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Multimodal Data

Multimodal vs. multisensory

https://docs.microsoft.com/en-gb/azure/kinect-dk/hardware-specification

Multimodal Data
Multimodal Learning

- More data
- More variety of data
- More (semantic) information (e.g., optical flow, joints, etc.)

Multiple modalities bring complementary information

But more data to process!
Outline

- Multimodal learning
- Privileged Information and Distillation
- A possible strategy, HALLUCINATION networks: two approaches
- Wrap-up and take-home message
Challenges of Multimodal Learning:

1. How can we build deep learning models that learn on these different clues.
   - Issue: balancing the learning pace of the modalities

2. How can these deep learning models be used in case of a missing modality?
Assuming that we have RGB only available at test time, we can cast this question in another way:

- How can other modalities help in learning a better RGB model?

  Distillation + Privileged Information framework
Missing Modality in multimodal Video Action Recognition

*Learning with Privileged Information*

1. Train a model exploiting **multimodal data**

   **TRAINING**
   - Depth
   - RGB

   ![Training Images]

   → Handshaking

2. How to deal with a **missing modality** at test time?

   **TESTING**
   - RGB

   ![Testing Images]

   → Handshaking

Main strategy

- Improve single-modality system performance using side information: *Privileged Information and distillation* → *generalized distillation*

- Use this extra modality in training only to *extract* suitable information

- Strategy: *Hallucination* networks
  - Trying to mimic the missing modality
  - Not necessarily at level of data, but at feature and prediction levels
  - *Distill* useful info from the missing modality data stream

Why hallucinating?

Depth Perception from Monocular RGB Image
Modality Distillation with Multiple Stream Networks for Action Recognition

N.C. Garcia, P. Morerio, and V. Murino, ECCV 2018
Hallucinating Depth Features from RGB


Knowledge Distillation

- A fact: an ensemble of networks usually performs better than a single network.

- The problem: an ensemble (or a very deep model) may be too heavy for inference in production.

- The idea: Train a single lightweight network to mimic the ensemble of networks (teacher-student approach)

Ba, J., Caruana, R.. Do deep nets really need to be deep? NIPS 2014
Knowledge Distillation

Data & label: \((x, y)\). Temperature \(T > 0\).

1. Learn Teacher \(\rightarrow\) Ensemble of networks on input pairs \((x_i, y_i)\)
2. Compute Teacher’s soft labels
   
   \[ s_i = \varsigma \left( \text{Teecher}(x_i) / T \right), \quad \varsigma \text{ softmax operator} \]
3. Learn Student \(\rightarrow\) lightweight network using \((x_i, y_i)\) and \((x_i, s_i)\)

What if the ensemble learns from multiple modalities, but the Student network can learn from one only?

Hinton, G., Vinyals, O., Dean, J. “Distilling the knowledge in a neural network.”, NIPS 2014 Deep Learning Workshop
Privileged Information

Hypothesis:

- Having access to a Teacher that considers additional information, $x^*$, together with the pair (data, label) = $(x, y)$,
- and assuming that $x^*$ is not available at test time.

The question is:

- How to leverage the additional information $x^*$ at training time to build a better model that will have access only to $x$ in testing.

Privileged Information and Distillation

**Generalized Distillation**

- “Machines-teaching-machines” paradigm.
- 3 steps that are common to KD and PI.
- Consider \((x, x^*, y)\):
  1. Learn *Teacher* network on \((x^*, y)\)
  2. Compute Teacher’s soft labels as \(s = \varsigma(Teacher(x^*) / T)\), \(\varsigma\) softmax operator
  3. Learn *Student* network using \((x, y)\) and \((x^*, s)\)

- If \(x^* = x\) and the Teacher is bigger than Student network, we are in a Distillation framework.
- If \(x^*\) is additional information, we are in a Privileged Information framework.

Hallucinating Depth Features from RGB


Losses

- The 1st step refers to the separate (pre-)training of depth and RGB streams with standard cross entropy classification loss.

- The 2nd step represents the actual learning of the Teacher (depth) network
  - Both streams are initialized with the respective weights from step 1 and trained jointly with a cross-entropy loss as a traditional two-stream model, using RGB and depth data.

- We used a similar connection mechanism (⊙) between the 2 networks as in Feichtenhofer et al.: it is actually implemented at the four convolutional layers of the Resnet-50 model, aiming at learning better spatiotemporal representations.
Losses

- **3rd step**: learning the student (hallucination) network using Feature (hallucination) Loss + Distillation loss
  - **Feature loss**: To align the features of Hallucination Stream with the real Depth Stream.
    \[
    L_{hal}(l) = \lambda_l \| \sigma(A^d_l) - \sigma(A^h_l) \|^2_2
    \]
    where $\sigma$ is the sigmoid function, and $A^d_l$'s are the $l$-th layer activations of depth (d) and hallucination (h) networks.

- This Euclidean loss forces both activation maps to be similar.
Distillation loss: To align the predictions of Hallucination Stream with the real Depth Stream. The Generalized Distillation Loss is:

\[ L_{GD}(i) = (1 - \lambda)\ell(y_i, \varsigma(f(x_i))) + \lambda\ell(s_i, \varsigma(f(x_i))), \quad \lambda \in [0, 1] \]

where \( s_i = \varsigma(f_t(x_i)/T), \quad T > 0. \)

1\textsuperscript{st} term: uses the ground truth labels, \( y_i \)
2\textsuperscript{nd} term: uses the soft targets provided by teacher, \( s_i \), and \( \varsigma \) is the softmax function

- The final loss is: \( L = (1 - \alpha)L_{GD} + \alpha L_{hall}, \quad \alpha \in [0,1] \)
The 4th and last step refers to a fine-tuning step and also represents the test setup of our model:
- the hallucination stream is initialized from the respective weights from 3rd step, and the RGB stream with the respective weights from the 2nd step
Training details

- $\lambda, \alpha$: balancing the ground truth and soft labels highly depends on the performance of the teacher network.
  - In our experiments we used $\lambda = 0.5$ and $\alpha = 0.5$.
- We used Resnet-50 for all networks.
  - Augmented with 1D temporal convolutions, that span over 5 frames.
- Initialized with ImageNet weights.
- Trained with SGD until validation accuracy reaches a plateau.
Datasets

- **NTU RGB+D**
  - This is the largest public dataset for multimodal video action recognition.
  - Composed by 56,880 videos, available in four modalities: RGB, depth sequences, infrared frames, and 3D skeleton data of 25 joints.
  - Acquired with a Kinect v2 sensor in 80 different viewpoints, and includes 40 subjects performing 60 distinct actions.
  - We follow the two evaluation protocols originally proposed in Shahroudy et al., which are cross-subject and cross-view.
  - As in the original paper, we use about 5% of the training data as validation set for both protocols, in order to fix the values of parameters and T.

- In this work, we use only RGB and depth data.

Datasets

- **UWA3DII**
  - This dataset consists of 1075 samples of RGB, depth and skeleton sequences.
  - It features 10 subjects performing 30 actions captured in 5 different views.

- **Northwestern-UCLA**
  - Similarly to the other datasets, it provides RGB, depth and skeleton sequences for 1475 samples.
  - It features 10 subjects performing 10 actions captured in 3 different views.
## Comparison with State of the Art

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Test Mods.</th>
<th>NTU (p1)</th>
<th>NTU (p2)</th>
<th>UWA3DII</th>
<th>NW-UCLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luo [17]</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luo [17]</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahmani [22]</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOG-2 [19]</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Tube [7]</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours - depth, step 1</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>70.44%</td>
<td>75.16%</td>
<td>75.28%</td>
<td>72.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours - RGB, step 1</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>66.52%</td>
<td>71.39%</td>
<td>63.67%</td>
<td>85.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep RNN [23]</td>
<td>Joints</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep LSTM [23]</td>
<td>Joints</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharoudy [23]</td>
<td>Joints</td>
<td>62.93%</td>
<td>70.27%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim [26]</td>
<td>Joints</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharoudy [24]</td>
<td>RGB+D</td>
<td>74.86%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liu [14]</td>
<td>RGB+D</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahmani [20]</td>
<td>Depth+Joints</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours - step 2</td>
<td>RGB+D</td>
<td>79.73%</td>
<td>81.43%</td>
<td>79.66%</td>
<td>88.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman et al. [11]</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>64.64%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>83.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours - step 3</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>71.98%</td>
<td>74.10%</td>
<td>71.54%</td>
<td>76.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ours - step 4</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>73.42%</td>
<td>77.21%</td>
<td>73.23%</td>
<td>86.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Classification accuracies and comparisons with the state of the art. Performances referred to the several steps of our approach (ours) are highlighted in bold. × refers to comparisons with unsupervised learning methods. △ refers to supervised methods: here train and test modalities coincide. □ refers to privileged information methods: here training exploits RGB+D data, while test relies on RGB data only. The 3rd column refers to cross-subject and the 4th to the cross-view evaluation protocols on the NTU dataset. The results reported on the other two datasets are for the cross-view protocol.
For almost all datasets, Depth outperforms RGB in both Cross-View and Cross-Subject: it makes sense to consider Depth as Teacher modality.

- Although weak teachers might also improve students, see “Revisiting Knowledge Distillation via Label Smoothing Regularization” by Yuan et al. @ CVPR2020

Network trained with distillation, with RGB as input (Hallucination, step 3) outperforms original (step 1) RGB network.

- Means that Distillation is indeed providing additional knowledge / regularization effect.

Still, RGB network + Hallucination achieves the best result (Step 4).

Hallucination network allows to deal with noisy (depth) data

This approach can be used in any order of modality (e.g., RGB as Teacher, but it’s less performing)
Learning with privileged information via adversarial discriminative modality distillation

Hallucinating Depth Features from RGB

Hallucinating $\leftrightarrow$ Generating
GAN-based approach

D-dimensional noise vector

Real Images → Discriminator Network → Predicted Labels
real/fake

Generator Network → Fake Images

Learning with privileged information

An adversarial approach

- Adversarial learning strategy to learn the hallucination network.
- The hallucination network plays an adversarial game with a discriminator.
  - The discriminator’s job is to distinguish between true and hallucinated features.
  - The hallucination network’s job is to fool the discriminator.
- Tasks: video action recognition and object recognition.
Why Adversarial Learning?

- Using adversarial learning allows for more flexibility.
  - For example, balancing the different losses (Euclidean distance of features and Distillation) can be difficult and certainly varies for different tasks.
- Two-in-one: *align representations and train the classifier* in one objective.
- It provides a mechanism to detect if the modality is too noisy, so we can switch to using the hallucination network.
- It is agnostic regarding the pair of modalities used, being suitable beyond RGB and depth data.
- Thanks to the discriminator design, which includes an auxiliary classification task, our method is able to transfer the discriminative capability from a teacher (depth) network to a student (hallucination) network, up to a full recovery of the teacher’s accuracy.
The adversarial strategy
Training

- **Step 1**: separate training of RGB and depth networks with standard cross-entropy loss.
- At test time the raw predictions (logits) of the two separate streams are simply averaged, boosting the recognition performance.
Training

- **Step 2** refers to the adversarial training.
  - The Generator role is played by the Hallucination network \((H)\), and the “real” target is provided by the Depth network, which is frozen.
  - Input to the Discriminator \((D)\): concatenation of the feature vector, and the relative (temporal) position \((y^t)\) of the frame in the video.
  - The discriminator also features the additional classification task of assigning samples to the correct class.

- At test time, predictions from the RGB and the hallucination streams are fused.
Why concatenate the relative position of frame $y^t$

- Each networks’ input is a set of frames.
- Each network is composed by 2D and 1D temporal convolutions.
- The output is a prediction vector for each input frame.
- The first frame and corresponding feature vector might be very different from the last frame / feature vector, even though the prediction should be the same.
- We concatenate the relative position to ground the generator to a position in time, e.g., $y^t = [00100]$ indicates that this frame is sampled from the middle of the clip.
Discriminator task

- To discriminate between real depth features and hallucinated features, and to classify the set of frames.
- The target $\hat{y}$ and the objective function are defined as:

$$
\hat{y} = \begin{cases} 
[zeros(C) \| 1], & \text{for } x_{rgb} \\
[y_i \| 0], & \text{for } x_d
\end{cases}
$$

being $y_i$ the $C$-dimensional one-hot encoding of the true class label and $C$ is the number of classes.

$$
\min_{\theta_D} \max_{\theta_H} \ell = \mathbb{E}_{(x_i, y_i) \sim (x_{rgb}, Y)} \mathcal{L}(D(D(x_i) \| y^t), \hat{y}_i) + \mathbb{E}_{(x_i, y_i) \sim (x_d, Y)} \mathcal{L}(D(E_d(x_i) \| y^t), \hat{y}_i)
$$

being $\mathcal{L}$ the cross-entropy.
Both networks are Resnet-50, augmented with 1D temporal convolutions.

The input to the Discriminator is obtained from the last feature map of a Resnet-50 [7x7x2048], after pooling and a convolutional layer, to obtain a final vector of size 128.

The architecture of the Discriminator varies: 3 fully connected (FC) layers for action recognition tasks, and 5 FC for object recognition.

All networks are trained with Adam, \( lr=0.001 \), from ImageNet checkpoints.
### Experiments

**Object Recognition**

![RGB and depth frames from the NYUD (RGB-D) dataset.](image)

**Fig. 5.** Examples of RGB and depth frames from the NYUD (RGB-D) dataset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Trained on</th>
<th>Tested on</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depth alone</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>40.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGB alone</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>52.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGB ensemble</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>54.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-stream (average preds.)</td>
<td>RGB+D</td>
<td>RGB+D</td>
<td>57.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModDrop [22]</td>
<td>RGB+D</td>
<td>RGB+D</td>
<td>58.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModDrop [22]</td>
<td>RGB+D</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>53.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autoencoder</td>
<td>RGB+D</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>50.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCRN [23] depth estimation</td>
<td>RGB+D</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>50.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garcia <em>et al.</em></td>
<td>RGB+D</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>55.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ours (ADMD)</strong></td>
<td>RGB+D</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>57.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4
Classification accuracies and comparisons with the state of the art for video action recognition. Performances referred to the several steps of our approach (ours) are highlighted in bold. ∙ refers to comparisons with unsupervised learning methods. △ refers to supervised methods: here train and test modalities coincide. □ refers to privileged information methods: here training exploits RGB+D data, while test relies on RGB data only. The 4th column refers to cross-subject and the 5th to the cross-view evaluation protocols on the NTU dataset. The results reported on the other two datasets are for the cross-view protocol.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Test Mods.</th>
<th>NTU (p1)</th>
<th>NTU (p2)</th>
<th>NW-UCLA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Luo [58]</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Luo [58]</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rahmani [59]</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HOG-2 [60]</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Action Tube [61]</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Depth stream [11]</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>70.44%</td>
<td>75.16%</td>
<td>72.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ADM - Depth stream</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>70.53%</td>
<td>76.47%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ADM - Depth stream + bott.</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>71.87%</td>
<td>75.32%</td>
<td>71.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>[11] - RGB stream</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>66.52%</td>
<td>80.01%</td>
<td>85.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ADM - RGB stream</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>67.95%</td>
<td>80.01%</td>
<td>85.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Deep RNN [16]</td>
<td>Joints</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Deep LSTM [16]</td>
<td>Joints</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sharoudy [16]</td>
<td>Joints</td>
<td>62.93%</td>
<td>70.27%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kim [62]</td>
<td>Joints</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sharoudy [63]</td>
<td>RGB+D</td>
<td>74.86%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Liu [6]</td>
<td>RGB+D</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rahmani [63]</td>
<td>Depth+Joints</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Two-stream, step 2 [11]</td>
<td>RGB+D</td>
<td>79.73%</td>
<td>81.43%</td>
<td>88.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>ADM - Two-stream (no finetune)</td>
<td>RGB+D</td>
<td>77.74%</td>
<td>85.49%</td>
<td>89.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hoffman et al. [10]</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>64.64%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>83.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Luo et al. [21]</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>89.50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hallucination model, step 3 [11]</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>71.93%</td>
<td>74.10%</td>
<td>76.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Hallucination model, step 4 [11]</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>73.42%</td>
<td>77.21%</td>
<td>86.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ADM - Hall. stream alone</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>67.57%</td>
<td>71.80%</td>
<td>83.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ADM - Hall. two-stream model</td>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>73.11%</td>
<td>81.50%</td>
<td>91.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Robustness to depth noise

Accuracy values for the two-stream model trained on RGB and depth, and tested with RGB and noisy depth data.

### NTU RGB+D action dataset - ADMD performance is 81.50%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\sigma^2$</th>
<th>Two-stream</th>
<th>no noise</th>
<th>$10^{-3}$</th>
<th>$10^{-2}$</th>
<th>$10^{-1}$</th>
<th>$10^0$</th>
<th>$10^1$</th>
<th>void</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no noise</td>
<td>85.49%</td>
<td>85.52%</td>
<td>82.05%</td>
<td>68.99%</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>3.35%</td>
<td>8.55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NYUD object dataset - ADMD performance is 57.52%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\sigma^2$</th>
<th>Two-stream</th>
<th>no noise</th>
<th>$10^{-3}$</th>
<th>$10^{-2}$</th>
<th>$10^{-1}$</th>
<th>$10^0$</th>
<th>$10^1$</th>
<th>void</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no noise</td>
<td>58.73%</td>
<td>58.68%</td>
<td>58.23%</td>
<td>57.18%</td>
<td>48.27%</td>
<td>28.40%</td>
<td>47.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModDrop [20]</td>
<td>58.93%</td>
<td>58.89%</td>
<td>58.56%</td>
<td>57.49%</td>
<td>48.90%</td>
<td>25.95%</td>
<td>47.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detecting noisy inputs

Fig. 6. Discriminator confidence at predicting 'fake' label as a function of noise in the depth frames. The more corrupted the frame, the more confident \( D \), and the lower the accuracy of the Two-stream model (NYUD dataset).
If a modality is missing and the task is not pixel-level, one can still bring some of the performance offered by that modality without actually predicting the modality itself, but just the features.

- Autoencoder 50.52% vs. Ours 57.52%

Adversarial Learning (Real / Synthetic) is not enough to learn good features: the auxiliary classification task is important.

The fact that [RGB + Hallucination stream] ensemble outperforms [RGB + RGB] indicates that Distillation is not only a way to regularize the learning, but also transfers knowledge.
Conclusions

- Multimodal Learning poses interesting and unsolved challenges
  - Learning representations from multiple modalities while leveraging the potential of each one efficiently.
  - Applying the models in real scenarios, e.g., missing or noisy modalities.

- KD and PI provide a framework for learning using multiple streams of information.

- The test-time modality network can be enriched with information coming from other modalities / networks
  - either by having a hallucination network providing the missing predictions
  - or by simply using the extra pairs \((x^*, s)\) to enlarge the dataset.
Conclusions

- KD is a regularization method, but a special one:
  - it also serves to provide additional, useful information to the student network.
- It is related to the idea of noisy labels or label augmentation
- Embodies the idea that using hard labels is not always optimal.
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