

# Captioning Images with Diverse Objects

Subhashini Venugopalan<sup>†</sup>  
Raymond Mooney<sup>†</sup>  
<sup>†</sup>UT Austin

{vsub,mooney}@cs.utexas.edu

Lisa Anne Hendricks\*  
Trevor Darrell\*  
\*UC Berkeley

{lisa\_anne, rohrbach, trevor}  
@eecs.berkeley.edu

Marcus Rohrbach\*  
Kate Saenko<sup>‡</sup>  
<sup>‡</sup>Boston Univ.

saenko@bu.edu

## Abstract

Recent captioning models are limited in their ability to scale and describe concepts unseen in paired image-text corpora. We propose the Novel Object Captioner (NOC), a deep visual semantic captioning model that can describe a large number of object categories not present in existing image-caption datasets. Our model takes advantage of external sources – labeled images from object recognition datasets, and semantic knowledge extracted from unannotated text. We propose minimizing a joint objective which can learn from these diverse data sources and leverage distributional semantic embeddings, enabling the model to generalize and describe novel objects outside of image-caption datasets. We demonstrate that our model exploits semantic information to generate captions for hundreds of object categories in the ImageNet object recognition dataset that are not observed in MSCOCO image-caption training data, as well as many categories that are observed very rarely. Both automatic evaluations and human judgements show that our model considerably outperforms prior work in being able to describe many more categories of objects.

## 1. Introduction

Modern visual classifiers [6, 22] can recognize thousands of object categories, some of which are basic or entry-level (e.g. television), and others that are fine-grained and task specific (e.g. dial-phone, cell-phone). However, recent state-of-the-art visual captioning systems [2, 3, 8, 10, 15, 26] that learn directly from images and descriptions, rely solely on paired image-caption data for supervision and fail in their ability to generalize and describe this vast set of recognizable objects in context. While such systems could be scaled by building larger image/video description datasets, obtaining such captioned data would be expensive and laborious. Furthermore, visual description is challenging because models have to not only correctly identify visual concepts contained in an image, but must also compose these concepts into a coherent sentence.



Figure 1. We propose a model that learns simultaneously from multiple data sources with auxiliary objectives to describe a variety of objects unseen in paired image-caption data.

Recent work [7] shows that, to incorporate the vast knowledge of current visual recognition networks without explicit paired caption training data, caption models can learn from external sources and learn to compose sentences about visual concepts which are infrequent or non-existent in image-description corpora. However, the pioneering DCC model from [7] is unwieldy in the sense that the model requires explicit transfer (“copying”) of learned parameters from previously seen categories to novel categories. This not only prevents it from describing rare categories and limits the model’s ability to cover a wider variety of objects but also makes it unable to be trained end-to-end. We instead propose the Novel Object Captioner (NOC), a network that can be trained end-to-end using a joint training strategy to integrate knowledge from external visual recognition datasets as well as semantic information from independent unannotated text corpora to generate captions for a diverse range of rare and novel objects (as in Fig. 1).

Specifically, we introduce auxiliary objectives which allow our network to learn a captioning model on image-caption pairs simultaneously with a deep language model and visual recognition system on unannotated text and labeled images. Unlike previous work, the auxiliary objectives allow the NOC model to learn relevant information from multiple data sources simultaneously in an end-to-end fashion. Furthermore, NOC implicitly leverages pre-trained distributional word embeddings enabling it to describe unseen and rare object categories. The main contributions of our work are 1) an end-to-end model to describe objects not present in paired image-caption data, 2) auxiliary/joint



over the vocabulary of words. During training, we introduce auxiliary image-specific ( $\mathcal{L}_{IM}$ ), and text-specific ( $\mathcal{L}_{LM}$ ) objectives along with the paired image-caption ( $\mathcal{L}_{CM}$ ) loss. These loss functions, when trained jointly, influence our model to not only produce reasonable image descriptions, but also predict visual concepts as well as generate cohesive text (language modeling). We first discuss the auxiliary objectives and the joint training, and then discuss how we leverage embeddings trained with external text to compose descriptions about novel objects.

### 3.1. Auxiliary Training Objectives

Our motivation for introducing auxiliary objectives is to learn how to describe images without losing the ability to recognize more objects. Typically, image-captioning models incorporate a visual classifier pre-trained on a source domain (e.g. ImageNet dataset) and then tune it to the target domain (the image-caption dataset). However, important information from the source dataset can be suppressed if similar information is not present when fine-tuning, leading the network to forget (over-write weights) for objects not present in the target domain. This is problematic in our scenario in which the model relies on the source datasets to learn a large variety of visual concepts not present in the target dataset. However, with pre-training as well as the complementary auxiliary objectives the model maintains its ability to recognize a wider variety of objects and is encouraged to describe objects which are not present in the target dataset at test time. For the ease of exposition, we abstract away the details of the language and the visual models and first describe the joint training objectives of the complete model, i.e. the text-specific loss, the image-specific loss, and the image-caption loss. We will then describe the language and the visual models.

#### 3.1.1 Image-specific Loss

Our visual recognition model (Fig. 2, left) is a neural network parametrized by  $\theta_I$  and is trained on object recognition datasets. Unlike typical visual recognition models that are trained with a single label on a classification task, for the task of image captioning an image model that has high confidence over multiple visual concepts occurring in an image simultaneously would be preferable. Hence, we choose to train our model using multiple labels (more in Sec. 5.1) with a multi-label loss. If  $l$  denotes a label and  $z_l$  denotes the binary ground-truth value for the label, then the objective for the visual model is given by the cross-entropy loss ( $\mathcal{L}_{IM}$ ):

$$\mathcal{L}_{IM}(I; \theta_I) = - \sum_l \left[ z_l \log(S_l(f_{IM}(I; \theta_I))) + (1 - z_l) \log(1 - S_l(f_{IM}(I; \theta_I))) \right] \quad (1)$$

where  $S_i(x)$  is the output of a softmax function over index  $i$  and input  $x$ , and  $f_{IM}$ , is the activation of the final layer of the visual recognition network.

#### 3.1.2 Text-specific Loss

Our language model (Fig. 2, right) is based on LSTM Recurrent Neural Networks. We denote the parameters of this network by  $\theta_L$ , and the activation of the final layer of this network by  $f_{LM}$ . The language model is trained to predict the next word  $w_t$  in a given sequence of words  $w_0, \dots, w_{t-1}$ . This is optimized using the softmax loss  $\mathcal{L}_{LM}$  which is equivalent to the maximum-likelihood:

$$\mathcal{L}_{LM}(w_0, \dots, w_{t-1}; \theta_L) = - \sum_t \log(S_{w_t}(f_{LM}(w_0, \dots, w_{t-1}; \theta_L))) \quad (2)$$

#### 3.1.3 Image-caption Loss

The goal of the image captioning model (Fig. 2, center) is to generate a sentence conditioned on an image ( $I$ ). NOC predicts the next word in a sequence,  $w_t$ , conditioned on previously generated words ( $w_0, \dots, w_{t-1}$ ) and an image ( $I$ ), by summing activations from the deep language model, which operates over previous words, and the deep image model, which operates over an image. We denote these final (summed) activations by  $f_{CM}$ . Then, the probability of predicting the next word is given by,  $P(w_t|w_0, \dots, w_{t-1}, I)$

$$\begin{aligned} &= S_{w_t}(f_{CM}(w_0, \dots, w_{t-1}, I; \theta)) \\ &= S_{w_t}(f_{LM}(w_0, \dots, w_{t-1}; \theta_L) + f_{IM}(I; \theta_I)) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Given pairs of images and descriptions, the caption model optimizes the parameters of the underlying language model ( $\theta_L$ ) and image model ( $\theta_I$ ) by minimizing the caption model loss  $\mathcal{L}_{CM} : \mathcal{L}_{CM}(w_0, \dots, w_{t-1}, I; \theta_L, \theta_I)$

$$= - \sum_t \log(S_{w_t}(f_{CM}(w_0, \dots, w_{t-1}, I; \theta_L, \theta_I))) \quad (4)$$

#### 3.1.4 Joint Training with Auxiliary Losses

While many previous approaches have been successful on image captioning by pre-training the image and language models and tuning the caption model alone (Eqn. 4), this is insufficient to generate descriptions for objects outside of the image-caption dataset since the model tends to “forget” (over-write weights) for objects only seen in external data sources. To remedy this, we propose to train the image model, language model, and caption model simultaneously on different data sources. The NOC model’s final objective simultaneously minimizes the three individual complementary objectives:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{CM} + \mathcal{L}_{IM} + \mathcal{L}_{LM} \quad (5)$$

By sharing the weights of the caption model’s network with the image network and the language network (as depicted in Fig. 2 (a)), the model can be trained simultaneously on independent image-only data, unannotated text data, as well as paired image-caption data. Consequently, co-optimizing different objectives aids the model in recognizing categories outside of the paired image-sentence data.

### 3.2. Language Model with Semantic Embeddings

Our language model consists of the following components: a continuous lower dimensional embedding space for words ( $W_{glove}$ ), a single recurrent (LSTM) hidden layer, and two linear transformation layers where the second layer ( $W_{glove}^T$ ) maps the vectors to the size of the vocabulary. Finally a softmax activation function is used on the output layer to produce a normalized probability distribution. The cross-entropy loss which is equivalent to the maximum-likelihood is used as the training objective.

In addition to our joint objective (Eqn.5), we also employ semantic embeddings in our language model to help generate sentences when describing novel objects. Specifically, the initial input embedding space ( $W_{glove}$ ) is used to represent the input (one-hot) words into semantically meaningful dense fixed-length vectors. While the final transformation layer ( $W_{glove}^T$ ) reverses the mapping [15, 25] of a dense vector back to the full vocabulary with the help of a softmax activation function. These distributional embeddings [17, 20] share the property that words that are semantically similar have similar vector representations. The intuitive reason for using these embeddings in the input and output transformation layers is to help the language model treat words unseen in the image-text corpus to (semantically) similar words that have previously been seen so as to encourage compositional sentence generation i.e. encourage it to use new/rare word in a sentence description based on the visual confidence.

### 3.3. Visual Classifier

The other main component of our model is the visual classifier. Identical to previous work [7], we employ the VGG-16 [22] convolutional network as the visual recognition network. We modify the final layers of the network to incorporate the multi-label loss (Eqn. 1) to predict visual confidence over multiple labels in the full vocabulary. The rest of the classification network remains unchanged.

Finally, we take an elementwise-sum of the visual and language outputs, one can think of this as the language model producing a smooth probability distribution over words (based on GloVe parameter sharing) and then the image signal “selecting among these based on the visual evidence when summed with the the language model beliefs.

## 4. Datasets

In this section we describe the image description dataset as well as the external text and image datasets used in our experiments.

### 4.1. External Text Corpus (WebCorpus)

We extract sentences from Gigaword, the British National Corpus (BNC), UkWaC, and Wikipedia. Stanford CoreNLP 3.4.2 [14] was used to extract tokenizations. This dataset was used to train the LSTM language model. For

the dense word representation in the network, we use GloVe [20] pre-trained on 6B tokens of external corpora including Gigaword and Wikipedia. To create our LM vocabulary we identified the 80,000 most frequent tokens from the combined external corpora. We refine this vocabulary further to a set of 72,700 words that also had GloVe embeddings.

### 4.2. Image Caption data

To empirically evaluate the ability of NOC to describe new objects we use the training and test set from [7]. This dataset is created from MSCOCO [13] by clustering the main 80 object categories using cosine distance on word2vec (of the object label) and selecting one object from each cluster to hold out from training. The training set holds out images and sentences of 8 objects (bottle, bus, couch, microwave, pizza, racket, suitcase, zebra), which constitute about 10% of the training image and caption pairs in the MSCOCO dataset. Our model is evaluated on how well it can generate descriptions about images containing the eight held-out objects.

### 4.3. Image data

We also evaluate sentences generated by NOC on approximately 700 different ImageNet [21] objects which are not present in the MSCOCO dataset. We choose this set by identifying objects that are present in both ImageNet and our language corpus (vocabulary), but not present in MSCOCO. Chosen words span a variety of categories including fine-grained categories (e.g., “bloodhound” and “chrysanthemum”), adjectives (e.g., “chiffon”, “woollen”), and entry level words (e.g., “toad”). Further, to study how well our model can describe rare objects, we pick a separate set of 52 objects which are in ImageNet but mentioned infrequently in MSCOCO (52 mentions on average, with median 27 mentions across all 400k training sentences).

## 5. Experiments on MSCOCO

We perform the following experiments to compare NOC’s performance with previous work [7]: 1. We evaluate the model’s ability to caption objects that are held out from MSCOCO during training (Sec. 5.1). 2. To study the effect of the data source on training, we report performance of NOC when the image and language networks are trained on in-domain and out-of-domain sources (Sec. 5.2). In addition to these, to understand our model better: 3. We perform ablations to study how much each component of our model (such as word embeddings, auxiliary objective, etc.) contributes to the performance (Sec. 5.3). 4. We also study if the model’s performance remains consistent when holding out a different subset of objects from MSCOCO (Sec. 5.4).

### 5.1. Empirical Evaluation on MSCOCO

We empirically evaluate the ability of our proposed model to describe novel objects by following the experimental setup of [7]. We optimize each loss in our model with the following datasets: the caption model, which

Model	bottle	bus	couch	microwave	pizza	racket	suitcase	zebra	Avg. F1	Avg. METEOR
DCC	4.63	29.79	<b>45.87</b>	<b>28.09</b>	64.59	52.24	13.16	79.88	39.78	21.00
NOC (ours)	<b>17.78</b>	<b>68.79</b>	25.55	24.72	<b>69.33</b>	<b>55.31</b>	<b>39.86</b>	<b>89.02</b>	<b>48.79</b>	<b>21.32</b>

Table 1. MSCOCO Captioning: F1 scores (in %) of NOC (our model) and DCC [7] on held-out objects not seen jointly during image-caption training, along with the average F1 and METEOR scores of the generated captions across images containing these objects.




Figure 3. COCO Captioning: Examples comparing captions by NOC (ours) and DCC [7] on held out objects from MSCOCO.

jointly learns the parameters  $\theta_L$  and  $\theta_I$ , is trained only on the subset of MSCOCO without the 8 objects (see section 4.2), the image model, which updates parameters  $\theta_I$ , is optimized using labeled images, and the language model which updates parameters  $\theta_L$ , is trained using the corresponding descriptions. When training the visual network on images from COCO, we obtain multiple labels for each image by considering all words in the associated captions as labels after removing stop words. We first present evaluations for the in-domain setting in which the image classifier is trained with all COCO training images and the language model is trained with all sentences. We use the METEOR metric [1] to evaluate description quality. However, METEOR only captures fluency and does not account for the mention (or lack) of specific words. Hence, we also use F1 to ascertain that the model mentions the object name in the description of the images containing the object. Thus, the metrics measure if the model can both identify the object and use it fluently in a sentence.

**COCO heldout objects.** Table 1 compares the F1 score achieved by NOC to the previous best method, DCC [7] on the 8 held-out COCO objects. NOC outperforms DCC (by 10% F1 on average) on all objects except “couch” and “microwave”. The higher F1 and METEOR demonstrate that NOC is able to correctly recognize many more instances of the unseen objects and also integrate the words into fluent descriptions.

## 5.2. Training data source

To study the effect of different data sources, we also evaluate our model in an out-of-domain setting where classifiers

	Image	Text	Model	METEOR	F1
1		Baseline	LRCN	19.33	0
		(no transfer)	DCC	19.90	0
2	Image Net	Web	DCC	20.66	34.94
		Corpus	NOC	17.56	36.50
3	COCO	Web	NOC	19.18	41.74
		Corpus			
4	COCO	COCO	DCC	21.00	39.78
		COCO	NOC	<b>21.32</b>	<b>48.79</b>

Table 2. Comparison with different training data sources on 8 held-out COCO objects. Having in-domain data helps both the DCC [7] and our NOC model caption novel objects.

for held out objects are trained with images from ImageNet and the language model is trained on text mined from external corpora. Table 2 reports average scores across the eight held-out objects. We compare our NOC model to results from [7] (DCC), as well as a competitive image captioning model - LRCN [2] trained on the same split. In the out-of-domain setting (line 2), for the chosen set of 8 objects, NOC performs slightly better on F1 and a bit lower on METEOR compared to DCC. However, as previously mentioned, DCC needs to explicitly identify a set of “seen” object classes to transfer weights to the novel classes whereas NOC can be used for inference directly. DCC’s transfer mechanism also leads to peculiar descriptions. E.g., *Racket* in Fig. 3.

With COCO image training (line 3), F1 scores of NOC improves considerably even with the Web Corpus LM training. Finally in the in-domain setting (line 4) NOC outperforms DCC on F1 by around 10 points while also improving METEOR slightly. This suggests that NOC is able to associate the objects with captions better with in-domain training, and the auxiliary objectives and embedding help the model to generalize and describe novel objects.

## 5.3. Ablations

Table 3 compares how different aspects of training impact the overall performance. *Tuned Vision contribution* The model that does not incorporate Glove or LM pre-training has poor performance (METEOR 15.78, F1 14.41); this ablation shows the contribution of the vision model alone in recognizing and describing the held out objects. *LM & Glove contribution:* The model trained without the

Contributing factor	Glove	LM pretrain	Tuned Visual Classifier	Auxiliary Objective	METEOR	F1
Tuned Vision	-	-	✓	✓	15.78	14.41
LM & Embedding	✓	✓	✓	-	19.80	25.38
LM & Pre-trained Vision	✓	✓	Fixed	-	18.91	39.70
Auxiliary Objective	✓	-	✓	✓	19.69	47.02
All	✓	✓	✓	✓	<b>21.32</b>	<b>48.79</b>

Table 3. Ablations comparing the contributions of the Glove embedding, LM pre-training, and auxiliary objectives, of the NOC model. Our auxiliary objective along with Glove have the largest impact in captioning novel objects.

Model	bed	book	carrot	elephant	spoon	toilet	truck	umbrella	Avg. F1	Avg. METEOR
NOC (ours)	53.31	18.58	20.69	85.35	02.70	73.61	57.90	54.23	45.80	20.04

Table 4. MSCOCO Captioning: F1 scores (in %) of NOC (our model) on a different subset of the held-out objects not seen jointly during image-caption training, along with the average F1 and METEOR scores of the generated captions across images containing these objects. NOC is consistently able to caption different subsets of unseen object categories in MSCOCO.

auxiliary objective, performs better with F1 of 25.38 and METEOR of 19.80; this improvement comes largely from the GloVe embeddings which help in captioning novel object classes. *LM & Pre-trained Vision:* It’s interesting to note that when we fix classifier’s weights (pre-trained on all objects), before tuning the LM on the image-caption COCO subset, the F1 increases substantially to 39.70 suggesting that the visual model recognizes many objects but can “forget” objects learned by the classifier when fine-tuned on the image-caption data (without the 8 objects). *Auxiliary Objective:* Incorporating the auxiliary objectives, F1 improves remarkably to 47.02. We note here that by virtue of including auxiliary objectives the visual network is tuned on all images thus retaining it’s ability to classify/recognize a wide range of objects. Finally, incorporating all aspects gives NOC the best performance (F1 48.79, METEOR 21.32), significantly outperforming DCC.

#### 5.4. Validating on a different subset of COCO

To show that our model is consistent across objects, we create a different training/test split by holding out a different set of eight objects from COCO. The objects we hold out are: bed, book, carrot, elephant, spoon, toilet, truck and umbrella. Images and sentences from these eight objects again constitute about 10% of the MSCOCO training dataset. Table 4 presents the performance of the model on this subset. We observe that the F1 and METEOR scores, although a bit lower, are consistent with numbers observed in Table 1 confirming that our model is able to generalize to different subsets of objects.

## 6. Experiments: Scaling to ImageNet

To demonstrate the scalability of NOC, we describe objects in ImageNet for which no paired image-sentence data exists. Our experiments are performed on two subsets of

ImageNet, (i) Novel Objects: A set of 638 objects which are present in ImageNet as well as the model’s vocabulary but are not mentioned in MSCOCO. (ii) Rare Objects: A set of 52 objects which are in ImageNet as well as the MSCOCO vocabulary but are mentioned infrequently in the MSCOCO captions (median of 27 mentions). For quantitative evaluation, (i) we measure the percentage of objects for which the model is able to describe at least one image of the object (using the object label), (ii) we also report accuracy and F1 scores to compare across the entire set of images and objects the model is able to describe. Furthermore, we obtain human evaluations comparing our model with previous work on whether the model is able to incorporate the object label meaningfully in the description together with how well it describes the image.

### 6.1. Describing Novel Objects

Table 5 compares models on 638 novel object categories (identical to [7]) using the following metrics: (i) Describing novel objects (%) refers to the percentage of the selected ImageNet objects mentioned in descriptions, i.e. for each novel word (e.g., “otter”) the model should incorporate the word (“otter”) into at least one description about an ImageNet image of the object (otter). While DCC is able to recognize and describe 56.85% (363) of the selected ImageNet objects in descriptions, NOC recognizes several more objects and is capable of describing 91.27% (582 of 638) ImageNet objects. (ii) Accuracy refers to the percentage of images from each category where the model is able to correctly identify and describe the category. We report the average accuracy across all categories. DCC incorporates a new word correctly 11.08% of the time, in comparison, NOC improves this appreciably to 24.74%. (iii) F1 score is computed based on precision and recall of mentioning the object in the description. Again, NOC outperforms with average F1 33.76% to DCC’s 14.47%.

Model	Desc. Novel (%)	Acc (%)	F1 (%)
DCC	56.85	11.08	14.47
NOC	<b>91.27</b>	<b>24.74</b>	<b>33.76</b>

Table 5. ImageNet: Comparing our model against DCC [7] on % of novel classes described, average accuracy of mentioning the class in the description, and mean F1 scores for object mentions.

	<i>Woolen (n04599235)</i> DCC: A red and white cat sitting on top of a red <b>woollen</b> . NOC (Ours): A red and blue <b>woollen</b> yarn sitting on a wooden table.
	<i>Newsstand (n03822656)</i> DCC: A bunch of people are sitting on a <b>newsstand</b> . NOC (Ours): A extremely large <b>newsstand</b> with many different items on it.
	<i>Scythe (n04158250)</i> DCC: A small child is holding a small child on a skateboard. NOC (Ours): A man is standing on a green field with a <b>scythe</b> .
	<i>Circuitry (n03034405)</i> DCC: A large white and black and white photo of a large building. NOC (Ours): A bunch of different types of <b>circuitry</b> on a table.
	<i>Moussaka (n07872593)</i> DCC: A white plate topped with a sandwich and a <b>moussaka</b> . NOC (Ours): A <b>moussaka</b> with cheese and vegetables on a white plate.
	<i>Warship (n04552696)</i> DCC: A <b>warship</b> is sitting on the water. NOC (Ours): A large <b>warship</b> is on the water.
	<i>Caribou (n02433925)</i> DCC: A <b>caribou</b> is in a field with a small caribou. NOC (Ours): A <b>caribou</b> that is standing in the grass.
	<i>Pharmacy (n03249342)</i> [Both models incorporate the word incorrectly] DCC: A white refrigerator freezer sitting on top of a <b>pharmacy</b> . NOC (Ours): A kitchen with a <b>pharmacy</b> and a refrigerator.

Figure 4. ImageNet Captioning: Examples comparing captions by NOC (ours) and DCC [7] on objects from ImageNet.

Although NOC and DCC [7] use the same CNN, NOC is both able to describe more categories, and correctly integrate new words into descriptions more frequently. DCC [7] can fail either with respect to finding a suitable object that is both semantically and syntactically similar to the novel object, or with regard to their language model composing a sentence using the object name, in NOC the former never occurs (i.e. we don’t need to explicitly identify similar objects), reducing the overall sources of error.

Fig. 4 and Fig. 6 (column 3) show examples where NOC describes a large variety of objects from ImageNet. Fig. 4 compares our model with DCC. Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 (right) outline some errors. Failing to describe a new object is one common error for NOC. E.g. Fig. 6 (top right), NOC incorrectly describes a man holding a “sitar” as a man holding a “baseball bat”. Other common errors include generating non-grammatical or nonsensical phrases (example with “gladiator”, “aardvark”) and repeating a specific object (“A barracuda ... with a barracuda”, “trifle cake”).

## 6.2. Describing Rare Objects/Words

The selected rare words occur with varying frequency in the MSCOCO training set, with about 52 mentions on aver-

	<i>Gladiator (n10131815)</i> Error: Semantics NOC: A man wearing a <b>gladiator</b> wearing a <b>gladiator</b> hat.
	<i>Taper (n13902793)</i> Error: Counting NOC: A group of three <b>taper</b> sitting on a table.
	<i>Trifle (n07613480)</i> Error: Repetition NOC: A <b>trifle</b> cake with <b>trifle</b> cake on top of a <b>trifle</b> cake.
	<i>Lory (n01820348)</i> Error: Recognition NOC: A bird sitting on a branch with a colorful bird sitting on it.

Figure 5. ImageNet Captioning: Common types of errors observed in the captions generated by the NOC model.

age (median 27) across all training sentences. For example, words such as “bonsai” only appear 5 times, “whisk” (11 annotations), “teapot” (30 annotations), and others such as pumpkin appears 58 times, “swan” (60 annotations), and on the higher side objects like scarf appear 144 times. When tested on ImageNet images containing these concepts, a model trained only with MSCOCO paired data incorporates rare words into sentences 2.93% of the time with an average F1 score of 4.58%. In contrast, integrating outside data, our NOC model can incorporate rare words into descriptions 35.15% of the time with an average F1 score of 47.58%. We do not compare this to DCC since DCC cannot be applied directly to caption rare objects.

## 6.3. Human Evaluation

ImageNet images do not have accompanying captions and this makes the task much more challenging to evaluate. To compare the performance of NOC and DCC we obtain human judgements on captions generated by the models on several object categories. We select 3 images each from about 580 object categories that at least one of the two models, NOC and DCC, can describe. (Note that although both models were trained on the same ImageNet object categories, NOC is able to describe almost all of the object categories that have been described by DCC). When selecting the images, for object categories that both models can describe, we make sure to select at least two images for which both models mention the object label in the description. Each image is presented to three workers. We conducted two human studies (sample interface is in the supplement): Given the image, the ground-truth object category (and meaning), and the captions generated by the models, we evaluate on:

**Word Incorporation:** We ask humans to choose which sentence/caption incorporates the object label meaningfully in the description. The options provided are: (i) Sentence 1 incorporates the word better, (ii) Sentence 2 incorporates the word better, (iii) Both sen-

### Novel Objects (COCO)



A tennis player preparing to hit the ball with a **racket**.



A **bus** driving down a busy street with people standing around.



A cat sitting on a **suitcase** next to a bag.

### Rare Words



A man in a red and white shirt and a red and white **octopus**.



A red **trolley train** sits on the tracks near a building.



A close up of a plate of food with a **spatula**.

### Novel Objects (ImageNet Images)



A white and red **cockatoo** standing in a field.



A **woodpecker** sitting on a tree branch in the woods.



A **otter** is sitting on a rock in the sun.



A woman is holding a large **megaphone** in her hand.



A **orca** is riding a small wave in the water.



A **saucepan** full of soup and a pot on a stove.



A table with a plate of **sashimi** and vegetables.



A large **flounder** is resting on a rock.



A man is standing on a field with a **caddie**.

### Errors (ImageNet)



A man holding a baseball bat standing in front of a building.



A cat is laying inside of a small white **aardvark**.



A **barracuda** on a blue ocean with a **barracuda**.

Figure 6. Descriptions produced by NOC on a variety of objects, including “caddie”, “saucepan”, and “flounder”. (Right) NOC makes errors and (top right) fails to describe the new object (“sitar”). More categories of images and objects are in the supplement.

tences incorporate the word equally well, or (iv) Neither of them do well.

**Image Description:** We also ask humans to pick which of the two sentences describes the image better.

This allows us to compare both how well a model incorporates the novel object label in the sentence, as well as how appropriate the description is to the image. The results are presented in Table 6. On the subset of images corresponding to objects that both models can describe (Intersection), NOC and DCC appear evenly matched, with NOC only having a slight edge. However, looking at all object categories (Union), NOC is able to both incorporate the object label in the sentence, and describe the image better than DCC.

## 7. Conclusion

We present an end-to-end trainable architecture that incorporates auxiliary training objectives and distributional semantics to generate descriptions for object classes unseen in paired image-caption data. Notably, NOC’s architecture and training strategy enables the visual recognition network to retain its ability to recognize several hundred categories of objects even as it learns to generate captions on a different set of images and objects. We demonstrate our model’s captioning capabilities on a held-out set of MSCOCO objects as well as several hundred ImageNet objects. Both human evaluations and quantitative assessments show that our model is able to describe many more novel objects compared to previous work. NOC has a 10% higher F1 on unseen COCO objects and 20% higher F1 on ImageNet objects compared to previous work, while also maintaining or

Objects subset →	Word Incorporation		Image Description	
	Union	Intersection	Union	Intersection
NOC is better	<b>43.78</b>	34.61	<b>59.84</b>	51.04
DCC is better	25.74	34.12	40.16	48.96
Both equally good	6.10	9.35	-	-
Neither is good	24.37	21.91	-	-

Table 6. ImageNet: Human judgements comparing our NOC model with DCC [7] on the ability to meaningfully incorporate the novel object in the description (Word Incorporation) and describe the image. ‘Union’ and ‘Intersection’ refer to the subset of objects where atleast one model, and both models are able to incorporate the object name in the description. All values in %.

improving descriptive quality. We also present an analysis of the contributions from different network modules, training objectives, and data sources. Additionally, our model directly extends to generate captions for ImageNet objects mentioned rarely in the image-caption corpora. Code is available at: <https://vsubhashini.github.io/noc.html>

## Acknowledgements

We thank anonymous reviewers and Saurabh Gupta for helpful suggestions. Venugopalan is supported by a UT scholarship, and Hendricks was supported by a Huawei fellowship. Darrell was supported in part by DARPA; AFRL; DoD MURI award N000141110688; NSF awards IIS-1212798, IIS-1427425, and IIS-1536003, and the Berkeley Artificial Intelligence Research Lab. Mooney and Saenko are supported in part by DARPA under AFRL grant FA8750-13-2-0026 and a Google Grant.

## References

- [1] M. Denkowski and A. Lavie. Meteor universal: Language specific translation evaluation for any target language. In *Proceedings of the Ninth Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation*, 2014. 5
- [2] J. Donahue, L. A. Hendricks, S. Guadarrama, M. Rohrbach, S. Venugopalan, K. Saenko, and T. Darrell. Long-term recurrent convolutional networks for visual recognition and description. In *CVPR*, 2015. 1, 2, 5
- [3] H. Fang, S. Gupta, F. N. Iandola, R. Srivastava, L. Deng, P. Dollár, J. Gao, X. He, M. Mitchell, J. C. Platt, C. L. Zitnick, and G. Zweig. From captions to visual concepts and back. In *CVPR*, 2015. 1, 2
- [4] A. Frome, G. S. Corrado, J. Shlens, S. Bengio, J. Dean, T. Mikolov, et al. Devise: A deep visual-semantic embedding model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2121–2129, 2013. 2
- [5] C. Gulcehre, O. Firat, K. Xu, K. Cho, L. Barrault, H. Lin, F. Bougares, H. Schwenk, and Y. Bengio. On using monolingual corpora in neural machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.03535*, 2015. 2
- [6] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR*, 2016. 1
- [7] L. A. Hendricks, S. Venugopalan, M. Rohrbach, R. Mooney, K. Saenko, and T. Darrell. Deep compositional captioning: Describing novel object categories without paired training data. In *CVPR*, 2016. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
- [8] A. Karpathy and L. Fei-Fei. Deep visual-semantic alignments for generating image descriptions. In *CVPR*, 2015. 1, 2
- [9] R. Kiros, R. Salakhutdinov, and R. Zemel. Multimodal neural language models. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-14)*, pages 595–603, 2014. 2
- [10] R. Kiros, R. Salakhutdinov, and R. S. Zemel. Unifying visual-semantic embeddings with multimodal neural language models. *TACL*, 2015. 1, 2
- [11] P. Kuznetsova, V. Ordonez, T. L. Berg, U. C. Hill, and Y. Choi. Treetalk: Composition and compression of trees for image descriptions. In *TACL*, 2014. 2
- [12] A. Lazaridou, E. Bruni, and M. Baroni. Is this a wampimuk? cross-modal mapping between distributional semantics and the visual world. In *ACL*, 2014. 2
- [13] T.-Y. Lin, M. Maire, S. Belongie, J. Hays, P. Perona, D. Ramanan, P. Dollár, and C. L. Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *ECCV*, 2014. 2, 4
- [14] C. Manning, M. Surdeanu, J. Bauer, J. Finkel, S. J. Bethard, and D. McClosky. The stanford corenlp natural language processing toolkit. In *Proceedings of 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 55–60, 2014. 4
- [15] J. Mao, W. Xu, Y. Yang, J. Wang, Z. Huang, and A. Yuille. Deep captioning with multimodal recurrent neural networks (m-rnn). In *ICLR*, 2015. 1, 2, 4
- [16] J. Mao, W. Xu, Y. Yang, J. Wang, Z. Huang, and A. L. Yuille. Learning like a child: Fast novel visual concept learning from sentence descriptions of images. In *ICCV*, 2015. 2
- [17] T. Mikolov, I. Sutskever, K. Chen, G. S. Corrado, and J. Dean. Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *NIPS*, 2013. 4
- [18] M. Mitchell, J. Dodge, A. Goyal, K. Yamaguchi, K. Stratos, X. Han, A. Mensch, A. C. Berg, T. L. Berg, and H. D. III. Midge: Generating image descriptions from computer vision detections. In *EACL*, 2012. 2
- [19] M. Norouzi, T. Mikolov, S. Bengio, Y. Singer, J. Shlens, A. Frome, G. S. Corrado, and J. Dean. Zero-shot learning by convex combination of semantic embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.5650*, 2013. 2
- [20] J. Pennington, R. Socher, and C. D. Manning. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. *Proceedings of the Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP 2014)*, 12:1532–1543, 2014. 2, 4
- [21] O. Russakovsky, J. Deng, H. Su, J. Krause, S. Satheesh, S. Ma, Z. Huang, A. Karpathy, A. Khosla, M. Bernstein, A. C. Berg, and L. Fei-Fei. ILSVRC, 2014. 2, 4
- [22] K. Simonyan and A. Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *CoRR*, abs/1409.1556, 2014. 1, 4
- [23] R. Socher, A. Karpathy, Q. V. Le, C. D. Manning, and A. Y. Ng. Grounded compositional semantics for finding and describing images with sentences. *TACL*, 2014. 2
- [24] M. Sundermeyer, R. Schlüter, and H. Ney. LSTM neural networks for language modeling. In *INTERSPEECH*, 2012. 2
- [25] S. Venugopalan, L. A. Hendricks, R. Mooney, and K. Saenko. Improving LSTM-based video description with linguistic knowledge mined from text. In *EMNLP*, 2016. 4
- [26] O. Vinyals, A. Toshev, S. Bengio, and D. Erhan. Show and tell: A neural image caption generator. In *CVPR*, 2015. 1, 2
- [27] Y. Yang, C. L. Teo, H. Daumé III, and Y. Aloimonos. Corpus-guided sentence generation of natural images. In *EMNLP*, 2011. 2