10-423/623: Generative AI Lecture 14 – Visual-Language Models

Henry Chai & Matt Gormley 10/21/24

Front Matter

- Announcements:
	- HW3 released 10/7, due 10/24 at 11:59 PM
		- Please be mindful of your grace day usage!
	- Project team formation due 10/25 at 11:59 PM
		- Each team should only submit one PDF; see [handout](https://www.cs.cmu.edu/~mgormley/courses/10423/homework/project.pdf) for instructions on how to make group submissions in Gradescope
		- Reminder: **you may not take grace days on any project deliverables**
	- Quiz 4 on 10/28 (Monday)
		- Will cover Lectures 12 15

Multimodal **Models**

- Previously: Text-to-image models adapt generative models for vision in order to guide their output toward some desired target using natural language
	- Output is still an image

- Today: visual language models (VLMs) adapt generative models for text in order to allow them to interact with images (as well as text) as input
	- Output is (typically) still text

Common benchmarks for VLMs include

- **Visual reasoning**: given an image (or a pair of images) determine if some natural language statement about the image(s) is true or false
- **Visual grounding**: locate an object in some image given a natural language description
- **Visual question answering**: given an image (or images), respond to arbitrary, potentially openended questions about the content.
- **Caption generation**: create natural language descriptions of content of some image

Common benchmarks for VLMs include

 Visual reasoning: given an image (or a pair of images) determine if some natural language statement about the image(s) is true or false

The left image contains twice the number of dogs as the

One image shows exactly two brown acorns in
back-to-back caps on green foliage.

Common benchmarks for VLMs include

- **Visual reasoning**: given an image (or a pair of images) determine if some natural language statement about the image(s) is true or false
- **Visual grounding**: locate an object in some image given a natural language description

RefCOCO:
1. giraffe on left

- 1. giraffe with lowered head
2. giraffe head down
-

back with its horn
2. giraffe hugging another giraffe

Common benchmarks for VLMs include

images) det i some natural languages i some natural languages i som

Is the umbrella upside down? How many children are in the bed?

 Visual question answering: given an image (or images), respond to arbitrary, potentially open-

ended questions about the content.

Common benchmarks for VLMs include

Ground Truth Caption: A little boy runs away from the approaching waves of the ocean.

Generated Caption: A young boy is running on the beach.

Ground Truth Caption: A brunette girl wearing sunglasses and a yellow shirt.

Generated Caption: A woman in a black shirt and sunglasses smiles.

 Caption generation: create natural language descriptions of content of some image

VLM: Architecture

Two common encoders:

VQ-VAE encoder followed by an embedding layer that converts the discrete tokens into dense numerical vectors CLIP encoder, that directly learns an embedding vector using a contrastive 10/21/24 Source: <https://huggingface.co/blog/vlms> **10/21/24 pre-training objective**

VLM: Architecture

Two common encoders:

VQ-VAE encoder followed by an embedding layer that converts the discrete tokens into dense numerical vectors CLIP encoder, that directly learns an embedding vector using a contrastive 10/21/24 Source: <https://huggingface.co/blog/vlms> **10** pre-training objective 10

Recall: Parti

Recall: Image Tokenization

How can we (pre -)train these models given the non differentiable quantization operation?

 \cdot Embedding space consists of K D-dimensional latent vectors $\{e_1, ..., e_K\}$ which are learned during training

 \cdot The indices $[1, ..., K]$ of each latent vector correspond to the "image tokens" in some fixed-length codebook

• The encoder (e.g., a ResNet-like CNN) maps images to N D -dimensional vectors

The decoder takes the discretized representation and recreates the original image

Wait, how would we take the gradient through the argmin?

Intuition: the closer $z_q(x)$ and $z_q(x)$, the better the estimate (under certain assumptions)

Straight-through Estimator

- \cdot Intuition: we want the latent vectors to correspond to relevant points in the embedding space i.e., ones that are near the outputs of the encoder
- However, we also want the encoder to respect the latent vectors and not overfit to the training dataset
- Idea: augment the standard VAE objective with some regularizing terms that drive the two closer to each other

$$
\log p_{\theta}(x|z_q(x)) + ||\text{sg}[z_e(x)] - z_q(x)||_2^2
$$

+ $\beta ||z_e(x) - \text{sg}[z_q(x)]||_2^2$

where sg is the stop-gradient operator which fixes the argument to be non-updated constant

- \cdot Intuition: we want the latent vectors to correspond to relevant points in the embedding space i.e., ones that are near the outputs of the encoder
- However, we also want the encoder to respect the latent vectors and not overfit to the training dataset
- Idea: augment the standard VAE objective with some regularizing terms that drive the two closer to each other

$$
\log p_{\theta}(x|z_{q}(x)) + ||\text{sg}[z_{e}(x)] - z_{q}(x)||_{2}^{2} + \beta ||z_{e}(x) - \text{sg}[z_{q}(x)]||_{2}^{2}
$$

The first term is the typical reconstruction error objective

- \cdot Intuition: we want the latent vectors to correspond to relevant points in the embedding space i.e., ones that are near the outputs of the encoder
- However, we also want the encoder to respect the latent vectors and not overfit to the training dataset
- Idea: augment the standard VAE objective with some regularizing terms that drive the two closer to each other $\log p_{\theta}(x|z_q(x)) + ||\text{sg}[z_e(x)] - z_q(x)||_2^2$ 2 2

 The second term drives the latent vector to be closer to the encoder output vector that was mapped to it

 $+ \beta ||z_e(x) - sg[z_q(x)]||_2^2$

- \cdot Intuition: we want the latent vectors to correspond to relevant points in the embedding space i.e., ones that are near the outputs of the encoder
- However, we also want the encoder to respect the latent vectors and not overfit to the training dataset
- Idea: augment the standard VAE objective with some regularizing terms that drive the two closer to each other

 $\log p_{\theta}(x|z_q(x)) + ||\text{sg}[z_e(x)] - z_q(x)||_2^2$ 2 $+ \beta ||z_e(x) - sg[z_q(x)]||_2^2$ 2

 The third term drives the encoder to output vectors closer to the latent vectors

VLM: Architecture

Two common encoders:

VQ-VAE encoder followed by an embedding layer that converts the discrete tokens into dense numerical vectors CLIP encoder, that directly learns an embedding

vector using a contrastive

10/21/24 Source: <https://huggingface.co/blog/vlms> **10/21/24** pre-training objective

CLIP

Pepper the Text aussie pup The text encoder (e.g., an Encoder encoder-only transformer) and the image encoder (e.g., a ResNet-like CNN or ViT) are both linearly projected into same-CLIP Image dimensional vectors i.e., the Encoder multi-modal embedding space

CLIP

10/21/24 **29** vectors and minimize all other pairwise cosine similarities \cdot Given a mini-batch of N (image, caption) pairs, both encoders are simultaneously pre-trained to maximize the cosine similarity of corresponding image-caption embedding

CLIP: Zero-shot classification

CLIP vs. VQ-VAEs

- VLMs with VQ-VAE encoders (or any vector quantized image model) can also generate images in addition to text by defining a loss over the image codebook tokens
- CLIP does not discretize its image embedding so VLMs with CLIP-based encoders cannot (naturally) define a loss over images and thus, can only output text
- However, CLIP embeddings are more expressive than the discrete VQ-VAE encodings so can lead to improved performance in some settings