Experiments

Experimental Results

Table 1: Comparison results on the query-focused video summarization dataset in terms of Precision, Recall and F1-score.

	SeqDPP			SH-DPP			QC-DPP			TPAN			CHAN		
	Pre	Rec	F1	Pre	Rec	F1	Pre	Rec	F1	Pre	Rec	F1	Pre	Rec	F1
Vid1	53.43	29.81	36.59	50.56	29.64	35.67	49.86	53.38	48.68	49.66	50.91	48.74	54.73	46.57	49.14
Vid2	44.05	46.65	43.67	42.13	46.81	42.72	33.71	62.09	41.66	43.02	48.73	45.30	45.92	50.26	46.53
Vid3	49.25	17.44	25.26	51.92	29.24	36.51	55.16	62.40	56.47	58.73	56.49	56.51	59.75	64.53	58.65
Vid4	11.14	63.49	18.15	11.51	62.88	18.62	21.39	63.12	29.96	36.70	35.96	33.64	25.23	51.16	33.42
Avg.	39.47	39.35	30.92	39.03	42.14	33.38	40.03	60.25	44.19	47.03	48.02	46.05	46.40	53.13	46.94

- CHAN is outperforms the state-of-the-art approach (TPAN) by 1.9%
 - Specifically video 2 & 3, CHAN can have a better performance than TPAN (2.64%, 3.6%)
- The improvements of performance identify the effectiveness of our approaches to learn the relevance between the video shots and user's query.
 - The average running time of each video 134.4ms, shorter than TPAN 1.614s by 91.6%.

Experiments

Ablation Study

- F1-score of CHAN without local selfattention module is reduced by 7.84%
- The performance without query-aware global attention module decreases by 18.8%
- Local self-attention & query-aware global attention module can capture visual information inside a video segment and between segments
 - Helpful to improve performance

Table 2: Ablation analysis on query-conditioned video summarization in terms of Precision, Recall and F1-score.

Model	Pre	Rec	F1
CHAN w/o Local Att	42.72	49.04	43.26
CHAN w/o Global Att	37.62	43.17	38.09
CHAN	46.40	53.13	46.94