

Audio-Visual Scene Analysis with Self-Supervised Multisensory Features

Andrew Owens Alexei A. Efros

UC Berkeley

Abstract. The thud of a bouncing ball, the onset of speech as lips open — when visual and audio events occur together, it suggests that there might be a common, underlying event that produced both signals. In this paper, we argue that the visual and audio components of a video signal should be modeled jointly using a fused multisensory representation. We propose to learn such a representation in a self-supervised way, by training a neural network to predict whether video frames and audio are temporally aligned. We use this learned representation for three applications: (a) sound source localization, i.e. visualizing the source of sound in a video; (b) audio-visual action recognition; and (c) on/off-screen audio source separation, e.g. removing the off-screen translator’s voice from a foreign official’s speech. Code, models, and video results are available on our webpage: <http://andrewowens.com/multisensory>

1 Introduction

As humans, we experience our world through a number of simultaneous sensory streams. When we bite into an apple, not only do we taste it, but — as Smith and Gasser [1] point out — we also hear it crunch, see its red skin, and feel the coolness of its core. The coincidence of sensations gives us strong evidence that they were generated by a common, underlying event [2], since it is unlikely that they co-occurred across multiple modalities merely by chance. These cross-modal, temporal co-occurrences therefore provide a useful learning signal: a model that is trained to detect them ought to discover multimodal structures that are useful for other tasks. In much of traditional computer vision research, however, we have been avoiding the use of other, non-visual modalities, arguably making the perception problem harder, not easier.

In this paper, we learn a temporal, multisensory representation that fuses the visual and audio components of a video signal. We propose to train this model without using any manually labeled data. That is, rather than explicitly telling the model that, e.g., it should associate moving lips with speech or a thud with a bouncing ball, we have it discover these audio-visual associations through self-supervised training [3]. Specifically, we train a neural network on a “pretext” task of detecting misalignment between audio and visual streams in synthetically-shifted videos. The network observes raw audio and video streams — some of which are aligned, and some that have been randomly shifted by a few seconds — and we task it with distinguishing between the two. This turns out to be a challenging training task that forces the network to fuse visual motion with audio information and, in the process, learn a useful audio-visual feature representation.




Fig. 1: Applications. We use self-supervision to learn an audio-visual representation that: (a) can be used to visualize the locations of sound sources in video; (b) is useful for visual and audio-visual action recognition; (c) can be applied to the task of separating on- and off-screen sounds. In (c), we demonstrate our source-separation model by visually masking each speaker and asking it to predict the on-screen audio. The predicted sound contains only the voice of the visible speaker. Please see our webpage for video results: <http://andrewowens.com/multisensory>.

We demonstrate the usefulness of our multisensory representation in three audio-visual applications: (a) sound source localization, (b) audio-visual action recognition; and (c) on/off-screen sound source separation. Figure 1 shows examples of these applications. In Fig. 1(a), we visualize the sources of sound in a video using our network’s learned attention map, i.e. the impact of an axe, the opening of a mouth, and moving hands of a musician. In Fig. 1(b), we show an application of our learned features to audio-visual action recognition, i.e. classifying a video of a chef chopping an onion. In Fig. 1(c), we demonstrate our novel on/off-screen sound source separation model’s ability to separate the speakers’ voices by visually masking them from the video.

The main contributions of this paper are: 1) learning a general video representation that fuses audio and visual information; 2) evaluating the usefulness of this representation qualitatively (by sound source visualization) and quantitatively (on an action recognition task); and 3) proposing a novel video-conditional source separation method that uses our learned representation to separate on- and off-screen sounds, and is the first method to work successfully on real-world video footage, e.g. television broadcasts. Our feature representation, as well as code and models for all applications are available online.

2 Related work

Evidence from psychophysics While we often think of vision and hearing as being distinct systems, in humans they are closely intertwined [4] through a process known as *multisensory integration*. Perhaps the most compelling demonstration of this phenomenon is the McGurk effect [5], an illusion in which visual motion of a mouth

changes one’s interpretation of a spoken sound¹. Hearing can also influence vision: the timing of a sound, for instance, affects whether we perceive two moving objects to be colliding or overlapping [2]. Moreover, psychologists have suggested that humans fuse audio and visual signals at a fairly early stage of processing [7,8], and that the two modalities are used jointly in perceptual grouping. For example, the McGurk effect is less effective when the viewer first watches a video where audio and visuals in a video are unrelated, as this causes the signals to become “unbound” (i.e. not grouped together) [9,10]. This multi-modal perceptual grouping process is often referred to as *audio-visual scene analysis* [11,7,12,10]. In this paper, we take inspiration from psychology and propose a self-supervised multisensory feature representation as a computational model of audio-visual scene analysis.

Self-supervised learning Self-supervised methods learn features by training a model to solve a task derived from the input data itself, without human labeling. Starting with the early work of de Sa [3], there have been many self-supervised methods that learn to find correlations between sight and sound [13,14,15,16]. These methods, however, have either learned the correspondence between static images and ambient sound [15,16], or have analyzed motion in very limited domains [14,13] (e.g. [14] only modeled drum-stick impacts). Our learning task most closely resembles Arandjelović and Zisserman [16], which predicts whether an image and an audio track are sampled from the same video. Their task, however, is solvable from a single frame by recognizing semantics (e.g. indoor vs. outdoor scenes). Our inputs, by contrast, always come from the same video, and we predict whether they are aligned; hence our task requires motion analysis to solve. Time has also been used as supervisory signal, e.g. predicting the temporal ordering in a video [17,18,19]. In contrast, our network learns to analyze audio-visual actions, which are likely to correspond to salient physical processes.

Audio-visual alignment While we study alignment as a self-supervised learning task, it has also been studied as an end in itself [20,21,22] e.g. in lip-reading applications [23]. Chung and Zisserman [22], the most closely related approach, train a two-stream network with an embedding loss. Since aligning speech videos is their end goal, they use a face detector (trained with labeled data) and a tracking system to crop the speaker’s face. This allowed them to address the problem with a 2D CNN that takes 5 channel-wise concatenated frames cropped around a mouth as input (they also propose using their image features for self-supervision; while promising, these results are very preliminary).

Sound localization The goal of visually locating the source of sounds in a video has a long history. The seminal work of Hershey et al. [24] localized sound sources by measuring mutual information between visual motion and audio using a Gaussian process model. Subsequent work also considered subspace methods [25], canonical correlations [26], and keypoints [27]. Our model learns to associate motions with sounds via self-supervision, without us having to explicitly model them.

Audio-Visual Source Separation Blind source separation (BSS), i.e. separating the individual sound sources in an audio stream — also known as the *cocktail party*

¹ For a particularly vivid demonstration, please see: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G-1N8vWm3m0> [6]

problem [28] — is a classic task in audio understanding [29]. Researchers have proposed many successful probabilistic approaches to this problem [30,31,32,33]. More recent deep learning-based approaches involve predicting an embedding that encodes the correct audio clustering [34,35], or optimizing a *permutation invariant* loss [36]. It is natural to also want to include the visual signal to solve this problem, often referred to as *Audio-Visual Source Separation*. For example, [37,25] masked frequencies based on their correlation with optical flow; [12] did inference in a graphical model; [27] used priors on harmonics; [38] used a sparsity-based factorization method; and [39] clustered features to separate on-screen speakers. There are also methods based on face detection and multi-microphone beamforming [40]. These methods make strong assumptions about the relationship between sound and motion, and have mostly been applied to lab-recorded videos. These limitations have led researchers to propose learning-based methods, e.g. [41] who use mixture models to predict separation masks. Recently, [42] proposed a two-stream neural network that isolates on-screen speech, although this model is relatively small-scale (tested on videos from one speaker). We do on/off-screen source separation on significantly more challenging internet and broadcast videos by combining our representation with a *u*-net [43] regression model.

Concurrent work Concurrently and independently from us, a number of groups have proposed closely related methods for source separation and sound-source localization. Gabbay et al. [44,45] use a vision-to-sound method to isolate on-screen speech, and propose a convolutional separation model similar to ours. Unlike our work, they assume that the speaker’s identity is known. Ephrat et al. [46] proposed a method for separating the speech a user-chosen speaker, with a model trained on a dataset of in-the-wild educational videos. Work by Zhao et al. [47] and Gao et al. [48] address the problem of segmenting multiple sound-making objects (e.g. musical instruments) and separating their audio. This task involves associating objects with the sounds they typically make, whereas ours involves the “fine-grained” recognition/motion-analysis task of separating sound from two human speakers. There has also been recent work on localizing sound sources using a network’s attention map [49,50,51]. Their methods are similar to ours, though they are used to find objects associated with ambient sound in static images, while ours detects motions in videos.

3 Learning a self-supervised multisensory representation

We propose to learn an audio-visual representation via self-supervision, by training a model to predict whether a video’s audio and visual streams are temporally synchronized. Solving this problem requires the integration of low-level information across modalities. In order to detect misalignment in a video of human speech, for instance, the model must associate the subtle motion of lips with the timing of utterances in the audio.

Fused audio-visual network design We hypothesize that early fusion of audio and visual streams is important for modeling fine-grained temporal co-occurrences [8,7], and we therefore propose a multisensory convolutional network with an early-fusion design. We show the full network in Figure 2. It is similar to the visual residual network architecture (ResNet-18) [52], but with 3D (temporal) convolutions instead of 2D ones




Fig. 2: Fused audio-visual network. We train an early-fusion, multisensory network to predict whether video frames and audio are temporally aligned. We include residual connections between pairs of convolutions [52]. We represent the input as a $T \times H \times W$ volume, and denote a stride by “/2”. To generate misaligned samples, we synthetically shift the audio by a few seconds.

— a network design that is akin to video CNNs with inflated 3D convolutions [53,54]. Our network has an additional audio sub-network that is fused after the third visual downsampling layer. Before this fusion, we apply a small number of 3D convolution and pooling operations to the video stream, reducing its temporal sampling rate by a factor of 4. We also apply a series of strided 1D convolutions to the input waveform, until its sampling rate matches that of the video network, and fuse the two sub-networks by concatenating them (after spatially tiling the audio activations). The fused network then undergoes a series of 3D convolutions, followed by global average pooling [55].

Aligning sight with sound During training, we feed the network 4.2-second video clips. In half of these clips, the modalities are synchronized; in the other half, we artificially shift the audio track by 2.0 to 5.8 seconds (similar to [22]). When we shift an audio track, we ensure that it aligns with video frame boundaries (similar to [50]). The network is tasked with distinguishing these shifted and unshifted clips.

We train our model on a dataset of approximately 750,000 video clips sampled from AudioSet [56]. Each is 10 seconds long (from which we extract random 4.2 sec. subsequences). We provide the network with full frame-rate videos (29.97 Hz), resulting in 125 frames for each training example. From each clip, we take random 224×224 crops from 256×256 images, with random left-right flipping, and use stereo audio sampled at 21 kHz. We provide optimization details in Section A1.




Fig. 3: Visualizing sound sources. We show the video frames in held-out AudioSet videos with the strongest class activation map (CAM) response (we scale its range per image to compensate for the wide range of values).

Performance How well does the network learn to perform this task? We evaluated its accuracy on test videos, and found that it obtained 59.9% accuracy (chance is 50%). While at first glance this may seem low, we note that in many videos the sounds occur off-screen [15]. Moreover, we found that this task is also very challenging for humans. To get a better understanding of human ability, we showed 30 subjects from Amazon Mechanical Turk 60 different shifted/unshifted video pairs, and asked them to identify the one with out-of-sync audio. We gave the humans 15 secs. of video (so that they have a significant amount of temporal context) and always used a large, 5-second shift. Subjects successfully solved this problem $66.6\% \pm 2.4\%$ of the time.

Of course, the most important question is whether the learned audio-visual representation is useful for downstream tasks.

4 Evaluating the learned representation

We use our learned representation for two audio-visual analysis applications. First, we use qualitative network visualizations to confirm that the model has learned to attend to sound sources. Then, we show via pretraining experiments that the learned features are useful for visual and audio-visual action recognition.




Fig. 4: Visualizing sound sources. We show the CAM response for categories in the Kinetics-Sounds dataset [16], after manually removing activations that responded to only a face (which appear in almost all categories) to increase diversity. We note that no labeled data was used for training. We do not rescale the heat maps per image (i.e. the range used in this visualization is consistent across examples).

4.1 Visualizing the locations of sound sources

One way of evaluating our representation is to visualize the audio-visual structures that it detects. A representation that is good for audio-visual scene analysis, we hypothesize, will pay special attention to *visual sound sources* — on-screen actions that make a sound, or whose motion is highly correlated with sound production. We note that there is a great deal of ambiguity in the notion of a sound source for in-the-wild videos. For example, a musician’s lips, their larynx, and their tuba could all plausibly be called the source of a sound. Hence we use this term to refer merely to motions that are correlated with production of a sound, and study it through network visualizations. We adapt the class activation map (CAM) method of [57], which has recently been used in other audio-visual work [51]. Given a space-time video patch I_x , its corresponding audio signal A_x , and the features assigned to them by the last convolutional layer of our model, $f(I_x, A_x)$, we can estimate probability of alignment with:

$$p(y \mid I_x, A_x) = \sigma(w^\top f(I_x, A_x)), \quad (1)$$

where y is the alignment label, σ a sigmoid, and w is the model’s final affine layer. We can therefore measure the information content of a patch — and, by our hypothesis, the likelihood that it is a sound source — by the magnitude of the score $|w^\top f(I_x, A_x)|$.

Model	Acc.	Table 1: Action recognition on UCF-101 (split 1). We compared methods pretrained without labels (top), and with semantic labels (bottom). Our model, both with and without sound, significantly outperforms other self-supervised methods.
Multisensory (full)	82.1%	
Multisensory (vision only)	77.6%	
Multisensory (scratch)	68.1%	
I3D-RGB (scratch) [53]	68.1%	
O3N [19]	60.3%	
Purushwalkam et al. [60]	55.4%	
C3D [54,53]	51.6%	
Shuffle [17]	50.9%	
Wang et al. [61,60]	41.5%	
I3D-RGB + ImageNet + Kinetics [53]	94.5%	
I3D-RGB + ImageNet [53]	84.2%	
Two-stream [62,53]	91.2%	

One might ask how this self-supervised localization approach relates to generative methods, such as classic mutual information-based methods [24,25]. To help understand this, we can view our audio-visual observations as having been produced by a generative process, using a construction similar to [58]: we sample the label y , which determines the alignment, and then conditionally sample I_x and A_x . Rather than computing mutual information between the two modalities (which requires a generative model that self-supervised approaches do not have), we find the patch/sound that provides the most information about the latent variable y , based on our learned posterior $p(y | I_x, A_x)$.

Visualizations What actions does our network respond to? First, we asked which space-time patches in our test set were most informative, according to Equation 1. We show the top-ranked patches in Figure 3, with the class activation map displayed as a heatmap and overlaid on its corresponding center video frame. From this visualization, we can see that our model is highly selective to faces and moving mouths. The strongest non-face responses tend to be unusual but highly salient audio-visual stimuli — for example, the top two non-face responses feature strobe lights and loud music.

Next, we asked how the model responds non-speech actions. To address this, we applied our visualization method to the Kinetics-Sounds dataset [16] — a subset of the Kinetics dataset [59] of actions that contain interesting audio events. We show the examples with the highest response for a variety of categories, after removing those that respond solely to a face (common in every category) to increase diversity. The results are shown in Figure 4.

Finally, we asked how the model’s attention varies with motion. To study this, we computed our CAM-based visualizations for videos, which we have included in the supplementary video (we also show some hand-chosen examples in Figure 1(a)). These qualitatively suggest that the model’s attention varies with on-screen motion — a result that is very different from single-frame self-supervised models [51,16], which largely attend to static sound-making objects that are associated with distinctive ambient sounds, rather than to sound-related actions.

4.2 Action recognition

We have seen through visualizations that our representation conveys information about interesting audio-visual structures. We now ask whether it has learned features that are

useful for recognition tasks. To evaluate this, we retrained our model on the UCF-101 action recognition dataset [63], initializing the weights using the representation learned via the self-supervised alignment task. We provide the results in Table 1, and compare our model to a selection of unsupervised learning and 3D CNN-based methods.

During training, the model observes random 2.56-second sequences (following [53]), which we augment with random flipping and cropping, and small (up to one-frame) audio shifts. At test time, we follow [62] and average our model’s predictions over 25 subsequences for each video (unlike [62], we sample only a single center crop). We provide optimization details in Section A1.

We see, first, that our model significantly outperforms self-supervised approaches that have previously been applied to this task, including Shuffle-and-Learn [17] (82.1% vs. 50.9% accuracy) and O3N [19] (60.3%). We suspect this is in part due to the fact that these methods either process a single frame or a short sequence, and they solve tasks that do not require extensive motion analysis. We then compared our model to methods that use supervised pretraining, focusing on the state-of-the-art I3D [53] system. While there is a large gap between our self-supervised model and a version of I3D that has been pretrained on the closely-related Kinetics dataset (94.5%), our performance is close to I3D with ImageNet [64] pretraining (84.2%), despite being self-supervised.

Next, we asked how the different components of our model contribute to its performance. To test whether the model is obtaining its predictive power from audio, we train a version of our model where the audio subnetwork is ablated (activations set to zero), finding that this results in approximately a 5% drop in performance. This suggests both that sound is important for our results, but also that the learned visual features are useful in isolation. To measure the importance of our self-supervised pretraining, we compared our model to a randomly initialized network (i.e. trained from scratch), finding that there was a significant (14%) drop in performance — similar in magnitude to removing ImageNet pretraining from I3D. These results suggest that the model has learned a representation that is useful both for vision-only and audio-visual action recognition.

5 On/off-screen audio-visual source separation

We have seen through qualitative visualizations that our representation conveys information about the visual locations of sound sources, and that it is useful as pretraining for action recognition. Now, we apply it to a classic audio-visual scene understanding task: separating on- and off-screen sound. To do this, we propose a novel source separation model that uses our learned features, and compare it to existing separation methods.

Our problem formulation is similar to recent audio-visual and audio-only separation work [34,36,65,42]. We synthetically create audio mixtures by summing an input video’s audio track with a randomly chosen “off-screen” track from another video. Our model is then tasked with separating the on- and off-screen sounds. We note that this problem formulation differs from audio-visual separation methods that segment multiple on-screen audio sources [39]. Ambient sounds originating off-screen in the original videos — common in real-world videos [15] — are not explicitly modeled (they act as labeling noise).




Fig. 5: Adapting our audio-visual network to a source separation task. Our model separates an input spectrogram into on- and off-screen audio streams. After each temporal downsampling layer, our multisensory features are concatenated with those of a u -net computed over spectrograms. We invert the spectrograms to obtain waveforms. The model operates on raw video, without any preprocessing (e.g. no face detection).

We consider a variety of models that each take a spectrogram representing mixed audio as input, and recover the original components. Our simplest on/off-screen separation model learns to minimize:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{O}}(x_M, I) = \|x_F - f_F(x_M, I)\|_1 + \|x_B - f_B(x_M, I)\|_1, \quad (2)$$

where x_M is the mixture sound, x_F and x_B are the spectrograms of the on- and off-screen sounds that comprise it (i.e. foreground and background), and f_F and f_B are our model’s predictions of them conditional on the (audio-visual) video I .

We also consider models that segment the two sounds without regard for their on- or off-screen provenance. For this, we use the permutation invariant (PIT) loss of Yu et al. [36]. This loss is similar to Equation 2, but it allows for the on- and off-screen sounds to be swapped without penalty:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}(x_F, x_B, \hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2) = \min(L(\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2), L(\hat{x}_2, \hat{x}_1)), \quad (3)$$

where $L(x_i, x_j) = \|x_i - x_F\|_1 + \|x_j - x_B\|_1$ and \hat{x}_1 and \hat{x}_2 are the predictions.

5.1 Source separation model

As shown in Figure 5, we augment our audio-visual network with a u -net encoder-decoder [43,67,68] that maps the mixture sound to its on- and off-screen components.

Method	All				Mixed sex		Same sex		GRID transfer	
	On/off	SDR	SIR	SAR	On/off	SDR	On/off	SDR	On/off	SDR
On/off + PIT	11.2	7.6	12.1	10.2	10.6	8.8	11.8	6.5	13.0	7.8
Full on/off	11.4	7.0	11.5	9.8	10.7	8.4	11.9	5.7	13.1	7.3
Mono	11.4	6.9	11.4	9.8	10.8	8.4	11.9	5.7	13.1	7.3
Single frame	14.8	5.0	7.8	10.3	13.2	7.2	16.2	3.1	17.8	5.7
No early fusion	11.6	7.0	11.0	10.1	11.0	8.4	12.1	5.7	13.5	6.9
Scratch	12.9	5.8	9.7	9.4	11.8	7.6	13.9	4.2	15.2	6.3
I3D + Kinetics	12.3	6.6	10.7	9.7	11.6	8.2	12.9	5.1	14.4	6.6
<i>u</i> -net PIT [36]	–	7.3	11.4	10.3	–	8.8	–	5.9	–	8.1
Deep Sep. [65]	–	1.3	3.0	8.7	–	1.9	–	0.8	–	2.2

Table 2: Source separation results on speech mixtures from the VoxCeleb (broken down by gender of speakers in mixture) and transfer to the simple GRID dataset. We evaluate the on/off-screen sound prediction error (On/off) using L1 distance to the true log-spectrograms (lower is better). We also use blind source separation metrics (higher is better) [66].

	VoxCeleb short videos (200ms)			
	On-SDR	SDR	SIR	SAR
Ours (on/off)	7.6	5.3	7.8	10.8
Hou et al. [42]	4.5	–	–	–
Gabbay et al. [44]	3.5	–	–	–
PIT-CNN [36]	–	7.0	10.1	11.2
<i>u</i> -net PIT [36]	–	7.0	10.3	11.0
Deep Sep. [65]	–	2.7	4.2	10.3

Table 3: Comparison of audio-visual and audio-only separation methods on short (200ms) videos. We compare SDR of the on-screen audio prediction (On-SDR) with audio resampled to 2 kHz.

To provide it with information about the video, we concatenate our multisensory network’s feature activations (Section 3) at three temporal scales of the encoder. We take the last layer of each temporal resolution and concatenate it with the layer of the encoder that with the closest temporal sampling rate. Prior to concatenation, we use linear interpolation to make the video features match the audio sampling rate; we then mean-pool them spatially, and tile them over the frequency domain, thereby reshaping our 3D CNN’s time/height/width dimensions to match the 2D encoder’s time/frequency dimensions. We use parameters for *u*-net similar to [67], adding an extra pair of convolution and deconvolution layers to compensate for the large number of frequency channels in our spectrograms. We predict both the magnitude of the log-spectrogram and its phase (scaling the loss of the latter by 0.01 to reflect the fact that it is significantly less perceptually important).

We emphasize that this network operates on raw video, without any preprocessing (e.g. no face detection, segmentation, tracking). To obtain waveforms, we invert the predicted spectrograms (we do not apply any postprocessing or iterative synthesis)

Training We evaluated our model on the task of separating speech sounds. We used the VoxCeleb dataset [69] to train our model, after splitting the training and test set to have disjoint speaker identities (approximately 72% of speakers for training, 8%

for validation, and 20% for test). This results in 103,860 training and 25,680 for test sequences (each 5 seconds long), from splits containing 904 and 247 (disjoint) speakers.

During training, we sampled 2.1-second video clips from longer 5-second clips, and normalized each waveform’s squared-amplitude to a constant value. We computed spectrograms using a 64 ms frame length and a 16 ms step size, resulting in 128×1025 spectrograms. In each mini-batch of stochastic gradient descent, we randomly paired video clips, making one the off-screen sound for the other. During training, we jointly optimized our multisensory network and the *u*-net model, initializing the weights using our self-supervised representation. We provide optimization details in Section A1.

5.2 Evaluation

We compared our model to a variety of source separation approaches: to other feature representations using the same separation model; to audio-based separation methods using blind separation metrics; and to other audio-visual separation methods.

Model variations Since our major goal is to evaluate the quality of our learned features, we compare with a number of variations of our model (Table 2). First, we try replacing our multisensory features with the I3D network pretrained with the Kinetics dataset — a 3D CNN-based representation that was very effective for action recognition (Section 4.2). As with our own model, we concatenated the I3D features to the audio encoder at matching temporal scales. The resulting model performs significantly worse than ours (from 11.4 to 12.3 spectrogram ℓ_1 loss, as in Equation 2). One possible reason for this is that our self-supervision task requires extensive motion analysis to solve, whereas even single-frame action recognition can still perform well [62,70].

We then asked how much of our representation’s performance comes from analyzing motion, rather than by recognizing static properties of the speaker such as gender. To test this, we trained the model with only a single frame (replicated temporally to form a video). We found a significant drop in performance (11.4 vs. 14.8 loss). The drop is particularly large for audio mixtures in which the two speakers have the same gender, where motion cues are more important.

One might also ask whether early fusion of audio and visual streams is necessary, since this network also does fusion in the spectrogram encoder. To test this, we trained a variation of our model where our self-supervised representations’ audio stream was ablated. This significantly reduced performance, suggesting that early audio-visual fusion is important — perhaps via features that respond to concurrent lip and mouth motion. Finally, while the encoder-decoder uses only monaural audio, our representation takes stereo. To test whether it uses binaural cues, we converted all the audio to mono and re-evaluated it. We found that this did not significantly change performance, which is perhaps due to the difficulty in using stereo cues in in-the-wild internet videos (e.g. 39% of audio tracks are mono).

We also tried transferring (without retraining) our learned models to the GRID dataset [71], a lab-recorded dataset in which people speak simple phrases in front of a plain background, finding a similar relative ordering of the results.

Audio-only separation To get a better understanding of our model’s effectiveness, we compared it to several audio-only separation methods. While these methods are



Fig. 6: Qualitative results from our on/off-screen separation model. We show an input frame and spectrogram for two synthetic mixtures from our test set, and two in-the-wild internet videos containing multiple speakers. The first (a male/male mixture) contains more artifacts than the second (a female/male mixture). The third video is a real-world mixture in which a female speaker (simultaneously) translates a male Spanish speaker into English. Finally, we separate the speech of two (male) speakers on a television news show. Although there is no ground truth for these real-world examples, the source separation method qualitatively separates the two voices. Please refer to our webpage (<http://andrewowens.com/multisensory>) for video source separation results.

not applicable to our on/off-screen separation task, we can modify our own model to have it separate audio using an additional permutation-invariant loss (Equation 3). We then evaluate these methods using the blind separation metrics from Vincent et al. [66]. This includes the signal-to-distortion ratio (SDR), signal-to-interference ratio (SIR), and signal-to-artifacts ratio (SAR). For consistency across methods, we resample all waveforms to 16 kHz (the minimum used by all methods), and we use the mixture phase to invert our model’s spectrogram, rather than the phase predicted by our model (which none of the others predict).

We compared our model to PIT-CNN [36]. This model applies a VGG-style [72] CNN to the mixture spectrogram and outputs two soft separation masks via a fully connected layer. These maps are multiplied by the input mixture to obtain the segmented streams. We note that this method is also very similar to affinity-based separation methods [34,35] when separating two sounds [36]. While we found that PIT-CNN worked well for separating short clips, it failed on the longer inputs (e.g. obtaining 1.8 SDR in the experiment shown in Table 2). Therefore, to create a stronger PIT baseline, we created an audio-only version of our u -net model, optimizing the PIT loss instead of our on/off-screen loss (Equation 3), i.e. replacing the VGG-style network and masks in PIT-CNN with u -net. We confirm that this model obtains similar performance on short sequences (Table 3), and successfully trains on longer videos. Finally, we compared with a pretrained separation model [65], which is based on recurrent neural networks and trained on the TSP database [73].

We found that our audio-visual model, when trained with a PIT loss, outperformed all of these methods, except for on the SAR metric, where the u -net PIT model was slightly better (which measures the presence of artifacts in the generated waveform). In particular, our model does significantly better when the genders of the two speakers in the mixture are the same (Table 2), a case where audio priors are not enough to separate the two sounds. Interestingly, we found that the audio-only methods still perform better on blind separation metrics when transferring to the lab-recorded GRID dataset, which we hypothesize is due to the visual and language domain shifts.

Audio-visual separation models Although our main goal is to understand what information is provided by our self-supervised representation, we also compare with the audio-visual separation model from Hou et al. [42]. This model was introduced for enhancing the speech of a previously known speaker, but we apply it here because it is the most closely related prior method. We also compare with the network of Gabbay et al. [45] (a concurrent approach to ours). We train these models using the same procedure as our own ([45] used the speaker identity to construct hard mixtures during training; we instead assume that the speaker identities are unknown and mix randomly). Both models take very short short (5-frame) video sequences as input. Therefore, following [45] we use 200ms of video (Table 3). For these methods, we crop the video around the speaker’s mouth using the Viola-Jones-based [74] lip detector of [45]. These methods use a small number of frequency bands in their (Mel-) STFT representations, which significantly limits their performance. To address these limitations, we evaluated only the on-screen audio, and downsampled the audio to a low, common rate (2 kHz) before computing SDR. Our model significantly outperforms these methods. Qualitatively, we observed that [45] often smooths the input spectrogram, and we suspect its performance on source separation metrics may be affected by the relatively small number of frequency bands in its audio representation.

5.3 Qualitative results

Our quantitative results suggest that our model can successfully separate on- and off-screen sounds. However, these metrics are limited in their ability to convey the quality of the predicted sound (and are sensitive to factors that may not be perceptually important,

such as the frequency representation). Therefore, we also provide a large number of qualitative examples.

Real-world mixtures We visualize results from our algorithm in Figure 6 for two synthetic mixtures from our test set, as well as on two real-world mixtures. These mixtures contain a simultaneous Spanish-to-English translation, and a television news show in which two people are speak concurrently. Since our model is convolutional, we can apply it to these videos (each is 8.3 seconds long) despite the fact that they are much longer than those seen during training.

We also include a number of additional source separation examples in the supplementary videos on our webpage. In particular, we include a random sample of (synthetically mixed) test videos, as well as results on in-the-wild videos that contain both on- and off-screen sound.

Multiple on-screen sound sources To demonstrate our model’s ability to vary its prediction based on the speaker, we took a video in which two people are speaking simultaneously on a split-screen TV debate show, masked out one side of the screen, and asked the network to perform source separation (motivated by a similar experiment in [25]). As illustrated in Figure 1, when the speaker on the left is masked out, we hear the speaker on the right, and vice versa. Please see our video for results.

6 Discussion

In this paper, we have presented a method for learning rich multisensory representations using self-supervision. The features that this model learned were useful for pretraining action recognition systems, and also it provides a representation that can be used to localize sound sources, such as moving lips. We then showed that the model could easily be extended to other audio-visual learning tasks by training it to perform on/off-screen source separation.

We see this work as opening two potential directions for future audio-visual research. The first direction is that of developing other methods to train temporal, multi-modal representations. Here we presented one self-supervised learning method for training our fused audio-visual network, but it could potentially be augmented with complementary single-image approaches [16,15,75]. The other direction is to use our fused representation for additional audio-visual applications. We presented several applications here, but there are other audio-understanding tasks could potentially benefit from visual information and, likewise, visual applications that could benefit from fused audio information.

Acknowledgements This work was supported, in part, by DARPA grant FA8750-16-C-0166, U.C. Berkeley Center for Long-Term Cybersecurity, and Berkeley DeepDrive. We thank Allan Jabri, David Fouhey, Andrew Liu, Morten Kolbæk, and Jitendra Malik for the helpful discussions.

References

1. Smith, L., Gasser, M.: The development of embodied cognition: Six lessons from babies. *Artificial life* **11**(1-2) (2005) 13–29 [1](#)

2. Sekuler, R.: Sound alters visual motion perception. *Nature* **385** (1997) 308–308 [1, 3](#)
3. de Sa, V.R.: Learning classification with unlabeled data. *Advances in neural information processing systems* (1994) 112–112 [1, 3](#)
4. Shimojo, S., Shams, L.: Sensory modalities are not separate modalities: plasticity and interactions. *Current opinion in neurobiology* **11**(4) (2001) 505–509 [2](#)
5. McGurk, H., MacDonald, J.: Hearing lips and seeing voices. *Nature* **264**(5588) (1976) 746–748 [2](#)
6. British Broadcasting Corporation: Is seeing believing? (2010) [3](#)
7. Schwartz, J.L., Berthommier, F., Savariaux, C.: Audio-visual scene analysis: evidence for a “very-early” integration process in audio-visual speech perception. In: *Seventh International Conference on Spoken Language Processing*. (2002) [3, 4](#)
8. Omata, K., Mogi, K.: Fusion and combination in audio-visual integration. In: *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*. (2008) [3, 4](#)
9. Nahorna, O., Berthommier, F., Schwartz, J.L.: Binding and unbinding the auditory and visual streams in the mcgurk effect. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* **132**(2) (2012) 1061–1077 [3](#)
10. Nahorna, O., Berthommier, F., Schwartz, J.L.: Audio-visual speech scene analysis: characterization of the dynamics of unbinding and rebinding the mcgurk effect. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* **137**(1) (2015) 362–377 [3](#)
11. Barker, J.P., Berthommier, F., Schwartz, J.L.: Is primitive av coherence an aid to segment the scene? In: *AVSP’98 International Conference on Auditory-Visual Speech Processing*. (1998) [3](#)
12. Hershey, J., Attias, H., Jovic, N., Kristjansson, T.: Audio-visual graphical models for speech processing. In: *Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing, 2004. Proceedings.(ICASSP’04). IEEE International Conference on. Volume 5., IEEE* (2004) V–649 [3, 4](#)
13. Ngiam, J., Khosla, A., Kim, M., Nam, J., Lee, H., Ng, A.Y.: Multimodal deep learning. In: *ICML*. (2011) [3](#)
14. Owens, A., Isola, P., McDermott, J., Torralba, A., Adelson, E.H., Freeman, W.T.: Visually indicated sounds. *CVPR* (2016) [3](#)
15. Owens, A., Wu, J., McDermott, J.H., Freeman, W.T., Torralba, A.: Ambient sound provides supervision for visual learning. In: *ECCV*. (2016) [3, 6, 9, 15](#)
16. Arandjelović, R., Zisserman, A.: Look, listen and learn. *ICCV* (2017) [3, 7, 8, 15](#)
17. Misra, I., Zitnick, C.L., Hebert, M.: Shuffle and learn: unsupervised learning using temporal order verification. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision*, Springer (2016) 527–544 [3, 8, 9](#)
18. Wei, D., Lim, J.J., Zisserman, A., Freeman, W.T.: Learning and using the arrow of time. In: *CVPR*. (2018) [3](#)
19. Fernando, B., Bilen, H., Gavves, E., Gould, S.: Self-supervised video representation learning with odd-one-out networks. In: *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, IEEE (2017) 5729–5738 [3, 8, 9](#)
20. McAllister, D.F., Rodman, R.D., Bitzer, D.L., Freeman, A.S.: Lip synchronization of speech. In: *Audio-Visual Speech Processing: Computational & Cognitive Science Approaches*. (1997) [3](#)
21. Marcheret, E., Potamianos, G., Vopicka, J., Goel, V.: Detecting audio-visual synchrony using deep neural networks. In: *Sixteenth Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association*. (2015) [3](#)
22. Chung, J.S., Zisserman, A.: Out of time: automated lip sync in the wild. In: *Workshop on Multi-view Lip-reading, ACCV*. (2016) [3, 5](#)
23. Chung, J.S., Senior, A., Vinyals, O., Zisserman, A.: Lip reading sentences in the wild. *CVPR* (2017) [3](#)

24. Hershey, J.R., Movellan, J.R.: Audio vision: Using audio-visual synchrony to locate sounds. In: NIPS. (1999) 3, 8
25. Fisher III, J.W., Darrell, T., Freeman, W.T., Viola, P.A.: Learning joint statistical models for audio-visual fusion and segregation. In: NIPS. (2000) 3, 4, 8, 15
26. Kidron, E., Schechner, Y.Y., Elad, M.: Pixels that sound. In: CVPR. (2005) 3
27. Barzelay, Z., Schechner, Y.Y.: Harmony in motion. In: Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2007. CVPR'07. IEEE Conference on, IEEE (2007) 1–8 3, 4
28. Cherry, E.C.: Some experiments on the recognition of speech, with one and with two ears. *The Journal of the acoustical society of America* 25(5) (1953) 975–979 4
29. Bregman, A.S.: Auditory scene analysis: The perceptual organization of sound. MIT press (1994) 4
30. Ghahramani, Z., Jordan, M.I.: Factorial hidden markov models. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. (1996) 472–478 4
31. Roweis, S.T.: One microphone source separation. In: Advances in neural information processing systems. (2001) 793–799 4
32. Cooke, M., Hershey, J.R., Rennie, S.J.: Monaural speech separation and recognition challenge. *Computer Speech & Language* 24(1) (2010) 1–15 4
33. Virtanen, T.: Monaural sound source separation by nonnegative matrix factorization with temporal continuity and sparseness criteria. *IEEE transactions on audio, speech, and language processing* 15(3) (2007) 1066–1074 4
34. Hershey, J.R., Chen, Z., Le Roux, J., Watanabe, S.: Deep clustering: Discriminative embeddings for segmentation and separation. In: Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2016 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE (2016) 31–35 4, 9, 14
35. Chen, Z., Luo, Y., Mesgarani, N.: Deep attractor network for single-microphone speaker separation. In: 2017 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP). (March 2017) 246–250 4, 14
36. Yu, D., Kolbæk, M., Tan, Z.H., Jensen, J.: Permutation invariant training of deep models for speaker-independent multi-talker speech separation. In: Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), 2017 IEEE International Conference on, IEEE (2017) 241–245 4, 9, 10, 11, 14
37. Darrell, T., Fisher, J.W., Viola, P.: Audio-visual segmentation and the cocktail party effect. In: Advances in Multimodal Interfaces ICMI 2000. Springer (2000) 32–40 4
38. Pu, J., et al.: Audio-visual object localization and separation using low-rank and sparsity. In: ICASSP. (2017) 4
39. Casanovas, A.L., et al.: Blind audiovisual source separation based on sparse redundant representations. *Transactions on Multimedia* (2010) 4, 9
40. Rivet, B., et al.: Audiovisual speech source separation: An overview of key methodologies. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine* (2014) 4
41. Khan, F., Milner, B.: Speaker separation using visually-derived binary masks. In: Auditory-Visual Speech Processing (AVSP). (2013) 4
42. Hou, J.C., Wang, S.S., Lai, Y.H., Tsao, Y., Chang, H.W., Wang, H.M.: Audio-visual speech enhancement using multimodal deep convolutional neural networks. (2017) 4, 9, 11, 14
43. Ronneberger, O., Fischer, P., Brox, T.: U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. In: International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention, Springer (2015) 234–241 4, 10
44. Gabbay, A., Ephrat, A., Halperin, T., Peleg, S.: Seeing through noise: Speaker separation and enhancement using visually-derived speech. arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.06767 (2017) 4, 11
45. Gabbay, A., Shamir, A., Peleg, S.: Visual speech enhancement using noise-invariant training. arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.08789 (2017) 4, 14

46. Ephrat, A., Mosseri, I., Lang, O., Dekel, T., Wilson, K., Hassidim, A., Freeman, W.T., Rubinstein, M.: Looking to listen at the cocktail party: A speaker-independent audio-visual model for speech separation. SIGGRAPH (conditionally accepted) (2018) [4](#)
47. Zhao, H., Gan, C., Rouditchenko, A., Vondrick, C., McDermott, J., Torralba, A.: The sound of pixels. (2018) [4](#)
48. Gao, R., Feris, R., Grauman, K.: Learning to Separate Object Sounds by Watching Unlabeled Video. arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.01665 (2018) [4](#)
49. Senocak, A., Oh, T.H., Kim, J., Yang, M.H., Kweon, I.S.: Learning to localize sound source in visual scenes. arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.03849 (2018) [4](#)
50. Arandjelović, R., Zisserman, A.: Objects that sound. arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.06651 (2017) [4](#), [5](#)
51. Owens, A., Wu, J., McDermott, J.H., Freeman, W.T., Torralba, A.: Learning sight from sound: Ambient sound provides supervision for visual learning. arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.07271 (2017) [4](#), [7](#), [8](#)
52. He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., Sun, J.: Deep residual learning for image recognition. In: CVPR. (2016) [4](#), [5](#)
53. Carreira, J., Zisserman, A.: Quo vadis, action recognition? a new model and the kinetics dataset. arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.07750 (2017) [5](#), [8](#), [9](#)
54. Tran, D., Bourdev, L.D., Fergus, R., Torresani, L., Paluri, M.: C3D: generic features for video analysis. CoRR **abs/1412.0767** (2014) [5](#), [8](#)
55. Lin, M., Chen, Q., Yan, S.: Network in network. arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.4400 (2013) [5](#)
56. Gemmeke, J.F., Ellis, D.P., Freedman, D., Jansen, A., Lawrence, W., Moore, R.C., Plakal, M., Ritter, M.: Audio set: An ontology and human-labeled dataset for audio events. In: ICASSP. (2017) [5](#)
57. Zhou, B., Khosla, A., Lapedriza, A., Oliva, A., Torralba, A.: Learning deep features for discriminative localization. In: Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition. (2016) 2921–2929 [7](#)
58. Isola, P., Zoran, D., Krishnan, D., Adelson, E.H.: Learning visual groups from co-occurrences in space and time. arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.06811 (2015) [8](#)
59. Kay, W., Carreira, J., Simonyan, K., Zhang, B., Hillier, C., Vijayanarasimhan, S., Viola, F., Green, T., Back, T., Natsev, P., et al.: The kinetics human action video dataset. arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.06950 (2017) [8](#)
60. Purushwalkam, S., Gupta, A.: Pose from action: Unsupervised learning of pose features based on motion. arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.05420 (2016) [8](#)
61. Wang, X., Gupta, A.: Unsupervised learning of visual representations using videos. In: ICCV. (2015) [8](#)
62. Simonyan, K., Zisserman, A.: Two-stream convolutional networks for action recognition in videos. In: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. (2014) [8](#), [9](#), [12](#)
63. Soomro, K., Zamir, A.R., Shah, M.: Ucf101: A dataset of 101 human actions classes from videos in the wild. arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.0402 (2012) [9](#)
64. Deng, J., Dong, W., Socher, R., Li, L.J., Li, K., Fei-Fei, L.: Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In: CVPR. (2009) [9](#)
65. Huang, P.S., Kim, M., Hasegawa-Johnson, M., Smaragdis, P.: Joint optimization of masks and deep recurrent neural networks for monaural source separation. IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing **23**(12) (December 2015) 2136–2147 [9](#), [11](#), [14](#)
66. Vincent, E., Gribonval, R., Févotte, C.: Performance measurement in blind audio source separation. IEEE transactions on audio, speech, and language processing (2006) [11](#), [13](#)
67. Isola, P., Zhu, J.Y., Zhou, T., Efros, A.A.: Image-to-image translation with conditional adversarial networks. arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.07004 (2016) [10](#), [11](#)
68. Michelsanti, D., Tan, Z.H.: Conditional generative adversarial networks for speech enhancement and noise-robust speaker verification. arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.01703 (2017) [10](#)

69. Nagrani, A., Chung, J.S., Zisserman, A.: Voxceleb: a large-scale speaker identification dataset. arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.08612 (2017) 11
70. Karpathy, A., Toderici, G., Shetty, S., Leung, T., Sukthankar, R., Fei-Fei, L.: Large-scale video classification with convolutional neural networks. In: CVPR. (2014) 12
71. Cooke, M., Barker, J., Cunningham, S., Shao, X.: An audio-visual corpus for speech perception and automatic speech recognition. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America (2006) 12
72. Simonyan, K., Zisserman, A.: Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556 (2014) 14
73. Kabal, P.: Tsp speech database. McGill University, Database Version (2002) 14
74. Viola, P., Jones, M.: Rapid object detection using a boosted cascade of simple features. In: Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2001. CVPR 2001. Proceedings of the 2001 IEEE Computer Society Conference on. Volume 1., IEEE (2001) I-I 14
75. Doersch, C., Gupta, A., Efros, A.A.: Unsupervised visual representation learning by context prediction. ICCV (2015) 15
76. Kingma, D.P., Ba, J.: Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980 (2014) 19

A1 Optimization

We use the following optimization parameters for our applications:

Temporal alignment We trained the network from scratch with a batch size of 15 (spread over 3 GPUs) for 650,000 iterations (approximately 17 days), decreasing the learning rate from its initial value of 0.01 by a factor of 2 every 200,000 iterations. We use stochastic gradient descent with momentum. In each mini-batch, we include both the video’s authentic and shifted audio, reusing the feature activations from the video subnetwork between these examples for efficiency.

Action recognition We fine-tuned the networks using a batch size of 24 (spread over on 3 GPUs) for 30,000 iterations, dropping the learning rate by a factor of 10 every 12,000 iterations. We used Adam [76] with an initial learning rate of 10^{-4} . We used data augmentation: cropping, left/right flipping, and shifting the audio by a small amount (up to 1 frame).

Source separation We trained fine-tuned the networks for 160,000 iterations with a batch size of 18 videos (spread over 3 GPUs), dropping the learning rate by a factor of 10 after 120,000 iterations. We used Adam [76] with an initial learning rate of 10^{-4} , and used cropping and left/right flipping visual augmentations. We trained the model that operated on shorter (200ms) sequences for 250,000 iterations total, and dropped the learning rate after 150,000 iterations.