Supplementary Material

A. Experimental Details

A.1. Implementation of Similarity Metrics

This subsection lists approaches for computing mage-toimage similarities and text-to-text similarities. In the imagetext-image and text-image-text tasks, the evaluation metrics and distance metrics are closely related, i.e., the evaluation metrics for one task serve as distance metrics for the other task. Hence, we present them jointly in this section.

CLIP: The CLIP ViT-L/14 model³ is pre-trained on a 400M text-image pair dataset. Specifically, we employ the outputs from the visual projection layer with an embedding size of 768 for the CLIP image encoder. For the CLIP text encoder, the outputs from the textual projection layer with an embedding size of 512 are used.

DINO: The pretrained DINO ViT-B/8 model⁴ are used to obtain the image embeddings. DINO has been trained on the images dataset in a self-supervised way and has shown superior performance on representation learning tasks. The input image size is set to 384 and the output embedding size to 768.

FID, IS: Following [46], the torch-fidelity library⁵ is used to compute the fidelity scores of the generated images.

SBERT: We use Sentence-BERT⁶ with embedding size of 384 and take the [CLS] embeddings from the last transformer layer as the representation for the input text.

WMD: We use the open implementation of NLTK library⁷ to compute WMD between a source sentence and a target sentence. Specifically, we use the *glove-wiki-gigaword* vector embeddings with 200 dimensions as the choice for the WMD. Since WMD is a distance metric rather than a score metric, we plot the *y*-axis in the reversed order to represent that the higher the y, the better the text, as shown in the second subfigure in Figure 3.

A.2. Details of Generation Models and Benchmarks

We use the NoCaps [1] validation set of 4500 images and a subset of 2000 images from the COCO Karpathy test split [27] to support the evaluation. For BLIP⁸, we use the ViT-L model finetuned for the image captioning task. For SD⁹, we use the weights sd-v1-4.ckpt and DDPM scheduler with sampling steps of 50 and a guidance scale of 7.5. The output image size is 512. The number of minimal words is set to 5 and the maximum number of words is set to 30. We set p=0.9 in the Top-p strategy.

B. Impact of Parameter of Top-*p* Sampling

p	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5
CIDEr	111.8	111.2	110.0	107.2	103.4
p	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.95
CIDEr	96.2	89.7	83.1	78.7	69.2

Table 6. Impact of p on the Top-p sampling performance of BLIP ViT-L.

Top-p sampling, which is also referred to as nucleus sampling, is a text generation method that samples words from a set of candidates whose cumulative probability exceeds a specified threshold p. By varying p, we achieve a trade-off between the diversity and accuracy of the generated text. Broadly speaking, larger values of p result in more diverse captions, whereas smaller values of p lead to less variable yet more accurate captions for an input image.

Note that in Table 2 of the BLIP paper [35], the Top-p sampling method is used to generate a diverse set of captions which are then utilized for bootstrapping the BLIP model. However, the evaluation result in that row is obtained by the beam search method. To examine the effect of p, we report the performance of BLIP ViT-L on the NoCaps dataset for image captioning, under different choices of p, in Table 6.

C. Influence of Sampling Methods for Image Captioning

Several sampling methods exist for generating text in the image captioning model. Apart from the Top-p sampling approach presented in the main text, we conduct a quantitative evaluation of two different sampling strategies, including Top-k [16] with k=10, and Tempered sampling [9, 39] with T=0.7. Each sampling method serves as a baseline. Table 7 verifies that our conclusion is solid across different sampling methods.

D. Impact of Number of Candidates N

We investigate the effect of the number of candidates N on our findings. We conduct experiments using the BLIP ViT-L model on the NoCaps dataset for image captioning, utilizing the Top-p sampling method. For image generation, we use the SD model and the DDPM scheduler. We sample N candidates for each input image or text in each experiment. We compare our approach to the baseline method, where a candidate is selected randomly.

³adapted from the public library https://huggingface.co/ docs/transformers/modeldoc/clip

⁴adapted from https://github.com/facebookresearch/ dino

⁵public implementation available from https://github.com/ toshas/torch-fidelity

⁶public implementation from https://huggingface.co/ sentence-transformers/all-MiniLM-L6-v2

⁷https://www.nltk.org/

⁸ https://github.com/salesforce/BLIP
9. //github.com/salesforce/BLIP

⁹https://github.com/huggingface/diffusers

	Nocaps								Сосо			
	In-do	omain	Near-domain		Out-domain		Overall		Karpathy Test			
Method	CIDEr	SPICE	CIDEr	SPICE	CIDEr	SPICE	CIDEr	SPICE	B@3	B@4	CIDEr	SPICE
Top-k Sampling	79.5	13.2	78.4	12.4	83.4	11.7	79.6	12.4	39.7	28.1	108.4	20.9
Ours	84.3	13.5	81.6	12.8	91.6	12.7	84.0	12.9	40.1	28.7	111.6	21.5
Gain (%)	+6.0	+2.3	+4.1	+3.2	+9.8	+8.5	+5.5	+4.0	+1.1	+2.3	+2.9	+2.9
Tempered Sampling	83.9	13.2	82.7	12.7	89.8	12.0	84.3	12.6	33.0	22.2	92.4	19.5
Ours	87.8	13.4	87.0	13.1	98.1	12.8	89.3	13.1	33.6	22.8	95.4	20.4
Gain (%)	+4.6	+1.5	+5.2	+3.1	+9.2	+6.7	+5.9	+4.0	+1.8	+2.6	+3.2	+4.7

Table 7. Comparison of different sampling methods and our proposed method on Nocaps and COCO datasets. Our method outperforms every sampling method on all metrics. The relative gain of our method compared to each sampling method is given in the last row in each block. B@k: BLEU@k.



Figure 9. Evaluation of the choice of the number of sample candidates.

Figure 9 depicts the impact of the number of candidates on image-text-image (left) and text-image-text (right) tasks. The figure (left) shows the image captioning score (y-axis) for our approach and the baseline method, with the x-axis representing the number of candidate captions for each input image. As shown in the figure, the performance of the baseline method remains consistent as it randomly samples captions with varying qualities. Conversely, our approach improves significantly after the number of captions has reached around five. When the number of candidates is limited, there may not be enough high-quality captions to choose from, resulting in lower performance. Nevertheless, our approach remains effective even in that stage. After acquiring a reasonable number of candidates, our method consistently outperforms the baseline method by a significant margin. A similar conclusion can be inferred for the text-image-text task, as demonstrated on the right side of the figure.

E. Qualitative Results for Image and Text Generation

To reinforce the findings in Section 3, we provide additional qualitative examples on the NoCaps dataset. The annotations and explanations for each figure are included in their respective captions. Figure 10 shows both positive examples and negative examples for the image-text-image task, whereas Figure 11 presents visualizations for the textimage-text task. All results are obtained from BLIP ViT-L and SD models.

F. Analysis of Different Image-to-Text and Text-to-Image Generative Models

We conduct further experiments with different image captioning and text-to-image models. Table 8 shows the result of BLIP with a VAE-based image generative model LAFITE for the image-text-image task, as well as SD with BLIP-2 for the text-image-text task. In general, our finding, that better reconstruction leads to better generation performance, still holds. We find that SD performs better than LAFITE, very likely due to its larger training data. When coupled with BLIP-2, SD improved the performance upon the baseline, but it performed worse than that in the case of BLIP.

Text Generation							
I2T	T2I	I-C	N-C	O-C	E-C		
Baseline		75.1	72.4	78.7	74.1		
BLIP [35]	SD [46]	77.3	78.3	88.8	80.3		
BLIP [35]	LAFITE [64]	75.4	76.2	82.9	77.4		
Image Generation							
T2I	I2T	CLIP↓	FID↓	15	S†		
Baseline		40.54	32.37	41.19	± 2.91		
SD [46]	BLIP [35]	33.47	29.59	45.64	± 2.40		
SD [46]	BLIP-2 [34]	39.41	31.34	42.34	± 2.23		

Table 8. Comparison of different combinations of generation models. We evaluate two image captioning models and two image generation models on the NoCaps dataset. I2T: Image-to-text model. T2I: Text-to-image model. I-C/N-C/O-C/E-C: In-/Near-/Out-/Entire-domain CIDEr.

G. Implementations of Tokenizer Transformation

We elaborate on the gradient backpropagation process between the output of BLIP and the input of SD, shown on the left side of Figure 6. Our framework includes three types of text tokenizers: BLIP utilizes the word-piece tokenizing method; BLIP-2 uses the byte-pair-encoding tokenizing method; SD employs the CLIP tokenizer, which uses the word-level tokenizing strategy. One of the challenges we faced is to align the output token distributions from BLIP with those from SD, allowing SD to interpret

the output of BLIP. To address this issue, we use these tokenization strategies to tokenize each sentence in the COCO training set and learn a one-to-one hard-coded mapping from a source token to a target token. Despite using different strategies, we found that these tokenizing methods have a high ratio of overlapping between tokens. Specifically, when applied to the COCO training set, more than 60% captions can be tokenized into the same set of tokens for BLIP and SD. For unmatched tokens, we map them to the most similar ones or to the [UNK] token. We visually examined this method by generating images conditioned on token distributions and found it to be practical. Additionally, we remove the prefix tokens of BLIP, a photo of, and add [BOS] and [EOS] tokens for SD.

H. Discussion on the Loss Function

Parameter Update While optimizing \mathcal{L}_{IR} for image captioning, both SD and BLIP are trained. \mathcal{L}_{TG} only updates the parameters of BLIP. Likewise, both SD and BLIP are trained when optimizing \mathcal{L}_{TR} , and only SD is updated by \mathcal{L}_{IG} . The reasons for training SD in \mathcal{L}_{IR} are twofold. First, SD needs to adapt to new distributions coming from BLIP. As in the standard training, the input of BLIP is discrete tokens. Whereas in our approach, the input is token distributions. Second, SD could be improved because of additional training data sampled from BLIP. In addition, since they are refreshed at each iteration, one model is able to provide better samples to train the other model throughout the training.

Connection to CycleGAN CycleGAN is a generative model that learns bidirectional mappings from domain Xto domain Y, where X and Y are images. Its cyclic loss ensures that the mapping between the input and output domains is consistent, i.e., if we take an image from domain X, pass it through the generator network to obtain an image in domain Y, and then pass that image through the generator network again to obtain an image in domain X, we should obtain an image that is similar to the original image in domain X. Likewise, we aim to enforce consistent mapping between the input and output domains, but we deal with two distinct domains, i.e., image and language, which may require much more complex mapping. In addition, we also optimize a single objective, similar to CycleGAN which is trained on the weighted cyclic loss and adversarial loss. CycleGAN employs a hyperparameter λ to control the relative importance of the cyclic loss to the adversarial loss, we found that a similar weighting did not yield substantial differences in performance in our work. Therefore we do not adjust this hyperparameter in our approach.

Pseudo-Code The pseudo-code of our train framework is presented in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Training Framework

```
Model UNet \epsilon_{\psi}, SD's Text Encoder \pi, BLIP b_{\theta}
Input an image-text pair (\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y})
```

- 1: repeat # Image-Text-Image (BLIP \rightarrow SD)
- $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y} \sim q(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}) \quad \triangleright$ Sample an image-text pair from the 2:
- dataset $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = b_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}) \quad \triangleright \, \hat{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times V}$: Output token distribution. 3:
- $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$: (causal) masked text input
- $\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathrm{CE}(\mathbf{y}, \hat{\mathbf{y}})$ ▷ CE: cross entropy loss 4: 5: $\mathbf{c} = \pi(\hat{\mathbf{y}})$ ▷ Text encoder encodes BLIP's output into embeddings
- $t \sim \text{Uniform}(\{1, \cdots, T\}) \triangleright \text{Sample a timestep for the}$ 6: diffusion process
- \triangleright Sample noise for timestep t7: $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$
- $\mathbf{x}_t = \sqrt{\alpha_t} \mathbf{x}_0 + \sqrt{1 \alpha_t} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ ▷ Add noise to image 8:
- 9: $\hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{\psi}(\mathbf{x}_t, t, \mathbf{c}) \quad \triangleright$ UNet predicts noise $\hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ from the noisy image \mathbf{x}_t
- $\mathcal{L}_2 = \| \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \|^2$ 10:
- # Text-Image-Text (SD \rightarrow BLIP)
- $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y} \sim q(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{y}) \quad \triangleright$ Sample an image-text pair from the 11: dataset
- 12: $\mathbf{c} = \pi(\mathbf{y})$ > Text encoder encodes input text into embeddings
- $t \sim \text{Uniform}(\{1, \cdots, T\}) \triangleright \text{Sample a timestep for the}$ 13: diffusion process
- 14: $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$ \triangleright Sample noise for timestep t
- $\mathbf{x}_t = \sqrt{\alpha_t} \mathbf{x}_0 + \sqrt{1 \alpha_t} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ ▷ Add noise to image 15: $\hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{\psi}(\mathbf{x}_t, t, \mathbf{c}) \quad \triangleright$ UNet predicts noise $\hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ from the noisy 16:
- image \mathbf{x}_t
- 17:
- $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_3 = \|\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}\|^2$ $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_t}} (\mathbf{x}_t \sqrt{1 \alpha_t} \hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}) \quad \triangleright 1 \text{-step approximation of }$ 18: \mathbf{x}_0
- $\mathcal{L}_4 = \operatorname{CE}(\mathbf{y}, b_{\theta}(\mathbf{\hat{x}}_0, \mathbf{\tilde{y}})) \triangleright \mathbf{\tilde{y}}$: (causal) masked text input 19: 20: Take gradient descent step on
- BLIP: $\nabla_{\theta}(\mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_3 + \mathcal{L}_4) = \nabla_{\theta}(\mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_4)$ SD: $\nabla_{\psi}(\mathcal{L}_1 + \mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_3 + \mathcal{L}_4) = \nabla_{\psi}(\mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_3 + \mathcal{L}_4)$ 21: until converged

22: return ψ, θ

I. Ablation Study

Table 9 summarizes the different losses and weightfreezing strategies, highlighting that improvement comes from the proposed reconstruction loss. For simplicity, we only list the effect of different settings on BLIP. Our default setting jointly optimizes both pipelines with both models trainable p_1 : I $\xrightarrow{\text{BLIP}}$ $\mathbf{T}(L_{TG}) \xrightarrow{\text{SD}}$ $\mathbf{I}(L_{IR})$, and p_2 : $\mathbf{T} \xrightarrow{\text{SD}}$ $\mathbf{I}(L_{IG}) \xrightarrow{\text{BLIP}}$ $\mathbf{T}(L_{TR})$. The third column in the table shows the training signals that BLIP can receive from the two pipelines under the specific setting. "-" means that loss has no effect as the model is frozen.

	Weights	Update			Loss F	unction				
BLIP^{p_1}	SD^{p_1}	$ $ SD ^{p_2}	BLIP^{p_2}	L_{TG}	L_{IR}	L_{IG}	L_{TR}	Effect on BLIP	Experiment	CIDEr
\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	p_1 : ground truth + reconstruction p_2 : augmentation	Ours, Tab. 4	111.8
\checkmark	×	×	×	\checkmark	×	-	-	p_1 : ground truth	Tab. 4	109.7
\checkmark	×	\checkmark	×	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	p_1 : ground truth + reconstruction	Ablation	110.9
×	\checkmark	×	\checkmark	-	\checkmark	-	\checkmark	p_2 : augmentation	Ablation	110.2
\checkmark	×	×	×	×	\checkmark	-	-	p_1 : reconstruction	Tab. 6	102.3
Table 0. Analyzis of different training nerodiams of loss terms and model fragen strategies										

Table 9. Analysis of different training paradigms of loss terms and model frozen strategies.

J. Qualitative Results for Training Framework

We provide additional qualitative examples of image captioning and image generation by our trained framework in Figure 12 and Figure 13, respectively. Detailed annotations and explanations can be found in the corresponding figure captions.



Figure 10. Examples for the image-text-image task using Top-p sampling. The first column displays the input images, followed by the generated caption and its corresponding generated image. We rank the generated text-image pairs based on the similarity of the images and show the score of the caption below each text. In the first row, *golf car* in the first sample is a more accurate description than *cart* in the fifth sample so that the first generated image is closer to the input image. Additionally, we show a few failed examples in the last two rows.

Input	Sample #1	Sample #2	Sample #3	Sample #4	Sample #5	
People are standing around a black luxury vehicle.	a crowd of people standing around a black car Visual Score: 0.559 FID: 175.6	a group of people standing around a black car Visual Score: 0.489 FID: 209.5	a large group of people standing around a black car Visual Score: 0.549 FID: 213.4	a couple of cars that are sitting in the street Visual Score: 0.456 FID: 217.2	a man standing on the side of a street talking on a cell phone Visual Score: 0.452 FID: 152.1	
A woman dressed in a black outfit is playing the harp on a stage	a woman in a black dress playing a harp Visual Score: 0.680 FID: 55.2	a woman in a black dress playing a harp Visual Score: 0.642 FID: 97.8	a woman in a black dress playing a musical instrument Visual Score: 0.609 FID: 71.2	a woman in a black dress holding a pair of scissors Visual Score: 0.356 FID: 575.0	a woman standing on a stage with wings Visual Score: 0.482 FID: 453.2	
A three layer white cake with blue,pink,red and green figures on top.	a multicolored cake sitting on to of a white cake plate Visual Score: 0.610	a multicolored cake with sprinkles on top Visual Score: 0.668	a colorful cake with candles on top of it Visual Score: 0.644	a colorful cake with a slice taken out of it	a cake with a slice taken out of the slice taken out of taken out of the slice taken out of taken out ot taken out of taken out of taken out of tak	
A crowd stands near a memorialized motorcycle that has a passenger car attached to it	FID: 269.6 a motorcycle parked in front of a crowd of people	FID: 280.7 a group of people standing around a motorcycle	FID: 333.1 a white motorcycle parked in front of a crowd of people	FID: 333.9 a red motorcycle parked in front of a crowd of people	FID: 382.9 a crowd of people standing around a red car	
A saxophone lays on a glass table in front of a window, and we can see its reflection in the table.	Visual Score v. /22 FID: 120 a saxophone sitting on top of a glass table	FID: 153.9 Figure 153.9 a saxophone sitting on top of a table next to a window	Visual score 0.676 FID: 111.2 a close up of a saxophone in front of a window	a glass table sitting in front of a window	FID: 216.0 a trumpet sitting on top of a table next to a window	
A black classic car with a black license plate.	Visual Score: 0.614 FiD: 106.9: 0.614 a black car parked on the side of the road	Visual Score: 0.592 FiD: 160.4 a black car driving down a city street	Visual Score: 0.772 FID: 71.5 a black car parked in front of a brick building	Visual Score: 0.410 FiD: 389.2 a black and white photo of a classic car	Visual Score: 0.437 FID: 303.5 a black and white photo of a classic car	
A curled up pretzel on a desk next to a computer mouse and wires.	Visual Score: 0.799 FiD: 99.1 a computer mouse and a pretel on a desk	Visual Score: 0.610 FID: 207.0 a pretzel sitting on top of a laptop computer	Yisual Score: 0.719 FID: 213.4 a computer mouse and some pretzels on a table	Visual Score: 0.596 FiD: 138.9 a pair of pretzels sing on a plate next to a laptop	Visual Score: 0.541 FiD: 136.7 a white computer mouse sitting on top of a wooden mouse pad	
A red bag of buttered popcorn sitting in a chair.	Visual Score: 0.668 FID: 140.9 a red bucket filled with pop of a chair Visual Score: 0.825 Visual Score: 0.825	Visual Score: 0.754 FD: 93.2 a bucket filled with popcom a chair Visual Score: 0.832	a red box filled with popcom a wooden table Visual Score: 0.829	Visual Score: 0.652 FID: 100.7 a red bag and a bucket of popcom Visual Score: 0.751	Visual Score: 0.452 FID: 348.8 a red lunch bag sitting on top of a couch Visual Score: 0.487	
A hockey player skating with a hockey puck.	FID: 314.5 a hockey player is skating on the ice Visual Score: 0.643	FID: 290.5 a hockey player on the ice with a hockey stick	FID: 250.3 a young man skating on an ice rink Visual Score: 0.520	FID: 261.3 a couple of men playing a game of hockey Visual Score: 0.624	FID: 365.3 a man in a black and yellow uniform skating on an ice rink Visual Score: 0.574	
Three young men are in a room playing the bass, the guitar and a trombone.	a group of young men playing instruments in a room	FID: 155.5 a group of men playing musical instruments in a room	a group of young men playing usical instruments	FID: 67.0 a group of men standing next to each other holding guitars	FID: 88.7 a couple of young men standing next to each other holding guitars	
A person is sitting in a chair in front of audio equipment.	FID: 1308 a man sitting on a chair in front of a speaker	visual Score: 0.568 FDI: 130.8 a man sitting in a chair with headphones on	Visual Score 0.559 FID: 236.8: a man sitting in a chair in front of a laptop	Visual Score: U.399 FID: 1683 a man sitting on a chair in a room	FID: 1532 a man sitting at a desk in front of a computer	
a black bottle of perfume with some floral details	Visual Score: 0.531 FID: 302-9 a bottle of perfume surrounded by flowers	Visual Score: 0.512 FID: 194.6 a close up of a bottle of perfume surrounded by flowers	Visual Score: 0.496 FID: 235.4 a bottle of perfume surrounded by pink flowers	Visual Score: 0.602 FiD: 354.8 a bottle of perfume next to a bouquet of flowers	Visual Score: 0.721 FID: 305.4 a bottle of perfume sitting on top of a table	
	Visual Score: 0.512 FID: 311.1	Visual Score: 0.463 FID: 415.3	Visual Score: 0.552 FID: 299.0	Visual Score: 0.533 FID: 301.0	Visual Score: 0.643 FID: 208.5	

Figure 11. Examples for the text-image-text task. The first column shows the input text, followed by generated image and its corresponding generated text. We rank the generated image-text pairs by the similarity of the text and show the score of the image in the box. As shown in the first line, the image in the first sample represents the input text better than the image in the fifth sample, and the similarity of the reconstructed text reflected this comparison. Further, we show some failed examples in the last two rows.



GT: A little girl with long straight reddish brown hair tilts her head to the right and smiles at us.

BLIP: a close up of a child with a toothbrush Ours: a little girl with a smile on her



with helmets BLIP: a group of people riding scooters down a street

Ours: a group of people riding notorcycles down a street



GT: A man wearing a jacket and doing tricks on a bike. BLIP: a man riding a bike down the middle of a street Ours: a man is doing a trick on a



BLIP: a couple of people that are sitting in a plane Ours: a man and a woman sitting in the cockpit of an airplane

GT: A small plant grows out of some dirt in a small pot. BLIP: a small green tree sitting on top

of a wooden table Ours: a bonsai tree in a pot on a table



GT: Glass curtained windows, rest above new-looking brick siding, fronted by a pair of healthy sunflowers BLIP: a large yellow sunflower in front of a brick wall Ours: two sunflowers in front of a brick

GT: A closeup of a large lobster in BLIP: a close up of a red and white crab under wate











Ours: a white car parked on the side of GT: A red grandfather clock is sitting by a white wall.

BLIP: a red grandfather clock sitting on top of a wooden floor Ours: a tall red clock sitting on top of wooden floor





heis

next to each other BLIP: a group of men standing next to each other on a podium Ours: three men standing on a podium with medals around their necks

GT: Three men in sports uniforms smiling

BLIP: a group of young people playing a

Ours: a young girl holding a basketball

GT: An empty cup of coffee on a saucer

BLIP: a cup of coffee sitting on top of

Ours: a cup of coffee on a saucer next

GT: Three women are dancing while

Ours: a group of women in black and white dresses dancing

GT: A man skis downhill on icey snow,

BLIP: a man riding skis down a snow

Ours: a person in an orange and white

GT: Grey dolphin swimming with half body

GT: A white bicycle chained to a lamp

Ours: a white bicycle is chained to a

GT: A person sitting on one of the four

BLIP: a woman sitting on a stool next to

Ours: a woman sitting at a bar with her

GT: Cookies are on a tray being cooked

Ours: a bunch of cookies that are on a

BLIP: a close up of chocolate chip

cookies on a baking sheet

stools standing in a line

BLIP: a bicycle parked next to a pole on

wearing a black and white dress

BLIP: a group of people that are

standing on a stage

one winter.

out of water

near a boat

water

post

pole

a city street

two stools

legs crossed

under heat.

covered slope

ski suit skiing down a hill

game of basketball

in a gym

by a phone

a white saucer







playing the saxophone BLIP: a man playing a trumpet in a black and white photo Ours: a man playing a saxophone in a black and white photo

GT: A man with a ponytail that is

GT: A woman standing beside an vintage two door car. BLIP: a woman standing in front of an old car Ours: a woman in a dress and hat standing next to an old car





GT: A man drinking a beer on a golf cart.

BLIP: a man sitting in a golf cart on a golf course





BLIP: a living room filled with furniture and a flat screen tv Ours: a living room with a black couch and a television





GT: A bunch of colorful balloons stand outside of tall buildings. BLIP: a bunch of green and yellow balloons in front of a building Ours: a bunch of balloons that are in

Figure 12. Qualitative results for image captioning. We compare the performance of our approach and BLIP ViT-B baseline. A ground truth (GT) caption is given for each image. On average, our method provides more accurate descriptions for input images. The last two rows show examples of our model performing worse than the baseline method.















Input	Ours	SD
A green car parked outside of a house.		
A kitchen with a table with chairs and a ceiling fan.		
White translucent jellyfish light up the darkness deep below the water.		
Man is enjoying playing while wearing their helmet.		
A dresser has some books on the top of it.		
A clock stands next to a white wall on wood floor.		
The lifeguard is sitting in a high chair with chairs and umbrellas behind him.		
Having a picnic outside your car is fun.		
Kitchen utensils alongside food in a large table		
A grey and white two story house between a grey fence with green bushes around the fence		

Figure 13. Qualitative results for image generation. We compare the original SD model with our finetuned model. Each row displays firstly the input text, followed by four images generated by our approach, and four images generated by the SD baseline. We can see that compared with the baseline method, the image generated by our method better reflects the semantics of the input text.