Multimodal Knowledge Distillation

Seperate Self-Attention

Baseline

	MSCOCO (5K test set)							Flickr30K (1K test set)						
Model	$Image \rightarrow Text$			$\text{Text} \rightarrow \text{Image}$			Image \rightarrow Text			$\text{Text} \rightarrow \text{Image}$				
	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10		
FLAVA	42.74	76.76	-	38.38	67.47	-	67.7	94.0	-	65.22	89.38	-		
Data2Vec2	0.02	0.08	0.22	0.01	0.10	0.19	0.02	0.12	0.26	0.02	0.06	0.12		
MM-D2V2 (Ours)	4.24	12.12	17.96	1.77	6.54	10.91	1.2	4.88	8.18	0.54	2.52	4.58		
MM-D2V2 (Ours)†	31.72	56.78	67.9	12.42	31.05	42.5	7.7	26.18	37.6	4.08	17.01	24.26		
MM-D2V2	32.78	58.34	69.3	12.83	31.85	43.4	8.08	27.92	38.6	4.14	17.5	24.82		
7_2(Ours)†														
MM-D2V2 7(Ours)†	30.24	56.48	67.46	11.96	30.48	41.88	7.36	26.42	36.6	3.7	16.58	23.84		

Table 1: Comparison of Zero-shot Image-Text and Text-Image Retrieval of first results with FLAVA and Data2Vec2 papers. Because Data2Vec2 is a unimodal model, we embed each image with the D2V2-Image model and each text with the D2V2-Text model. This yields unusable results, as there has been no incentive for the models to learn a shared representation, as both are unimodal. This is why we had to use both the image and the text model to embed the data.

†: This version has been trained with BEiT-2 as the teacher model, not the D2V2 Image model.

	MSCOCO (5K test set)							Flickr30K (1K test set)						
Model	$Image \rightarrow Text$			$\text{Text} \rightarrow \text{Image}$			Image \rightarrow Text			$\text{Text} \rightarrow \text{Image}$				
	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10		
Zero-Shot														
FLAVA	42.74	76.76	-	38.38	67.47	-	67.7	94.0	-	65.22	89.38	-		
CLIP	58.4	81.5	88.1	37.8	62.4	72.2	88.0	98.7	99.4	68.7	90.6	95.2		
MM-D2V2 (Ours)	31.72	56.78	67.9	12.42	31.05	42.5	7.7	26.18	37.6	4.08	17.01	24.26		
Finetune														
BEiT-3	84.8	96.5	98.3	67.2	87.7	92.8	98	100	100	90.3	98.7	99.5		
VLMo	74.8	93.1	96.9	57.2	82.6	89.8	92.3	99.4	99.9	79.3	95.7	97.8		

Table 2: