

# Detached and Interactive Multimodal Learning

Yunfeng Fan  
Department of Computing,  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic  
University, Hong Kong  
yunfeng.fan@connect.polyu.hk

Wenchao Xu\*  
Department of Computing  
The Hong Kong Polytechnic  
University, Hong Kong  
wenchao.xu@polyu.edu.hk

Haozhao Wang  
School of Computer Science and  
Technology  
Huazhong University of Science and  
Technology, Hubei, China  
hz\_wang@hust.edu.cn

Junhong Liu  
School of Software  
Beihang University, Beijing, China  
johumliu@gmail.com

Song Guo  
Department of Computer Science and  
Engineering  
The Hong Kong University of Science  
and Technology, Hong Kong  
songguo@cse.ust.hk

## ABSTRACT

Recently, Multimodal Learning (MML) has gained significant interest as it compensates for single-modality limitations through comprehensive complementary information within multimodal data. However, traditional MML methods generally use the *joint* learning framework with a uniform learning objective that can lead to the modality competition issue, where feedback predominantly comes from certain modalities, limiting the full potential of others. In response to this challenge, this paper introduces DI-MML, a novel *detached* MML framework designed to learn complementary information across modalities under the premise of avoiding modality competition. Specifically, DI-MML addresses competition by separately training each modality encoder with isolated learning objectives. It further encourages cross-modal *interaction* via a shared classifier that defines a common feature space and employing a dimension-decoupled unidirectional contrastive (DUC) loss to facilitate modality-level knowledge transfer. Additionally, to account for varying reliability in sample pairs, we devise a certainty-aware logit weighting strategy to effectively leverage complementary information at the instance level during inference. Extensive experiments conducted on audio-visual, flow-image, and front-rear view datasets show the superior performance of our proposed method. The code is released at <https://github.com/fanyunfeng-bit/DI-MML>.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Computing methodologies** → **Artificial intelligence**.

## KEYWORDS

Multimodal Learning, Modality Competition, Cross-modal Interaction, Dimension-decoupled Unidirectional Contrastive Loss

\*Corresponding author.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

MM '24, October 28-November 1, 2024, Melbourne, VIC, Australia.

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0686-8/24/10

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3664647.3680697>

## ACM Reference Format:


Yunfeng Fan, Wenchao Xu, Haozhao Wang, Junhong Liu, and Song Guo. 2024. Detached and Interactive Multimodal Learning. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia (MM '24)*, October 28-November 1, 2024, Melbourne, VIC, Australia. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 12 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3664647.3680697>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Multimodal learning (MML) has emerged to enable machines to better perceive and understand the world with various types of data, which has already been applied to autonomous driving [35], sentiment analysis [17], anomaly detection [45], etc. Data from different modalities may contain distinctive and complementary knowledge, which allows MML outperforms unimodal learning [14]. Despite the advances in MML, fully exploiting the information from multimodal data still remains challenging.

Recent studies [15, 30] have found that the unimodal encoder in MML underperforms its best unimodal counterpart trained independently. Huang et al. [15] attribute the cause of this phenomenon to *modality competition*, where the dominant modality hinders the learning of other weak modalities, resulting in imbalanced modality-wise performance. Existing solutions [9, 22, 41] mainly try to modulate and balance the learning paces of different modalities, which generally follow the joint training framework and a uniform learning objective is employed for all modalities, as shown in Figure 1. However, according to [8], the fused uniform learning objective is actually the reason for modality competition since the backward gradient predominantly comes from certain better modalities, hindering the learning of others, as illustrated in Figure 2. Meanwhile, [6] has declared that despite the competition between modalities, the interactions in joint training can facilitate the exploitation of multimodal knowledge. Therefore, existing solutions are caught in the dilemma of mitigating competition and facilitating interactions, where the competition issue has not been eradicated, limiting further improvements in multimodal performance.

In this paper, we empirically reveal that eliminating modality competition may be more critical for multimodal learning, which motivates us to design a competition-free training scheme for MML. Therefore, we decide to abandon the joint training framework and construct a novel *detached* learning process via assigning each



**Figure 1: The difference between previous methods with ours. Only our method abandons the uniform fusion objective and updates each modal network with isolated objectives.**


modality with isolated learning objectives. Although the naive detached framework, i.e., performing unimodal training independently, could avoid modality competition, it still suffers from the following two challenges, limiting its further improvement.

- **Disparate feature spaces.** The intrinsic heterogeneity between modalities usually requires different processing strategies as well as model structures, which may lead to disparate feature spaces based on independent unimodal training and then pose a great challenge on fusing the extracted multimodal knowledge.
- **Lack of cross-modal interactions.** The cross-modal interactions can help to facilitate the exploitation of multimodal knowledge. However, independent unimodal training insulates the interactions for both encoder training and multimodal prediction process, limiting the learning and exploitation of multimodal complementary information.

To address all above issues, we propose a novel DI-MML that achieves cross-modal Interactions under the Detached training scheme. Unlike independent unimodal training, we first apply an additional shared classifier to regulate a shared feature space for various modalities, alleviating the difficulty on fusion process. To encourage cross-modal interactions during encoder training, we propose a Dimension-decoupled Unidirectional Contrastive (DUC) loss to transfer the modality-level complementary knowledge. We introduce the dimension-wise prediction to evaluate the discriminative knowledge for each dimension and then divide feature dimensions into effective and ineffective groups, enabling the complementary knowledge transfer within modalities and maintaining the full learning of each modality itself. Further, to enhance interactions during multimodal prediction, we then freeze the learned encoders and train a fusion module. Considering that there may be reliability disparities between modalities in sample pairs, we devise a certainty-aware logit weighting strategy during inference so that we can fully utilize the complementarities at the instance level.

Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- To the best of our knowledge, this paper is the first to completely avoid modality competition while ensuring complementary cross-modal interactions in MML. We propose a



**Figure 2: Modality competition comes from uniform learning objective. The columns represent predicted probabilities for each class. The fused prediction is dominated by modality 1 (better), resulting in a significant gap between the fusion gradient and the gradient needed for modality 2 (weak).**

novel DI-MML framework that trains each modality with isolated learning objectives.

- We design a shared classifier to regulate a shared feature space and a Dimension-decoupled Unidirectional Contrastive (DUC) loss to enable sufficient cross-modal interactions, which exploits modality-level complementarities.
- During inference, we utilize the instance-level complementarities via a certainty-aware logit weighting strategy.
- We perform extensive experiments on four datasets with different modality combinations to validate superiority of DI-MML and its effectiveness on competition elimination.

## 2 RELATED WORK

### 2.1 Modality Competition in MML

Multimodal learning is expected to outperform the unimodal learning scheme since multiple signals generally bring more information [14]. However, recent research [30] has observed that the multimodal joint training network underperforms the best unimodal counterpart. Besides, even if the multimodal network surpasses the performance of the unimodal network, the unimodal encoders from multimodal joint training perform worse than those from unimodal training [5, 32, 33, 44]. This phenomenon is termed as “modality competition” [15], which suggests that each modality cannot be fully learned especially for weak modalities since there exists inhibition between them. Researchers have proposed various methods to address this challenge, including gradient modulation [8, 22], learning rate adjustment [27, 41], knowledge distillation [6], etc. Despite their improvement, the competition phenomenon still exists since they insist on leveraging joint training scheme with a uniform learning objective, which is the culprit for modality competition [8]. The preserved competition greatly limits the improvement of multimodal performance. In this paper, we aim to design a competition-free MML scheme which assigns isolated learning objectives to each modality without mutual inhibition, and guarantee the cross-modal interaction simultaneously.

### 2.2 Contrastive Learning in MML

Contrastive learning (CL) [3] aims to learn an embedding space where positive samples are clustered together while negative samples are pushed apart. Traditionally, CL has been applied to unimodal scenarios, e.g., self-supervised learning [12, 16], domain generalization [18, 40] and few-shot learning [21, 38]. In recent years,

multimodal contrastive representation learning (MCRL) [19, 24] has been proposed to learn a shared feature space where the semantically aligned cross-modal representations are acquired. In MCRL, the paired multimodal samples are viewed as positive samples while the mismatched sample pairs are considered as negative samples. The cross-modal contrastive loss aims to pull the positive representations close in the instance level. MCRL has achieved great success yet. Multimodal pretrained models [10] emerged based on it, e.g., the vision-language models UniCL [37], FILIP [39], audio-text model CLAP [7] and audio-visual model CAV-MAE [11]. However, these methods are designed to align shared information in different modalities while overlooking the learning about the modality-specific and complementary features. In this paper, we aim to achieve cross-modal interaction during the unimodal learning process via the complementary knowledge transfer based on CL.

### 3 METHODOLOGY

In this section, we analyze the modality competition problem and elaborate on the details of our proposed DI-MML. We mainly focus on a multi-class classification task with multimodal data.

#### 3.1 Modality Competition Analysis

Let  $x$  be a data sample and  $y = [K]$  be the corresponding label. Without loss of generality, we consider two input modalities  $x = [x^1, x^2]$ . In MML, we generally use two encoders  $\phi^1, \phi^2$  to extract features of each modality:  $\mathbf{h}^1 = \phi^1(\theta^1, x^1)$  and  $\mathbf{h}^2 = \phi^2(\theta^2, x^2)$ , where  $\theta^1$  and  $\theta^2$  are the parameters of encoders. And then, a fusion module is employed to integrate the information from two modalities and make predictions, i.e.  $\psi(\mathbf{h}^1, \mathbf{h}^2)$ , where  $\psi$  denotes the fusion and prediction function. The overall function of multimodal model can be written as  $f(x) = \psi(\phi^1(x^1), \phi^2(x^2))$ . Therefore, the cross-entropy loss for multimodal classification is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{CE}(x) = -\log \frac{\exp(f(x)_y)}{\sum_{k=1}^K \exp(f(x)_k)} \quad (1)$$

This is a uniform learning objective for both modalities. MML is expected to exploit the complementary information of all modalities to outperform unimodal learning, but the modality competition phenomenon limits the performance improvement of MML since the dominant modality will inhibit the learning process of other modalities. As demonstrated in Table 1, the unimodal performance from the traditional multimodal joint training severely underperforms the results from corresponding unimodal training.

Although several methods [22, 27, 30] have been proposed to alleviate the modality competition, we find that the culprit behind, a uniform learning objective for both modalities, has not been resolved. According to the loss function Eq. 1, we can obtain the gradient of the softmax logits output with ground-truth label  $y$ :

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{CE}}{\partial f(x)_y} = \frac{\exp(f(x)_y)}{\sum_{k=1}^K \exp(f(x)_k)} - 1 \quad (2)$$

which is the gap between the predictive probability on ground truth with the value 1. If one modality performs better (i.e., the needed gradient strength should be low) and dominates the fusion feature, the strength of generated gradient with the uniform learning objective could be weak, which cannot satisfy the requirement

of greater gradient strength for the weak modality, as illustrated in Figure 2. Therefore, *removing the uniform learning objective for encoder training* is the key to eliminating modality competition.

Intuitively, we can perform the detached unimodal learning for each encoder independently and then fuse their outputs (features or logits). As shown in Table 1, we fix the pretrained unimodal learned networks and fuse their information in two ways: (1) MM Clf, train a multimodal linear classifier with the output features; (2) Preds Avg, average the prediction of each modality. It is clear that they can achieve impressive improvement compared with joint training despite the restricted cross-modal interactions, indicating the necessity to eliminate competition in MML. However, there still remain some challenges. Firstly, due to the heterogeneity between modalities, independent unimodal training may lead to disparate latent feature spaces. The correlations between modalities are ignored, making it difficult to fuse information effectively. For example, MM Clf on CREMA-D and UCF101 is worse than Preds Avg since the heterogeneous feature spaces hinder the feature fusion. Secondly, according to [6], the cross-modal interactions in joint training can help to explore the complementary information that is hard to be learned with unimodal training. Independent encoder training blocks cross-modal interactions, thus, limiting the use of multimodal complementary knowledge. Here we apply naive cross-modal logit distillation in independently unimodal training, namely CM Dist, to achieve inter-modal knowledge transfer, enabling the multimodal interactions via prediction with multimodal data as in joint training. It can be seen that CM Dist is better than MM Clf and Preds Avg on CREMA-D and UCF101, showing the potential of cross-modal knowledge transfer for multimodal interactions. Nonetheless, the naive distillation does not consider the heterogeneity between the modalities so it does not work well always (perform worse on AVE), which motivates us to design more delicate cross-modal interactive behavior.

We then present our method in next subsection, which not only solves all of the above challenges but achieves consistent improvement for various datasets on both multi- and uni-modal accuracy.

#### 3.2 Detached and Interactive MML


According to the above discussion, we separately train each modality's encoder to avoid modality competition. Meanwhile, we enable cross-modal interactions during the encoder training and fusion process, as well as inference, to exploit the complementary information between different modalities. The details are given below and the overall framework is shown in Figure 3.

**Detached unimodal training.** The network of each modality is updated only according to its own data and learning objectives, and there is no fusion during the update of encoders. Encoders  $\phi^1, \phi^2$  are equipped with corresponding classifiers  $\psi^1$  and  $\psi^2$ . Therefore, the logit output of modality  $i$  is  $z^i = f^i(x^i) = \psi^i(\phi^i(x^i))$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . The classification loss  $\mathcal{L}_{CE}^i(x^i)$  of each modality is independent with each other, exploiting informative knowledge for classification.

**Interaction during encoder training.** To address the disparate feature spaces, we use a shared linear classifier (S-Clf) for different modalities to regulate the consistent feature space. Given the extracted features  $\mathbf{h}^i$ , the logit output through the shared classifier is  $\mathbf{sz}^i = W\mathbf{h}^i + b$ , where  $W = [W_1, \dots, W_K] \in \mathbf{R}^{d \times K}$ ,  $b \in \mathbf{R}^d$  are the parameters of S-Clf and  $d$  is the feature dimension. According

**Table 1: The modality competition analysis on CREMA-D, AVE and UCF101. The metric is the top-1 accuracy (%). ‘Audio’, ‘Visual’, ‘Flow’ and ‘Image’ denote the corresponding uni-modal performance in each dataset. ‘Multi’ is the multimodal performance. ‘Uni1’ and ‘Uni2’ mean unimodal training based on audio and visual data respectively for CREMA-D and AVE, while flow and image respectively for UCF101.**

Dataset	CREMA-D [2]			AVE [28]			UCF101 [26]		
	Audio	Visual	Multi	Audio	Visual	Multi	Flow	Image	Multi
Uni1	65.59	-	-	<b>66.42</b>	-	-	55.09	-	-
Uni2	-	78.49	-	-	46.02	-	-	42.96	-
Joint training	61.96	38.58	70.83	63.93	24.63	69.65	33.78	37.54	51.92
MM Clf	65.59	78.49	78.09	66.42	46.02	72.39	55.09	42.96	60.67
Preds Avg	65.59	78.49	82.66	66.42	46.02	69.40	55.09	42.96	64.43
CM Dist	63.17	77.28	82.93	62.94	41.79	67.41	54.30	42.93	64.45
Ours	<b>66.67</b>	<b>78.90</b>	<b>83.74</b>	64.18	<b>49.25</b>	<b>75.37</b>	<b>58.52</b>	<b>48.59</b>	<b>65.79</b>



**Figure 3: Overall framework of DI-MML. The encoders of each modality are trained with isolated learning objectives. The connections and interactions between modalities during encoder training are enabled by shared classifier and DUC loss.**

to [20, 25], the paired features  $h^1, h^2$  with label  $y$  are optimized to maximize the similarity between them with the  $y$ -th vector  $W_y$ , and hence, S-Clf forces two modalities to locate at the same feature space using  $W_y$  as the anchor. The corresponding loss for each modality is denoted as  $\mathcal{L}_{CE}^{Si}(x^i)$ .

Then, we need to enable the cross-modal interaction to exploit the complementary information. According to the analysis in Section 3.1, cross-modal knowledge transfer is a promising way for interactions. Considering the gap between modalities [36], we intend to transfer the modality-level complementarities for efficient knowledge transfer and importantly do not interfere with the learning of unimodal knowledge. To achieve this, we propose a novel Dimension-decoupled Unidirectional Contrastive (DUC) loss. Due to factors such as over-parameterization and implicit regularization [1, 43], deep networks tend to learn low-rank and redundant features, which motivates us to **compensate the ineffective information present in features with the effective cross-modal complementary information**.

First, we need to perform dimension separation to specify the effective and ineffective dimensions for each modality. We define the effective dimensions as dimensions with better discriminative

knowledge. Therefore, we devise the dimension-wise prediction to evaluate the discrimination for each modality. With all the features from modality  $i$ , we can obtain the feature centroid of each class as:

$$\bar{h}_k^i = \frac{1}{N_k} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{I}\{y_j = k\} h_j^i, \quad \bar{h}_k^i = [\bar{h}_{k,1}^i, \bar{h}_{k,2}^i, \dots, \bar{h}_{k,d}^i]^T \quad (3)$$

where  $N$  is the number of all samples and  $N_k$  is the number of samples belong to  $k$ -th class. And then, we can make dimension-wise evaluation by comparing the distance for each dimension with its dimensional centroid:

$$r_m^i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{I}\left\{\arg \min_k \left(h_{j,m}^i, \bar{h}_{k,m}^i\right) = y_j\right\}, m \in [d] \quad (4)$$

$d(\cdot, \cdot)$  is the distance function (Euclidean distance here).  $r_m^i$  can be used to assess the effectiveness of dimension  $m$  of modality  $i$ . Larger value indicates higher effectiveness on classification. Hence, the dimension separation principle is that the effective dimensions are represented with dimensions whose dimension-wise evaluation is greater than the mean value:

$$\begin{cases} r_m^i > \bar{r}^i & m \text{ is effective} \\ r_m^i < \bar{r}^i & m \text{ is ineffective} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$




Figure 4: During inference, the logit weighting is utilized on instance level.

where  $\bar{r}^i = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{m=1}^d r_m^i$ . Through this way, the feature dimensions of each modality are divided into effective group  $d_e^i = \{m | r_m^i > \bar{r}^i\}$  and ineffective group  $d_{ne}^i = \{m | r_m^i < \bar{r}^i\}$ . The dimension separation is operated after some warm-up epochs, see details in Algorithm 1 in Appendix.

Due to the heterogeneity between modalities, they do not shared all the effective dimensions. Hence, we then propose to transfer the effective information in modality 1 to the corresponding ineffective dimensions in modality 2 and vice versa, as shown in Figure 3. The knowledge transfer is performed by our proposed DUC loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{DUC}^1 = \mathbb{E}_{(x_1^1, x_2^2)} \left[ -\log \frac{\exp(-d(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^1, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^2)/T)}{\sum_j \exp(-d(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^1, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}_j^2)/T)} \right] \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{DUC}^2 = \mathbb{E}_{(x_1^1, x_2^2)} \left[ -\log \frac{\exp(-d(\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i^1, \hat{\mathbf{h}}_i^2)/T)}{\sum_j \exp(-d(\hat{\mathbf{h}}_j^1, \hat{\mathbf{h}}_i^2)/T)} \right]$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^1 = [h_{i,m}^1 | m \in d_{ne}^1 \cap d_e^2]$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^2 = [h_{i,m}^2 | m \in d_{ne}^1 \cap d_e^2]$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i^1 = [h_{i,m}^1 | m \in d_e^1 \cap d_{ne}^2]$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i^2 = [h_{i,m}^2 | m \in d_e^1 \cap d_{ne}^2]$ .  $T$  is the temperature. Notably, **the features of  $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_i^2$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_i^1$  do not pass gradient backward**, which means we only allow the ineffective dimensions of modality 1 (2) to learn toward the corresponding effective dimensions of modality 2 (1), and do not update the effective dimensions of modality 2 (1) with DUC to prevent damage on the unimodal learning process. Hence, we let the complementary knowledge between modalities transfer unidirectionally and use the integrated knowledge for prediction to enable cross-modal interaction.

The final loss for modality  $i$  can be calculated as:

$$\mathcal{L}^i = \mathcal{L}_{CE}^i + \lambda_s \mathcal{L}_{CE}^{Si} + \lambda_D \mathcal{L}_{DUC}^i \quad (7)$$

**Interaction during co-prediction.** The above training process does not directly utilize the multimodal data for completing tasks, therefore, in this stage we enable the interaction during the co-prediction process via training a fusion module with multimodal objective Eq. 1 while fixing the learned encoders.

### 3.3 Instance-level Weighting

In the training stage, we exploit the modality-level complementary information through DUC loss. However, the complementary capacities of the different modalities may also vary in different sample




Figure 5: Traditional contrastive loss is hard, aligning all the dimensions bidirectionally. Our DUC loss is soft, performing on part of dimensions and only transferring complementarities. Blue and green colors denote effective dimensions and white means ineffective dimension. Red color represents alignment between corresponding dimensions.

pairs [31]. Therefore, we propose a certainty-aware logit weighting strategy during inference to utilize the instance-level complementarities comprehensively, as demonstrated in Figure 4. We use the absolute certainty to evaluate the  $j$ -th instance reliability for each modality and their fusion:

$$c_j^i = \max_k \text{softmax}(z_j^i)_k, \quad i \in \{1, 2, f\}, \quad k \in [K]. \quad (8)$$

superscript  $f$  denotes the output of fusion module. Then, the final output is:

$$Z_j = w_j^1 z_j^1 + w_j^f z_j^f + w_j^2 z_j^2$$

$$w_j^i = \frac{\exp(c_j^i/T)}{\exp(c_j^1/T) + \exp(c_j^f/T) + \exp(c_j^2/T)} \quad (9)$$

where more reliable modalities are assigned with higher weights.

### 3.4 Comparison with MCRL Loss

Previous multimodal contrastive loss [24] pays attention to searching for the semantic alignment between modalities, hence, the learning strength is bidirectional on the whole dimensions, i.e. the positive samples of two modalities move toward each other. Nevertheless, the alignment objective is too ‘hard’ that may lead to information loss, since there may be noise in part of the dimensions for specific modalities and complete alignment would partially preserve the noise, as illustrated in Figure 5. In contrast, our DUC loss is not intended to perform semantic alignment, but rather cross-modal transfer of complementary knowledge. Therefore, we decouple the feature dimensions and perform a unidirectional cross-modal knowledge transfer to enhance the dimensions with less informative knowledge while retaining effective information unique to the current modality. It can be seen that our DUC is more ‘soft’, and the dimensions in  $d_e^1 \cap d_e^2$  are not required to align with each other, preserving the specific characteristics of each modality.

**Table 2: Comparative analysis of different methods on CREMA-D, AVE, UCF101 and ModelNet40. The metric is the top-1 accuracy (%). ‘Audio’, ‘Visual’, ‘Flow’, ‘Image’, ‘Front’ and ‘Rear’ denote the corresponding uni-modal performance in each dataset. ‘Multi’ is the multimodal performance. ‘Uni1’ and ‘Uni2’ mean unimodal training based on audio and visual data respectively for CREMA-D and AVE, while flow and image for UCF101, front-view and rear-view for ModelNet40. The best is in bold, and the second best is underlined.**

Dataset	CREMA-D [2]			AVE [28]			UCF101 [26]			ModelNet40		
	Audio	Visual	Multi	Audio	Visual	Multi	Flow	Image	Multi	Front	Rear	Multi
Uni1	<u>65.59</u>	-	-	<b>66.42</b>	-	-	55.09	-	-	<u>89.63</u>	-	-
Uni2	-	<u>78.49</u>	-	-	<u>46.02</u>	-	-	42.96	-	-	<u>88.70</u>	-
Joint training	61.96	38.58	70.83	63.93	24.63	69.65	33.78	37.54	51.92	85.98	81.81	89.63
MSES [9]	62.50	37.90	70.43	63.93	24.63	69.65	33.99	37.19	51.76	85.98	81.81	89.63
MSLR [41]	63.04	41.13	71.51	61.19	24.63	68.91	33.44	37.77	52.60	86.22	82.17	89.59
OGM-GE [22]	61.29	39.27	71.14	62.45	27.39	69.12	40.73	33.44	53.56	86.35	82.09	89.30
PMR [8]	63.04	71.24	75.54	63.18	35.57	70.89	45.86	39.49	51.73	87.28	86.02	90.19
UMT [6]	65.46	75.94	77.42	<u>65.42</u>	42.29	<u>73.88</u>	<u>55.41</u>	<u>45.15</u>	61.51	88.33	87.76	90.80
MM Clf	65.59	78.49	78.09	66.42	46.02	72.39	55.09	42.96	60.67	89.63	88.70	90.19
Preds Avg	65.59	78.49	<u>82.66</u>	66.42	46.02	69.40	55.09	42.96	<u>64.43</u>	89.63	88.70	<u>90.92</u>
Ours	<b>66.67</b>	<b>78.90</b>	<b>83.74</b>	64.18	<b>49.25</b>	<b>75.37</b>	<b>58.52</b>	<b>48.59</b>	<b>65.79</b>	<b>89.83</b>	<b>88.74</b>	<b>90.92</b>

## 4 EXPERIMENTS

### 4.1 Dataset

We use four multimodal datasets, *i.e.*, CREMA-D [2], AVE [28], UCF101 [26], and ModelNet40. CREMA-D is an audio-visual dataset for emotion recognition, consisting of 7442 segments, randomly divided into 6698 samples for training and 744 samples for testing. AVE is an audio-visual video dataset designed for event localization, encompassing 4,143 10-second videos. We extract frames from event-localized video segments and capture audio clips within the same segment, constructing a labeled multimodal classification dataset as in [8]. UCF101 is a dataset for action recognition. We treat the optical flow and images as two modalities. The dataset consists of 13,320 videos, with 9,537 for training and 3,783 for testing. ModelNet40 is one of the Princeton ModelNet datasets [34] with 3D objects of 40 categories, consisting of 9,843 training samples and 2,468 testing samples. Following [33], we treat the front and rear views as two modalities. The details about these datasets are in Appendix

### 4.2 Experimental Settings

For the four datasets, we used ResNet18 [13] as the backbone encoder network, mapping input data into 512-dimensional vectors. For the input data of CREMA-D and AVE, audio modality data was transformed into spectrograms of size  $257 \times 1,004$ , and visual modality data consisted of 3(4 frames for AVE) randomly selected frames from 10-frame video clips, with image size of  $224 \times 224$ . For UCF101, we randomly sampled contiguous 10-frame segments from videos during training, while testing, we sampled 10-frame segments from the middle of the videos. Optical flow modality data was of size  $20 \times 224 \times 224$ , and visual modality data consisted of randomly sampled 1 frame. For ModelNet40, we utilized front and back views as two modalities. For all visual modalities, we applied random cropping and random horizontal flipping as data augmentation during training; we resized images to  $224 \times 224$  without any augmentation during testing. We trained all models with a batch size of 16, using SGD optimizer with momentum of 0.9 and weight decay of  $1e-4$ , for

**Table 3: The ablation study on CREMA-D and AVE.**

TS	S-Clf	DUC	LW	CREMA-D			AVE		
				Audio	Visual	Multi	Audio	Visual	Multi
				61.96	38.58	70.83	63.93	24.63	69.65
✓				65.59	78.49	78.09	<b>66.42</b>	46.02	72.39
✓	✓			66.26	79.70	79.70	64.43	44.78	72.14
✓	✓	✓		66.67	78.90	82.80	64.18	49.25	72.89
✓	✓	✓	✓	<b>66.67</b>	<b>78.90</b>	<b>83.74</b>	64.18	<b>49.25</b>	<b>75.37</b>

a total of 150 epochs, with initial learning rate of  $1e-3$  decaying to  $1e-4$  after 70 epochs. For the training of fusion module, we trained for 20 epochs, with initial learning rate of  $1e-3$  decaying to  $1e-4$  after 10 epochs. All experiments were conducted on an NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090 GPU and a 3.9-GHz Intel Core i9-12900K CPU.

### 4.3 The Effectiveness of DI-MML

**Comparison with other baselines.** The compared methods are divided into two groups: with and without the uniform objective for encoder training. Only MM Clf, Preds Avg and our DI-MML do not utilize the uniform objective. The results are shown in Table 2, we not only report the multimodal performance and also the unimodal accuracy. To ensure the fairness of the comparison, we fix the parameters of their unimodal encoder networks after training, and evaluate their unimodal performance by training a classifier independently. It can be that the methods with the uniform objective (joint training, MSES, MSLR, OGM-GE, PMR and UMT) are all suffered from severe modality competition as their unimodal performance is generally lower than the best unimodal training counterpart, especially on Visual in CREMA-D and AVE, Flow in UCF101 and Rear in ModelNet40. MSES, MSLR, OGM-GE and PMR regulate the learning progress of modalities by adjusting the learning rates or gradients of different modalities, which alleviates modality competition to some extent, but they are difficult






Figure 6: The t-SNE feature visualization of each modality on CREMA-D. Different colors denote different classes.

Table 4: The performance comparison with various contrastive losses. ‘A’ and ‘V’ denote Audio and Visual.

Dataset	CREMA-D			AVE		
	A	V	Multi	A	V	Multi
w/o DUC	66.26	79.70	82.47	<b>64.43</b>	44.78	73.13
Our-C	65.73	79.17	81.72	63.18	46.77	71.39
Our-DBC	65.99	<b>79.84</b>	82.12	63.18	<b>49.50</b>	73.13
Ours	<b>66.67</b>	78.90	<b>83.74</b>	64.18	49.25	<b>75.37</b>

to completely eradicate it. UMT maintains the unimodal performance better, but it requires pretrained unimodal models for distillation, which is expensive and impractical. In contrast, our method completely avoid the modality competition, resulting in comparable or even the best unimodal performance (improved by up to 3.11% and 3.44% on Flow and Image of UCF101) and the best multimodal performance (improved by up to 6.32% on CREMA-D) on all four datasets. Besides, we do not require additional computational cost for encoder training. Compared with MM Clf and Preds Avg, our DI-MML enables cross-modal interactions and complementary knowledge transfer during the encoder training. Therefore, our method can achieve both better multimodal and unimodal performance on these datasets. These results show that our approach is indeed competition-free, which is the key difference compared with previous methods. It also suggests that the proposed cross-modal interactions via knowledge transfer are effective.

**Ablation study.** There are four main components in our method: two-stage training scheme (TS, i.e. encoders and fusion module are trained separately), shared classifier (S-Clf), dimension-decoupled unidirectional contrastive loss (DUC), and logit weighting (LW). Here, we perform an ablation study to explore the influence of various combinations of these components. As demonstrated in Table 3, applying TS denotes the MM Clf method, which is better than Joint training because there is no modality competition. The shared classifier can align a feature space for different modalities and achieve considerable improvement on CREMA-D. The DUC loss facilitates cross-modal interaction and knowledge transfer, helping to achieve complementary knowledge utilisation at the modality level. Similarly, LW enables complementary knowledge integration at the instance level, both of them are important for

Table 5: The number of effective dimensions for each modality on three datasets. ‘Overlap’ denotes  $|d_e^1 \cap d_e^2|$ . The results are obtained from the model after warmup epochs.


	CREMA-D	AVE	UCF101
Audio/Flow eff	259	258	246
Visual/Image eff	262	291	249
Overlap	156	142	138

multimodal performance enhancement. As discussed above, the four components are all essential in our method.

**Analysis on DUC loss.** The DUC loss is the central technique in our method to enhance the cross-modal interaction during the encoder training stage. In Section 3.4, we compare the differences between DUC and traditional multimodal contrastive loss in terms of aim and formality. Here, we give more experimental results to show the superiority of our method. The results are shown in Table 4, where ‘-C’ denotes replacing our DUC loss with traditional contrastive loss while ‘-DBC’ means dimension-decoupled bidirectional contrastive loss, i.e.,  $\tilde{h}_i^2$  and  $\hat{h}_i^1$  can pass gradients backward in Eq. 6, suggesting that  $\tilde{h}_i^1$  and  $\tilde{h}_i^2$  ( $\hat{h}_i^1$  and  $\hat{h}_i^2$ ) move toward each other as traditional contrastive loss. It is clear that ‘-C’ performs worst as it does not consider retaining the modality-wise complementary information. Applying DBC achieves improvement since it does not affect the learning of effective dimensions shared by modalities (i.e.,  $d_e^1 \cap d_e^2$ ). However, the noise information in the ineffective dimensions is preserved as illustrated in Figure 5. Our DUC loss both preserves the unimodal knowledge and facilitates inter-modal cooperation through complementary knowledge transfer, resulting in the best multimodal results. In Figure 6, we demonstrate the t-SNE [29] feature visualization for each modality on CREMA-D. Figure 6a showcases that there are no clear decision boundaries for visual features for joint training, consistent with its poor performance. As shown in Figure 6b, although applying contrastive loss in our method compensates for the gap between different modalities in feature space, the noise in visual modality is also preserved and transferred to audio modality to some extent, leading to worse multimodal performance. With the optimization of our DUC loss as shown in Figure 6c, the features of both modalities are more clearly clustered, besides, share a more similar distributional structure.

**Table 6: The performance of effective and ineffective dimensions of each modality.**

Dataset	CREMA-D			AVE		
	all	eff	ineff	all	eff	ineff
Audio	58.60	54.71	31.59	59.70	50.25	43.03
Visual	46.37	31.99	23.79	25.12	21.64	18.91

**Figure 7: Comparison with different values of  $\lambda_s$  and  $\lambda_D$  on CREMA-D. Our method is robust to two hyperparameters.**

**Analysis on dimension separation.** In this paper, we perform the dimension separation to divide dimensions into effective and ineffective parts. The separation results are displayed in Table 5. The effective dimensions for both modalities take up about half or more (feature is a 512-dimensional vector), and their overlap also accounts for only about half of effective dimensions, indicating that there are enough dimensions to ensure cross-modal knowledge transfer. The performance of corresponding dimension sets of effectiveness and ineffectiveness is shown in Table 6. When we evaluate the performance of effective dimension set, the values of ineffective dimensions are set to 0 and vice versa, removing its influence on the output prediction. The performance of effective dimensions is much better than that of ineffective dimensions, indicating that our dimension separation scheme is reasonable and effective.


#### 4.4 Robustness Validation

**Effective dimension evaluation.** In this paper, we devise the dimension-wise prediction as in Eq. 4 to evaluate the effectiveness of each dimension. Here, we compare our dimension-wise prediction with two other evaluation metrics: L2-norm and Shapley Value. According to [23], the L2-norm of the features gives an indication of their information content, thus it can be used as a metric to measure the effectiveness of each dimension. And shapley value can also be used to identify important features (dimensions here) by removing specific content for prediction. As depicted in Table 7, our proposed framework has significant enhancements with any evaluation method, showing the robustness of our DI-MML framework. Besides, among the three methods, our dimension-wise prediction performs the best on different datasets, indicating its validity for evaluating the dimensionally discriminative information.

**Hyperparameter sensitivity.** In the calibration of our DI-MML, we encounter two hyperparameters to determine:  $\lambda_s$  and  $\lambda_D$  in Eq. 7, determining the strength for feature space alignment and cross-modal knowledge transfer respectively. Here, we explore the effects

**Table 7: The performance of different methods for evaluating the effectiveness of each dimension.**

Dataset	CREMA-D	AVE
Method	Multi	Multi
Joint training	70.83	69.65
L2-norm	83.60	73.17
Shapley value	81.58	75.37
Dimension-wise prediction	<b>83.74</b>	<b>75.37</b>

**Figure 8: Comparison results with different batch sizes. Our method consistently outperforms joint training.**

of them by varying their values as illustrated in Figure 7. It is clear that the performance on DI-MML is marginally affected by  $\lambda_s$  and  $\lambda_D$ , suggesting the insensitivity of our method to hyperparameters. Despite some fluctuations in performance with hyperparameters, our method still demonstrates excellent effectiveness, i.e., being consistently better than joint training. In this paper, we select  $\lambda_s = 1$  and  $\lambda_D = 1$  for the best accuracy according to the obtained results.

**Robustness on Batch size.** To analyze the effect of batch size of our method, we demonstrate the results with different batch sizes on CREMA-D and AVE, varying from 8 to 64. It can be seen that small batch size could lead to better performance on both joint training and DI-MML, and our method consistently outperforms joint training on all the batch sizes, indicating the robustness of our DI-MML with respect to batch size. In this paper, we set batch size to 8 to get the best results for the four datasets.

## 5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we analyze the multimodal joint training and argue that the modality competition problem comes from the uniform learning objective for different modalities. Therefore, we propose to train multimodal encoders separately to avoid modality competition. To facilitate the feature space alignment and cross-modal interaction, we devise a shared classifier and the dimension-decoupled unidirectional contrastive loss (DUC) to achieve modality-level complementarities utilization. And then, the learned encoders are frozen and a fusion module is updated for interaction during co-prediction. Considering the reliability differences on various sample pairs, we further propose the certainty-aware logit weighting strategy to exploit instance-level complementarities comprehensively. Through extensive experiments, our DI-MML outperforms all competing methods in four datasets. We also showcase that our method can further promote the unimodal performance instead of inhibiting



them. In the future, we can investigate other types of cross-modal interactions and focus on multimodal tasks such as detection or generation instead of only classification. Besides, identifying the specific semantics in each dimension may be helpful to further evaluate the informative dimensions.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Sanjeev Arora, Nadav Cohen, Wei Hu, and Yuping Luo. 2019. Implicit regularization in deep matrix factorization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32 (2019).
- [2] Houwei Cao, David G Cooper, Michael K Keutmann, Ruben C Gur, Ani Nenkova, and Ragini Verma. 2014. Crema-d: Crowd-sourced emotional multimodal actors dataset. *IEEE transactions on affective computing* 5, 4 (2014), 377–390.
- [3] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. 2020. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1597–1607.
- [4] Junyoung Chung, Caglar Gulcehre, KyungHyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. Empirical evaluation of gated recurrent neural networks on sequence modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.3555* (2014).
- [5] Chenzhuang Du, Tingle Li, Yichen Liu, Zixin Wen, Tianyu Hua, Yue Wang, and Hang Zhao. 2021. Improving multi-modal learning with uni-modal teachers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.11059* (2021).
- [6] Chenzhuang Du, Jiaye Teng, Tingle Li, Yichen Liu, Tianyuan Yuan, Yue Wang, Yang Yuan, and Hang Zhao. 2023. On uni-modal feature learning in supervised multi-modal learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 8632–8656.
- [7] Benjamin Elizalde, Soham Deshmukh, Mahmoud Al Ismail, and Huaming Wang. 2023. Clap learning audio concepts from natural language supervision. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [8] Yunfeng Fan, Wenchao Xu, Haozhao Wang, Junxiao Wang, and Song Guo. 2023. PMR: Prototypical Modal Rebalance for Multimodal Learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 20029–20038.
- [9] Naotsuna Fujimori, Rei Endo, Yoshihiko Kawai, and Takahiro Mochizuki. 2020. Modality-specific learning rate control for multimodal classification. In *Pattern Recognition: 5th Asian Conference, ACPR 2019, Auckland, New Zealand, November 26–29, 2019, Revised Selected Papers, Part II 5*. Springer, 412–422.
- [10] Zhe Gan, Linjie Li, Chunyuan Li, Lijuan Wang, Zicheng Liu, Jianfeng Gao, et al. 2022. Vision-language pre-training: Basics, recent advances, and future trends. *Foundations and Trends® in Computer Graphics and Vision* 14, 3–4 (2022), 163–352.
- [11] Yuan Gong, Andrew Rouditchenko, Alexander H Liu, David Harwath, Leonid Karlinsky, Hilde Kuehne, and James Glass. 2022. Contrastive audio-visual masked autoencoder. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07839* (2022).
- [12] Kaiming He, Haoqi Fan, Yuxin Wu, Saining Xie, and Ross Girshick. 2020. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 9729–9738.
- [13] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 770–778.
- [14] Yu Huang, Chenzhuang Du, Zihui Xue, Xuanyao Chen, Hang Zhao, and Longbo Huang. 2021. What makes multi-modal learning better than single (provably). *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 10944–10956.
- [15] Yu Huang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, Hongxia Yang, and Longbo Huang. 2022. Modality competition: What makes joint training of multi-modal network fail in deep learning?(provably). In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 9226–9259.
- [16] Li Jing, Pascal Vincent, Yann LeCun, and Yuandong Tian. 2021. Understanding dimensional collapse in contrastive self-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.09348* (2021).
- [17] Ramandeep Kaur and Sandeep Kautish. 2022. Multimodal sentiment analysis: A survey and comparison. *Research anthology on implementing sentiment analysis across multiple disciplines* (2022), 1846–1870.
- [18] Daehee Kim, Youngjun Yoo, Seunghyun Park, Jinkyu Kim, and Jaekoo Lee. 2021. Selfreg: Self-supervised contrastive regularization for domain generalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 9619–9628.
- [19] Junnan Li, Ramprasaath Selvaraju, Akhilesh Gotmare, Shafiq Joty, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Chu Hong Hoi. 2021. Align before fuse: Vision and language representation learning with momentum distillation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021), 9694–9705.
- [20] Zhiqiu Lin, Samuel Yu, Zhiyi Kuang, Deepak Pathak, and Deva Ramanan. 2023. Multimodality helps unimodality: Cross-modal few-shot learning with multimodal models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 19325–19337.
- [21] Chen Liu, Yanwei Fu, Chengming Xu, Siqian Yang, Jilin Li, Chengjie Wang, and Li Zhang. 2021. Learning a few-shot embedding model with contrastive learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 35. 8635–8643.
- [22] Xiaokang Peng, Yake Wei, Andong Deng, Dong Wang, and Di Hu. 2022. Balanced Multimodal Learning via On-the-fly Gradient Modulation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 8238–8247.
- [23] Mirco Planamente, Chiara Plizzari, Emanuele Alberti, and Barbara Caputo. 2022. Domain generalization through audio-visual relative norm alignment in first person action recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*. 1807–1818.
- [24] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 8748–8763.
- [25] Jake Snell, Kevin Swersky, and Richard Zemel. 2017. Prototypical networks for few-shot learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [26] Khurram Soomro, Amir Roshan Zamir, and Mubarak Shah. 2012. UCF101: A dataset of 101 human actions classes from videos in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.0402* (2012).
- [27] Ya Sun, Sijie Mai, and Haifeng Hu. 2021. Learning to balance the learning rates between various modalities via adaptive tracking factor. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 28 (2021), 1650–1654.
- [28] Yapeng Tian, Jing Shi, Bochen Li, Zhiyao Duan, and Chenliang Xu. 2018. Audio-visual event localization in unconstrained videos. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*. 247–263.
- [29] Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. 2008. Visualizing data using t-SNE. *Journal of machine learning research* 9, 11 (2008).
- [30] Weiyao Wang, Du Tran, and Matt Feiszli. 2020. What makes training multimodal classification networks hard?. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 12695–12705.
- [31] Yuyang Wanyan, Xiaoshan Yang, Chaofan Chen, and Changsheng Xu. 2023. Active exploration of multimodal complementarity for few-shot action recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 6492–6502.
- [32] Thomas Winterbottom, Sarah Xiao, Alistair McLean, and Noura Al Moubayed. 2020. On modality bias in the TVQA dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.10210* (2020).
- [33] Nan Wu, Stanislaw Jastrzebski, Kyunghyun Cho, and Krzysztof J Geras. 2022. Characterizing and overcoming the greedy nature of learning in multi-modal deep neural networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 24043–24055.
- [34] Zhirong Wu, Shuran Song, Aditya Khosla, Fisher Yu, Linguang Zhang, Xiaoou Tang, and Jianxiong Xiao. 2015. 3d shapenets: A deep representation for volumetric shapes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 1912–1920.
- [35] Yi Xiao, Felipe Codevilla, Akhil Gurram, Onay Urfalioglu, and Antonio M López. 2020. Multimodal end-to-end autonomous driving. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 23, 1 (2020), 537–547.
- [36] Zihui Xue, Zhengqi Gao, Sucheng Ren, and Hang Zhao. 2022. The Modality Focusing Hypothesis: Towards Understanding Crossmodal Knowledge Distillation. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [37] Jianwei Yang, Chunyuan Li, Pengchuan Zhang, Bin Xiao, Ce Liu, Lu Yuan, and Jianfeng Gao. 2022. Unified contrastive learning in image-text-label space. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 19163–19173.
- [38] Zhanyuan Yang, Jinghua Wang, and Yingying Zhu. 2022. Few-shot classification with contrastive learning. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 293–309.
- [39] Lewei Yao, Runhui Huang, Lu Hou, Guansong Lu, Minzhe Niu, Hang Xu, Xiaodan Liang, Zhenguo Li, Xin Jiang, and Chunjing Xu. 2021. Filip: Fine-grained interactive language-image pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.07783* (2021).
- [40] Xufeng Yao, Yang Bai, Xinyun Zhang, Yuechen Zhang, Qi Sun, Ran Chen, Ruiyu Li, and Bei Yu. 2022. Pcl: Proxy-based contrastive learning for domain generalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 7097–7107.
- [41] Yiqun Yao and Rada Mihalcea. 2022. Modality-specific learning rates for effective multimodal additive late-fusion. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*. 1824–1834.
- [42] Amir Zadeh, Rowan Zellers, Eli Pincus, and Louis-Philippe Morency. 2016. Mosi: multimodal corpus of sentiment intensity and subjectivity analysis in online opinion videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.06259* (2016).
- [43] Qiulin Zhang, Zhuqing Jiang, Qishuo Lu, Zhengxin Zeng, Shang-Hua Gao, and Aidong Men. 2021. Split to be slim: an overlooked redundancy in vanilla convolution. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth International Conference on International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence*. 3195–3201.
- [44] Yuwei Zhou, Xin Wang, Hong Chen, Xuguang Duan, and Wenwu Zhu. 2023. Intra-and Inter-Modal Curriculum for Multimodal Learning. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. 3724–3735.

- [45] Jiaqi Zhu, Shaofeng Cai, Fang Deng, and Junran Wu. 2024. Do llms understand visual anomalies? uncovering llm capabilities in zero-shot anomaly detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.09654* (2024).

## A DATASETS

CREMA-D is an audio-visual dataset for researching emotion recognition, comprising facial and vocal emotional expressions. Emotions are categorized into 6 types: happy, sad, angry, fear, disgust, and neutral. The dataset consists of 7442 segments, randomly divided into 6698 samples for training and 744 samples for testing. AVE is an audio-visual video dataset designed for audio-visual event localization, encompassing 28 event classes and 4,143 10-second videos. It includes both auditory and visual tracks along with secondary annotations. All videos are collected from YouTube. In our experiments, we extract frames from event-localized video segments and capture audio clips within the same segment, constructing a labeled multimodal classification dataset as in [8]. UCF101 is a dataset for action recognition comprising real action videos with 101 action categories, collected from YouTube. We treat the optical flow and images of the videos as two separate modalities. The dataset consists of 13,320 videos, with 9,537 used for training and 3,783 for testing. ModelNet40 is one of the Princeton ModelNet datasets [34] with 3D objects of 40 categories, consisting of 9,843 training samples and 2,468 testing samples. Following [33], we treat the front view and the rear view as two modalities in our experiments. The CMU-Multimodal Opinion Sentiment and Emotion Intensity (CMU-MOSI) [42]: This dataset, developed in English, includes audio, text, and video modalities compiled from 2199 annotated video segments collected from YouTube monologue movie reviews. It offers a focused approach to studying sentiment detection within the context of film critiques

## B BASELINES

In this paper, we compare our method with eight multimodal baselines and we give the description of them below.

**Joint training:** Joint training is the most basic multimodal training framework with concatenation fusion on the extracted features from different modalities and then input into a linear classifier while the network is trained with the cross-entropy loss.

**MSES:** Modality-Specific Early Stop (MSES) [9] restrain the decrease in overall accuracy of the model by detecting the occurrence of overfitting in each modality and individually controlling the learning process. The detected overfitted modality will be stopped first.

**MSLR:** Modality-Specific Learning Rate (MSLR) [41] uses different learning rates for different modalities while training an additive late-fusion model. It contains “Keep”, “Smooth” and “Dynamic” strategies and in this paper we compare with its “Dynamic” strategy because of its better performance.

**OGM-GE:** On-the-fly Gradient Modulation (OGM-GE) [22] dynamically controls the optimization of each modality based on their contribution to the learning objective. By monitoring and adapting the gradients, the method aims to address the imbalance problem without the need for additional neural modules.

**PMR:** Prototypical Modal Rebalance (PMR) [8] focuses on stimulating the slow-learning modality without interference from other modalities. Using prototypes could help to regulate the learning directions and paces of modality-specific gradient.

**UMT:** Unimodal Teacher (UMT) [6] distills the pre-trained unimodal features to the corresponding parts in multi-modal networks

---

### Algorithm 1: The pseudo code of in DI-MML.

---

**Input:** Input data  $\mathcal{D} = \{x_i^1, x_i^2, y_i\}_{i=1,2,\dots,N}$ , initialized encoders  $\phi^1, \phi^2$ , classifiers  $\psi^1, \psi^2$ , and  $\psi^s$ , and fusion module  $\psi^f$ . Hyper-parameters  $\lambda_s, \lambda_D$ , epoch number  $E$ , warmup epoch number  $E_w$ , fusion epoch  $E_f$ .

```

1 int e=0;
2 Encoder training:
3 while  $e < E$  do
4   if  $e = E_m$  then
5     Calculate the dimension-wise prediction using Eq. 4,
6     obtain effective and ineffective dimensions using Eq.
7     5 (can perform only once)
8   end
9   foreach mini-batch data  $B_t$  in  $\mathcal{D}$  at step  $t$  do
10    if  $e < E_m$  then
11      Calculate the loss  $\mathcal{L}^i = \mathcal{L}_{CE}^i + \lambda_s \mathcal{L}_{CE}^{Si}$ 
12    else
13      Calculate the final loss  $\mathcal{L}^i$  with Eq. 7
14    end
15    Update networks  $\phi^1, \phi^2, \psi^1, \psi^2, \psi^s$  for different
16    modalities with  $\mathcal{L}^i$ .
17  end
18   $e=e+1$ ;
19 Fusion module training:
20 while  $e < E_f$  do
21   Freeze  $\phi^1, \phi^2$  and update  $\psi^f$  according to  $\mathcal{L}_{CE}^f$ .
22 end

```

---

in multi-modal training. Uni-modal distillation happens before fusion, so it’s suitable for late-fusion multi-modal architecture. The pre-trained uni-modal features are generated by inputting the data to the pre-trained uni-modal models.

**MM Clf and Preds Avg:** They are as described in Section 3.1.

## C TRAINING SCHEME

The details of training scheme is shown here as well as the pseudo code. The randomly initialized neural networks perform worse and cannot be used to identify the informative dimensions. Therefore, we perform unimodal training independently with unimodal cross-entropy loss for some warmup epochs (10 in our experiments). And then, the shared classifier and DUC loss are applied for the left encoder training epochs. After encoder training, we fix the parameters of encoders and train a linear fusion classifier by concating multimodal features.

## D MORE RESULTS

In the main body of this paper, we report the results on two-modal datasets. Our method can also be extended to three or more modalities. Considering three modalities A, B and C as an example, we get dual-modal pairs AB and AC and BC for DUC loss respectively. There is still only one shared classifier and fusion module for all modalities. Here, we give the experiments on text-image-audio

dataset CMU-MOSI [42]. For CMU-MOSI, we follow [44], build a late-fusion model composed of GRU [4] encoders. Besides, we further compare one new baseline I<sup>2</sup>MCL [44]. Our method still achieves the best, indicating that our method is effective on more modalities.

**Table 8: Results on CMU-MOSI.**

CMU-MOSI	Image	Audio	Text	Multi
Uni-modal	50.91	47.10	75.10	-
Joint	48.33	42.94	73.78	71.80
Grad-Blend	51.17	50.56	74.54	74.49
UMT	52.40	47.79	73.55	73.12
I <sup>2</sup> MCL	52.54	50.15	75.15	74.54
Ours	<b>56.71</b>	<b>58.84</b>	<b>75.76</b>	<b>75.30</b>

To verify that our method can be applied to different model structures, we use ResNet18 and PointNet for image and point cloud data of ModelNet40 for classification. Our method is still effective.

**Table 9: ResNet18 and PointNet for image and point cloud respectively of ModelNet40.**

	Image	Point	Joint training	UMT	MM	Clf	Preds	Avg	Ours
Image	85.88	-	68.23	85.18	85.88	85.88	85.88	<b>86.34</b>	
Point	-	87.93	85.68	87.73	87.93	87.93	87.93	<b>88.42</b>	
Multi	-	-	89.12	89.86	89.42	90.28	90.28	<b>90.88</b>	