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ABSTRACT

Video action recognition is a vital area of computer vision. By adding temporal dimension into convolution structure, 3D convolution neural network owns the capacity to extract spatio-temporal features from videos. However, due to computing constraints, it is hard to input the whole video into the convolution network at one time, resulting in a limited temporal receptive field of the network.

To address this issue, we propose a novel 3D temporal dilation convolution (3D-TDC) framework, to extract spatio-temporal features of actions from videos. First, we deploy the 3D temporal dilation convolution as the shallow temporal compression layer, enabling an effective capture of spatio-temporal information in a larger time domain with the reduced computational load. Then, an action recognition framework is constructed by integrating two networks with different temporal receptive fields to balance the long-short time difference. We conduct extensive experiments on three widely-used public datasets (UCF-101, HMDB-51, and Kinetics-400) for performance evaluation, and the experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed framework in video action recognition with low computational load.

1. Introduction

Video action recognition encompasses a wide range of applications, such as human computer interaction, smart video surveillance, sports, and health care [1]. It has made great progress, due to the rapid development of deep networks. These deep networks can be mainly divided into 2D and 3D convolution networks. A 2D convolution network, although effective for image recognition, is not strong to model the temporal information, while a sequential reasoning structure, such as recurrent neural network, is not sufficiently effective in visual analysis. Therefore, for video action recognition, on the one hand, two-stream methods [2–4] construct 2D convolution networks with the input of both RGB image and optical flow. The optical flow, however, is computationally costly, which limits the practical applications of such a method. On the other hand, 3D convolution networks [5–10] directly construct an end-to-end model to extract both the temporal and spatial features of actions, but such a network usually entails a large number of parameters and computation. As a result, how to improve the network structure, such that the action model can extract the spatio-temporal features in a large time domain with finite computation, has become a research focus of video action recognition.

Because the duration of a video varies, the video needs to be cut into segments with a fixed temporal size determining the temporal receptive field of the network. The recognition accuracy of a 3D convolution network is thus limited by the temporal size of each segment. To address this issue, in this paper, we propose a novel action recognition framework called 3D temporal dilation convolution framework (3D-TDC, as shown in Figure 1). First, we regularize the video duration for the network input. Then, the shallow temporal compression layer is introduced to embed 3D temporal dilation convolution, for effectively capturing the spatio-temporal information with a reduced computational load. Finally, the action recognition framework is constructed by integrating two networks with different temporal receptive fields, which can effectively control the network computational load while improving the recognition accuracy. The main contributions of this work are threefold:

1. Better spatio-temporal feature extraction: The 3D temporal dilation convolution embedded as the shallow temporal compression layer can effectively improve the temporal receptive field of the network for bet-
ter exploration of the spatio-temporal information and can reduce the computational load.

2. Improved recognition performance: By integrating two networks with different temporal receptive fields through parameter transfer, our proposed 3D-TDC framework can improve the accuracy of video action recognition.

3. Good practicality: Our 3D-TDC framework achieved superior performance on different benchmark datasets with a large range of tasks, including UCF-101, HMDB-51, and Kinetics-400. Moreover, our method can effectively balance the computational load and recognition accuracy of the network, vitally in practice.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we summarize the related work. Section 3 describes our proposed method and framework. The implementation details, experimental results, and analysis are presented in Section 4. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section 5.

2. Related Work

Video action recognition methods can be roughly categorized into traditional and deep-learning methods. Traditional methods extracted low-level action features from videos. The deep neural networks extracted high-level action semantic features and adopted end-to-end models to carry out unified feature extraction and classification [11]. In this section, we focus on the related work in deep learning, which can be mainly divided into three groups: two-stream convolution framework, dilation convolution network, and spatio-temporal convolution network.

2.1. Two-stream convolution framework

Two-stream convolution neural networks [2] extracted dynamic time-domain motion (optical flow) features and static spatial RGB features with two independent networks. These networks can be summarized from three aspects: input, network, and optimization. In the input aspect, the sparse time sampling strategies [3, 4] were used to segment video in the time domain; features were extracted from different segments; multiple branches were used to fit a whole-video-level recognition. FlowNet [12] and hidden two-stream convolution networks [13] focused on using convolution networks to generate optical flow features. TVNet [14] proposed an end-to-end neural network to simulate optical features. DMC-Net [15] and [16] were based on the video compression domain, transferring motion information from optical flow. In the network aspect, [17] explored different fusion algorithms of networks. AssembleNet [18] sought neural architectures with better connectivity and spatio-temporal interactions. CTAN [19] integrated the channel-wise attention mechanisms into networks. Yang et al. [20] proposed a generic temporal pyramid network at the feature level to capture action instances at various tempos. Besides, recurrent neural network based on two-stream convolution frameworks [21, 22] were used to directly fuse the convolution features to complete the temporal reasoning. In the optimization aspect, VLAD [23] aggregated deep features across the entire video according to adaptive video feature segmentation and sampling. PBNets [24] designed a watch-and-choose mechanism to optimize the back-propagation algorithms during two-stream network training. However, the motion feature coding of the two-stream frameworks depended on the optical flow, leading to a huge computational load in the input stage. In this work, we only use RGB images as the input of a two-stream network to pursue comparable performance with optical flow.

2.2. Dilation convolution network

Dilation convolution [25] in action recognition usually adopted to model temporal features and extract larger contextual information. In [26], a dense dilated network was trained to recognize actions from clip-level to global-level, by fusing outputs from each densely-connected dilated convolutions layer. In temporal aggregation network (TAN) [27], a dedicated temporal aggregation block was designed to encode multi-scale spatio-temporal patterns, and larger temporal context can be captured by dilated convolutions effectively. For long videos [28, 29], encoder-decoder temporal convolutional networks (TCN) can capture spatio-temporal and contextual information from adjacent image frames, and share the parameters between all time steps. Dilated-TCN [30] fused residual connections and dilated convolutions to model long-range temporal relationship. After that, MS-TCN [31] combined multiple dilated-TCNs [30] to form a multi-stage framework, in each stage of which the prediction results of the previous stage were refined. In the untrimmed videos with densely distributed actions, selecting the key temporal information is particularly vital. In [32], dilated attention layers (DAL) were proposed to encode representative local features, by weighting attentional coefficients to different frames. Based on multiple DALs deploying different dilatation rates, a pyramid dilated attention network (PDAN) can structure both short-term and long-term temporal relations. However, these approaches require a complex design of dilation convolution and multiple blocks of the network. In this work, we are mainly interested in designing dilation convolution only in the shallow layer, instead of multiple dilation convolution blocks throughout the network.

2.3. Spatio-temporal convolution network

Spatio-temporal convolution networks are usually end-to-end models, including 3D convolution network and its variants. The 3D convolution network [5] added a temporal dimension into the 2D convolution network, which enables a convolution network to simultaneously mine temporal and spatial features. For network structure, the mature topological structures of 2D convolution networks were transferred into the 3D convolution network. F3D [6] and R(2+1)D [8] split the 3D convolution kernel into convolution of space and convolution of time. TSM [33] proposed a temporal shift module to achieve the balance between the computational load of 2D CNN and the performance of 3D CNN. COST [10] proposed to extract spatio-temporal features from three video orthogonal views by three convolu-
tions with shared parameters. Song et al. [34] introduced a temporal-spatial mapping for capturing the temporal evolution of the frames by jointly analyzing all the frames of a video. Materzynska et al. [35] proposed a spatial-temporal interaction network to reason the geometric relations between constituent objects and an agent performing acting on compositional action recognition. [36] and [37] explored different structure constructions and the correlation between spatio-temporal channels. Different spatio-temporal coding structures [38–42] were proposed for improving the discrimination ability of spatio-temporal convolution networks. Besides, graph convolution networks (GCN) [43, 44] based on 3D convolution were adopted to capture the appearance features and the temporal relation between video sequences. For optimization, the video action transformer network introduced an attention mechanism to a 3D convolution network. Spatial-temporal attentive convolution neural network (STA-CNN) [45] incorporated a temporal attention mechanism and a spatial attention mechanism into a unified convolution network to recognize actions in videos. MARS [46] proposed a training method for a 3D convolution network under the supervision of optical flow. Kim et al. [47] presented random mean sampling (RMS) to relieve the overfitting in 3D residual networks. For framework construction, SlowFast networks [48] proposed a framework composed of two networks with different time scales. Sudhakaran et al. [49] introduced spatial gating in spatial-temporal decomposition of 3D kernels without additional parameters and computational overhead. Compared with 2D convolution networks, the spatio-temporal convolution framework has significant advantages in recognition performance for video actions. However, due to the existence of time domain in the hidden layers, the computational load of spatio-temporal convolution networks increases sharply with the expansion of the temporal receptive field. In this work, we adopt the dilation convolution to explore a tradeoff between computational load and temporal receptive field size.

3. Method

To balance the computational effectiveness and recognition accuracy, we propose a 3D temporal dilation convolution (3D-TDC) framework deployed as the shallow temporal compression layer, which can effectively extract the spatio-temporal features from a larger temporal receptive field without heavy computational load. In this section, we first introduce the action video prepossessing mechanism as the network input (section 3.1). Then, we describe the 3D temporal dilation convolution to demonstrate the effect of good temporal compression (section 3.2). Finally, we present our framework construction devoting to effective extraction of the spatio-temporal features of the action video, high recognition accuracy, and low computational load (section 3.3).

3.1. Network input

Suppose the original video input is \( I_T(:,:,:t) \in \mathbb{R}^{w\times h\times m} \), where \( m \) is the total number of the video frames \( (t \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}) \) and \( w \times h \) is the spatial size of the frame. The temporal size of the video \( (m) \) varies from video to video. Therefore, for network input, the video needs to be segmented into different local temporal clips with a fixed temporal size as follows:

\[
t = (t_1, \ldots, t_m)^T = (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_{nt}),
\]

where \( s_t = (t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_{3})^T \), \( s_{n} = (t_{n+1}, t_{n+2}, \ldots, t_{m})^T \), \( nt \) is the total number of the video frames, \( s_t \) is the spatial size of the frame. The temporal size \( (m) \) varies from video to video. Therefore, for network input, the video needs to be segmented into different local temporal clips with a fixed temporal size as follows:

\[
I_T(:,:,t) = I_T(:,:,t_1, \ldots, t_m)
\]

\[
= \begin{bmatrix}
I_T(:,:,t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_{3})^T \\
I_T(:,:,t_{n+1}, t_{n+2}, \ldots, t_{m})^T \\
\vdots \\
I_T(:,:,s_1) \\
I_T(:,:,s_{2}) \\
\vdots \\
I_T(:,:,s_{nt})
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
(2)
\]

Convolution network \( f^{ConvNet} \) encodes the clips separately and generates the output vector \( \text{score} \in \mathbb{R}^{1\times c} \) of the ith clip, where \( c \) is the number of action categories. Finally, the output vector \( \text{score} \in \mathbb{R}^{1\times c} \) of the whole video is obtained by average fusion of all clips:

\[
\text{score}_t = f^{ConvNet}(I_T(:,:,s_t)) \\
\vdots \\
\text{score}_n = f^{ConvNet}(I_T(:,:,s_{nt})) \\
\text{score} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n} \text{score}_t
\]

\[
(3)
\]

Figure 2: Temporal variation in 3D convolution network.

For the 3D convolution network, 3D ResNeXt-101 [9], the temporal size decreases gradually over the hidden layers to aggregate the spatio-temporal features, as shown in Figure 2. The temporal size of the first 3D-convolution-output feature maps remains the same as the original input, while after 3D pooling and four 3D-ResNeXt blocks, the temporal size of the hidden-layer feature maps is gradually compressed to encode the spatio-temporal features. For example, when \( r = 16 \), the temporal variation is 16-16-8-8-4-2-1. However, when the temporal size of the clip is small (e.g. \( r = 16 \)), the temporal size in the network will be quickly compressed to a very low value, so it is difficult to obtain sufficient temporal correlation for the hidden layers in such a 3D convolution network.
The computational load $FLOPs$ (floating point of operations) of a 3D convolution layer is as follows:

$$FLOPs = \left( (k^h \cdot k^w \cdot C_{in} \cdot T_c) \cdot C_{out} + C_{out} \right) \cdot (H \cdot W \cdot \tau_{out}),$$

(4)

where $k^h$, $k^w$, and $T_c$ are the spatial and temporal sizes of convolution kernel; $C_{in}$ and $C_{out}$ are the numbers of input and output channels; $H$, $W$ and $\tau_{out}$ are the spatial and temporal sizes of feature maps; for fixed $T_c$, temporal stride and temporal padding, $\tau_{out}$ is proportional to the temporal size $\tau$. Therefore, when the clip temporal size $\tau$ is large, it will lead to a high $FLOPs$ for the network.

### 3.2. 3D temporal dilation convolution

To balance the clip temporal size $\tau$ and the convolution computational load ($FLOPs$), temporal dilation is introduced here into the time domain of the 3D convolution kernel, leading to a 3D temporal dilation convolution, as shown in Figure 3. Each 3D convolution kernel can skip a certain number of input frames, to improve the temporal receptive field. Temporal dilation coefficient $D_t$ represents the number of intervals between frames in the 3D convolution kernel.

![Figure 3: Comparison of temporal receptive fields of the 3D temporal dilation convolution and the basic 3D convolution.](image)

Then the number of parameters $Params$ and computational load $FLOPs_{single}$ of a single 3D temporal dilation convolution (that is $\tau_{out} = 1$ in $FLOPs$) are

$$Params = \left( (k^h \cdot k^w \cdot C_{in} \cdot T_c) \cdot C_{out} + C_{out} \right) \cdot (H \cdot W).$$

(5)

For the time domain, when $T_c$ is fixed, the temporal dilation will not cause the above parameters to change. Therefore, compared with the original 3D convolution, 3D temporal dilation convolution will not increase the number of parameters $Params$ and the computational load $FLOPs_{single}$. Then, when $\tau_{out}$ is fixed, the computational load of a 3D convolution layer $FLOPs$ will remain unchanged. As a result, 3D temporal dilation convolution can enhance the temporal receptive field of the convolution without increasing the number of parameters and computational load.

### 3.3. Framework construction

As shown in Figure 1, we build a novel 3D temporal dilation convolution framework for action recognition. The temporal size in the hidden layers of the 3D convolution network decreases from the shallow layer to the deep layer, and the output temporal size of the former layer is the input of the latter layer. That is when the temporal size is reduced in the shallower layer, the computational load of the whole network decreases greatly. Therefore, we deploy the 3D temporal dilation convolution layer as the shallower layer of the network, which accomplishes the sparse expression of the larger time domain, as shown in Figure 4.

![Figure 4: The 3D temporal dilation convolution (3D-TDC) framework. It consists of two branches, which input segments with two different temporal sizes $\tau'$ and $\tau$ ($\tau' < \tau$). Meanwhile, the computational load of the two branches remains the same.](image)

3D temporal dilation convolution layer to extract the features with a large temporal size \( \tau \) of the clip. Finally, the two branches are fused to obtain the final classification results. The 3D temporal dilation convolution layer of “branch 2” compresses the temporal size from \( \tau \) to \( \tau ' \), while maintaining the same computational load as the original 3D convolution layer of “branch 1”.

The network training adopts multi-part training and transfer strategies. First, we use the backbone parameters trained by the large temporal size \( \tau ' \) of the clip. Meanwhile, the first layer parameters of the initialization are removed and transferred to the “branch 2”, which consists of the 3D temporal dilation convolution layers and the backbone branch. The “branch 2” is trained by the small temporal size \( \tau \) of the clip to obtain the final parameters. We use cross-entropy losses with softmax and back-propagate their gradients.

4. Experiments

We evaluate the proposed 3D-TDC framework on three datasets: UCF-101, HMDB-51 and Kinetics-400. The descriptions of datasets, data preprocessing and training details are presented in section 4.1. Then we present the details of our experiments on the effect of temporal input size (section 4.2.1), the comparison of different temporal compression structures (section 4.2.2), the performance and computational load of each branch (section 4.2.3), and the comparison with other state-of-the-art methods (section 4.3).

4.1. Data preprocessing and training details

Datasets. Our experiments are performed on three action recognition datasets: UCF-101 [50], HMDB-51 [51] and Kinetics-400 [52]. UCF-101 contains 101 categories of actions, with 13,320 instances. The videos are mainly from movies and Google videos. HMDB-51 contains 51 action categories, with 6,766 instances. Each category contains at least 101 videos. The Kinetic-400 contains 400 action categories, each of which contains more than 400 training video samples, and the temporal length of each video is about 10s.

Data preprocessing. We first transform the original video into the frame sequences (at 25FPS) through FFmpeg\(^1\), and resize the frame such that the smallest dimension is 256. During the training, we apply the data augmentation methods including random clipping, subtracting ActivityNet mean (114.7748, 107.7354, 99.475), and vertical and horizontal flipping with the spatial size of 112. For the training, three different temporal sizes \( \tau \) (16 frames, 32 frames and 64 frames) of clips are generated for the experiments. For the testing, the original frame sequences are cut into continuous clips without overlap. The recognition accuracy is obtained by the average fusion of multiple clip accuracy.

Training details. The selected backbone networks are 3D ResNeXt-101 [9] with different depths. When constructing a 3D temporal dilation convolution framework, the shallow layer of “branch 2” is removed and then connected with different temporal compression layers, and finally fused with the “branch 2”. Here we list the detailed structure parameters of the network with 101 layers, as shown in Table 1. In the training, the momentum gradient descent method is used. The corresponding parameters of weight attenuation are set to 0.001 and 0.9, and the dropout is 0.9. The initial learning rate is 0.01 based on the large temporal size \( \tau ' \) (64 frames) of clips and 0.0001 based on the small temporal size \( \tau \) (16 frames) of clips. Meanwhile, the structural parameters of the main network are frozen for transfer. After transfer, the overall learning rate is set to 0.000001 as the final fine-tuning. The learning rate attenuation strategy is that, when the accuracy of the last three rounds is not improved, the learning rate is halved. The model parameters are saved every two iterations, and the model with the best performance is finally selected. The experiments use the Kinetics pre-trained model [9], and the FLOPs are generated by the THOP\(^2\) module in Python. The experiment is carried out on a processor equipped with two NVIDIA GeForce GTX Titan X and eight 1080Ti GPUs, and the deep learning framework in experiments is PyTorch\(^3\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stage</th>
<th>“branch 1”</th>
<th>“branch 2”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>conv1</td>
<td>(7^3, 64)</td>
<td>(7^3, D_1 = 1, 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>block1</td>
<td>(1^3, 128)</td>
<td>(1^3, 128)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>block2</td>
<td>(3^3, g = 32, 128) (\times 3)</td>
<td>(3^3, g = 32, 128) (\times 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>block3</td>
<td>(3^3, g = 32, 128) (\times 3)</td>
<td>(3^3, g = 32, 128) (\times 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>block4</td>
<td>(1^3, 1024) (\times 23)</td>
<td>(1^3, 1024) (\times 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fully-connected</td>
<td>fully-connected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{1}\)https://github.com/FFmpeg/FFmpeg
\(^{2}\)https://github.com/Lyken17/pytorch-OpCounter
\(^{3}\)https://pytorch.org
4.2. Ablation studies

4.2.1. Effect of temporal input size on 3D convolution network

To verify the effect of different temporal size (τ) of the video clip on the recognition accuracy of the 3D convolution network, with the original 3D convolution in the shallow layer, we explore different temporal sizes (16, 32, and 64 frames) of clip input. The experimental results of the computational load (FLOPs) and accuracy are shown in Table 2 and Figure 5 (UCF-101 and HMDB-51).

![Figure 5: Recognition accuracy of 3D convolution network with different temporal sizes (τ = 16, 32, 64) of clips from UCF-101 and HMDB-51.](image)

As shown in Figure 5, the recognition accuracy of the 3D convolution network is significantly improved with the increase of temporal sizes from 16 to 64 frames, for any depth. It verifies that the spatio-temporal feature expressiveness of the network can be improved by increasing the temporal size τ of the clip. That is, for a 3D convolution network, a larger temporal receptive field can provide more sufficient temporal motion information. However, from Table 2, we can observe that: on the one hand, the computational load of the network increases gradually with the scale of model parameters; and on the other hand, when the temporal size τ of the clip is multiplied, the computational load of the network is multiplied, which requires higher computing capacity for devices. Therefore, the experiment demonstrates that the network recognition accuracy can be improved quickly by increasing the temporal size τ of the clip, but the network computational load will also increase sharply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>r</th>
<th>18 layers</th>
<th>34 layers</th>
<th>50 layers</th>
<th>101 layers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(33.25M)</td>
<td>(63.56M)</td>
<td>(26.07M)</td>
<td>(47.72M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.31G</td>
<td>12.71G</td>
<td>7.49G</td>
<td>9.61G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>33.27G</td>
<td>50.83G</td>
<td>29.97G</td>
<td>38.40G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: FLOPs of the 3D residual convolution network with different temporal sizes r. “(xx.xx G)” is the computational load (FLOPs). “(xx.xx M)” is the number of parameters of network. The spatial size of input frame is 112 × 112.

4.2.2. Comparison of different temporal compression structures

In this section, we take the 3D ResNetXt-101 [9] as the backbone, and combine it with the 3D temporal dilation convolution layer to build the 3D temporal dilation convolution framework, and compare it with other shallow temporal compression structures, including sparse sampling, sliding^1 and sliding^2, as shown in Figure 6.

![Figure 6: Different temporal compression structures.](image)

For the video clips with temporal size τ = 64, uniform sampling is carried out to obtain the temporal size τ' = 16 of the clip. sliding^1 and sliding^2 adjust the temporal step: stride and padding of original 3D convolution layer. sliding^1 represents one layer, and sliding^2 represents two layers. sliding^1: convolution kernel size k^1 = 7, stride^1 = 4. sliding^2: k^2 = 7, stride^2 = 2; k^2 = 3, stride^2 = 2. The 3D-TDC layer: k = 7, stride = 4, D_1 = 3/2. Then, we conduct an experimental comparison on the UCF-101 dataset, apply the above shallow temporal compression structures on the “branch 2” of the framework, and obtain the recognition accuracy and computational load (FLOPs) of the framework, as shown in Table 3 and Figure 7.

In sparse sampling, 64 frames are directly reduced to 16 frames, so that the temporal information is not compressed and mapped by parameter learning, but part of the infor-
than that of sliding\(^1\). The temporal size is 64. According to Table 3, the frameworks with the sliding\(^1\) layer and the 3D-TDC layer provide higher recognition accuracy, while the FLOPs of the 3D-TDC layer is less than that of sliding\(^2\) (Figure 7). This indicates that, by using the 3D-TDC layer, the recognition accuracy is improved and the computational load is also controlled.

In this framework, we further observe the difference, between the proposed 3D-TDC framework (\(D_1 = 1\)) and the original 3D CNN, in the recognition confidence difference of the random selected examples from the UCF-101 dataset (Figure 8). \(\Delta a1\) is the difference between the highest confidence and the sub-high confidence (\(\Delta a1 = \max(x(\text{score}) - \max(x(\text{score})).\)). \(\Delta a2\) is the difference between the highest confidence and the third highest confidence (\(\Delta a2 = \max(x(\text{score}) - \max(x(\text{score}).)).\). Here max\(_n\) (\(\text{score}\)) is the \(n\)-th largest value in score. Note that, \(\Delta a1\) and \(\Delta a2\) can highlight the difference between the prediction category confidence and other categories. From Figure 8, compared with the original 3D CNN, the \(\Delta a1\) and \(\Delta a2\) of the 3D-TDC framework is larger, indicating that the 3D-TDC framework extracts more discriminative features of actions; that is, in these categories, the 3D-TDC framework can encode more discriminative representations.

### 4.2.3. Performance and computational load of each branch

For further elaboration of the motivation for designing the two-branch framework, we show in Table 4 the performance, computational load, and temporal receptive field size of “conv1” in each branch. The experiment results are based on UCF-101. ‘branch 1’ is with a small temporal size \(\tau = 16\), while ‘branch 2’ uses a large temporal size \(\tau = 64\). ‘branch 1\(^*\)” has a same model configuration as “branch 1” except for a 64-frame input. The only difference between “branch 1” and “branch 2” is the shallow layer (i.e. “conv1”), where the latter adopts temporal dilation convolution to achieve a larger temporal receptive field. From Table 4, we can observe that “branch 2” has a larger temporal receptive field due to temporal dilation convolution, and it has the same model parameters as “branch 1” which has a small temporal size \(\tau = 16\). Note that, when temporal size is 64 frames, the computational load of “branch 2” is about a quarter of that of “branch 1\(^*\)” Although “branch 2” gains a larger temporal receptive field, temporal dilation convolution decreases the resolution in temporal dimension and makes the model difficult to optimize, which results in performance degradation. To address this issue, we fuse the results of “branch 1” and “branch 2” by using a weighted average. Note that, the computational load of “branch (1+2)” is about half that of “branch 1\(^*\)”, while “branch (1+2)” acquires a comparable performance compared with “branch 1\(^*\)”.

---

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layers</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>sp</th>
<th>std(^1)</th>
<th>std(^2)</th>
<th>(D_1 = 1)</th>
<th>(D_1 = 2)</th>
<th>(D_1 = 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>84.21</td>
<td>84.21</td>
<td>84.55</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>84.91</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>84.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>89.20</td>
<td>89.10</td>
<td>89.31</td>
<td>89.53</td>
<td>89.50</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>89.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>90.09</td>
<td>89.52</td>
<td>90.97</td>
<td>91.83</td>
<td><em>91.85</em></td>
<td>90.55</td>
<td>90.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 7: FLOPs results of different temporal compression structures and networks. (101 layers)*

motion in the long time domain is lost directly, resulting in low accuracy. In the shallow layer, the sliding\(^1\) layer, sliding\(^2\) layer, and 3D-TDC layer are to learn the temporal compression mapping relationship through convolution parameters. From Table 3, we can observe that, compared with the original network (\(\tau = 16\)), the accuracy of the frameworks using the above three temporal compression structures (\(\tau = 64, \tau' = 16\)) is significantly improved. Among them, the performances of sliding\(^2\) and the 3D-TDC layer are the best. Both sliding\(^1\) and sliding\(^2\) compress the time domain by controlling the temporal stride, but the recognition accuracy of sliding\(^2\) is higher. This is because, when the temporal stride is large, it is difficult to fully encode temporal relations, and sliding\(^2\) learns better mapping relations through smaller stride with more parameters. However, the accuracy of 3D-TDC is almost the same as that of sliding\(^2\) and is the highest one in the 101-layer network. Therefore, the larger temporal feature can be encoded by increasing the temporal size \(\tau\) of the clip. When \(D_1\) increases, with the input temporal sparsity increasing, the input information loss increases during feature extraction, and thus the accuracy slightly decreases, but it is still higher than the original network.

We obtain the computational load FLOPs of different temporal compression structures and the network, when the spatial size of the input frames is 112 × 112 and its temporal size is 64. According to Table 3, the frameworks with the sliding\(^2\) layer and the 3D-TDC layer provide higher recognition accuracy, while the FLOPs of the 3D-TDC layer is less than that of sliding\(^2\) (Figure 7). This indicates that, by using the 3D-TDC layer, the recognition accuracy is improved and the computational load is also controlled.
4.3. Comparison with state-of-the-art methods

For evaluating the accuracy of our proposed 3D-TDC framework more comprehensively, we conduct experiments on UCF-101, HMDB-51, and Kinetics-400, and we compare the accuracy of 3D-TDC with other action recognition methods. Note that the listed results of other methods are taken from their original papers. From Table 5, we can observe that the 3D-TDC (101) framework with only RGB input has the accuracy advantage and is closer to the methods that integrate optical flow as additional input. As can be observed from Table 6, when using R(2+1)D [8] as the backbone to construct our framework, we can improve the recognition accuracy to 93.82% on UCF-101 and 66.83% on HMDB-51, and the performance of our 3D-TDC (R(2+1)D) is also closer to that of the optical flow method, such as Mars [46]. Compared with other optical flow methods, such as Two-stream CNN [53] and Two-stream I3D [53], our 3D-TDC (R(2+1)D) achieves better recognition accuracy, and the recognition accuracy of our 3D-TDC (101) is better than that of the Two-stream CNN [53]. The FLOPs of 3D-TDC (R(2+1)D) are far below the FLOPs of Two-stream I3D [53] that adopts RGB and optical flow as input. As for 3D CNN methods, the recognition accuracy of our 3D-TDC (101) is better than C3D [5], P3D [6], T3D [54], I3D [53] and 3D-ResNeXt-101 [9]. Furthermore, the FLOPs of our 3D-TDC (101) are lower than C3D [5], P3D [6], I3D [53], R(2+1)D [8] and 3D-ResNeXt-101 [9].

As for dilution convolution methods, such as DDN [26], our 3D-TDC (101) and 3D-TDC (R(2+1)D) increase the accuracy by 2.16% and 4.13% on UFC-101, respectively. Compared with TSM [33], our 3D-

Figure 8: Recognition confidence difference of samples from UCF-101. In each block, the middle panel is the recognition confidence difference of basic 3D CNN, and the right-hand panel is that of the proposed 3D-TDC framework. \( \Delta a1 \) is the difference between the highest confidence and the sub-high confidence; \( \Delta a2 \) is the difference between the highest confidence and the third highest confidence.

Figure 9: Confidence differences between original 3D CNN and 3D-TDC for all categories in UCF-101.
TDC achieves the comparable recognition accuracy, and the FLOPs of 3D-TDC (101) are lower than TSM [33]. All of these verify the effectiveness and general applicability of our proposed 3D-TDC framework in achieving comparable recognition accuracy with less computational consumption.

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>FLOPs</th>
<th>UCF-101</th>
<th>HMDB-51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGB+Flow</td>
<td>Two-stream CNN [53]</td>
<td>19.22G</td>
<td>87.76/58.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-stream 3D [53]</td>
<td>213.85G</td>
<td>93.40/66.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mars [46]</td>
<td>18.13G</td>
<td>95.80/75.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>CS3D [5]</td>
<td>38.57G</td>
<td>83.60/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P3D [6]</td>
<td>18.15G</td>
<td>88.60/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T3D [64]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90.30/59.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ID3 [53]</td>
<td>111.33G</td>
<td>84.50/49.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R(2+1)D [8]</td>
<td>41.69G</td>
<td>93.60/66.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3D-ResNeXt-101 [6]</td>
<td>38.40G</td>
<td>90.09/63.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TSM [33]</td>
<td>32.88G</td>
<td>95.50/73.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DDN [26]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89.69/74.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRN [55]</td>
<td>23.50G</td>
<td>83.83/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3D-TDC (R(2+1)D)</td>
<td>84.39G</td>
<td>93.82/66.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3D-TDC (101)</td>
<td>19.22G</td>
<td>91.85/64.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Accuracy %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGB+Flow</td>
<td>Two-stream CNN [53]</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two-stream 3D [53]</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mars [46]</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3D-ResNeXt-101 [46]</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>CNN+LSTM [53]</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3D-ResNeXt-101 [9]</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3D-TDC (101)</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Conclusion

We propose a new action-recognition framework based on 3D temporal dilation convolution. We introduce the 3D temporal dilation convolution structure into the shallow layer, to enlarge the temporal receptive field of the whole network and compress the large temporal information. Then we build the 3D temporal dilation convolution framework for action recognition. Through extensive experiments and analysis on the various benchmark datasets, the performance advantages of our framework are verified. In the future, we will further explore the deployment of the 3D temporal dilation structure over the whole network and investigate a temporal feature extraction network suitable for a longer time domain.
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