

Introduction

- 1. Usefulness of image captioning software.
- 2. Do we need to re-train models for every domain?
- 3. CNN+LSTM image captioning models.
- 4. Can we adapt a pretrained model to a new domain?

Materials and Methods

- 1. The image captioning model from Xu et al. 2015, implemented by Nikolai for one of the tutorials in the course.
- 2. Changes:
 - 1. Relation filter(s)
 - 2. Unknown filter
 - 3. Excluding UNK tokens from caption generation.
- 3. Flickr8k (original) and imageCLEF (new domain)
- 4. Human judgement questionnaire

Results (Dominik)

number of	highest	fine-tuned
samples	BLEU score	epoch
100	0.065	13
200	0.091	9
500	0.146	19
1000	0.165	18
2000	0.201	13
5000	0.222	9

unknown	highest	fine-tuned
filter	BLEU score	epoch
0.1	0.065	13
0.15	0.104	18
0.2	0.176	12
1	0.162	19

Table 1: BLEU scores for different sample sizes (unknown filter 0.1)

Table 2: BLEU scores for different unknown filters (number of samples: 100)

Results (Maria)

Image	Best model (% responses)
15551	100_0.1 (50%)
20144	original (50%)
20343	100_0.1 (33.3%) or 100_1.0
	(33.3%)
12761	original (33.3%) or 100_1.0
	(33.3%)
22381	100_0.1 (83.3%)
10821	100_0.1 (100%)
18448	original (100%)
17173	original (66.7%)
13152	original (66.7%)
20272	original (100%)
11310	100_0.1 (66.7%)
14183	100_1.0 (50%)
10622	original (50%)
13123	original (100%)
19181	100_1.0 (83.3%)
16920	100_0.1 (100%)
11308	original (50%)
14016	original (83.3%)
21029	original (100%)
18355	original (33.3%) or 100_0.15
	(33.3%) or 100_0.2 (33.3%)

Image	Best model (% responses)
40416	original (83.3%)
39158	original (50%)
25053	original (83.3%)
30620	100_1.0 (66.7%)
32397	100_0.2 (66.7%)
38937	original (50%)
39005	100_0.1 (33.3%) or 100_0.15
	(33.3%) or 100_0.2 (33.3%)
40120	original (66.7%)
23588	100_1.0 (83.3%)
39472	100_0.1 (66.7%)
30138	original (50%)
40202	100_0.1 (83.3%)
35895	original (66.7%)
32663	100_0.2 (83.3%)
30705	original (83.3%)
38081	100_0.15 (66.7%)
31571	original (100%)
35858	original (66.7%)
37836	100_0.1 (33.3%) or 100_0.15
	(33.3%)
39239	100_0.15, 100_0.2, and
	100_1.0 (50%) ¹

Image	Best model (% re-
	sponses)
2116444946[]	original (100%)
2316097768[]	original (100%)
2439384468[]	original (66.7%)
2112921744[]	100_0.2 (50%)
2392460773[]	original (100%)
2434006663[]	original (100%)
2308256827[]	original (100%)
2111360187[]	original (66.7%)
2271671533[]	original (66.7%)
2328616978[]	original (100%)
2456907314[]	original (66.7%)
2229179070[]	100_0.1 (100%)
2279980395[]	100_0.1 (88.3%)
2393971707[]	original (83.3%)
211277478[]	100_0.1 (50%)
2337919839[]	original (83.3%)
2447035752[]	original (50%)
23445819[]	100_0.2 (66.7%)
2448210587[]	original (33.3%)
2445654384[]	100_0.1 (50%) or
	100_0.2 (50%)

Overall: captions were deemed to be low-quality, *r u b b i s h,* to quote one of the participants.

Table 3: Best captions per image in the unfiltered im-Table 4: Best captions per image in the filtered image-ageCLEF test set.

CLEF test set.

Table 5: Best captions per image in the Flickr8k test set.

Discussion

- 1. The fine-tuning was much more disruptive than expected.
- 2. Differences in caption structure (syntax) and vocabulary are major.
 - 1. Less data grammatical but thematically unfitting captions.
 - 2. More data ungrammatical, theoretically thematically fitting captions (UNK tokens).
- 3. Small improvements based on human judgements, but the captions are still bad.

Conclusions

- 1. We have addressed our questions and found out what issues impede domain adapatation.
- 2. Ideas for future research:
 - 1. Testing the influence of other hyperparameters.
 - 2. Testing the same thing on a different model architecture.
 - 3. Fine-tuning on a more similar dataset.
 - 4. Exploring ways of mitigating the discovered issues.

Thank you for your attention!