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Abstract

We investigate the use of multimodal information contained in images as an effective method for enhancing the commonsense of Transformer models for text generation. We perform experiments using BART and T5 on concept-to-text generation, specifically the task of generative commonsense reasoning, or CommonGen. We call our approach VisCTG: Visually Grounded Concept-to-Text Generation. VisCTG involves captioning images representing appropriate everyday scenarios, and using these captions to enrich and steer the generation process. Comprehensive evaluation and analysis demonstrate that VisCTG noticeably improves model performance while successfully addressing several issues of the baseline generations, including poor commonsense, fluency, and specificity.

1 Introduction

Transformer-based models have seen increasing popularity for NLP tasks and applications. This includes SOTA text generation models such as BART (Lewis et al. 2020) and T5 (Raffel et al. 2020). Larger corpora and better pretraining losses are major reasons driving these gains. However, despite increasing attention on the commonsense of models through works like COMET (Bosselut et al. 2019), studies have shown that even large pretrained models still struggle with commonsense tasks that humans can reason through very easily (Talmor et al. 2020). We believe that there is commonsense information in other modalities like vision, beyond what is reported (Gordon and Van Durme 2013) in text, which can possibly augment commonsense and enhance decision-making processes of text generation models.

In this paper, we show this is true by improving the performance of Transformer-based text generation models on concept-to-text generation using visual grounding, which we call VisCTG: Visually Grounded Concept-to-Text Generation. Concept-to-text generation is a high-level formulation of several constrained text generation and data-to-text natural language generation (NLG) tasks. These are challenging tasks that have seen increasing interest, and involve generating natural language outputs given certain pre-conditions, e.g., specific words in the outputs, and structured or semi-structured inputs. They typically involve converting a set of inputs into natural language text. These inputs can normally be thought of as concepts, or high-level words or structures, that play an important role in the generated text. Multimodal work has seen increasing popularity, but its exploration for constrained and data-to-text NLG has been limited (Baltrušaitis, Ahuja, and Morency 2019; Gao et al. 2020).

We investigate the task of generative commonsense reasoning, or CommonGen (Lin et al. 2020), which involves generating sentences that effectively describe everyday scenarios from concepts sets, which are words that must appear in the output. CommonGen is challenging as effective relational reasoning ability using commonsense knowledge is required. Models must also possess the compositional generalization capabilities to piece together different concepts. CommonGen is an effective benchmark for constrained text generation and commonsense as its task formulation and evaluation methodology are rather broadly applicable.

We experiment on CommonGen using BART and T5. An

\begin{table}[h]
  \centering
  \begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
    \hline
    \textbf{Image} & \textbf{Caption} \\
    \hline
    \includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{example1} & A person walks down a street holding an umbrella. \\
    \hline
    \includegraphics[width=0.4\textwidth]{example2} & A cat is laying on a bed and petting it. \\
    \hline
  \end{tabular}
  \caption{Examples of retrieved images, captions, baseline and VisCTG (our model’s) generations. The images and captions are used as an intermediary to guide the final generation and it need not be faithful to them. E.g. nobody is petting the cat in the image, but since the VisCTG output is conditioned on both the concept set and caption, it includes \textit{being petted}.}
  \label{tab:example_images}
\end{table}

Table 1: Examples of retrieved images, captions, baseline and VisCTG (our model’s) generations. The images and captions are used as an intermediary to guide the final generation and it need not be faithful to them. E.g. nobody is petting the cat in the image, but since the VisCTG output is conditioned on both the concept set and caption, it includes being petted.

\footnote{Code: https://github.com/styfeng/VisCTG}
initial analysis (§3.1) of baseline generations shows several issues related to commonsense, specificity, and fluency. We hypothesize that these can be addressed through image captions (§3.2). Images representing everyday scenarios are commonplace, and typically logical and grounded in commonsense. Captioning models can also normally produce decent captions for everyday images, which can be used to guide and enhance the generation process. See Table 1 for examples.

Expounding on this, we use a pretrained image captioning model on MSCOCO captions (Lin et al. 2014) to caption the top retrieved images for each concept set (§4.1,4.2). We use these captions as additional information to augment inputs to our generation models (§4.3). Extensive evaluation (§6) demonstrates that VisCTG improves model performance and commonsense while addressing the baseline inadequacies.

2 Dataset, Models, and Metrics

2.1 CommonGen Dataset

The original CommonGen dataset is made up of 35,141 concept sets (consisting of 3 to 5 keywords each) and 79,051 sentences, split into train, dev, and test splits. Since the original test set is hidden, we partition the original dev set into new dev and test splits for the majority of our experiments. We do, however, ask the CommonGen authors to evaluate our re-implementations of the base and large versions. Both are seq2seq Transformer models. T5 has strong multitask pretraining. BART is pretrained as a denoising autoencoder to reproduce original from noised text. We use their HuggingFace implementations.

We train two seeded versions of each model on train$_{CG}$ and evaluate their performance on dev$_O$. These serve as the baselines for our experiments. Using the numbers in Lin et al. (2020) as comparison, we validate our implementations. We use the hyperparameters from Lin et al. (2020), beam search for decoding, and select the final epoch as the one reaching maximum ROUGE-2 (Lin and Hovy 2003) on the dev set. From Table 3, we observe that our re-implementations reach or exceed reported results in Lin et al. (2020) on most metrics.

2.2 Models: T5 and BART

We use pretrained text generation models T5 and BART, both the base and large versions. Both are seq2seq Transformer models. T5 has strong multitask pretraining. BART is pretrained as a denoising autoencoder to reproduce original from noised text. We use their HuggingFace implementations.

We train two seeded versions of each model on train$_{CG}$ and evaluate their performance on dev$_O$. These serve as the baselines for our experiments. Using the numbers in Lin et al. (2020) as comparison, we validate our implementations. We use the hyperparameters from Lin et al. (2020), beam search for decoding, and select the final epoch as the one reaching maximum ROUGE-2 (Lin and Hovy 2003) on the dev set. From Table 3, we observe that our re-implementations reach or exceed reported results in Lin et al. (2020) on most metrics.

2.3 Evaluation Metrics

We use several evaluation metrics, including those in Lin et al. (2020) such as BLEU (Papineni et al. 2002), CIDEr (Vedantam, Lawrence Zitnick, and Parikh 2015), SPICE (Anderson et al. 2016), and coverage (cov). These (other than cov) assess similarity between human references and generations. In particular, CIDEr captures a combination of sentence similarity, grammaticality, saliency, importance, and accuracy. SPICE maps texts to semantic scene graphs and calculates an F-score over the graphs’ tuples. Lin et al. (2020) note that SPICE correlates highest with human judgment for CommonGen. Cov measures the average percentage of input concepts covered by the output text in any form.

We also use BERTScore (Zhang et al. 2019) and Perplexity (PPL). BERTScore measures BERT (Devlin et al. 2019) embeddings similarity between individual tokens, serving as a more semantic rather than surface-level similarity measure. We multiply by 100 when reporting BERTScore. PPL serves as a measure of fluency, with lower values representing higher fluency. We use GPT-2 (Radford et al. 2019) for PPL. For all metrics other than PPL, higher means better performance.

3 Initial Analysis and Motivation

3.1 Baseline Model Generations

We conduct an initial analysis of the baseline model outputs, and observe that several lack fluency. Some are more like phrases than full coherent sentences, e.g. “body of water on a raft”. Others miss important words, e.g. “A listening music and dancing in a dark room” misses a noun before listening. A large portion of generations are generic and bland, e.g. “Someone sits and listens to someone talk”. This may be an instance of the dull response problem faced by generation models (Du and Black 2019; Li et al. 2016), where they prefer safe and frequent responses independent of the input.

Many generations also lack commonsense. For example, “body of water on a raft” is illogical as the phrases “body of water” and “a raft” are pieced together incorrectly. A similar issue occurs with the {horse, carriage, draw} example in Table 4. At times the models also cannot understand what certain nouns can do, e.g. “A dog checking his phone on a pier.” Several other examples of this can be found in Table 4.

3.2 Images and Captions

Images that represent everyday scenarios are quite prevalent for almost any reasonable concept set. Further, the images are typically grounded in commonsense. For example, searching...
The captions are concatenated together and onto the concept set using <s> separator tokens. These serve as augmented inputs to BART and T5. They learn to convert these
augmented inputs to human references during training, and are fed the augmented inputs (corresponding to the value of NTC) during validation and testing. Some examples of augmented inputs and generations can be found in Table 5.

## 5 Experiments

### 5.1 Model Training and Selection

For training VisCTG models, we mainly follow baseline hyperparameters, barring learning rate (LR) which is tuned per NTC value, and the maximum encoder length which is chosen depending on the tokenizer and value of NTC to ensure the entire input sequence can fit onto the encoder. We train two seeds per model. See Appendix C for more details.

For each model, we choose the epoch corresponding to highest ROUGE-2 on dev\textsubscript{CG}, and use beam search for decoding. NTC itself is a hyperparameter, so while we train separate versions of each model corresponding to different NTC values, the final chosen models correspond to the NTC values that performed best on dev\textsubscript{CG} when averaged over both seeds. We then use the final chosen models to generate on both test\textsubscript{CG} and test\textsubscript{O}, and report the results in §6.

### 5.2 Human Evaluation

We conduct two human evaluations: one using Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT), and one using an expert linguist. For the AMT study, we ask annotators to evaluate 86 test\textsubscript{CG} examples per model. Our evaluation is based on pairwise comparison of VisCTG and baseline model outputs. We ask human annotators to choose which amongst the two outputs (presented in a random order per example) has better Overall Quality. There are 3 choices - O1: VisCTG is better, O2: baseline is better, O3: both are indistinguishable. To aggregate multiple annotations per example, we find the fraction of responses towards each outcome value as the per-example distribution. We then find the sample mean of this outcome distribution over all examples. For sample mean and significance testing, we are interested in the values for O1 vs. O2.

For the expert linguist study, our expert is a native English speaker with a graduate degree in linguistics from a North American university. The expert is asked to annotate three aspects for 50 BART-large\textsuperscript{7} test\textsubscript{CG} examples - Overall Quality (Overall), Commonsense Plausibility (Commonsense), and Fluency (Fluency). For all aspects, we have a pairwise-comparison evaluation setup similar to that for AMT.

### 6 Results and Analysis

#### 6.1 Analysis of Automatic Evaluation Results

We see from Tables 6 and 7 that VisCTG outperforms the baselines on all metrics across the models on test\textsubscript{CG}. Performance gains are strong and statistically significant for BART-base, BART-large, and T5-base. VisCTG appears relatively less effective for T5-large which is the strongest baseline, and hence improving its performance may be more difficult.

From Table 8, we see that VisCTG models substantially outperform corresponding baselines reported in Lin et al. (2020) on test\textsubscript{O}. T5-base VisCTG outperforms the reported T5-base and large baselines across metrics, and BART-base VisCTG performs similarly to the reported BART-large baseline. BART-large VisCTG outperforms the reported baseline, EKI-BART (Fan et al. 2020), and KG-BART (Liu et al. 2021). These are SOTA published CommonGen BART models that use external knowledge from corpora and KGs. We show that visual grounding is more effective, and BART-large VisCTG places high on the leaderboard.\textsuperscript{9} T5-large VisCTG outperforms the reported baseline, but lags behind SAPPHIRE (Feng et al. 2021b) and RE-T5 (Wang et al. 2021).

Figure 2 shows that as NTC increases, metrics increase to a peak and taper off after. As we saw in Figure 1, the rate of increase of coverage declines with larger NTC. The latter images and captions are thus of diminishing quality, and hence using too many negatively affects model performance.

We also computed ROUGE between captions and outputs over test\textsubscript{CG}. ROUGE1/2/L = 36.2/12.3/33.5 are modestly valued. Our models do not simply copy caption content.

#### 6.2 Analysis of Human Evaluation Results

Table 9 shows that VisCTG outperforms the baseline on all four models based on human annotators (with high IAA). Annotators, on average, prefer VisCTG outputs over baseline outputs on overall quality, especially for BART-large. Table

---

\textsuperscript{6}See Appendix D for further human evaluation details.

\textsuperscript{7}Since this is the best performing VisCTG model - see §6.

\textsuperscript{8}Evaluated by the CommonGen authors on their hidden test set.

\textsuperscript{9}https://inklab.usc.edu/CommonGen/leaderboard.html
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>BART-base ($NTC = 5$)</th>
<th>BART-large ($NTC = 2$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROUGE-1</td>
<td>43.36 ± 0.03</td>
<td>45.44 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.44 ± 0.08</td>
<td>54.67 ± 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUGE-2</td>
<td>17.31 ± 0.02</td>
<td>19.15 ± 0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.15 ± 0.21</td>
<td>18.77 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUGE-L</td>
<td>36.65 ± 0.00</td>
<td>38.43 ± 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.43 ± 0.07</td>
<td>37.83 ± 0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLEU-1</td>
<td>73.20 ± 0.28</td>
<td>75.65 ± 0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.65 ± 0.78</td>
<td>74.45 ± 0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLEU-2</td>
<td>54.50 ± 0.14</td>
<td>59.05 ± 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.05 ± 0.07</td>
<td>56.25 ± 0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLEU-3</td>
<td>40.40 ± 0.14</td>
<td>44.90 ± 0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.90 ± 0.42</td>
<td>42.15 ± 0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLEU-4</td>
<td>30.10 ± 0.14</td>
<td>34.10 ± 0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.10 ± 0.57</td>
<td>32.10 ± 0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METEOR</td>
<td>30.35 ± 0.35</td>
<td>31.95 ± 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.95 ± 0.07</td>
<td>31.70 ± 0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDEr</td>
<td>15.56 ± 0.10</td>
<td>16.54 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.54 ± 0.05</td>
<td>16.42 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPICE</td>
<td>30.05 ± 0.07</td>
<td>31.80 ± 0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.80 ± 0.28</td>
<td>31.85 ± 0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERTScore</td>
<td>59.19 ± 0.32</td>
<td>61.44 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.44 ± 0.02</td>
<td>59.95 ± 0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>90.43 ± 0.17</td>
<td>90.66 ± 1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90.66 ± 1.39</td>
<td>94.49 ± 0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL</td>
<td>80.39 ± 3.05</td>
<td>72.45 ± 0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.45 ± 0.79</td>
<td>80.37 ± 4.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Auto eval results for BART on testCG over two seeds. Bold corresponds to best performance. We include p-values (from Pitman’s permutation test (Pitman 1937)) for VisCTG compared to the baseline. Insignificant ones ($\alpha = 0.1$) marked with *.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>T5-base ($NTC = 2$)</th>
<th>T5-large ($NTC = 1$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROUGE-1</td>
<td>44.63 ± 0.13</td>
<td>46.26 ± 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.26 ± 0.07</td>
<td>46.32 ± 0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUGE-2</td>
<td>18.40 ± 0.19</td>
<td>17.80 ± 0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.80 ± 0.30</td>
<td>19.59 ± 0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUGE-L</td>
<td>37.60 ± 0.16</td>
<td>38.80 ± 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.80 ± 0.25</td>
<td>39.20 ± 0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLEU-1</td>
<td>73.60 ± 0.85</td>
<td>76.80 ± 0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.80 ± 0.28</td>
<td>77.55 ± 0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLEU-2</td>
<td>57.00 ± 0.71</td>
<td>60.30 ± 0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.30 ± 0.28</td>
<td>60.80 ± 0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLEU-3</td>
<td>42.75 ± 0.49</td>
<td>46.25 ± 0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.25 ± 0.64</td>
<td>46.50 ± 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METEOR</td>
<td>32.70 ± 0.49</td>
<td>36.10 ± 0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.10 ± 0.85</td>
<td>36.20 ± 0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDEr</td>
<td>16.25 ± 0.25</td>
<td>17.65 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.65 ± 0.02</td>
<td>17.79 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPICE</td>
<td>31.95 ± 0.07</td>
<td>33.40 ± 0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.40 ± 0.28</td>
<td>33.90 ± 0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERTScore</td>
<td>61.40 ± 0.34</td>
<td>62.42 ± 0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.42 ± 0.17</td>
<td>62.67 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>90.96 ± 1.77</td>
<td>94.48 ± 1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94.48 ± 1.39</td>
<td>94.40 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL</td>
<td>83.04 ± 1.62</td>
<td>77.50 ± 3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.50 ± 3.86</td>
<td>81.78 ± 4.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Auto eval results for T5 on testCG over two seeds. Bold corresponds to best performance. We include p-values (from Pitman’s permutation test (Pitman 1937)) for VisCTG compared to the baseline. Insignificant ones ($\alpha = 0.1$) marked with *.

10 illustrates that VisCTG outperforms the baseline model for BART-large based on an expert linguist’s perspective. VisCTG outputs are highly preferred, on average, over the baseline on all three aspects of overall quality, commonsense, and fluency. This aligns with our automatic results in §6.1.

6.3 Qualitative Analysis

Table 11 shows several baseline outputs that contain issues from §3.1, e.g. incomplete and/or illogical sentences. Human references are all fluent and logical. VisCTG can usually generate much higher-quality text than the baselines.

The baseline outputs for ex. 1-2 are phrases lacking arguments, and all illogical for ex. 1-3. Using captions, VisCTG successfully adjusts semantic roles of entities, replaces incorrect subjects, fixes dependency structure, and grounds generations in commonsense. For ex. 1, captions are of the form “{X} sitting on a chair with {Y}”, where {X} is a subject and {Y} an object. VisCTG output has a similar structure, being fluent and logical with higher coverage. The baseline output also has an incorrect subject of “hands”. Our VisCTG output contains an additional entity (not present in the input set) of “boy” as subject, likely since it is a subject in the captions. This highlights the usefulness of visual grounding, as the image space can provide additional commonsense information not present in the text (e.g. toys are associated with children/boys). For ex. 2, the baseline output treats “hand of a bird” as a single entity, the subject. Captions separate “bird” and “hand” into two, likely guiding the VisCTG output to do so. For ex. 3, the baseline misplaces “bus” as subject. Captions are of form “{X} sitting on a bench {Y}”, where {X} is a logical subject and {Y} is an expression. The VisCTG output has this structure, with correct subject and commonsense, and higher coverage. Overall, we see that visual grounding guides the model to learn which nouns/subjects can perform which actions (e.g. “hands” cannot sit on a chair but a “boy” can), which is a major baseline deficiency discussed in §3.1.

For ex. 4, the baseline output lacks a subject that the captions contain, likely guiding the VisCTG output to contain one: “a man”. For ex. 5, the baseline output is generic due to uses of “someone”. VisCTG’s output is more specific and refers to “man”, likely because the caption (though not very fitting) includes a “man” subject. Even for captions that fit the concepts less, structure and fluency can still be exploited.

Overall, we see that the baselines simply try to piece to-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>ROUGE-L</th>
<th>BLEU-3/4</th>
<th>METEOR</th>
<th>CIDEr</th>
<th>SPICE</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5-base</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>34.56</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>18.54</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-large</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>43.01</td>
<td>31.96</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>15.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART-large</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.02</td>
<td>41.78</td>
<td>39.52</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td>31.83</td>
<td>13.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKI-BART</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35.945</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG-BART</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.867</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPPHIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.119</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE-T5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.863</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-base VisCTG</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td>44.98</td>
<td>45.749</td>
<td>34.722</td>
<td>31.809</td>
<td>16.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-large VisCTG</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td>45.76</td>
<td>47.376</td>
<td>36.409</td>
<td>33.012</td>
<td>16.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART-base VisCTG</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.73</td>
<td>43.44</td>
<td>43.235</td>
<td>32.291</td>
<td>30.86</td>
<td>15.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART-large VisCTG</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.68</td>
<td>45.07</td>
<td>48.031</td>
<td>36.939</td>
<td>33.215</td>
<td>17.199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Auto eval results of VisCTG on testCG, evaluated by CommonGen authors. We compare to reported baseline numbers in Lin et al. (2020) (they did not evaluate BART-base), and models on their leaderboard with publications at time of writing. Their leaderboard reports BLEU-4, CIDEr, and SPICE. Bold corresponds to best performance (for those three) per model type+size.

Figure 2: BLEU-4, CIDEr, and SPICE on testCG over different values of NTC for BART-base and T5-base.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>O1</th>
<th>O2</th>
<th>O3</th>
<th>IAA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BART-base</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART-large</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-base</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-large</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Avg. AMT eval results on testCG for overall quality. O1: VisCTG wins, O2: baseline wins, O3: indistinguishable. All results are stat sig based on paired two-tailed t-tests and \( \alpha = 0.1 \). Inter-annotator agreement (IAA) is the avg. direct fractional agreement (both annotators choose O1 or O2) over all examples. See §5.2 and Appendix D for further details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>O1</th>
<th>O2</th>
<th>O3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BART-large</td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commonsense</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Avg. expert linguist eval results on testCG for BART-large. O1: VisCTG wins, O2: baseline wins, O3: indistinguishable. See §5.2 and Appendix D for further details.

Together the input concepts into a form of English syntax, often failing to do so effectively. VisCTG models can produce more grammatical, fluent, and logical text by exploiting the syntactic and dependency structures of the captions. Further, the visual grounding improves the commonsense of the generations. The images inherently capture commonsense by representing everyday scenarios, and this commonsense info is rarely explicitly included in text. Hence, large text-based models such as our baselines tend to not know this info, whereas VisCTG models learn it through the grounding.

VisCTG is, however, imperfect. For ex. 6, its output is less logical and lower coverage than the baseline’s. The captions are all simplistic and low coverage; the first is illogical, and some others are of the form “a bunch of apples […] on a tree”, likely negatively impacting the generation. Ex. 4’s human reference is creative, which is an area where VisCTG still lacks in comparison. For ex. 5, while VisCTG edits “someone” to “man”, it is unable to merge the two instances of “man” or adjust the sentence to be more coherent. These weaknesses are likely because captions tend to be simplistic (due to the captioning model’s training data), limiting VisCTG’s ability to make heavier edits. VisCTG, unsurprisingly, appears to depend quite heavily on the captions, and hence the quality of the images and captioning model.

7 Related Work

Constrained Text Generation: There have been several works on constrained text generation. Miao et al. (2019) use Metropolis-Hastings sampling to determine Levenshtein edits per generation step. Feng, Li, and Hoey (2019) pro-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept set</td>
<td>{sit, chair, toy, hand} (example 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captions</td>
<td>a little girl sitting on a chair with a teddy bear (&lt;s&gt;) a young boy sitting on a chair with a skateboard (&lt;s&gt;) a man sitting on a chair with a remote hands sitting on a chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART-base-BL</td>
<td>hands sitting on a chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART-base-VisCTG</td>
<td>A boy sitting on a chair with a toy in his hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human reference</td>
<td>A baby sits on a chair with a toy in one of its hands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept set</td>
<td>{food, eat, hand, bird} (example 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captions</td>
<td>a bird is perched on a branch with a hand (&lt;s&gt;) a person holding a small bird in their hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART-large-BL</td>
<td>hand of a bird eating food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART-large-VisCTG</td>
<td>A bird eats food from a hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human reference</td>
<td>A small bird eats food from someone’s hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept set</td>
<td>{bench, bus, wait, sit} (example 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captions</td>
<td>a man sitting on a bench with a book (&lt;s&gt;) a person sitting on a bench with a laptop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-base-BL</td>
<td>A bus sits on a bench.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-base-VisCTG</td>
<td>A man sits on a bench waiting for a bus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human reference</td>
<td>The man sat on the bench waiting for the bus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept set</td>
<td>{jacket, wear, snow, walk} (example 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captions</td>
<td>a young boy in a red jacket is standing in the snow (&lt;s&gt;) a man in a red jacket is standing in the snow walking in the snow wearing a furry jacket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART-large-BL</td>
<td>A man is walking in the snow wearing a jacket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART-large-VisCTG</td>
<td>Jamie took a walk out into the snow with only a T shirt on and instantly went back inside to wear his jacket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept set</td>
<td>{hold, hand, stand, front} (example 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captions</td>
<td>a man holding a pair of scissors in front of a wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-large-BL</td>
<td>Someone stands in front of someone holding a hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-large-VisCTG</td>
<td>A man stands in front of a man holding a hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human reference</td>
<td>A man stands and holds his hands out in front of him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept set</td>
<td>{bag, put, apple, tree, pick} (example 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captions</td>
<td>a person holding an apple in a tree (&lt;s&gt;) a bunch of apples are growing on a tree (&lt;s&gt;) a close up of a green apple with a tree (&lt;s&gt;) a bunch of apples are growing on a tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART-base-BL</td>
<td>A man is putting apples in a bag and picking them up from the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART-base-VisCTG</td>
<td>A man puts a bag of apples on a tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human reference</td>
<td>I picked an apple from the tree and put it in my bag.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Qualitative examples for test\(_{CG}\). BL stands for baseline. Concept set refers to the input keywords and Captions refers to the captions (separated by \(<s>\)) used by the VisCTG model for that particular example to produce its final generation.

pose Semantic Text Exchange to adjust topic-level text semantics. Gangal et al. (2021) introduce narrative reordering (NAREOR) to edit the temporality of narratives.

Data-to-text NLG: E2E-NLG (Dušek, Novikova, and Rieser 2018) and WebNLG (Gardent et al. 2017) are two popular NLG benchmarks with structured inputs - meaning representation (MR) and triple sequences, respectively.

Commonsense Injection and Incorporation: One commonsense knowledge graph (KG) is COMET, trained on KG edges. EKI-BART (Fan et al. 2020) and KG-BART (Liu et al. 2021) use external knowledge to improve Commonsense performance. Distinctly, VisCTG uses visual grounding and shows higher performance (see §6). Visual Commonsense Reasoning (VCR) (Zellers et al. 2019) involves answering commonsense-related MC questions about images. Our work focuses on injecting commonsense into text generators.

Multimodal Machine Learning and NLP: There has been more work on multimodality, in areas like representation and video captioning, but little for constrained and data-to-text NLG (Baltrusaitis, Ahuja, and Morency 2019; Gao et al. 2020). There is work on pretrained multimodal models like ViLBERT (Lu et al. 2019): mainly encoders that jointly represent images and text rather than seq2seq models. Further, unlike these models which are pretrained, VisCTG exploits per-example visual info to fix specific issues per concept set.

8 Conclusion and Future Work

In conclusion, we motivated and explored the use of visual grounding for improving the commonsense of Transformer models for text generation. We investigated this for concept-to-text generation, calling our method VisCTG: Visually Grounded Concept-to-Text Generation. Extensive experiments on BART and T5 showed its efficacy on the Commonsense task. Comprehensive evaluation and analysis showed that VisCTG boosts model performance and commonsense while addressing baseline deficiencies. Potential future work includes using a stronger captioning model, e.g. one based on CLIP (Radford et al. 2021). Video captioning and image generation can also be explored. Further, VisCTG can be investigated for other data-to-text NLG tasks, e.g. WebNLG, and applications like data augmentation for text generation (Feng et al. 2020, 2021a), and enhancing the commonsense reasoning of personalized dialogue agents (Li et al. 2020).
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