

GA²-CLIP: Generic Attribute Anchor for Efficient Prompt Tuning in Video-Language Models

Bin Wang^{1,2} Ruotong Hu^{1,2} Wenqian Wang⁴ Wentong Li³ Mingliang Gao¹

Runmin Cong^{2*} Wei Zhang^{2*}

¹Shandong University of Technology ²Shandong University

³Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics ⁴Singapore University of Technology and Design

dqwangbin@sdut.edu.cn, {rmcong, davidzhang}@sdu.edu.cn

Abstract

Visual and textual soft prompt tuning can effectively improve the adaptability of Vision-Language Models (VLMs) in downstream tasks. However, fine-tuning on video tasks impairs the model’s generalization ability to unseen classes. Existing methods attempt to mitigate this forgetting effect by regularizing the gap between hand-crafted prompts and soft prompts, but this also weakens the learning ability of soft prompts. To address this challenge, we propose a plug-and-play coupling prompt learning framework to optimize the generalization performance of V-L models in video tasks, with the core motivation of mitigating semantic space narrowing during fine-tuning by introducing an externally supervised prompt. Specifically, for textual prompts, we introduce pre-trained prompts from other datasets as hard prompt tokens. These are concatenated with soft prompt tokens and coupled via a learnable mapping layer. This competitive prompting approach prevents the semantic space from overfitting to supervised categories. In addition, we introduce a set of well-designed irrelevant video sets and negative prompts as generic attribute anchors to maintain the generic relevance of the attributes in the pre-trained semantic space, thus preserving the generalization ability. Experiments on video tasks demonstrate that our method significantly outperforms state-of-the-art prompt tuning approaches across generalization benchmarks, particularly on base-to-new class prediction. <https://github.com/BBYL9413/GA2-CLIP>.

1. Introduction

Large-scale Vision-Language Models (VLMs), such as CLIP [37], ALIGN [11], and Florence [58], demonstrate strong generalized representation learning capabilities. This capability is attributed to the large image language training data set, which uses contrast learning to achieve excel-




Figure 1. Comparative analysis of video-text alignment process via learnable prompts. (a) Current video prompt fine-tuning learning methods destroy the original semantic spatial information, causing the model to lose the ability to discriminate between unknown categories. (b) GA²-CLIP mitigates video semantic bias towards known category by introducing generic attribute anchors and generic attribute prompt.

lent zero-shot generalization capabilities in various image tasks. Though some image-based VLM methods such as ATPrompt [23], DCP [19], and ArGue [46] have recently achieved impressive results, however this model is difficult to replicate perfectly in video-related tasks, the computational cost of training a video-language model increases exponentially, and it is difficult to align all the content in a video through language. Therefore, recent researchers are trying to migrate prompt learning to video action recogni-

tion tasks, which achieves good performance with only a few learnable soft prompts[12].

Inspired by image classification tasks [16, 55, 62, 63], current text feature-based video learning methods mainly replace hand-crafted fixed text prompts by combining learnable soft prompts with hard class labeling. Although this approach can be well adapted to the downstream video task, as shown in Fig. 1(a), it can easily over-align the known categories in the video thus losing the ability to generalize to unknown categories. Intuitively, this stems from semantic narrowing within the original textual semantic space during base-class video training. Taking “water” in the figure as an example: while it inherently associates with diverse motions (e.g., fishing, swimming) in the original semantic space, exposure to limited downstream video contexts involving “water” biases its semantic space toward known water-related categories (e.g., sailing). Consequently, “water” becomes a class-specific attribute. In addition, the complex background information of the video may form spurious semantic correlations [46], thus losing the capture of critical motion information.

Building on these observations, we propose an innovative framework, GA²-CLIP, to counter semantic narrowing in the fine-tuning process by introducing external supervision. Specifically, we construct a set of generic attribute anchors disjoint from both base and novel category, as visualized in Fig. 1(b). During model learning, these anchors are aligned with generic attribute prompts through contrastive learning, and integrated into the training objective as a regularization term. Compared to predefined attribute methods [23, 49, 64], it does not require filtering of useful attributes for complex videos and is completely autonomously learned by the model. In addition, we introduce a set of pre-trained hard prompt tokens for supervised semantic learning of soft prompt tokens, with feature coupling via a nonlinear mapping layer. It can effectively prevent the soft prompt token from fully adapting to the label semantics of the base category, which is used as input noise to realize competitive prompt learning.

In summary, this paper focuses on how to guide the semantics of textual features to effectively correlate the key information of the video, to improve the generalization performance of the video task. GA²-CLIP is a plug-and-play technique without additional parameters, which enables the existing models to achieve good video performance enhancement.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose a generic attribute anchor prompting approach for video language fine-tuning to counteract semantic narrowing in downstream tasks.
- We introduce an externally supervised hard prompt coupled with soft prompts via nonlinear mapping layers, enhancing generalization through competitive learning

mechanisms.

- Extensive experiments demonstrate that GA²-CLIP achieves seamless integration with existing video-text learning methods, boosting performance with negligible computational overhead.

2. Related work

Vision Language Models: The integration of language supervision with natural image in Visual-language (V-L) models [11, 28, 59] has emerged as a significant research focus in computer vision. Such models utilize large-scale image-text pairs for contrastive learning to construct joint feature representation spaces across modalities, with the core advantage of encoding rich semantic information and supporting zero-shot [49] and few-shot [43, 61] knowledge transfer. These methods enable the learning of fine-grained visual concepts through self-supervised training and show excellent generalization capabilities in downstream tasks in the image domain (e.g., semantic segmentation [40], target detection [7], point cloud classification [56]) and video tasks (video classification, retrieval). However, V-L models in the video domain still face challenges due to issues such as insufficient data size. In this work, we present a new framework utilizing prompt fine-tuning that can cost-effectively migrate visual and language models to video tasks.

Video Action Recognition: Video action recognition has undergone a leap from convolutional neural networks [9, 21, 25, 36, 47, 50] to transformer [2, 3, 8, 29, 31, 39] architectures, with the key to learning spatiotemporal representations from video. Recently, with the emergence of powerful vision-language pre-training models like CLIP, which show remarkable generalization across a variety of image tasks, researchers start to migrate them to video tasks. [33, 35, 48, 57] add trainable temporal adapters to the model to achieve dynamic feature learning. [27, 45, 60] use ladder models to migrate pre-training weights, avoiding back-propagation of gradients thus freeing up more memory. [51, 52, 54] devise multi-modal temporal modeling architectures to achieve high-performance action recognition while maintaining high robustness and transferability. Vita-CLIP [53] and ViLT-CLIP [49] introduce multi-modal prompt learning in both vision and text thereby balancing the generalized supervised performance for video tasks. Although prompt fine-tuning has been successfully introduced to video tasks, we note that while existing methods follow multi-modal solutions, the generalization performance still needs to be improved.

Vision Prompt Learning: Text prompt is a novel paradigm in the field of natural language processing that uses sentence forms as templates, and is often used in the language branches of V-L models to better help the models understand the semantics. Prompts are categorized into manual and automatic forms [12, 13, 15], and automatic forms are




Figure 2. Comparison of existing video prompt tuning architectures. (a) ViFi-CLIP inputs multiple learnable soft tokens combined with class tokens to the text encoder. (b) ViLT-CLIP guides the soft tokens learning by introducing hand-crafted prompt templates from vanilla CLIP to avoid soft tokens learning too well in the base category and thus losing their generalization ability. (c) Our GA²-CLIP innovatively introduces generic attribute anchors and hard prompts to guide the learning of soft tokens, and shows strong performance in both the base category and the novel category.

used for the fine-tuning phase of automatic learning, often called Prompt Learning. Current language prompt learning is widely used in multi-modal models, e.g., CoOp [63] and Co-CoOp [62] enhance language coherence by optimizing successive prompt vectors in language branches. PromptKD [22] supervises the transfer of knowledge from CLIP to a lightweight model through an unsupervised approach using a teacher model. ArGue [46] utilizes a large-scale language model to mine multiple in-class attributes and proposes a negative sample prompt to eliminate spurious connections caused by backgrounds. ATPrompt [23] extends the learning space of soft prompts from the one-dimensional category level to the multidimensional attribute level by proposing hard attribute anchors to improve the generalization of attributes to new categories. Most of the existing research uses visual attributes to enhance model performance, which is achieved by providing additional attribute information through LLM, etc. However this is extremely difficult in video tasks, where it is difficult to correlate all the actions with the background, and therefore the model cannot be guided to learn the action features by means of predefined attributes.

In this work, we rethink the significance of video attributes. We argue that while we cannot tell the model which attributes in a video are positive, we are able to guide the model on which attributes may be meaningless. We implement video learning for the model by proposing a global generic attribute anchor and a local hard-supervised prompt.

3. Methodology

Our method aims to transfer the capabilities of CLIP to video action recognition tasks through visual language modeling and visual prompt learning. As shown in Fig. 2(a), existing video text based approaches use the clas-

sical paradigm of soft prompt tokens with hard categorical tokens passed as inputs to a text encoder, but this can easily lead to overfitting degrading the generalization ability. Although utilizing the vanilla prompt constraints from CLIP improves the situation, as shown in Fig. 2(b), it also reduces the prompt learning capability. To address this problem, this paper proposes a video prompt learning method called GA²-CLIP, which utilizes generic attribute anchors instead of the vanilla prompts of CLIP to constrain the prompt learning process, as shown in Fig. 2(c). With generic attribute anchors, soft prompts are able to reduce spurious correlations with complex background information in the video, thus improving the video recognition performance of the video language model in unknown categories. In addition, to further improve the generalization ability of textual prompts, we introduce a pre-trained hard prompt for limiting the overfitting of learnable textual prompts in the base category task. For each video task, we can share the same pre-trained hard prompt as a supervisor and integrate it into our GA²-CLIP for model fine-tuning, the overall is shown in Fig. 3.

3.1. Visual and Text Encoding

Visual Encoding: For the input video $\mathcal{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times T \times H \times W}$ with T frames and $H \times W$ spatial size, the t -th frame $\{I_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is divided into $\{\mathbf{x}_{k,t}\}_{k=1}^M \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times P^2}$ patch sizes according to the ViT architecture, k denotes the patch number and $M = H \times W / P^2$. All patches are projected through a linear layer p into a set of patch embedding vectors $\mathcal{E}_{0,t} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times d_v}$, d_v being the dimension of the token and for the i -layer transformer L can be represented as $\mathcal{E}_{i,t}$. After adding a learnable class token $\mathbf{C}_{i,t}$ and positional encoding \mathbf{e}_0 , the frame-level encoding E_v of the video can be expressed mathematically as:

$$\mathcal{E}_{0,t} = [\mathbf{C}_{0,t}, p^T \mathbf{x}_{k,t}, \dots, p^T \mathbf{x}_{M,t}] + \mathbf{e}_0, \quad (1)$$




Figure 3. Architecture of the Generic Attribute Anchors CLIP (GA²-CLIP) method for multimodal prompt learning. The approach optimizes the model by adapting the vision and language branches, where only input prompts are learned while keeping the remainder of the model frozen.

$$E_v = [\mathcal{E}_{i,t}] = L_i([\mathcal{E}_{i-1,t}]), i = 1, 2, \dots, l, \quad (2)$$

where l is the number of transformer layers. To obtain the final video feature representation, we obtain the class token of the output of the last layer of the transformer and map it to a common V-L embedding space through the projection layer.

Text Encoding: The pre-trained text encoder is a 12-layer transformer structure with an embedding dimension of 512 and a context length of 77, which employs a Multi-Headed Self-Attention Mechanism (MHSA) backed feed-forward network (FFN) to capture interword associations and contextual information in the text sequence. Vanilla CLIP uses a fixed template of manually designed text prompts, e.g., “a video of a person doing [CLS]”, and subsequently uses a text encoder E_t to obtain representation vectors for each category.

Prompt Learning: Unlike fixed prompts that require hand-crafted image-text alignment, the prompt learning approach quickly adapts to the downstream task by learning suitable soft prompts. Specifically, M learnable soft tokens are utilized to replace the originally fixed textual prompts after connecting with the classification token CLS as new input to a text encoder. The form is as follows:

$$W_P = [P_1][P_2] \dots [P_M][CLS], \quad (3)$$

where M denotes the length of the soft prompt token. In addition to adding soft prompt markers at the text input, existing approaches explore ways to introduce soft prompt

tokens at deeper layers. For the text encoder E_t , this is implemented by re-adding soft prompt tokens in each layer of the Transformer and removing them after the computation of self-attention in each layer is completed, repeating the above process for each layer. The process for the i -th layer can be represented as:

$$E_t = L_i([P_{i-1}, CLS_{i-1}]), i = 1, 2, \dots, l, \quad (4)$$

where L_i represents the i -th transformer block and P_i denotes the set of learnable soft prompt tokens, defined as $P_i = [P_1]_i, \dots, [P_M]_i$. For the visual encoder, the soft prompt addition process can still be followed for the text encoder by adding N soft prompt tokens in the first layer of the visual transformer, and similarly re-adding them in the deeper layers and deleting them after the completion of the self-attention computation. Formally this can be expressed as:

$$E_v = L_i([\mathcal{E}_{i-1,t}, Q_{i-1}]), i = 1, 2, \dots, l, \quad (5)$$

where Q_i represents the set of learnable soft prompt tokens in visual transformer, defined as $Q_i = [Q_1]_i, \dots, [Q_N]_i$, N is the length of the visual soft prompt token.

3.2. Pre-training Hard Prompt Token

Pre-training Stage: We use a two-step tuning strategy to implement our pre-trained hard prompt tokens: first, we choose a small dataset that can better align video and text, which does not need to be very large but as informative as possible, and moderately fine-tune the original prompt

vectors in the tuned main model in order to obtain the pre-trained prompts P' , which is subsequently frozen continuously during training.

While frozen tuning prompts P' can ensure generalization ability during new category inference, which works with trainable tuning prompts to decouple the base category and the new category tasks [19], our work explores the impact of this ability on video text alignment. Previous work embedded attribute hard prompts into text as they could get rich enough in inter-class semantics to achieve the expected gains. However, it is difficult to predefine effective semantic attributes for video, and the original purpose of the soft prompt token is to expect the model to learn effective semantic information, and although we cannot explain exactly what it learns, it turns out to be effective. We believe that the tuning prompt learns a generic projection, similar to a certain 'attribute' of a video, which is fixed by methods such as ATPrompt [23] using VLMs, but is difficult to implement for video tasks. The approach in this paper is to make the model learn to summarize this 'attribute', and formally, the proposed hard prompt tokens belong to a special form of attribute prompts.

Coupling of Double Prompts: In order to realize the coupling collaboration between the frozen prompts P' and the soft prompts P , we need to maintain a dual-prompt input model during the fine-tuning and inference phases. Previous approaches use fixed weights to realize the coupling of inputs and re-decouple them when the novel and base category are tested, which is less flexible in video tasks. To address this problem, we use a set of nonlinear projection layers to realize the coupling of frozen prompts and soft prompts \tilde{P} , defined as:

$$\tilde{P} = Proj(P', P), \quad (6)$$

where the nonlinear projection layer consists of a linear layer, the ReLU function and the Dropout layer. The introduction of nonlinear units can alleviate the problem of non-convergence caused by the uneven distribution between the randomly initialized soft prompt P and the frozen hard prompt P' , allowing \tilde{P} to learn more complex feature relationships. The above design avoids manual decoupling during base category and new category inference while ensuring model integrity, and enables flexible matching of potential features of freezing prompts P' and tuning prompts P across tasks. More coupling approaches will be explored in the Appendix.

3.3. Generic Attribute Anchor

Motivation Analysis: Previous work explores the negative impact caused by activating spurious correlations with background information, and in this section we rethink the impact mechanism of background attributes. Correctly

distinguishing between foreground and background in image recognition tasks is one of the key factors affecting performance, and the introduction of negative background prompts (e.g., the background of a [CLS]) can effectively improve performance. However, this does not seem to be valid for video tasks, where the identification of many actions depends on certain background information. For example, water in the background plays a key role in distinguishing between volleyball and water volleyball, but cannot be relied upon for recognizing the volleyball action itself. Therefore, it is difficult to guide model learning by fixed attribute definitions.

From another point of view, the background information of videos is too complex, and when the data is few, it is easy to produce a large number of spurious correlations of background information, resulting in a narrowing of the semantics of the text that has been aligned with a large number of images and texts. Therefore, we expect to introduce a set of task-irrelevant videos as generic attribute anchors, which can make the textual prompts become "moderate" in the semantic training process. As a result, the model is able to focus on the category names themselves to which the different videos refer, reducing the amount of spurious correlation of background semantics.

Attribute Anchors and Prompts: For the creation of attribute anchors, our process is based on two core guidelines: 1) the background information of the selected videos is rich enough to be semantically aligned with the text, and 2) the original category labels cannot be the same as the labels of the videos to be trained. To this end, we design two independent steps to create attribute anchors: first, we randomly select a number of videos in irrelevant labels in a dataset with better video semantic alignment (e.g., Kinetics), and preprocess them using an independent sampler that follows the settings of the main backbone model. We then randomly feed these videos into the training pipeline using an iterator. To save resources, it can be fed to the video encoder uniformly with the main video in a concatenated manner and sliced for recovery at the output.

These videos can use a uniform prompt label called attribute anchor prompt. Attribute anchor prompts are used in a fixed way, e.g., a video of a person doing something else. All word inputs V are fed to the text encoder with fixed prompts, a process denoted as:

$$W_v = [V_1][V_2]...[V_N], \quad (7)$$

where N denotes the length of the attribute anchor prompts. It is noteworthy that attribute anchor prompts belong to a special pattern similar to category-directed prompts, which can be incorporated into the general prompting framework by replacing the last word with the class name.

Training method: During training, we jointly optimize textual and visual prompts, generic attribute anchors, and

generic attribute prompts, constraining the model to learn the high similarity between action features in a video and the corresponding category embeddings, while reducing the similarity with other categories. Specifically, given an annotated video classification dataset containing K category labels $C = \{c_i\}_{i=1}^K$, for the input video x , firstly, feature extraction is performed by a visual coder to obtain the feature vector $f = E_v(x)$; meanwhile, a series of textual descriptions t are generated for each category using a soft prompt template; subsequently these textual descriptions are fed into the text encoder to obtain the textual features $w = E_t(t)$. The standard comparison loss learning is:

$$\mathcal{L}(y | x) = \frac{\exp(\cos(f, w_y)/\tau)}{\sum_{i=1}^N \exp(\cos(f, w_i)/\tau)}, \quad (8)$$

where τ is the temperature parameter and $\cos(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes cosine similarity, N is the number of seen classes.

For the generic attribute anchors input sample x^n , the visual coder is used to obtain the vector $g = E_v(x^n)$. We define the embedding vector of its attribute prompts as $n_c = \{v_1, v_1, \dots, v_M\}$, where v_i is the word vector of the attribute prompt and M represents the number of prompt words, next let $C = \{c_j^n\}_{j=1}^K$. At this point the comparison between generic attribute anchors and generic attribute prompts can be represented as:

$$\mathcal{L}_n(y | x^n) = \frac{\exp(\cos(g, w_y^n)/\tau)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(\cos(g, w_j^n)/\tau)}, \quad (9)$$

where K is the number of anchor attribute prompts. The function is optimized using cross-entropy. Finally, we introduce a specific weighting factor ω_n to redistribute the two losses to obtain the final total loss \mathcal{L}_s :

$$\mathcal{L}_s = \omega_n \mathcal{L} + (1 - \omega_n) \mathcal{L}_n, \quad (10)$$

the above design allows the model to flexibly adjust the weight coefficients based on the number of training datasets and generic attribute anchor datasets without the need to specifically adjust the number of attribute anchor videos.

4. Experiments

We use five benchmark datasets in our experiments: the Kinetics-400 and Kinetics-600 [14], HMDB-51 [18], UCF-101 [44], and Something-Something v2 (SSv2) [10].

Kinetics-400 and Kinetics-600 datasets: the Kinetics-400 dataset contains 400 human action categories, consisting of video clips from different YouTube platforms, each of which is about 10 seconds long. The dataset contains about 240,000 training videos and 20,000 validation videos. Kinetics-600 is an extension of Kinetics-400 and contains about 650,000 video clips covering 600 action categories,

of which about 410,000 are training videos and 29,000 are validation videos.

HMDB-51: The HMDB-51 dataset contains 6,766 short videos from 51 categories. These video clips are collected from movies, the web, and public databases, and cover a wide range of complex scenes and viewpoints. The dataset is divided into three separate training and validation sets: 3,783 segments for training and 1,530 segments for validation.

UCF-101: The UCF-101 dataset contains 13,320 short video clips in 101 categories from the YouTube website, covering a variety of human activities, musical instrument playing, sports, and other scenarios. The standard training set of this dataset contains 9,537 videos and the evaluation set contains 3,783 videos which are divided into three subsets for testing.

Something-Something v2 (SSv2): The SSv2 dataset is a collection of video clips containing a large number of humans performing actions with everyday objects, covering 174 action classes. The dataset is primarily used to train models that are capable of fine-grained understanding of human actions, such as the action of placing an item at a specific location or on another object. The standard division contains 168,913 training videos and 24,777 validation videos.

Evaluation Protocols: For the **few-shot experiments**, we follow the generalized K-shot split scheme, where K-shot denotes that K samples from each category are randomly selected for training. Specifically, 2, 4, 8 and 16 samples are used for training for the three datasets HMDB-51, UCF-101 and SSv2, respectively. The training and validation process only considers the first split of the HMDB-51 and UCF-101 datasets, while Kinetics and SSv2 are evaluated with the model on the full validation set. The setup uses 32 frames and evaluates with single-view inference. For **base-to-new generalization experiments**, these splits evenly divided the total categories into two equal groups: the most frequent categories as base categories and the less frequent categories as new categories, with 16 random samples of action categories per category. Models are evaluated on the first split of the HMDB-51 and UCF-101 datasets as well as on the full validation splits of Kinetics and SSv2. Both the base-to-new and few-sample experiments used 32 frames and evaluates with single-view inference.

Implementation Details: In the GA²-CLIP experiments, all randomly sampled frames are preprocessed to a spatial size of 224×224 . The maximum number of text characters is limited to 77 according to the CLIP [37] settings. We use the AdamW optimizer and set the weight decay factor to 0.001. We carry out the analysis in four experimental scenarios: zero-shot, base-to-novelty generalization, few-shot, and fully supervised. In the base-to-novelty generalization scenario, we train 12 epochs with a batch size of 64

Method	HMDB-51			UCF-101			SSv2			Kinetics-400		
	Base	Novel	HM	Base	Novel	HM	Base	Novel	HM	Base	Novel	HM
Adapting pre-trained image VL models												
Vanilla CLIP [38]	53.3	46.8	49.8	78.5	63.6	70.3	4.9	5.3	5.1	62.3	53.4	57.5
ActionCLIP [51]	69.1	37.3	48.5	90.1	58.1	70.7	13.3	10.1	11.5	61.0	46.2	52.6
X-CLIP [32]	69.4	45.5	55.0	89.9	58.9	71.2	8.5	6.6	7.4	74.1	56.4	64.0
A5 [13]	46.2	16.0	23.8	90.5	40.4	55.8	8.3	5.3	6.4	69.7	37.6	48.8
Tuning pre-trained image VL models												
CLIP image-FT [41]	62.6	47.5	54.0	86.4	65.3	74.4	9.2	8.5	8.8	72.9	58.0	64.6
CLIP text-FT [41]	70.0	51.2	59.1	90.9	67.4	78.3	12.4	9.5	10.8	73.4	59.7	65.8
ViFi-CLIP [41]	73.8	53.3	61.9	92.9	67.7	78.3	16.2	12.1	13.9	<u>76.4</u>	<u>61.1</u>	<u>67.9</u>
Prompt tuning pre-trained image VL models												
ViFi-CLIP [41]	77.1	54.9	64.1	95.1	74.1	83.6	15.8	11.5	13.3	–	–	–
ViLT-CLIP [49]	76.7	57.5	65.7	95.2	70.5	81.0	17.3	12.8	14.7	77.4	63.0	69.5
Ours	78.3	58.9	67.2	96.8	75.2	84.6	18.7	14.3	16.2	77.0	63.3	69.5
	+1.2	+4.0	+3.1	+1.7	+1.1	+1.0	+2.9	+2.8	+2.9	+0.6	+2.2	+1.6

Table 1. Base-to-novel generalization ability performance: Comparison with other state-of-the-art methods on HMDB-51, UCF-101, SSv2 and Kinetics-400 datasets. Where Base refers to half of the video categories randomly selected for training and Novel consists of the remaining categories, HM refers to the harmonic mean, which is used to measure the trade-off between base accuracy and novelty accuracy. ViFi-CLIP is used as a baseline for comparison, and the gains are highlighted in the last row.

Method	Frames	Views	Top-1	Top-5
Uni-modal architectures				
Uniformer-B (2023)	32	4 × 3	83.0	95.4
TimeSformer-L (2021)	96	1 × 3	80.7	94.7
Swin-L (2022)	32	4 × 3	83.1	95.9
Adapting pre-trained image VL models				
ActionCLIP (2021)	32	10 × 3	83.8	96.2
X-CLIP (2022)	16	4 × 3	84.7	96.8
A6 (2022)	16	–	76.9	93.5
Prompting pre-trained image VL models				
ViLT-CLIP B/16 (2024)	16	4 × 3	77.6	94.5
Ours	16	4 × 3	77.8	95.1

Table 2. Fully-supervised action recognition performance comparison on Kinetics-400.

and a learning rate of $4e-2$ using 16 vision and language prompts in the first 9 layers of the CLIP vision and language encoders, respectively. In the action recognition task in few-shot scenarios, we optimize the GA²-CLIP model by using 10 visual and language prompt in all transformer layers. The model is trained for 30 epochs using a cosine decay scheduler with the initial learning rate set to $8e-3$. In fully supervised scenarios, we train GA²-CLIP for 30 epochs on the Kinetics-400 dataset using a batch size of 256 and a learning rate of $4e-2$.

4.1. Cross-Domain Generalization and Adaptation

We evaluate the cross-domain generalization and adaptation capabilities of the Generic Attribute Anchor tuning method GA²-CLIP in a video action recognition task with the following experimental setups: 1) base-to-novel setting, 2) full-supervised setting, 3) few-shot setting, 4) zero-shot setting.

Base-to-New Generalization. In Tab. 1, we evaluate the performance of ViLT-CLIP on the four datasets, HMDB-51, UCF-101, SSv2, and K-400, in terms of its ability to generalize from base to novel categories. Compared with the baseline method ViFi-CLIP, the proposed method gains a significant improvement in both base and novel category accuracy. The model achieves a better balance between base and novel category accuracy, resulting in the best harmonic mean across all datasets. Notably, GA²-CLIP in the SSv2 dataset, which has relatively low background effects, shows unexpected results, with +2.9% and +1.5% improvement compared to the prompt fine-tuning baseline ViFi-CLIP and the state-of-the-art ViLT-CLIP. The experimental results indicate that the proposed method can effectively improve the generalization performance of the video task.

Fully-Supervised: We compare the action recognition performance of GA²-CLIP trained on the Kinetics-400 dataset with other unimodal and prompt methods in Tab. 2. Although the proposed method focuses on cross-domain adaptation and generalization capabilities, it still leads the state-

Method	HMDB-51				UCF-101				SSv2			
	K=2	K=4	K=8	K=16	K=2	K=4	K=8	K=16	K=2	K=4	K=8	K=16
Adapting pre-trained image VL models												
Vanilla CLIP [38]	41.9	41.9	41.9	41.9	63.6	63.6	63.6	63.6	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.7
ActionCLIP [51]	47.5	57.9	57.3	59.1	70.6	71.5	73.0	91.4	4.1	5.8	8.4	11.1
X-CLIP [32]	53.0	57.3	62.8	64.0	48.5	75.6	83.7	91.4	3.9	4.5	6.8	10.0
A5 [13]	39.7	50.7	56.0	62.4	71.4	79.9	85.7	89.9	4.4	5.1	6.1	9.7
Tuning pre-trained image VL models												
CLIP image-FT [41]	49.6	54.9	57.8	62.0	74.4	79.1	85.3	90.5	4.9	6.0	7.2	10.4
CLIP text-FT [41]	54.5	61.6	63.1	65.0	80.1	82.8	85.8	88.1	6.2	6.1	6.3	9.1
ViFi-CLIP [41]	57.2	62.7	64.5	66.8	80.7	85.1	90.0	92.7	6.2	7.4	8.5	12.4
Prompt tuning pre-trained image VL models												
ViFi-CLIP [41]	57.8	60.0	64.8	67.4	84.0	87.1	90.4	93.1	7.3	8.1	9.8	13.0
ViLT-CLIP [49]	60.6	61.9	66.9	69.6	85.3	90.0	91.3	93.8	7.8	9.4	10.3	13.2
Ours	61.9	64.3	68.1	70.8	90.0	91.8	93.8	95.5	6.8	9.9	10.6	14.7
	+4.1	+4.3	+3.3	+3.4	+6.0	+4.7	+3.4	+2.4	-0.5	+1.8	+0.8	+1.7

Table 3. Few-shot setting performance: Comparison with other state-of-the-art methods on HMDB-51, UCF-101 and SSv2 datasets. We performed few-shot experiments using 2, 4, 8, and 16 video sequences in different datasets, with a different number of video sequences for each category. ViFi-CLIP is used as a baseline for comparison, and the gains are highlighted in the last row.

Method	HMDB-51	UCF-101
Uni-modal zero-shot action recognition models		
ZSECOC [34]	22.6 \pm 1.2	15.1 \pm 1.7
UR [65]	24.4 \pm 1.6	17.5 \pm 1.6
E2E [4]	32.7	48.0
ER-ZSAR [5]	35.3 \pm 4.6	51.8 \pm 2.9
Adapting pre-trained image VL models		
Vanilla CLIP [38]	40.8 \pm 0.3	63.2 \pm 0.2
ActionCLIP [51]	40.8 \pm 5.4	58.3 \pm 3.4
X-CLIP [32]	44.6 \pm 5.2	72.0 \pm 2.3
A5 [13]	44.3 \pm 2.2	69.3 \pm 4.2
Prompting pre-trained image VL models		
ViLT-CLIP B/16 [49]	45.3 \pm 0.9	73.6 \pm 1.1
Ours	48.3 \pm 0.5	68.2 \pm 1.2

Table 4. Zero-shot action recognition performance on HMDB-51 and UCF-101 datasets. Use 32 frames and evaluate with a single-view inference.

of-the-art ViLT-CLIP in prompt fine-tuning methods with a Top1 accuracy +0.2%. There is a gap with other unimodal and VL pre-training methods, but our method only needs to train learnable prompts so it is more flexible.

Few-shot Learning: To evaluate the effectiveness and generalization ability of the proposed method under limited

data conditions, we show the performance of GA²-CLIP in few-shot scenario, as shown in Tab. 3. As the number of videos increases, the accuracy improves significantly. Intuitively, we achieve performance gains on all three datasets compared to the previous state-of-the-art method. This indicates that GA²-CLIP not only enhances the model generalization ability, but also has strong resistance to overfitting. **Zero-shot Video Recognition:** In the zero-shot setting, we train our model on Kinetics-400, a large-scale video action recognition dataset, and evaluate on two validation sets: HMDB-51 and UCF-101. As shown in Tab. 4, compared to the previous state-of-the-art, our approach achieves a performance gain of +3.0% on HMDB-51, while exhibiting marginal degradation on UCF-101. In summary, GA²-CLIP demonstrates strong cross-domain generalization capabilities in video action recognition tasks.

5. Conclusion

In this work, we propose a video prompt learning method called GA²-CLIP. This method effectively improves the generalization from known to unknown categories by introducing hard prompts and generic attribute anchors as a bridge. Our innovations are: The proposed video language fine-tuning generic attribute anchor prompt method can counteract the semantic narrowing problem in the downstream task; we introduce externally supervised hard and soft prompts through a nonlinear mapping layer, which enhances the generalization ability through a competitive

learning mechanism. Extensive experiments validate the effectiveness of the method, and we believe that this work provides new research directions in the field of video prompt learning, especially for researchers who lack sufficient experimental conditions.

Appendix

A. More Experimental Results and Analysis

A.1. Pre-trained Hard Prompt

Hard Prompt Training Source: In this section we study the impact of different hard prompt data sources on performance. In the main experiment, the hard prompts for HMDB-51, UCF-101 and SSv2 are derived from the Kinetics-400 base category training set in order to avoid the suspicion of data leakage. For Kinetics-400, the hard prompts for the main experiment are derived from a training set consisting of an additional 100 classes of videos unrelated to the Kinetics-400 labels.

Data Source	Base	Novel	HM	Δ
-	76.4	61.1	67.9	
UCF-101	76.9	62.2	68.8	+0.8
HMDB-51	76.6	61.4	68.2	+0.3
SSv2	76.3	58.7	66.4	-1.5
K-600	77.0	63.3	69.5	+1.6

Table 5. Impact of different hard prompt data sources on Kinetics-400 base to novel generalization performance.

In addition, we also study the effect of different hard prompt data sources on the performance of base to novel generalization, and the results are shown in Tab. 5. In our experiments, we only use base category from different datasets for pre-training (K-600 uses independent 100 class-independent videos), and the results show that the performance gains a certain amount of improvement except for SSv2, and the improvement using K-600 is more significant +1.6%. SSv2 focuses more on temporal related actions and ignores the background semantic correlation, thus producing a negative effect.

Coupling Method: We also investigate the effect of the way hard prompt tokens are coupled with soft prompt tokens. Fig. 4 illustrates the different ways of setting up, and Tab. 6 presents the different results. We find that using non-linear coupling gives the best performance, and followed by linear coupling. All other coupling methods that directly interact with soft prompt tokens break the semantic representation.




Figure 4. Comparison of different hard and soft prompt token coupling methods.

Style	Base	Novel	HM
Soft Prompt (Baseline)	76.6	61.9	68.5
Nonlinear Coupling (Ours)	77.0	63.3	69.5
Linear Coupling	76.9	62.2	68.7
Additive Coupling	76.5	59.6	67.0
Connection Position	76.4	60.1	67.2
Random Position	75.3	54.9	63.5

Table 6. Performance of different soft and hard prompt coupling methods.

Regularization	Base	Novel	HM
Explicit regularization (Ours)	78.3	58.9	67.2
Margin Loss ($\lambda = 0.1$)	78.1	56.4	65.5
Margin Loss ($\lambda = 0.2$)	77.7	55.1	64.5

Table 7. Impact of different regularization methods on performance.

A.2. About Generic Attribute Anchor

Component analysis: The generic attribute anchor videos used in the experiments are from the base category of K-400

Lable	Source Label	Instruction (LLM generation)
“pour”	wrapping present	All involve dumping or wrapping action related
“pullup”	pull ups	Exactly the same action, different naming
“punch”	punching bag	Striking motion
“pushup”	situp	It’s all about basic fitness
“sit”	read book	Static sitting activities
“throw”	catching or throwing frisbee	Throwing type of action
“walk”	walk the dog	Walking type of action
“wave”	pumping fist	Related to the arm swinging motion

Table 8. Use DeepSeek-R3 [26] to generate matching results and descriptions for HMDB-51 and K-400 labels. The first column is the HMDB-51 labels.

(for K-400 , we use the novel category in K-600). Specifically, we manually or using an LLM model (e.g., GPT-4 [1, 20, 24, 26]) filter out several labels among the labels of all anchor source datasets that may be semantically related but different from the training data labels (e.g., pushing cart vs. pushing; sit vs. read book; walking the dog vs. walk, etc.). Tab. 8 shows the matching results and the instructions for LLM generation for some of the HMDB-51 and K-400 labels. For labels with the same semantics, generic attribute anchors can serve to increase the samples; while similar labels can sufficiently avoid semantic narrowing. And then randomly sample K videos from the selected labels to use as anchor videos, where the effect of the value of K on the performance is shown in Fig. 5(a). The results show that the performance gradually improves as the number of samples increases, which proves that generic attribute anchors are effective.

In summary, the method of obtaining specific attributes [6, 17, 23, 46] can guide the model to “know what to learn”, but this is difficult for video tasks, especially those related to human movement. The generic attribute anchors method is closer to guiding the model to “know what not to learn”, which avoids the problem of missing key information due to characteristic attributes, but also faces the problem of insufficient number of negative samples and prompts, which is a trade-off for the simplicity of our method.

Regularization settings: In this subsection, we experiment with different regularization methods and parameter settings. Fig. 5(b) shows the base to novel performance for different regularization factors, with the harmonic mean optimal at $\omega_n = 1.0$. Tab. 7 shows the performance of the two different regularization methods and the results of utilizing direct regularization are better compared to the Margin Loss [42] method.




Figure 5. The effect of different settings on base to novel. (a) The effect of the number of different anchor videos, sampled from 4-64, with 0 indicating no use. (b) The effect of the fusion factor, here the weight of the vanilla factor is fixed to 1.0.

B. Visualization Related

Fig. 6 demonstrates the proposed method and the baseline approach ViFi-CLIP [41] on the HMDB-51 and UCF-101 datasets, base to novel experimental setup. We utilize t-SNE [30] to visualize the embedding of the last layer of visual coder output, employing a maximum 500 sample limit. The results show that the fine-tuning prompt method enables linear dimensionality reduction with improved generalization performance in the presence of frozen other transformer layers.

C. Limitations and Future Works

In addition to the limitations discussed in the main paper, this work has the following issues that need to be addressed: (1) Although generic attribute anchors have achieved good results, they lack full explainability, especially when compared to methods such as attribute prompting. (2) No generic attribute anchor data source suitable for all video action recognition benchmarks has been found, but this work proves that the direction is promising and we will explore more video generic anchor methods in the future.




Figure 6. t-SNE visualizations for HMDB-51 and UCF-101 datasets. We perform t-SNE visualizations of the final visual embedded features of the base and novel category, and compare them with the baseline method ViFi-CLIP [41], the results show that the proposed method has better separability.

(3) The temporal-oriented video task still lacks sufficient power, and traditional semantic correlation methods perform poorly in temporally relevant datasets such as SSv2, so we will explore more “action-oriented” attribute anchors in the future. In summary, future work may focus on exploring more effective semantic anchors for video using methods such as Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs).

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [2] Anurag Arnab, Mostafa Dehghani, Georg Heigold, Chen Sun, Mario Lučić, and Cordelia Schmid. Vivit: A video vision transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 6836–6846, 2021.
- [3] Gedas Bertasius, Heng Wang, and Lorenzo Torresani. Is space-time attention all you need for video understanding? In *ICML*, page 4, 2021.
- [4] Biagio Brattoli, Joseph Tighe, Fedor Zhdanov, Pietro Perona, and Krzysztof Chalupka. Rethinking zero-shot video classification: End-to-end training for realistic applications. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4613–4623, 2020.
- [5] Shizhe Chen and Dong Huang. Elaborative rehearsal for zero-shot action recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 13638–13647, 2021.
- [6] Tong Ding, Wanhua Li, Zhongqi Miao, and Hanspeter Pfister. Tree of attributes prompt learning for vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.11201*, 2024.
- [7] Yu Du, Fangyun Wei, Zihe Zhang, Miaojing Shi, Yue Gao, and Guoqi Li. Learning to prompt for open-vocabulary object detection with vision-language model. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14084–14093, 2022.
- [8] Haoqi Fan, Bo Xiong, Karttikeya Mangalam, Yanghao Li, Zhicheng Yan, Jitendra Malik, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. Multiscale vision transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 6824–6835, 2021.
- [9] Christoph Feichtenhofer. X3d: Expanding architectures for efficient video recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 203–213, 2020.
- [10] Raghav Goyal, Samira Ebrahimi Kahou, Vincent Michalski, Joanna Materzynska, Susanne Westphal, Heuna Kim, Valentin Haenel, Ingo Fruend, Peter Yianilos, Moritz Mueller-Freitag, et al. The “something something” video database for learning and evaluating visual common sense. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 5842–5850, 2017.
- [11] Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom

- Duerig. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4904–4916. PMLR, 2021.
- [12] Menglin Jia, Luming Tang, Bor-Chun Chen, Claire Cardie, Serge Belongie, Bharath Hariharan, and Ser-Nam Lim. Visual prompt tuning. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 709–727. Springer, 2022.
- [13] Chen Ju, Tengda Han, Kunhao Zheng, Ya Zhang, and Weidi Xie. Prompting visual-language models for efficient video understanding. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 105–124. Springer, 2022.
- [14] Will Kay, Joao Carreira, Karen Simonyan, Brian Zhang, Chloe Hillier, Sudheendra Vijayanarasimhan, Fabio Viola, Tim Green, Trevor Back, Paul Natsev, et al. The kinetics human action video dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.06950*, 2017.
- [15] Muhammad Uzair Khattak, Hanoona Rasheed, Muhammad Maaz, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Maple: Multi-modal prompt learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 19113–19122, 2023.
- [16] Muhammad Uzair Khattak, Syed Talal Wasim, Muzammal Naseer, Salman Khan, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Self-regulating prompts: Foundational model adaptation without forgetting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 15190–15200, 2023.
- [17] Gahyeon Kim, Sohee Kim, and Seokju Lee. Aapl: Adding attributes to prompt learning for vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1572–1582, 2024.
- [18] Hildegard Kuehne, Hueihan Jhuang, Estíbaliz Garrote, Tomaso Poggio, and Thomas Serre. Hmdb: a large video database for human motion recognition. In *2011 International conference on computer vision*, pages 2556–2563. IEEE, 2011.
- [19] Haoyang Li, Liang Wang, Chao Wang, Jing Jiang, Yan Peng, and Guodong Long. Dpc: Dual-prompt collaboration for tuning vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 25623–25632, 2025.
- [20] Wentong Li, Yuqian Yuan, Jian Liu, Dongqi Tang, Song Wang, Jie Qin, Jianke Zhu, and Lei Zhang. Tokenpacker: Efficient visual projector for multimodal llm. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, pages 1–19, 2025.
- [21] Yan Li, Bin Ji, Xintian Shi, Jianguo Zhang, Bin Kang, and Limin Wang. Tea: Temporal excitation and aggregation for action recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 909–918, 2020.
- [22] Zheng Li, Xiang Li, Xinyi Fu, Xin Zhang, Weiqiang Wang, Shuo Chen, and Jian Yang. Promptkd: Unsupervised prompt distillation for vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 26617–26626, 2024.
- [23] Zheng Li, Yibing Song, Penghai Zhao, Ming-Ming Cheng, Xiang Li, and Jian Yang. Atprompt: Textual prompt learning with embedded attributes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.09442*, 2024.
- [24] Bin Lin, Yang Ye, Bin Zhu, Jiayi Cui, Munan Ning, Peng Jin, and Li Yuan. Video-llava: Learning united visual representation by alignment before projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10122*, 2023.
- [25] Ji Lin, Chuang Gan, and Song Han. Tsm: Temporal shift module for efficient video understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 7083–7093, 2019.
- [26] Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, et al. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437*, 2024.
- [27] Ruyang Liu, Jingjia Huang, Ge Li, Jiashi Feng, Xinglong Wu, and Thomas H Li. Revisiting temporal modeling for clip-based image-to-video knowledge transferring. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6555–6564, 2023.
- [28] Shilong Liu, Hao Cheng, Haotian Liu, Hao Zhang, Feng Li, Tianhe Ren, Xueyan Zou, Jianwei Yang, Hang Su, Jun Zhu, et al. Llava-plus: Learning to use tools for creating multi-modal agents. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 126–142. Springer, 2024.
- [29] Ze Liu, Jia Ning, Yue Cao, Yixuan Wei, Zheng Zhang, Stephen Lin, and Han Hu. Video swin transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3202–3211, 2022.
- [30] Laurens van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. Visualizing data using t-sne. *Journal of machine learning research*, 9 (Nov):2579–2605, 2008.
- [31] Daniel Neimark, Omri Bar, Maya Zohar, and Dotan Asselmann. Video transformer network. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 3163–3172, 2021.
- [32] Bolin Ni, Houwen Peng, Minghao Chen, Songyang Zhang, Gaofeng Meng, Jianlong Fu, Shiming Xiang, and Haibin Ling. Expanding language-image pretrained models for general video recognition. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1–18. Springer, 2022.
- [33] Juntong Pan, Ziyi Lin, Xiatian Zhu, Jing Shao, and Hongsheng Li. St-adapter: Parameter-efficient image-to-video transfer learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:26462–26477, 2022.
- [34] Jie Qin, Li Liu, Ling Shao, Fumin Shen, Bingbing Ni, Jiaxin Chen, and Yunhong Wang. Zero-shot action recognition with error-correcting output codes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2833–2842, 2017.
- [35] Zhiwu Qing, Shiwei Zhang, Ziyuan Huang, Yingya Zhang, Changxin Gao, Deli Zhao, and Nong Sang. Disentangling spatial and temporal learning for efficient image-to-video transfer learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 13934–13944, 2023.
- [36] Zhaofan Qiu, Ting Yao, and Tao Mei. Learning spatio-temporal representation with pseudo-3d residual networks.

- In *proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 5533–5541, 2017.
- [37] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021.
 - [38] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PmLR, 2021.
 - [39] Kanchana Ranasinghe, Muzammal Naseer, Salman Khan, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Michael S Ryoo. Self-supervised video transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2874–2884, 2022.
 - [40] Yongming Rao, Wenliang Zhao, Guangyi Chen, Yansong Tang, Zheng Zhu, Guan Huang, Jie Zhou, and Jiwen Lu. Denseclip: Language-guided dense prediction with context-aware prompting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 18082–18091, 2022.
 - [41] Hanoona Rasheed, Muhammad Uzair Khattak, Muhammad Maaz, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Fine-tuned clip models are efficient video learners. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6545–6554, 2023.
 - [42] Saharon Rosset, Ji Zhu, and Trevor Hastie. Margin maximizing loss functions. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 16, 2003.
 - [43] Julio Silva-Rodriguez, Sina Hajimiri, Ismail Ben Ayed, and Jose Dolz. A closer look at the few-shot adaptation of large vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 23681–23690, 2024.
 - [44] Khurram Soomro, Amir Roshan Zamir, and Mubarak Shah. Ucf101: A dataset of 101 human actions classes from videos in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.0402*, 2012.
 - [45] Yi-Lin Sung, Jaemin Cho, and Mohit Bansal. Lst: Ladder side-tuning for parameter and memory efficient transfer learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:12991–13005, 2022.
 - [46] Xinyu Tian, Shu Zou, Zhaoyuan Yang, and Jing Zhang. Argue: Attribute-guided prompt tuning for vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 28578–28587, 2024.
 - [47] Du Tran, Heng Wang, Lorenzo Torresani, Jamie Ray, Yann LeCun, and Manohar Paluri. A closer look at spatiotemporal convolutions for action recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6450–6459, 2018.
 - [48] Bin Wang and Wenqian Wang. Tds-clip: Temporal difference side network for image-to-video transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.10688*, 2024.
 - [49] Hao Wang, Fang Liu, Licheng Jiao, Jiahao Wang, Zehua Hao, Shuo Li, Lingling Li, Puhua Chen, and Xu Liu. Vilt-clip: Video and language tuning clip with multimodal prompt learning and scenario-guided optimization. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 5390–5400, 2024.
 - [50] Limin Wang, Zhan Tong, Bin Ji, and Gangshan Wu. Tdn: Temporal difference networks for efficient action recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1895–1904, 2021.
 - [51] Mengmeng Wang, Jiazheng Xing, Jianbiao Mei, Yong Liu, and Yunliang Jiang. Actionclip: Adapting language-image pretrained models for video action recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2023.
 - [52] Mengmeng Wang, Jiazheng Xing, Boyuan Jiang, Jun Chen, Jianbiao Mei, Xingxing Zuo, Guang Dai, Jingdong Wang, and Yong Liu. A multimodal, multi-task adapting framework for video action recognition. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 5517–5525, 2024.
 - [53] Syed Talal Wasim, Muzammal Naseer, Salman Khan, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Mubarak Shah. Vita-clip: Video and text adaptive clip via multimodal prompting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 23034–23044, 2023.
 - [54] Wenhao Wu, Xiaohan Wang, Haipeng Luo, Jingdong Wang, Yi Yang, and Wanli Ouyang. Bidirectional cross-modal knowledge exploration for video recognition with pre-trained vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6620–6630, 2023.
 - [55] Jingjing Xie, Yuxin Zhang, Jun Peng, Zhaohong Huang, and Liujuan Cao. Textrefiner: Internal visual feature as efficient refiner for vision-language models prompt tuning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 8718–8726, 2025.
 - [56] Runsen Xu, Xiaolong Wang, Tai Wang, Yilun Chen, Jiangmiao Pang, and Dahua Lin. Pointllm: Empowering large language models to understand point clouds. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 131–147. Springer, 2024.
 - [57] Taojiannan Yang, Yi Zhu, Yusheng Xie, Aston Zhang, Chen Chen, and Mu Li. Aim: Adapting image models for efficient video action recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.03024*, 2023.
 - [58] Lu Yuan, Dongdong Chen, Yi-Ling Chen, Noel Codella, Xiyang Dai, Jianfeng Gao, Houdong Hu, Xuedong Huang, Boxin Li, Chunyuan Li, et al. Florence: A new foundation model for computer vision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.11432*, 2021.
 - [59] Xiaohua Zhai, Xiao Wang, Basil Mustafa, Andreas Steiner, Daniel Keysers, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. Lit: Zero-shot transfer with locked-image text tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 18123–18133, 2022.
 - [60] Jeffrey O Zhang, Alexander Sax, Amir Zamir, Leonidas Guibas, and Jitendra Malik. Side-tuning: a baseline for net-

work adaptation via additive side networks. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part III* 16, pages 698–714. Springer, 2020.

- [61] Renrui Zhang, Rongyao Fang, Wei Zhang, Peng Gao, Kunchang Li, Jifeng Dai, Yu Qiao, and Hongsheng Li. Tip-adapter: Training-free clip-adapter for better vision-language modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.03930*, 2021.
- [62] Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Conditional prompt learning for vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 16816–16825, 2022.
- [63] Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Learning to prompt for vision-language models. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 130(9):2337–2348, 2022.
- [64] Beier Zhu, Yulei Niu, Yucheng Han, Yue Wu, and Hanwang Zhang. Prompt-aligned gradient for prompt tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 15659–15669, 2023.
- [65] Yi Zhu, Yang Long, Yu Guan, Shawn Newsam, and Ling Shao. Towards universal representation for unseen action recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9436–9445, 2018.