

**FROM CNN-LSTM TO VLM:
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS ON
MED-VQA WITH SLAKE**

PREPARED BY:

TEAM: JHERNG

HONG JIA HERNG - U2005313


LECTURER:

PROF. IR. DR. CHAN CHEE SENG

1 - Background

Why Med-VQA?

- Medical Visual Question Answering (Med-VQA) enables models to answer **image-grounded clinical questions**
- Useful for:
 - clinical decision support
 - improving interpretability
 - assisting radiology workflows



Knowledge-based:

(En) What is the **function** of the **rightmost organ** in this picture?

(Zh) 图中是否有**器官**属于**呼吸系统**?

(Are there **organs** in this image belonging to the **respiratory system**?)

Vision-only:

(En) Does the image contain **left lung**?

(Zh) 这张图片是关于**腹部**吗?

(Is this image about the **abdomen**?)

Why compare CNN-LSTM vs VLM?

- Traditional multimodal models treat Med-VQA as **discriminative** problem (classification)
- Vision-Language Models treat Med-VQA as **generative** problem (text generation)
- Goal:
 - understand performance gaps + tradeoffs
 - benchmarks both approaches on SLAKE (Liu et al., 2021)



2 - Objectives

- To build and evaluate a classical multimodal baseline using a CNN for image encoding and an LSTM for question encoding.
- To benchmark a modern pretrained Vision–Language Model (BLIP-VQA) on the same dataset.
- To compare strengths, limitations, and performance of both approaches on the SLAKE Med-VQA dataset.
- To identify which modelling approach is more suitable for medical VQA problems at small data scales.

3 - EDA

Dataset Overview: SLAKE


- SLAKE (Semantically-Labeled Knowledge-Enhanced)
 - Medical images (e.g., CT, MRI, X-ray, etc.)
 - Both closed-ended questions (Yes/No, modality type, organ identification)
 - And open-ended factual questions (e.g., “What organ is enlarged?”)
 - *This study uses English question-answer pairs only.*
- Answer Type (English Only):
 - CLOSED answers: 1943 (39.50%)
 - OPEN answers: 2976 (60.50%)



3 - EDA Highlights


1. Question vocabulary size: 290

- All unique tokens/words in train.



2. Max question length: 21 → 32 tokens (word-level tokenization for CNN-LSTM).


- Why bump to 32?
 - Protect against slightly longer questions



3. Answer space for classifier (221 classes):

- Top-K answers (K=220, i.e., all answers in train) + <unk> for unseen/rare answers.

4. Long-tailed answer distribution impacts macro-F1 and rare class performance.




5. Max answer length: 12 (Useful info for VLM)

4 - Methods

CNN-LSTM (Discriminative)

- **Formulation**
 - Input: image + question
 - Output: answer class (Top-K unique answers)
 - K=221, where 220 is #unique answers, 1 is <unk>
 - Loss: cross-entropy
- **Architecture**
 - CNN image encoder (frozen vs fine-tuned)
 - Using ResNet-18
 - Hypothesis: Small enough, won't overfit too bad on SLAKE
 - LSTM question encoder
 - Fusion + MLP classifier head



4 - Methods


CNN-LSTM Training Setup

- **Preprocessing**

- Image resize + normalization
- Tokenize question → fixed length 32 (vocab size = 290)
- Answer classification: 220 + <unk>



- **Training**

- Train 2 variants, frozen backbone & full fine-tuning
- Took ~12 mins each on A100 80GB
- Configs:
 - Optimizer: Adam ($\text{lr}=1\text{e}-3$)
 - Epoch: 50
 - Model selection metric: Val Accuracy
 - Batch size: 128
- Parameters:
 - Frozen backbone:
 - Total params: 12,943,901, Trainable params: 1,767,389
 - Unfreezed backbone:
 - Total params: 12,943,901, Trainable params: 12,943,901



4 - Methods


CNN-LSTM Training History



4 - Methods

BLIP (Generative) + LoRA


- **Formulation**
 - Input: image + question
 - Output: generated text answer
 - Loss: Language Modeling (LM) loss
 - Cross entropy in autoregressive fashion
 - Details hidden in transformers library
- **Why BLIP + LoRA?**
 - BLIP is lightweight compared to BLIP-2
 - LoRA fine-tunes efficiently:
 - fewer trainable params
 - faster training + lower GPU cost
- **Adaptation Strategy**
 - Pretrained BLIP-VQA backbone
 - LoRA fine-tuning on attention projections
 - Text decoder: **query, key, value**
 - Vision encoder: **qkv**



4 - Methods


BLIP + LoRA Training Setup

- Preprocessing
 - Built-in processor handles image + text tokenization/padding.
- Training
 - Took ~52 mins each on A100 80GB
 - Configs:
 - Optimizer: AdamW ($\text{lr}=1\text{e-}4$)
 - standard choice for larger model like BLIP, more stable training
 - Epoch: 20
 - Model selection metric: Val Token F1-Score
 - Batch size: 64 (GPU usage ~36/80 GBs, we can do more)
 - Parameters:
 - Total params: 363,294,524, Trainable params: 2,064,384




4 - Methods

BLIP + LoRA Training History



- If enough resources, we should train more, model is far from overfitting yet





5 - Results

Evaluation Metrics

- CNN-LSTM
 - **Accuracy***
 - Top-5 Accuracy: GT appears within top-5 predicted classes
 - Macro-F1 (Overall / OPEN / CLOSED)
 - F1-score averaged equally across classes (sensitive to rare answers)
 - BLIP
 - **Token-F1 (Overall / OPEN / CLOSED)***
 - Measures token overlap between pred and GT
 - Exact Match (normalized)
 - 1 if pred matches GT after text normalization
 - OPEN only:
 - BLEU: N-gram precision-based similarity, 0-1, higher better
 - ROUGE-L: Longest common subsequence overlap, 0-1, higher better
 - BERTScore: Semantic similarity (“CT” vs “computed tomography”, 0-1, higher better
 - Fair Cross-Model Comparison
 - To compare discriminative vs generative:
 - Exact Match
 - Token-F1
- * key metric

5 - Results

CNN-LSTM



	model	subset	accuracy	macro_f1	top5_accuracy
0	CNN-LSTM (Frozen)	OVERALL	0.7983	0.4758	0.9576
1	CNN-LSTM (Frozen)	OPEN	0.7767	0.4718	0.9318
2	CNN-LSTM (Frozen)	CLOSED	0.8317	0.6095	0.9976
3	CNN-LSTM (Unfrozen)	OVERALL	0.7766	0.4350	0.9576
4	CNN-LSTM (Unfrozen)	OPEN	0.7473	0.4238	0.9318
5	CNN-LSTM (Unfrozen)	CLOSED	0.8221	0.6600	0.9976

- **Accuracy (Key metric):**
 - CNN-LSTM (Frozen Backbone) wins in all *answer_type*.
 - CNN-LSTM does better in CLOSED (0.83), decent in OPEN (0.78) too.
- **Top-5 acc:**
 - Top-5 accuracy is much higher than Top-1 accuracy (0.96 vs 0.80).
 - Indicates correct answers are often ranked highly but not selected as top prediction.

5 - Results

BLIP (LoRA)


	model	subset	exact_match	token_f1	bleu	rougeL	bertscore_precision	bertscore_recall	bertscore_f1
0	BLIP (LoRA)	OVERALL	0.6927	0.7364	-	-	-	-	-
1	BLIP (LoRA)	OPEN	0.6202	0.6919	0.0311	0.7259	0.9194	0.9136	0.9162
2	BLIP (LoRA)	CLOSED	0.8053	0.8053	-	-	-	-	-

- **Token F1-score (Key metric):**

- BLIP is doing better in CLOSED (0.81), significantly worse in OPEN (0.69)
- Lower OPEN due to flexible free-form answers
- Impressive **exact match** (0.81) on CLOSED too

5 - Results


Long-tail Analysis (Best CNN-LSTM)



- Per-class accuracy **correlates positively** with class frequency.
- Frequent classes (e.g., modality/yes-no) **dominate** accuracy.
- Highlights limitations of fixed-vocabulary classification in Med-VQA.
- Note:
 - The acc spike at the tail of the distribution is due to having only 1 sample for testing

5 - Results


Confusion Matrix (Best CNN-LSTM)



- Upper left correlates more because more training examples; lower right, more noisy, not as accurate due to less training examples
- In overall, discriminative model is making good prediction
 - **Accuracy (OVERALL):** 0.7983
 - **Accuracy (CLOSED):** 0.8317
 - **Accuracy (OPEN):** 0.7767

5 - Results

Comparison: CNN-LSTM vs BLIP




- CNN-LSTM still works better than BLIP
 - CNN-LSTM (Frozen) > CNN-LSTM (Unfrozen) > BLIP (LoRA)
- Performances are
 - consistent among OVERALL / OPEN / CLOSED
 - consistent among Token F1-score & Exact Match

	model	subset	exact_match	token_f1
0	CNN-LSTM (Frozen)	OVERALL	0.7983	0.8253
1	CNN-LSTM (Unfrozen)	OVERALL	0.7766	0.8131
2	BLIP (LoRA)	OVERALL	0.6927	0.7364
3	CNN-LSTM (Frozen)	OPEN	0.7767	0.8212
4	CNN-LSTM (Unfrozen)	OPEN	0.7473	0.8073
5	BLIP (LoRA)	OPEN	0.6202	0.6919
6	CNN-LSTM (Frozen)	CLOSED	0.8317	0.8317
7	CNN-LSTM (Unfrozen)	CLOSED	0.8221	0.8221
8	BLIP (LoRA)	CLOSED	0.8053	0.8053

5 - Results


Qualitative Analysis: CNN-LSTM vs BLIP



Question:

Which part of the body does this image belong to?


Ground Truth: Abdomen
CNN-LSTM: abdomen ✓
BLIP + LoRA: abdomen ✓



Question:

What organ system is pictured?

Ground Truth: Chest
CNN-LSTM: chest ✓
BLIP + LoRA: chest ✓



Question:

Where is/are the abnormality located?

Ground Truth: Left Lung, Lower Right
CNN-LSTM: center ✗
BLIP + LoRA: right lung ✗

- **Common failure cases:**

- Asking location, fine-grained anatomical terms, etc.




- **General Ideas:**

- BLIP often produces semantically correct answers even with different wording (synonyms).
- CNN is constrained to Top-K answer and may output <unk> for rare answers.

6 - Discussion

- **How to improve?**

- BLIP can be trained longer (if given enough resources), far from overfitting
- Try BLIP-2 or stronger VLMs, just 20 epochs of BLIP showed promising results
- CNN-LSTM can utilize Word2Vec, GloVe, BERT as text encoder (semantic embeddings), without needing to train a question vocab embeddings from scratch



7 - Conclusion

- CNN-LSTM provides a strong, simple baseline for OPEN/CLOSED questions at small data scale.
- BLIP + LoRA achieves the high BERTScore (>0.9) telling us that the predicted answers are semantically similar to GTs.
- Top-5 vs Top-1 gap + lower macro-F1 indicate long-tail challenges for discriminative models.
- VLM fine-tuning with LoRA is an effective approach for medical VQA under limited compute.
- To see the results in action/reproduce the results:
 - <https://github.com/hongjiaherng/woa7015-medvqa.git>



THANK YOU

› End Slide