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Abstract

Talking face generation aims at generating photorealistic video portraits of a target person driven by input audio. Due to its nature of one-to-many mapping from the input audio to the output video (e.g., one speech content may have multiple feasible visual appearances), learning a deterministic mapping like previous works brings ambiguity during training, and thus causes inferior visual results. Although this one-to-many mapping could be alleviated in part by a two-stage framework (i.e., an audio-to-expression model followed by a neural-rendering model), it is still insufficient since the prediction is produced without enough information (e.g., emotions, wrinkles, etc.). In this paper, we propose MemFace to complement the missing information with an implicit memory and an explicit memory that follow the sense of the two stages respectively. More specifically, the implicit memory is employed in the audio-to-expression model to capture high-level semantics in the audio-expression shared space, while the explicit memory is employed in the neural-rendering model to help synthesize pixel-level details. Our experimental results show that our proposed MemFace surpasses all the state-of-the-art results across multiple scenarios consistently and significantly.

1. Introduction

Talking face generation enables synthesizing photorealistic video portraits of a target person in line with the speech content [7, 9, 17, 21, 34, 53, 55, 56]. It shows great potential in applications like virtual avatars, online conferences, and animated movies since it conveys the visual content of the interested person besides the audio.

The most popular methods to solve audio-driven talking face generation follow a two-stage framework [56], where an intermediate representation (e.g., 2D landmarks [7, 37, 48, 53], blendshape coefficients of 3D face models [26, 56, 62, 65], etc.) is first predicted from the input audio, then a renderer is employed to synthesize the video portraits according to the predicted representation. Along this path, remarkable progress has been made towards improving the overall realness of the video portraits, by achieving natural head movements [6, 68, 69, 72], enhancing lip-sync quality [30, 41, 42], generating emotional expression [21, 33, 65], etc. However, the aforementioned methods are biased towards learning a deterministic mapping from the given audio to a video, while it is worth noting that talking face generation is inherently a one-to-many mapping problem. It means that, for an input audio clip, there are multiple feasible visual appearances of the target person due to the variations of phoneme contexts [1], emotions [12], and illumination conditions [50], etc. In this way, learning a deterministic mapping brings ambiguity during the training, making it harder to yield realistic visual results.

To some extent, this one-to-many mapping could be alleviated in part by the two-stage framework [56, 62, 65], since it decomposes the whole one-to-many mapping difficulty into two sub-problems (i.e., an audio-to-expression problem and a neural-rendering problem). However, although effective, each of these two stages is still optimized to predict the information that is missed by the input, thus re-
remaining hard for prediction. For example, the audio-to-expression model learns to produce an expression that semantically matches the input audio, which misses the high-level semantics like habits, attitudes, etc. While the neural-rendering model synthesizes the visual appearances based on the expression estimation, which misses the pixel-level details like wrinkles, shadows, etc. To further alleviate the one-to-many mapping problem, in this paper, we propose MemFace to complement the missing information with memories [51, 63], by devising an implicit memory and an explicit memory that follows the sense of the two stages respectively. More specifically, the implicit memory is jointly optimized with the audio-to-expression model to complement the semantically-aligned information, while the explicit memory is constructed in a non-parametric way and tailored for each target person to complement visual details.

Therefore, instead of directly using the input audio to predict the expression [56], our audio-to-expression model leverages the extracted audio feature as the query to attend to the implicit memory. The attention result, which served as semantically-aligned information, is then complemented with the audio feature to yield expression output. By enabling end-to-end training, the implicit memory is encouraged to relate high-level semantics in the audio-expression shared space, thus narrowing the semantic gap between the input audio and the output expression.

After obtaining the expression, the neural-rendering model is employed to synthesize the visual appearances based on the mouth shapes that are obtained from expression estimations. To further complement pixel-level details between them, we first construct the explicit memory for each person by regarding the vertices of 3D face models [3, 64] and its associated image patches as keys and values respectively. Then, for each input expression, its corresponding vertices are used as the query to retrieve the similar keys in the explicit memory, and the associated image patch is returned as the pixel-level details to the neural-rendering model. Intuitively, by introducing the explicit memory to the model, it allows the model to selectively associate expression-required details without generating them by the model itself, and thus eases the generation process.

Extensive experiments on various widely adopted datasets (e.g., Obama [53], HDTF [71]) verify that the proposed MemFace achieves state-of-the-art lip-sync and rendering quality, surpassing all the baseline methods across multiple scenarios consistently and significantly. For example, our MemFace achieves a relative improvement of 37.52% in the subjective evaluation of the Obama dataset.

2. Related Works
2.1. Talking Face Generation

Audio-driven talking face generation enables synthesizing photo-realistic video portraits in sync with the input speech content. To tackle this problem, lots of methods have been proposed for improving the overall realness of the generated video portraits [18, 20, 37, 38, 56], such as to achieve natural head movements [6, 68, 69, 72], to enhance lip-sync [7, 8, 30, 41, 53, 56], to make emotional expression [21, 33, 65], etc. For example, Thies et al. [56] proposed a two-stage framework that estimates lip motions and then renders the appearance of the target person. Inspired by dynamic NeRF [15, 39], recent advances also proposed methods that directly map the audio features to dynamic facial radiance fields for portrait rendering [17, 35, 45].

Although these methods could alleviate the one-to-many mapping to some extent by the two-stage framework [7, 26, 37, 48, 53, 56, 62, 65] or the implicit function [17, 35, 45], they were still optimized to predict the information that is missed by the input. Differently, we propose to complement the missing information with memories to tackle the one-to-many mapping difficulty.

2.2. Memory-based Networks

We introduce the works that are related to implicit memory and explicit memory respectively in this section.

Implicit memory. There were a number of attempts to introduce a specialized implicit memory that can be read and written for better memorization [29, 31, 51, 63]. They typically used continuous memory representations [51] or key-value pairs [40] to read/write memories, allowing them to train the memory in an end-to-end way. Based on the success of implicit memory and the observation of the one-to-many mapping nature of audio-to-expression learning, we propose to incorporate an implicit memory into audio-to-expression stage to complement the missing semantically-aligned information and tackle the one-to-many mapping.

Explicit memory. Augmenting neural networks with an explicit external memory has recently drawn attention in natural language processing [24, 25, 47]. For retrieval-based visual models, different from early attempts that only exploited the training data itself [36, 49, 57], recent advances introduced an external memory for text-to-image generation [4]. Unlike these approaches that built a unified memory for every sample, we build the explicit memory for each identity to complement the personalized visual details for realistic talking face generation.

It should be noted that Yi et al. [68] and Park et al. [41] also introduced memory to the talking face generation. Our solution is different from theirs in that: 1) Memory network in MemGAN [68] stored paired spatial features (extracted from a pre-trained ResNet-18 [19]) and identity features (extracted from a pre-trained ArcFace [13]) that provide more identity information to refine the rendering process. In contrast, we directly retrieve the mouth-related image patches from the video of the target person with our explicit memory, which makes the memory construction
Fig. 2. The overview of MemFace. To alleviate the one-to-many mapping difficulty, we propose to complement the missing information with memories. The implicit memory is introduced to the audio-to-expression model to complement the semantically-aligned information (see Sec. 3.1 for details). Furthermore, given that the audio-to-expression model \(f\) and the neural-rendering model \(g\) play different roles in talking face generation, we devise two variants of memory for complementing missing information accordingly. The details for applying memories to \(f\) and \(g\) are elaborated in Sec. 3.2 and Sec. 3.3 respectively.

3. MemFace

Preliminaries. Our training corpus contains video portraits that are synced with the audio stream. For data preprocessing, following previous methods \[12, 52, 56\], we transform the audio content to audio feature \(\mathbf{A}\) with a pre-trained speech-to-text model \[2\]. The audio feature \(\mathbf{A}\) is used as input instead of the raw audio waveform.

We adopt blendshape coefficients of 3D face model \[3, 64\] as the intermediate representation due to its flexibility in talking face generation \[26, 56, 62, 65\]. The 3D face model is a statistical model that enables the 3D reconstruction from the disentangled facial shape, expression, and other properties with delta-blendshapes \[3, 64\]. We obtain the labels of shape coefficients \(\alpha_{id}\), expression coefficients \(\alpha_{exp}\), and pose coefficients \(\alpha_{pose}\) following Wood et al. \[64\] in our experiments. To easily leverage the 3D face in our model, we project the 3D face onto the 2D image plane through a perspective camera model, resulting in an image \(\mathbf{I}_{3D}\).

To fully exploit the coefficients of 3D face model, we also extract the coordinates of all vertices \(\mathbf{O}\) by reconstructing the 3D face from the coefficients \[64\]. Since the mouth-related region is the focus for talking, we only use the pre-defined mouth-related vertices \(\mathbf{O}_m\). The obtained \(\mathbf{O}_m\) is leveraged in both the audio-to-expression model and the neural-rendering model.

Method overview. As shown in Fig. 2, given input audio of the target person, our goal is to synthesize a photo-realistic video portrait that is consistent with the speech content. To achieve this goal, our inputs consist of an input audio feature \(\mathbf{A}\) and a template video of the target person. For the template video, we follow the previous works \[56, 62, 68\] to mask the face region. To make the prediction focus on the face region, the remaining part of the template video is employed as input to produce extra information (see Fig. 2 for illustration). We first employ our audio-to-expression model \(f\) to take in the extracted audio feature \(\mathbf{A}\), and predict the mouth-related expression coefficients \(\hat{\alpha}_{exp}\). The predicted expression coefficients \(\hat{\alpha}_{exp}\) are then merged with the original shape and pose coefficients of the template video, and yield an image \(\hat{\mathbf{I}}_{3D}\) that corresponds to the predicted expression coefficients. Next, our neural-rendering model \(g\) takes in the \(\hat{\mathbf{I}}_{3D}\) and the masked template video, and outputs the final results that correspond to the mouth shape of \(\hat{\mathbf{I}}_{3D}\). In this way, the audio-to-expression model is responsible for lip-sync quality, while the neural-rendering model is responsible for rendering quality.

However, this two-stage framework is still insufficient for tackling one-to-many mapping difficulty, since each stage is optimized to predict the information that is missed by the input (e.g., habits, wrinkles, etc.). Therefore, we propose to complement the missing information with memory (see Sec. 3.1 for details). Furthermore, given that the audio-to-expression model \(f\) and the neural-rendering model \(g\) play different roles in talking face generation, we devise two variants of memory for complementing missing information accordingly. The details for applying memories to \(f\) and \(g\) are elaborated in Sec. 3.2 and Sec. 3.3 respectively.

3.1. Memory as One-to-Many Mapping Alleviator

Memory enables an easy way to read and write to scalable storage for neural networks \[51, 63\]. In this work, we propose to complement the missing information with memories, therefore alleviating the one-to-many mapping challenge. Formally, suppose that we have a key set \(\mathbf{K}\) and a value set \(\mathbf{V}\) that are to be stored in the memory, where each item of \(\mathbf{K}\) is associated with a value in \(\mathbf{V}\). For a query \(\mathbf{Q}\) that is derived from the input, we compute the matching score.
In form of implicit memory, both the key set and the value set are randomly initialized at the beginning of the training, and are updated according to the backpropagation of the error signal during the training process.

As shown in Fig. 3, our audio-to-expression (i.e., \( a^2e \)) model \( f \) consists of an encoder \( f_{enc} \) and a decoder \( f_{dec} \). The implicit memory is introduced between the encoder and the decoder. Specifically, the feature extracted by the encoder is employed as the query \( Q^{a2e} = f_{enc}(A) \). Then we take the inner product followed by a softmax function between the \( Q^{a2e} \) and the key set \( K^{a2e} \), obtaining a weighted representation of the value set \( V^{a2e} \). The attention result, which is served as the complemented information, is then added to the \( Q^{a2e} \) in an element-wise manner to form the input of the decoder \( f_{dec} \). Formally:

\[
\hat{\alpha}_{exp} = f_{dec}(Q^{a2e} \oplus \text{attn}(Q^{a2e}, K^{a2e}, V^{a2e})),
\]

where \( \oplus \) denotes the element-wise addition. The size of \( K^{a2e} \) and \( V^{a2e} \) here are both \( M \times h_a \), where \( M \) stands for the number of keys and values.

**Loss functions.** We adopt three loss functions to train the audio-to-expression model. 1) We minimize the \( l_2 \) distance between the predicted expression coefficients \( \hat{\alpha}_{exp} \) and the ground-truth one \( \alpha_{exp} \). 2) We minimize the distance between the predicted vertices \( \hat{O}_m \) and the ground-truth one \( O_m \) (see preliminaries for vertices acquisition). The size of vertices is \( T \times h_v \times 3 \), where \( h_v \) denotes the number of vertices, and 3 denotes the dimension of the coordinate. 3) To prevent each item in the memory to be similar to each other so as to increase the memory capacity, we also provide a regularization term on \( K^{a2e} \) and \( V^{a2e} \) during the training:

\[
\begin{align*}
L_{cof}^{a2e} &= \| \alpha_{exp} - \hat{\alpha}_{exp} \|_2, \\
L_{vtx}^{a2e} &= \| O_m - \hat{O}_m \|_2, \\
L_{reg}^{a2e} &= \frac{1}{M(M-1)} \left( \text{corr}(K^{a2e}) + \text{corr}(V^{a2e}) \right), \\
L^{a2e} &= \lambda_{cof} L_{cof}^{a2e} + \lambda_{vtx} L_{vtx}^{a2e} + \lambda_{reg} L_{reg}^{a2e},
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \text{corr}(X) = \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j=1}^M \cos(X_i, X_j) \), and \( \cos(\cdot, \cdot) \) denotes the cosine similarity between two vectors following previous works \([5, 66, 67]\), \( \lambda_{cof} \), \( \lambda_{vtx} \), and \( \lambda_{reg} \) are weights for each loss item. In total, we use \( L^{a2e} \) to train the audio-to-expression model with the implicit memory.

### 3.3. Complementing Visual Appearance with Explicit Memory

Given the predicted expression coefficients \( \hat{\alpha}_{exp} \), and the template video, the neural-rendering model \( g \) is responsible for synthesizing the photo-realistic results. As demonstrated in Sec. 1, there also exists one-to-many mapping difficulty in the neural-rendering model. For example, one expression may have multiple feasible visual appearances due...
to different wrinkles and illuminations. Therefore, to complement the pixel-level details of the target person, an explicit memory is introduced to the neural-rendering model.

The explicit memory in the neural-rendering model. Different from the implicit memory that learns the key set $K$ and the value set $V$ from training data automatically, the explicit memory constructs the key set $K$ and the value set $V$ directly from the data. For example, the key-value form can be formulated as representation-token pair in [24], text-image pair in [47], and vertex-image pair in our case.

As shown in Fig. 4, our neural-rendering (i.e., $nr$) model $g$ adopts an encoder-decoder architecture [44], where the explicit memory is introduced between the encoder $g_{enc}$ and the decoder $g_{dec}$. Specifically, we adopt the coordinates of vertices $O_m$ as key set $K^{nr}$ (see preliminaries for vertices acquirement), and its corresponding image of mouth region as the value set $V^{nr}$. We build the explicit memory based on $K^{nr}$ and $V^{nr}$ for each target person with $N$ key-value pairs. To make each item in the memory to be dissimilar so as to increase the capacity of the memory, we identify $N$ most dissimilar mouth shapes by calculating the Root-Mean-Square distance between mouth-related vertices. Then we use the $N$ vertex-image pairs to build the explicit memory. More details can be found in Sec. A of supplementary materials.

For the predicted expression coefficients $\hat{\alpha}_{exp}$, we obtain the pre-defined mouth-related vertices $\hat{O}_m$ as elaborated in the preliminaries, and regard it as the query $Q^{nr}$ to attend to the constructed explicit memory. The attention result, which includes substantial pixel-level details of the target person, is then merged with the feature $F^{nr}$ extracted from the input of $g$ by the encoder $g_{enc}$ to generate the output:

$$\hat{I}_{RGB} = g_{dec}(F^{nr} \oplus \mathrm{attn}(Q^{nr}, K^{nr}, V^{nr})), \quad (5)$$

where $I_{RGB}$ denotes the final synthesized results. Intuitively, by using the explicit memory, the closer the mouth-related vertices between $Q^{nr}$ and $K^{nr}$, the larger weight the corresponding mouth-related pixels will be returned as the complemented information for synthesis, thus making the prediction easier.

Adaptation to new speakers. Since the explicit memory stores the person-specific visual appearance, when meeting a new speaker, the explicit memory is rebuilt from the talking video of the new speaker. In this way, our neural-rendering model can be flexibly adapted to the new speaker.

Loss functions. We adopt two kinds of loss functions to optimize the neural-rendering model. 1) A reconstruction loss and a VGG perceptual loss [22] are employed to penalize the errors between the synthesized image and the ground-truth image. 2) To generate more realistic results, we employ a discriminator $d$ to verify whether the input is a natural image or a faked image produced by the neural-rendering model [16, 56]. Formally:

$$L_{rec}^{nr} = \|I_{RGB} - \hat{I}_{RGB}\|_2 + \alpha \cdot \operatorname{VGG}(I_{RGB}, \hat{I}_{RGB}),$$

$$L_{adv}^{d} = -E(\log d(I_{RGB})) - E(\log(1 - d(\hat{I}_{RGB}))),$$

$$L_{adv}^{nr} = E(\log(1 - d(I_{RGB}))),$$

$$L^{nr} = \lambda_{rec} L_{rec}^{nr} + \lambda_{adv} L_{adv}^{d} + \lambda_{adv} L_{adv}^{nr}, \quad (6)$$

where $\alpha \cdot \operatorname{VGG}(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the VGG perceptual loss [22], $\lambda_{rec}$ and $\lambda_{adv}$ are weights for each loss item. In total, we use $L^{nr}$ to train the neural-rendering model.

3.4. Discussions

Why do we alleviate one-to-many mapping with memory? We note that one-to-many relationship exists in a wide range of problems [32, 43, 60], such as text-to-speech [54], machine translation [61], image translation [23, 46], etc. Among them, generative models (e.g., generative adversarial network [16], normalizing flow [14], variational auto-encoder [28]) demonstrate great potential for the challenge of one-to-many mapping, with the intuition in that learning a distribution instead of a deterministic result. In our work, we also leverage the advance of the generative adversarial network, and further present the memory mechanism as an orthogonal approach to alleviating one-to-many mapping. The incorporation of memory implicates an insight: since predicting the missing information is difficult, why not construct storage to complement the information to the input? We answer this question in this paper, and demonstrate the effectiveness of memory for talking face generation in Sec. 4.

Why do we use two memory variants for two stages respectively? Basically, the audio-to-expression model and neural-rendering model play different roles in talking face generation. The audio-to-expression model is responsible for generating semantically-aligned expressions from the input audio, while the neural-rendering model synthesizes the pixel-level visual appearance according to the estimated
expressions. Therefore, to make each prediction easier, we devise an implicit memory and an explicit memory to follow the sense of these two models. Intuitively, the implicit memory is to learn the prior from the training data automatically, then the learned prior can be used to complement the information that is missed by the input, yielding more realistic generation results. For neural rendering, where each mouth shape shares a similar visual appearance, we explicitly construct the expression-related prior from the video and directly retrieve the prior to complement the input. Our experiments in Sec. 4.3 show the effectiveness of each choice.

4. Experiments

In this section, we compare our MemFace with state-of-the-art methods, and provide ablation studies. Since we alleviate the one-to-many mapping problem and make the prediction easier, we also adapt our model to new speakers with few adaptation data and make comparisons. More results can be found in Sec. C of supplementary materials.

4.1. Experimental Setups

Datasets. Following previous works [6, 59], we utilize GRID dataset [11] (20 speakers, about four hours video) to train the audio-to-expression model and utilize Obama dataset [53] (about 3 minutes video) to train the neural-rendering model. For experiments on adaptation to new speakers, we randomly collect 10 speakers with various talking styles from HDTF dataset [71]. We use training data with different durations (15s and 30s) for each speaker.

Objective metrics. For objective evaluation, following previous works [17, 41, 45, 56], we adopt Sync-C (SyncNet Confidence) and Sync-D (SyncNet Distance) to measure the lip-sync quality via SyncNet [10]. Higher Sync-C or lower Sync-D indicates better lip-sync quality. Since we can obtain vertices from the 3D face model (see Sec. 3.3 for details), we adopt RMSE (Root Mean Square Error) score between the ground-truth vertices and our predicted one to further evaluate the lip-sync quality. Lower RMSE indicates better lip-sync quality. We also adopt commonly used LPIPS [70] (Learned Perceptual Image Patch Similarity) score to evaluate the perceptual similarity between ground-truth images and the generated ones. Lower LPIPS indicates better perceptual quality.

Subjective metrics. For subjective evaluation, 20 experienced participants are invited and each participant needs to make around 104 judgments in total. We make detailed guidelines and example videos to ensure consistent grading criteria. We use MOS (Mean Opinion Score) and CMOS (Comparison Mean Opinion Score) as our metrics. MOS contains subjective scores on lip-sync quality (Lip-sync), rendering quality (Render), and overall quality (Overall). Higher MOS or CMOS indicates better subjective quality. More details for subjective evaluation are provided in Sec. B.3 of supplementary materials.

Implementation details. For the dimension of the hidden states, we use $h_a = 64$ [2], $h_c = 85$ [64] and $h_v = 69$ [64] in our experiments. In this paper, we adopt the image resolution of $256 \times 256$. $\lambda_{cof}$, $\lambda_{reg}$, $\lambda_{+	ext{rec}}$, and $\lambda_{adv}$ are empirically set to 1, 1, 0.1, 20 and 1 respectively. Unless it is stated, we use $M = 1000$ and $N = 300$. We adopt the Adam [27] optimizer with a learning rate of $1e-4$. More details are provided in Sec. B of supplementary materials.

Table 1. Quantitative comparison with the state-of-the-art methods on Obama dataset. Our MemFace achieves the best subjective and objective quality by a large margin. We highlight the best and the second-best number in bold and underline respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Subjective Evaluation</th>
<th>Objective Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lip-sync↑</td>
<td>Render↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MemGAN [68]</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>2.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MemFace (Ours)</td>
<td>4.381</td>
<td>3.909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Qualitative comparison with the state-of-the-art methods (NVP [56], MemGAN [68], ADNeRF [17] and DFRF [45]) on Obama dataset. The blue and green arrows indicate inferior lip-sync and rendering quality respectively. It shows that our MemFace achieves higher lip-sync and rendering quality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaption Set</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Subjective Evaluation</th>
<th>Objective Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lip-sync↑</td>
<td>Render↑</td>
<td>Overall↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15s</td>
<td>AD-NeRF [17]</td>
<td>1.9419</td>
<td>2.4347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DFRF [45]</td>
<td>2.2753</td>
<td>2.8116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MemGAN [68]</td>
<td>2.2217</td>
<td>2.5726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MemFace (Ours)</td>
<td><strong>4.1288</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.8231</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>AD-NeRF [17]</td>
<td>2.2896</td>
<td>2.4057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DFRF [45]</td>
<td><strong>2.8116</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.7536</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MemGAN [68]</td>
<td>2.4058</td>
<td>2.3187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MemFace (Ours)</td>
<td><strong>4.4405</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.9854</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Comparisons with Previous Models

Our MemFace outperforms the state-of-the-art methods in both objective and subjective evaluation. With the same input audio, we compare our synthesized results with the following works: NVP [56], LipSync3D [30], MemGAN [68], ADNeRF [17] and DFRF [45]. In Fig. 5, we present the synthesized results of different methods when saying the same syllable. It demonstrates that, compared to the state-of-the-art methods, our synthesized results in the last row exhibit more accurate lip-sync and more satisfactory rendering quality. Quantitative results are shown in Tab. 1, where our method generally outperforms the comparison ones in both subjective and objective evaluation.

Our MemFace outperforms the state-of-the-art methods when adapting the model to new speakers with few adaption data. As discussed in Sec. 3.4, to alleviate the one-to-many mapping, we ease the prediction by complementing the missing information with memories. To verify that the memories make the prediction easier, we conduct experiments on adapting our model to new speakers with few adaption data (i.e., 15s and 30s training videos from HDTF dataset [71]). Specifically, for both our MemFace and the state-of-the-art methods [17, 45, 68], we first pre-train the models on the Obama dataset. Then, we build the explicit memory for each identity from the short adaption video. Finally, we fine-tune both the audio-to-expression model and neural-rendering model on the short adaption videos based on the pre-trained model parameters. As shown in Table. 2, our method exhibits an obviously better performance in all aspects under different scenarios. We also present some qualitative results in Fig. 6 to make an intuitive comparison. It can be seen that, the baseline methods tend to generate blurry images [17,45] or inaccurate lip motion [45,68]. In contrast, our adaptation results retain more texture details such as the teeth, and achieve a satisfactory lip-sync quality for different talking styles.

4.3. Ablation Studies

In this section, we verify the choices of implicit and explicit memory for each stage, and provide ablation studies on the hyper-parameters of memory (i.e., the number of key-value pairs). More ablation studies are provided in Sec. C of supplementary materials.

The implicit memory is more suitable for audio-to-expression model. We introduce an implicit memory to the audio-to-expression model. To verify which memory is suitable for the audio-to-expression model, we remove the implicit memory (w/o mem.) or replace it with explicit memory (w/ expl. mem.), where the audio features $A$ and expression coefficients $\hat{\alpha}_{exp}$ are regarded as keys and values respectively. We train the audio-to-expression model with the GRID dataset and then adapt the model to the 15s HDTF dataset to study the memory choice. In Tab. 3 and Fig. 7, it can be observed that compared with both settings (i.e., w/o mem. & w/ expl. mem.), our scheme with implicit memory achieves the better objective and subjective quality, which verifies that the implicit memory is more suitable for the audio-to-expression model. It also demonstrates that replacing the implicit memory with the explicit memory even leads to inferior quality than removing the implicit memory for the audio-to-expression model. We argue that the prediction of expression is semantically aligned with the input audio, and depends on the audio context. Therefore, directly
Table 3. Abalation studies on the implicit memory in the audio-to-expression model. The CMOS criterion represents lip-sync quality here. See Sec. 4.3 for detailed descriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>GRID</th>
<th>15s HDTF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSE $\downarrow$</td>
<td>CMOS $\uparrow$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MemFace</td>
<td>0.0826</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o mem.</td>
<td>0.0834</td>
<td>-0.1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ expl. mem.</td>
<td>0.0846</td>
<td>-0.2363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Abalation study on the explicit memory in the neural-rendering model. The CMOS criterion represents rendering quality here. See Sec. 4.3 for detailed descriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Obama</th>
<th>15s HDTF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPIPS $\downarrow$</td>
<td>CMOS $\uparrow$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MemFace</td>
<td>0.0207</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/o mem.</td>
<td>0.0248</td>
<td>-0.0454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/ impl. mem.</td>
<td>0.0245</td>
<td>-0.0281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Ablation studies on the number of key-value pairs in two memories ($M$ and $N$). Param. indicates the number of parameters of the audio-to-expression model. We train the neural-rendering model using Obama (LPIPS-1) and 15s HDTF (LPIPS-2, 375 frames) data to study the effect of the memory capacity.

(a) The implicit memory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>Param.</th>
<th>RMSE $\downarrow$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>177k</td>
<td>0.0828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>240k</td>
<td>0.0826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>305k</td>
<td>0.0826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>369k</td>
<td>0.0825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) The explicit memory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>LPIPS-1 $\downarrow$</th>
<th>LPIPS-2 $\downarrow$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0218</td>
<td>0.0237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.0215</td>
<td>0.0224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0207</td>
<td>0.0218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.0205</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

retrieving the corresponding expression leads to more noisy expressions, thus damaging the performance.

The explicit memory is more suitable for the neural-rendering model. In the neural-rendering model, we use explicit memory to complement the personalized visual details. We also verify which memory is suitable for the neural-rendering model in Tab. 4 and Fig. 8, in which we remove the explicit memory (w/o mem.) or replace it with implicit memory (w/ impl. mem.). The keys and values of this implicit memory are randomly initialized and jointly trained with the neural-rendering model. We train the neural-rendering model with the Obama dataset and then adapt the model to the 15s HDTF dataset. It can be observed that our scheme with explicit memory achieves the best objective and subjective quality. It also demonstrates that although employing an implicit memory (w/ impl. mem.) in the neural-rendering model can complement the missing information to some extent, our explicit memory (MemFace) provide more visual details and yield better synthesis quality.

Ablation studies on the number of key-value pairs in two memories. To study the effect of memory capacity, we vary the number of key-value pairs in two memories (i.e., $M$ and $N$ for the implicit and explicit memory respectively). The results shown in Tab. 5 indicate that $M = 1000$ and $N = 300$ achieve the best objective quality, which also shows that our model does not depend on larger memory capacity.

5. Conclusion

In this work, we improve both the lip-sync and rendering quality of talking face generation by alleviating the one-to-many mapping challenge with memories. Our MemFace incorporates an implicit memory and an explicit memory into the audio-to-expression model and the neural-rendering model respectively. The experiments verify the effectiveness of the two memories across multiple scenarios.

For future works, it is worth applying our idea to other one-to-many mapping tasks, such as text-to-image generation, and image translation. We will also investigate better ways to alleviate one-to-many mapping difficulty.
**Ethical consideration.** Our MemFace is developed only for research purposes. It should not be abused for fake face synthesis.
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In this supplementary, we provide more details and results to make our paper more comprehensive. Specifically, we present more method details in Sec. A, more experimental details in Sec. B, and more experimental results in Sec. C.

A. Details of Method

A.1. Construction of the explicit memory

As illustrated in Sec. 3.3 of the main paper, to construct the explicit memory in the neural-rendering model, we identify $N$ most dissimilar mouth shapes by calculating the Root-Mean-Square distance between mouth-related vertices, and then use the $N$ vertex-image pairs to build the explicit memory. Obviously, exploring all possible cases is almost infeasible due to heavy computation. So we adopt a manually-designed algorithm to construct the explicit memory. The detailed steps are shown in Alg. 1.

**Algorithm 1 Construction of the explicit memory.**

**Input:** All vertex-image pairs ($K_{all}^{vr}$ and $V_{all}^{vr}$) in dataset.

**Output:** $N$ vertex-image pairs ($K^{vr}$ and $V^{vr}$).

1. Set $N$ and randomly select $N$ vertex-image pairs from $K_{all}^{vr}$ and $V_{all}^{vr}$ to initialize $K^{vr}$ and $V^{vr};$
2. $(k_{m1}, k_{m2}, D_{min}) \leftarrow f(K^{vr})$, where $f$ is a function identifying the most similar two mouth shapes ($k_{m1}, k_{m2}) \in K^{vr}$ according to the corresponding Root-Mean-Square (RMS) distance $D_{min};$
3. for $(k_{imp}, v_{imp})$ in ($K_{all}^{vr}, V_{all}^{vr}$) do
4. $K_{imp1}^{vr} \leftarrow K^{vr}$, replace $k_{m1} \in K_{imp1}^{vr}$ with $k_{imp},$
5. $(..., D_{min1}) \leftarrow f(K_{imp1}^{vr});$
6. $K_{imp2}^{vr} \leftarrow K^{vr}$, replace $k_{m2} \in K_{imp2}^{vr}$ with $k_{imp},$
7. $(..., D_{min2}) \leftarrow f(K_{imp2}^{vr});$
8. if $max(D_{min1}, D_{min2}) > D_{min}$ then
9. if $D_{min1} > D_{min2}$ then
10. Replace $(k_{m1} \in K^{vr}, v_{m1} \in V^{vr})$ with $(k_{imp}, v_{imp});$
11. else
12. Replace $(k_{m2} \in K^{vr}, v_{m2} \in V^{vr})$ with $(k_{imp}, v_{imp});$
13. end if
14. end for
15. Return $K^{vr}$ and $V^{vr}$ as the $N$ vertex-image pairs to construct the explicit memory.

B. Details of Experiments

B.1. Dataset details

**Adaptation dataset.** As described in Sec. 4.1 of the main paper, we randomly collect 10 speakers with various talking styles from HDTF dataset [71], and conduct two sets of experiments using adaptation data with different durations (15s and 30s). We additionally conduct experiments with a 60s adaptation set for cases with intense head movements, and the results are shown in Sec. C.2.

B.2. Training details

We adopt Adam [27] optimizer with a learning rate of $1e^{-4}$ in the training stage. For adaptation experiments, we adapt the audio-to-expression model with a learning rate of $5e^{-6}$ (200 epochs) and the neural-rendering model with a learning rate of $1e^{-4}$ (50 epochs). To make the training easier, for the implicit memory, we update model parameters and memory alternately in the first half of the training.

B.3. Metrics

**Details of subjective evaluation.** For subjective evaluation, 20 experienced users are invited to participate. We use MOS (Mean Opinion Score) and CMOS (Comparison Mean Opinion Score) as our metrics in comparison experiments and ablation studies respectively. In MOS experiments, we present one video at a time and ask the users to rate the presented video at five grades in lip-sync, rendering, and overall quality respectively. Different grade choices in MOS are: Very Good (5), Good (4), Average (3), Poor (2), Very Poor (1). In CMOS experiments, we present two videos at a time and ask the users to make comparisons in lip-sync or rendering quality. Different grade choices in CMOS are: left video is obviously better (2), left video is a little better (1), indistinguishable (0), right video is a little better (1), right video is obviously better (-2).

We conduct the online evaluations with well-designed Google questionnaires. A detailed guideline with example videos is provided at the beginning of the questionnaires to ensure a consistent grading criterion.

C. More Experimental Results

C.1. More ablation studies

**Dimension of the implicit memory.** In Sec. 4.3 of the main paper, we conduct ablation studies on the number of key-value pairs in the implicit memory. As a supplement, we also explore the dimension selection of keys and values in the implicit memory. In Tab. 7, we set the dimension of keys and values to 32, 64 (our adoption), 96 and 128 respectively and show the corresponding performance. From Tab. 7, with the increase of dimensions, the prediction performance on GRID [11] dataset (RMSE-1) increases while the performance on HDTF [71] adaptation set (RMSE-2) decreases which may be caused by an overfitting problem due to more model parameters. The results show that our model does not depend on a larger memory capacity. In this paper, we adopt the dimension of 64 by default.
### Table 6. More adaptation results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaption Set</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Subjective Evaluation</th>
<th>Objective Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lip-sync ↑</td>
<td>Render ↑</td>
<td>Overall ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60s</td>
<td>AD-NeRF [17]</td>
<td>2.4347</td>
<td>2.2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DFRF [45]</td>
<td>2.1738</td>
<td>2.4637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MemGAN [68]</td>
<td>1.6790</td>
<td>2.3187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MemFace (Ours)</td>
<td>4.2746</td>
<td>3.9853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Set the implicit memory to random values. (upper half: train the audio-to-expression model on GRID [11], lower half: adaptation on HDTF [71]). The blue arrows indicate obvious inferior lip-sync quality.

Table 7. Ablation study on the size of the implicit memory. The number of key-value pairs is 1000, \( D \) means the dimension of keys and values. Param. indicates the number of parameters of the audio-to-expression model. We perform training with GRID [11] data (RMSE-1) and perform adaptation with HDTF [71] data (RMSE-2) to study the effect of \( D \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( D )</th>
<th>Param.</th>
<th>RMSE-1 ( \downarrow )</th>
<th>RMSE-2 ( \downarrow )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>178k</td>
<td>0.0832</td>
<td>0.1341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>240k</td>
<td><strong>0.0826</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.1343</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>314k</td>
<td>0.0824</td>
<td>0.1352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>382k</td>
<td>0.0823</td>
<td>0.1357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C.2. More adaptation results

As mentioned in Sec. B.1, we perform adaptation experiments with a 60s adaptation set, and the quantitative results are shown in Tab. 6 where our MemFace exhibits an obviously better performance in all aspects. Additionally, we provide several demo videos (5 minutes in total) to present our synthesized results and make comparisons with the state-of-the-art methods.

### C.3. Toy experiments

**Set the implicit memory to random values.** To verify that the implicit memory complements some missing information, after training, we reset the keys and values in the implicit memory to values with normal distribution, and the results are shown in Fig. 9. We can see that complementing random information leads to a decrease in lip-sync quality.

**Set the explicit memory to the visual appearance of another person.** To verify that the explicit memory complements useful missing information, we set the explicit memory to the visual appearance of another person and the results are shown in Fig. 10. We can see that complementing another’s pixel-level details leads to a decrease both in lip-sync and rendering quality.
Figure 10. Set the explicit memory to the visual appearance of another person. (upper half: train the neural-rendering model on Obama [53], lower half: adaptation on HDTF [71]). The blue and green arrows indicate inferior lip-sync and rendering quality respectively.