ours w/o \mathcal{L}_{global}	20.9	14.9	41.1	33.3	11.5	17.9	26.2	55.2
Ours w/o \mathcal{L}_{div}	26.7	20.5	40.9	44.6	16.9	27.6	29.3	66.1
Ours w/o \mathcal{L}_{smooth}	27.1	21.2	40.0	48.7	17.7	26.9	33.0	63.4
Ours w/o Drop-DTW	28.1	20.3	41.4	47.0	20.1	28.0	40.8	62.1
Ours	28.3	22.1	42.0	41.9	23.7	32.9	43.1	67.1

Table 3. Ablation study of StepFormer’s training and inference components on CrossTask.

model. First, StepFormer is trained to align *entire videos* with their subtitles, which allows StepFormer to globally reason about the step order, giving it an advantage over the original UniVL features, extracted locally. Second, step slots are directly conditioned on video and therefore have higher potential of better aligning with video content.

To better understand the behavior of our step slots and highlight their usefulness, in Figure 5, we demonstrate the attention of the selected step slots (or ground-truth text features) in the video. While Shen et al. [31] outputs steps unalignable with the video, StepFormer’s step slots accurately capture independent procedure steps and provide clear attention peaks in the true key-step locations. Further, the quality of the StepFormer outputs even surpasses those of the ground-truth text features.

4.4. Ablation Study

In this section, we perform an ablation study of our approach by systematically removing StepFormer’s components and measuring the performance on unsupervised step segmentation and zero-shot key-step localization on CrossTask. An additional study on the hyper-parameters can be found in the supplement. The ablation results are summarized in Table 4. Removing the main sequence-to-sequence alignment loss, \mathcal{L}_{seq} , severely degrades the perfor-

mance of our model, especially on zero-shot key-step localization, where step order is essential. The global contrastive learning loss, \mathcal{L}_{global} , is also important for learning expressive step slots, removing it impairs the performance on both tasks. Finally, removing the diversity, \mathcal{L}_{div} , and smoothness, \mathcal{L}_{smooth} , regularizers of our step slots mildly hurts unsupervised step segmentation performance. However, the drop in performance of zero-shot key-step localization is more noticeable, as accurate key-step localization requires step slots to be diverse (when aligning them to step text descriptions), and have smooth attention in the video (when aligning the slots to the video). Finally, we replace our step localization inference procedure based on Drop-DTW, with an order-agnostic procedure, that assigns a frame to the most similar step-slot, akin to [11, 31]. This modification does not affect the performance on unsupervised segmentation significantly, because the task evaluation is insensitive to the step order. However, there is a notable drop in performance on zero-shot key-step localization, where recovering the correct step order is essential. Overall, all the proposed components of StepFormer are important to achieve state-of-the-art step discovery and localization.

5. Conclusion

We introduced StepFormer, a self-supervised, task-agnostic model that discovers and localizes key-steps in instructional videos. We train it on a large dataset of instructional videos using automatically generated subtitles as the only source of supervision. Our model yields state-of-the-art results on step localization across multiple datasets, even outperforming weakly-supervised models. StepFormer not only provides good step localization, it defines a new type of model for procedure understanding, that is simple, effec-

tive, scalable and requires no supervision. Therefore, it has potential to advance research in procedure understanding.

Appendix

A. Summary

In this supplemental material, we elaborate on the details of the proposed approach and experimental validation setup. In Section B, we begin by supplementing the description of data processing provided in Section 3.1 of the main paper with an explicit illustration of the subtitle processing outcome. Next, we define the regularization losses in Section C. Then, in Section D, we give a more detailed description of the used baselines. Finally, we present the additional ablation studies in Section E.

B. Subtitle processing

To train StepFormer, we derive supervision from video subtitles (or narrations), as described in Section 3.1 of the main paper. More precisely, we run the narrations through punctuation [36] and co-reference resolution [33] modules, followed by a dependency parser to discover verb-phrases of the form *verb+(prt)+obj+(prep+pobj)*. As a result, we transform long subtitle text into an ordered sequence of verb phrases, some of which describe groundable actions and procedure steps occurring in the video. We demonstrate an example of the verb phrase extraction in Figure 6, and additionally highlight the phrases that were matched to step slots during training (in the last epoch). This example, confirms that a subset of the extracted verb phrases indeed contain important information about procedure steps. Notably, most of the relevant verb phrases get selected by Drop-DTW for supervision, as shown in the underlined steps on the right of Figure 6.

C. Regularization losses

As described in Section 3.3 of the main paper, we train StepFormer with verb phrases supervision and employ two extra regularizers, acting on the step slots.

Diversity regularizer. The first regularizer, \mathcal{L}_{div} , enforces diversity among step slots. Precisely, given the step slots $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times d}$ extracted from video $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$ using the transformer, \mathcal{T} , i.e., $\mathbf{s} = \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{v})$, the diversity regularizer encourages low cosine similarity among the step slots \mathbf{s}_i as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{div}} = \frac{1}{K(K-1)} \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{j \neq i} \cos(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{s}_j), \quad (5)$$

Where K is the number of predicted slots. The diversity regularizer promotes slot diversity and improves performance by removing duplicate slots as validated in Table 3 of the main paper.

Full Subtitles Text

hello this video here will be a demonstration on how to disassemble a 802 keyless remote this also includes how to replace the battery now first we want to start by doing this is a three button remote here so as the lock unlock buttons and also the panic button on the rear of it now you can see here it's a little harder to see on the video but there's actually a little cut out I'll just put the case now you can take a flat screwdriver or possibly just a thin coin and just pop it in there what you want to do is actually just pry it open now if you're having a little trouble you can go around the outside here if it's stuck together just to pop it open so you can see you have the back half here now just for the battery itself here what you want to do actually is continue with the button just pushing on them here just to push the whatever house actually is a rubber case that goes all the way around that houses the circuit board itself so I simply just pull the part of the circuit board like there then you can slide the battery out itself now the battery number is two zero three two now when placing a new battery you want to make sure the positive side goes up now the battery is marked but it's also the flat side of the battery that side there's actually the negative side now it also shows on the circuit board right here right at the top here does say where the battery the positive side does goes up there too so it also has markings on here now if you do have any contact problems you can actually bend these little tabs up here I just in the bottom side there just to give it a little more pressure on the battery itself now as to continue on further removal of the key fob assembly here you can peel the rubber out here see that just slides in there now the buttons actually just pop out on their own now the unlock button here does go on the bottom here like so but it also does have a little tab on the top side there or slides into a little cutout right there now as for the panic button itself it does slide in with a rubber here it actually does slide them to a groove itself so we actually want to do is just sometimes you can get this with your finger here and pop the rubber out itself see there it's through rear a gasket oh and then the rear panic button now this is it for my tutorial video if you have any comments or questions please don't hesitate to post them also rate and subscribe to my channel thank you for watching you

Extracted Verb Phrases

1. disassemble remote
2. replace the battery
3. do this
4. put the case
5. take a flat screwdriver
6. do what
7. have a little trouble
8. have the back half for the battery
9. do what
10. push the whatever house
11. pull the part
12. slide the battery
13. place a new battery
14. have markings
15. have any contact problems
16. bend these little tabs
17. give a little more pressure
18. peel the rubber
19. have a little tab
20. get this
21. pop the rubber
22. have any comments



Figure 6. **Verb-phrase extraction from subtitles.** (left) Original video subtitles. (right) Verb phrases extracted from the subtitles. The underlined verb phrases are the ones chosen by Drop-DTW for step slot supervision at end of training.

Smoothness regularizer. The second regularizer, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{smooth}}$, enforces that step slots attend to video content smoothly. Intuitively, due to natural video continuity, we expect the attention of step slots in the video to change smoothly, and be similar for close frames. Given the video, $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$, and the corresponding step slots, $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times d}$, the attention, $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times K}$, of all steps in the video is defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{a} = \text{softmax}(\cos(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{s})/\gamma), \quad (6)$$

where $\gamma = 0.03$ is the softmax temperature, softmax is taken along the last dimension, and $\cos(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{s}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times K}$ is a matrix of cosine similarities, *i.e.* $\cos(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{s})_{ij} = \cos(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{s}_j)$.

To define the regularizer on the attention vectors, we draw inspiration from the video representation learning literature [19]. In particular, we require that, for a given attention vector $\mathbf{a}_i \in \mathbb{R}^K$ (at frame i), the attention vectors \mathbf{a}_k of the neighboring frames, *i.e.* $\|i - k\| \leq M$, are similar, and the attention vectors, \mathbf{a}_j of distant frames, *i.e.* $\|i - j\| > M$, are dissimilar, where M is the size of the positive neighborhood. We implement this requirement using the MIL-NCE contrastive loss on the attention according to

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{smooth}} = -\log \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i=1}^L \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{P}_i} f(\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_j)}{\sum_{l \in \mathcal{I}} f(\mathbf{a}_i, \mathbf{a}_l)}, \quad (7)$$

Where \mathcal{I} is the set of L frame indices sampled at random, \mathcal{P}_i is a subset of \mathcal{I} indices that form a positive pair with i , *i.e.* lie in the positive neighborhood of M frames, and $f(x, z) = \exp(\cos(x, z)/\gamma)$, where $\gamma = 0.03$ is a scaling temperature.

Method	Unsup. Segmentation			Zero-shot Localization				
	F1	Prec.	MoF	IoU	Prec.	MoF		
Ours (24 slots)	27.9	21.4	40.5	45.3	21.6	30.9	44.2	66.4
Ours (48 slots)	26.5	20.7	39.8	40.6	24.2	34.1	40.1	67.7
Ours (2 layers)	23.2	18.4	34.1	39.6	14.9	24.9	26.8	68.1
Ours (4 layers)	27.8	21.4	41.2	43.6	20.8	28.9	38.8	67.4
Ours (8 layers)	26.6	22.0	39.7	42.5	22.7	32.4	45.5	66.7
Ours (6 layers, 32 slots)	28.3	22.1	42.0	41.9	23.7	32.9	43.1	67.1

Table 4. Ablation study of StepFormer’s training and inference components on CrossTask.

D. Baselines

To verify the effectiveness of StepFormer, we compare our model to three baselines: Kukleva et al. [18], Elhamifar et al. [11], and Shen et al. [31]. We consider all the baselines as weakly-supervised, as they use information about the video task label during training. Kukleva et al. [18] and Elhamifar et al. [11] train a model purely from video; thus, we use these baselines only in unsupervised step localization (Section 4.2 of the main paper). More similar to StepFormer, Shen et al. [31] extract prototypes from a video on the fly and supervises them with text subtitles. In principle, their prototypes should follow the temporal order and be alignable with text features, similar to our step slots. Hence, we compare StepFormer to Shen et al. also in the zero-shot step localization setup (Section 4.3 of the main paper). While Elhamifar et al. directly uses video task labels for supervision, Kukleva et al. and Shen et al. use such labels implicitly, *i.e.* they train a separate model for each task using only the videos that belong to that task. In this work, we adapt the methods of Kukleva et al. and Shen et

al. to completely unsupervised training (*i.e.* without video labels), by merging all tasks (and their videos) into a single dataset-level task, thereby not revealing the task-specific labels during training. Unlike StepFormer, all the baseline methods must be trained and tested on the same dataset (as they learn task-specific step prototypes), and cannot generalize to new data. For direct comparison with StepFormer, we train all the baselines using the same video features [22], and fix the same training and testing splits in every dataset.

E. Ablation study

In this section, we complement Section 4.4 of the main paper with additional ablations of StepFormer components on the CrossTask dataset. Specifically, we vary the number of transformer decoder layers and the number of output step slots used to describe a video, and report the results in Table 4. First, as the table demonstrates, increasing the number of transformer layers to 6, *i.e.* the default value used in the main paper, helps improve the performance. However, further increasing the number of layers actually hurts. We attribute this effect to optimization difficulty of larger models. Second, using 32 step slots to solve unsupervised step localization seems to be optimal for unsupervised step discovery and localization. However, to solve zero-shot step localization, more step slots seem to work better. We attribute the increased zero-shot step localization performance with 48 slots to the improved text-to-slot matching step, as 48 slots offer more freedom in the matching. Nevertheless, we elect to use the setup consisting of 6 layers and 32 step slots as it offers a good compromise in terms of performance on both target tasks.

References

- [1] Jing Bi, Jiebo Luo, and Chenliang Xu. Procedure planning in instructional videos via contextual modeling and model-based policy learning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2021. 1
- [2] Kaidi Cao, Jingwei Ji, Zhangjie Cao, Chien-Yi Chang, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Few-shot video classification via temporal alignment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2020. 2, 3
- [3] Nicolas Carion, Francisco Massa, Gabriel Synnaeve, Nicolas Usunier, Alexander Kirillov, and Sergey Zagoruyko. End-to-end object detection with transformers. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2020. 2
- [4] Chien-Yi Chang, De-An Huang, Yanan Sui, Li Fei-Fei, and Juan Carlos Niebles. D3TW: Discriminative differentiable dynamic time warping for weakly supervised action alignment and segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2019. 2, 3, 6
- [5] Chien-Yi Chang, De-An Huang, Danfei Xu, Ehsan Adeli, Li Fei-Fei, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Procedure planning in instructional videos. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2020. 1
- [6] Xiaobin Chang, Frederick Tung, and Greg Mori. Learning discriminative prototypes with dynamic time warping. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2021. 3
- [7] Marco Cuturi and Mathieu Blondel. Soft-DTW: A differentiable loss function for time-series. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2017. 3
- [8] Li Ding and Chenliang Xu. Weakly-supervised action segmentation with iterative soft boundary assignment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2018. 2
- [9] Nikita Dvornik, Isma Hadji, Konstantinos G Derpanis, Animesh Garg, and Allan Jepson. Drop-DTW: Aligning common signal between sequences while dropping outliers. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2021. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
- [10] Nikita Dvornik, Isma Hadji, Hai Pham, Dhaivat Bhatt, Brais Martinez, Afsaneh Fazly, and Allan Jepson. Flow graph to video grounding for weakly-supervised multi-step localization. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2022. 1, 2, 3
- [11] Ehsan Elhamifar and Dat Huynh. Self-supervised multi-task procedure learning from instructional videos. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2020. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10
- [12] Bernard Ghanem Fabian Caba Heilbron, Victor Escorcia and Juan Carlos Niebles. ActivityNet: A large-scale video benchmark for human activity understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2015. 2
- [13] Rohit Girdhar and Kristen Grauman. Anticipative Video Transformer. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2021. 1
- [14] Isma Hadji, Konstantinos G. Derpanis, and Allan D. Jepson. Representation learning via global temporal alignment and cycle-consistency. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2021. 3
- [15] Tengda Han, Weidi Xie Xie, and Andrew Zisserman. Temporal alignment networks for long-term video. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022. 2, 3
- [16] De-An Huang, Li Fei-Fei, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Connectionist temporal modeling for weakly supervised action labeling. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2016. 2
- [17] KJ Joseph, Salman Khan, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Vineeth N Balasubramanian. Towards open world object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2021. 3
- [18] Anna Kukleva, Hilde Kuehne, Fadime Sener, and Jurgen Gall. Unsupervised learning of action classes with continuous temporal embedding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2019. 2, 3, 6, 7, 10

- [19] Hanwen Liang, Niamul Quader, Zhixiang Chi, Lizhe Chen, Peng Dai, Juwei Lu, and Yang Wang. Self-supervised spatiotemporal representation learning by exploiting video continuity. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2022. 10
- [20] Francesco Locatello, Dirk Weissenborn, Thomas Unterthiner, Aravindh Mahendran, Georg Heigold, Jakob Uszkoreit, Alexey Dosovitskiy, and Thomas Kipf. Object-centric learning with slot attention. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020. 6
- [21] Zijia Lu and Ehsan Elhamifar. Set-supervised action learning in procedural task videos via pairwise order consistency. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022. 2
- [22] Huaishao Luo, Lei Ji, Botian Shi, Haoyang Huang, Nan Duan, Tianrui Li, Jason Li, Taroon Bharti, and Ming Zhou. UniVL: A unified video and language pre-training model for multimodal understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.06353*, 2020. 2, 3, 4, 11
- [23] Minghuang Ma, Haoqi Fan, and Kris M. Kitani. Going deeper into first-person activity recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2016. 2
- [24] Antoine Miech, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Lucas Smaira, Ivan Laptev, Josef Sivic, and Andrew Zisserman. End-to-End Learning of Visual Representations from Uncurated Instructional Videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2020. 1, 2, 3, 5
- [25] Antoine Miech, Dimitri Zhukov, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Makarand Tapaswi, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. HowTo100M: Learning a Text-Video Embedding by Watching Hundred Million Narrated Video Clips. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2019. 1, 2, 3, 6
- [26] Aaron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748*, 2018. 5
- [27] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 3
- [28] Alexander Richard, Hilde Kuehne, Ahsan Iqbal, and Juergen Gall. NeuralNetwork-Viterbi: A framework for weakly supervised video learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2018. 2
- [29] Fadime Senner and Angela Yao. Zero-shot anticipation for instructional activities. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2019. 1
- [30] Pierre Sermanet, Corey Lynch, Yevgen Chebotar, Jasmine Hsu, Eric Jang, Stefan Schaal, and Sergey Levine. Time-contrastive networks: Self-supervised learning from video. In *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2018. 2
- [31] Yuhan Shen, Lu Wang, and Ehsan Elhamifar. Learning to segment actions from visual and language instructions via differentiable weak sequence alignment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2021. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10
- [32] Kihyuk Sohn. Improved deep metric learning with multi-class n-pair loss objective. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 29, 2016. 5
- [33] spaCy. Industrial-strength natural language processing. <https://spacy.io/>. 3, 9
- [34] Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Dropout: a simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *The journal of machine learning research (JMLR)*, 2014. 6
- [35] Yansong Tang, Dajun Ding, Yongming Rao, Yu Zheng, Danyang Zhang, Lili Zhao, Jiwen Lu, and Jie Zhou. COIN: A large-scale dataset for comprehensive instructional video analysis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2019. 1, 2, 3, 6
- [36] Ottokar Tilk and Tanel Alumäe. Bidirectional recurrent neural network with attention mechanism for punctuation restoration. In *INTERSPEECH*, 2016. 3, 9
- [37] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 30, 2017. 3
- [38] Ruibin Xiong, Yunchang Yang, Di He, Kai Zheng, Shuxin Zheng, Chen Xing, Huishuai Zhang, Yanyan Lan, Liwei Wang, and Tieyan Liu. On layer normalization in the transformer architecture. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2020. 6
- [39] Antoine Yang, Antoine Miech, Josef Sivic, Ivan Laptev, and Cordelia Schmid. Just Ask: Learning to Answer Questions from Millions of Narrated Videos. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2021. 1
- [40] He Zhao, Isma Hadji, Nikita Dvornik, Konstantinos G Derpanis, Richard P Wildes, and Allan Jepson. P3IV: Probabilistic procedure planning from instructional videos with weak supervision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022. 1
- [41] Luowei Zhou, Chenliang Xu, and Jason J. Corso. Towards automatic learning of procedures from web instructional videos. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018. 2, 3
- [42] Dimitri Zhukov, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Ramazan Gokberk Cinbis, David Fouhey, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Cross-task weakly supervised learning from instructional videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2019. 1, 2, 3, 6