

What’s in a Caption? Dataset-Specific Linguistic Diversity and Its Effect on Visual Description Models and Metrics

David M. Chan¹, Austin Myers², Sudheendra Vijayanarasimhan², David A. Ross²

Bryan Seybold², John F. Canny¹

¹University of California, Berkeley ²Google Research

{davidchan, canny}@berkeley.edu

{aom, svnaras, dross, seybold}@google.com

Abstract

While there have been significant gains in the field of automated video description, the generalization performance of automated description models to novel domains remains a major barrier to using these systems in the real world. Most visual description methods are known to capture and exploit patterns in the training data leading to evaluation metric increases, but what are those patterns? In this work, we examine several popular visual description datasets, and capture, analyze, and understand the dataset-specific linguistic patterns that models exploit but do not generalize to new domains. At the token level, sample level, and dataset level, we find that caption diversity is a major driving factor behind the generation of generic and uninformative captions. We further show that state-of-the-art models even outperform held-out ground truth captions on modern metrics, and that this effect is an artifact of linguistic diversity in datasets. Understanding this linguistic diversity is key to building strong captioning models, we recommend several methods and approaches for maintaining diversity in the collection of new data, and dealing with the consequences of limited diversity when using current models and metrics.

1. Introduction

Automated visual description is an emergent field in computer vision, aiming to generate natural language descriptions of visual information. With various applications including digital accessibility [47] and video summarization [48] as well as indexing and search [24], methods for visual description have the potential to impact the daily lives of billions of users. Recent improvements such as vision and language pre-training [49], compositional and graph methods [9, 27], and non-autoregressive training [21] have driven metric performance on standard benchmarks such as MSR-VTT [43] and MS-COCO [20] to new heights.




Figure 1. Captions generated by state-of-the-art (SOTA) models outperform held-out ground truth captions written by humans on common visual description datasets and metrics. Despite being far from human-level, SOTA models appear to outperform humans on most datasets and metrics, with the exception of VATEX, a relatively new dataset (and not even on all metrics). This discrepancy begs the question, “What causes these effects?” and “Are these effects indicative of a more serious issue with visual description datasets or model evaluation methods?” The figure above shows metric performance normalized to a recent SOTA model across several visual description datasets.

Unfortunately, despite recent improvements in model architectures [21, 27], metrics [15, 41], and datasets [25, 42], automated visual description has been plagued by issues of poor generalization and description quality [1, 33, 36, 45]. Models consistently perform poorly on novel data, generate nonsense descriptions, or produce descriptions that are too vague to be of use to visually impaired users [22]. It remains an open question in visual description to understand the source of these generalization issues.

This paper is motivated by both the fact that often state-of-the-art methods outperform leave-one-out experiments

with ground truth sample data (explored in 3) as well as results demonstrating poor cross-dataset generalization in video captioning from Smeaton *et al.* [33] and Yang *et al.* [46]. We find that one major issue in current datasets—description linguistic diversity—explains a great deal about model evaluations.

Our work, consisting of analyses on several popular visual description datasets, contains several primary contributions:

1. We demonstrate that a lack of linguistic diversity at a token and n-gram level can bias models to generate descriptions lacking in semantic detail (section 4).
2. We show that diversity among ground truths for a single visual context presents a catch-22: low within-sample linguistic diversity leads to generic captions, as information is repetitive; on the other hand, high within-sample diversity leads to a breakdown of single-sample metrics, causing inconsistencies in model evaluation and inaccurate understanding of model performance (section 5).
3. We detail how a lack of semantic diversity at the dataset level can encourage models to generate generic descriptions through classification, instead of learning to understand and relay visual phenomena at various levels of detail (section 6).
4. We discuss our findings demonstrating the need for future research in visual description datasets, methods, and metrics, present recommendations on possible solutions to current linguistic diversity, and introduce a new toolkit for dataset evaluation and split generation focused on linguistic diversity (section 7).

2. Experimental Design

In this work, we explore the field of visual description data through the lens of some of the most popular visual description datasets. While there are a large number of visual description datasets to choose from, we decided to focus on some of the most common datasets for video description, and an additional dataset for image description:¹ MSR-VTT [43], VATEX [42], MSVD [8] and MS-COCO [20] (for full details, see the supplementary materials).

All of these datasets collect multiple ground truth descriptions per visual context, and the ground truth descriptions that they do collect are generated by human annotators (via Amazon Mechanical Turk for these datasets). Unfortunately, very large benchmark datasets such as Conceptual Captions [30] and HowTo-100M [24] often contain only a single description per image/video, of questionable quality as the datasets are not annotated by hand. While datasets

like S-MiT [25] contain human-annotated ground truths, they post-process spoken language with automated speech recognition tools, making the dataset difficult to analyze from an n-gram metric angle. Both ActivityNet Captions [17] and YouCook [54] are dense video description datasets that contain high-quality descriptions, however only contain a single ground truth per video.

Given the datasets, we will contextualize our experiments through the lens of several standard metrics for visual description. The BLEU (or BLEU@N) [26] score is a measure of n-gram precision, the ROUGE-L [19] score is a measure of longest common sub-sequence recall, the METEOR [3] score is a F1-oriented alignment-based metric, and the CIDEr [40] score is a TF-IDF weighted similarity metric. For more details of the individual metrics, see Aafaq *et al.* [1]. Recently, metrics which focus more on including visual content directly such as TIGer [15] and FAIEr [41] have shown improvements in human-judgement correlation and scores such as CLIP-score [28], BERT-score [50], and SMURF [13] have been shown to closer approximate semantic content. While improving the metrics is an extremely important area of research, we also believe that analyzing both why current metrics are failing and what patterns models exploit to optimize these metrics, can give essential insight into model improvements.

We selected a set of recent works from the field as representing the state of the art. For visual description on MSR-VTT and MSVD, we refer to SemSynAN [27], a recent work that uses semantic embeddings based on POS tagging to achieve strong results. SemSynAN was not evaluated on the VATEX dataset, so for VATEX, we refer to the performance of MGRMP (Motion Guided Region Message Passing) [9], a recent method for visual description which leverages message passing between object regions. For MS-COCO, we refer specifically to Vin-VL [49], a method that uses object-level attention and vision and language pre-training for visual description.

3. How Can Models Outperform Humans?

Recently, there has been a strong contrast between the metrics-based evaluation of methods for generating visual descriptions on data sets and whether those methods generalize to real-world use cases [36]. The goal of our analysis in this paper is to understand some of the core reasons why models are failing to generalize and to make recommendations for the future design of datasets, models, and metrics, in an attempt to avoid further generalization shortcomings.

A core indicator of the difficulty of using standard metrics to improve generalization is that the “leave-one-out” performance of the ground truths for each dataset is typically poor. Because we investigate datasets that have more than a single ground truth sample per visual context, we can measure the metric scores between a randomly sampled ground

¹As described in section 7, we make the tools available for this analysis public, so any additional datasets can be analyzed.

Dataset	Unique	WS-Unique	Head
MSVD	9455	11.8%	944
MSR-VTT	22780	21.55%	1636
VATEX	31364	24.87%	1363
MS-COCO	35341	33.76%	824

Table 1. Vocabulary metrics for each of the datasets. Unique: The number of unique tokens. WS-Unique: Average percentage of tokens that are unique within a sample (image/video). Head: The number of unique tokens comprising 90% of the total tokens.

truth, and the remaining ground truths for that visual context. When averaged over many trials, this stochastic approach generates an estimate of human performance on the dataset (see the supplementary materials for details).

Our results are summarized in [Figure 1](#). We can see that SOTA methods significantly outperform this estimate of human performance on the MSVD, MSR-VTT, and MS-COCO datasets. This result is not only counter-intuitive, but detrimental to progress in the field of video description, as it draws into question the usefulness of standard metrics as an indicator of model performance and generalization. These results motivate questions of understanding: “Why, and how, do models exploit the current metrics to achieve strong performance?” and “How can we limit the the exploitation of N-Gram centric metrics”. The goal of the next several sections is to explore these questions through the lens of data diversity. Through analysis of single-token, n-gram, within-sample, and cross-sample diversities, we demonstrate how linguistic patterns affect models and metrics and explore how we can mitigate these effects.

4. Single Sample Diversity

To understand and analyze the impact of caption diversity on both model and metric quality, we need to first understand the diversity of the dataset itself. Many datasets use “vocabulary size”, the number of unique tokens (usually words), as a proxy for the diversity of the dataset, however we hypothesize that this metric alone does not tell the full story of token level diversity in visual description datasets. In this section, we analyze the diversity of visual description datasets bottom-up, starting from tokens and working our way up to measures of n-gram complexity.

4.1. Token-Level Diversity

[Table 1](#) provides a token-level analysis of each of the datasets. In addition to reporting the number of unique tokens in the dataset, we also introduce three new measures of diversity: Within-Sample uniqueness, which measures the percentage of tokens that are unique within a particular image/video; and “Vocab-Head”, which measures the number of tokens making up 90% of the tokens in the dataset. Within-sample diversity ranges between 11% and 35%,

suggesting that within samples, the descriptions are relatively varied. We discuss the impact of within-sample diversity in [section 5](#). As expected, a small fraction of tokens represent 90% of the occurrence in most of the datasets. In MS-COCO, 2% of the tokens represent 90% of the occurrences, while at the other extreme 10% of the tokens are required for MSVD. This begs the question: how does the effective vocab size impact performance?

To validate how effective vocab size impacts performance, we used the same setup as in [section 3](#) to compute the performance of the ground truths, however, replaced tokens in the tail of the token distribution with unique “UNK” tokens. Performance dropped significantly in all cases, with the most dramatic drop for MSVD (drop of 63.87%) and the least for MS-COCO (drop of 51.23%). MSR-VTT experienced a decrease of 58.66% and VATEX experienced a decrease of 56.20%). Counter-intuitively, the longer the tail, the less performance decreased. This result, confirmed in classification by Tang *et al.* [37], implies that models which generate from a limited vocabulary are advantaged (in terms of n-gram performance) when the head is relatively small, leading to undesirable generation behavior.

Following Wang *et al.* [42], we analyze the datasets at the level of the parts of speech in the dataset (See the supplementary materials for details). VATEX has more than 2 verbs per caption on average (by design, see [42]) while the other datasets have at most 1.3 verbs. While VATEX is the most linguistically complex, the distribution has significantly different base statistics, likely explaining poor cross-dataset generalization to VATEX from MSR-VTT and MSVD trained models. MSR-VTT is the most diverse from an object perspective (1512 nouns representing 90% of the noun mass), which lends additional support to the observations by Zhang *et al.* [51], who find that a strong object detector and good object features are necessary for strong MSR-VTT performance. Notably, MS-COCO has a very high within-sample noun diversity, suggesting that many of the captions in MS-COCO focus on different objects in each sample, and supporting hypotheses introduced in Anderson *et al.* [2] based on multiple-object attention for this dataset.

4.2. N-Gram-Level Diversity

From tokens, we can move on to exploring how the tokens fit together. One of the major issues in overall dataset diversity is a tendency for language models to accentuate a lack of n-gram diversity, leading to domination of common n-grams over visually likely n-grams [14]. A standard metric reported by Wang *et al.* [42] in VATEX is the number of unique n-grams in the dataset, however, we find that alone, the number of unique n-grams does not allow for strong comparison between datasets, both because the number is not normalized, and the number of n-grams says little about the overall distribution of those n-grams.

Dataset	TPC	EVS-2	EVS-3	EVS-4	ED@10
MSVD	7.03	47.83%	25.29%	14.67%	2.90
MSR-VTT	9.32	52.96%	26.44%	13.68%	2.88
VATEX	15.29	54.84%	32.60%	18.86%	3.38
MS-COCO	11.33	53.91 %	32.59%	20.56%	3.51
WT-103	87.04	95.19 %	34.49%	17.81%	3.72

Table 2. Effective vocab size (EVS), number of tokens per caption (TPC) and Effective Decision (ED@N). The EVS-n is the percentage of n-grams that do not act like 1-grams in the dataset. A large EVS-n means that language is more diverse, while a small EVS-n means that there are very few combinations of possible n-grams. The ED@N is the expected number of decision that a model has to make when generating captions of length N. WT-103 is WikiText-103 [23], a common natural language dataset.

Instead of only looking at the number of n-grams, in order to measure the amount of n-gram diversity that is introduced into a dataset, we introduce the N-Gram Effective Vocab Size metric (EVS-N), which measures the percentage of n-grams that do not act like 1-grams in practice. Formally, EVS-N is the percentage of tokens for which an N-gram language model has zero conditional variance (i.e. the percentage of tokens for which an n-gram language model does not assign 100% probability to a single next token). This metric can be thought of as a language-generation complexity metric — a higher EVS means that it will be more difficult for a model to memorize captions, while a low EVS suggests that models need only determine the first few words in order to generate a high-quality caption. Table 2 shows EVS-N performance, and a shocking result. The EVS-2 is approximately 50% for all datasets, suggesting that in the majority of cases, the model is able to make only one decision to generate two tokens, contrasting with WikiText-103 [23], where the EVS-2 is 95.19%.

In addition to just understanding the EVS, we can combine the EVS scores with the average number of tokens in the dataset to compute the average number of “decisions” that a model has to make during generation. The ED@N, or expected number of decisions made in a description of length N is also given in Table 2. Formally, the ED@N is the expected number of tokens in a description of length N for which an n-gram language model of the dataset has non-zero variance conditioned on the sentence so far. Surprisingly, most of the datasets have very similar ED scores (despite their differing average token lengths), and the number is low: only 3-3.5 decisions have to be made on average to get the desired caption. This low number has major implications in the quality of the captions: the fewer the number of decisions that need to be made at training, the less diverse the captions will be during test time, and the less likely models trained on the low-ED data will be able to generalize to fine-grained differences between samples. Further, this means that the number of captions models will

be able to generate is restricted to V^{ED} , where V is the size of the vocab, a notably smaller number than expected with large vocab sizes, and long captions. We believe that this is one of the reasons that non-auto-regressive approaches such as those in Liu *et al.* [21] and Yang *et al.* [44] are able to perform so well on these datasets: they can focus on the visual information, and don’t have to worry about the syntactic structure as it is similar for all descriptions.

5. Within Sample Diversity

While we have seen that token-level diversity is important for the generation of high quality captions, we also want to understand how within-sample diversity (i.e. diversity within a collection of ground truths for a single visual context) impacts the performance of visual description models.

To define how much within sample diversity there is in a dataset, there are several methods that we can use. One metric, common to many papers, is an analysis of how many captions in each sample are novel. VATEX (100%) and MS-COCO (99.9%) have high caption novelty, while MSR-VTT (92.66%) and MSVD (85.3%) contain somewhat less exact novelty. Further, we could look at within-sample token diversity (shown in Table 1), which suggests that within a sample, diversity is actually relatively high, with 11% to 33% of tokens being unique within a sample. Further, the within sample verb (15% to 56%) and noun (13% to 35%) uniqueness is relatively high as well, suggesting that individually, captions discuss unique parts of a visual context (Full results are given in the supplementary materials). This is demonstrated qualitatively in Figure 4.

The issue with these measures of novelty is that they account only for novelty at the caption or token level by exact matching, but do not directly target the semantic novelty of the captions. In order to look closer at within-sample diversity, we compute the pairwise semantic distance between each description and all other unique descriptions in the sample using the cosine distance between MP-Net embeddings [34] trained for sentence similarity. Figure 2 shows the minimum of the inter-sample cosine distances, a metric we call sample redundancy. Notably, almost 10% of the samples in MSVD have a very close semantic match, suggesting that MSVD has more semantically redundant information than other description datasets.

Sample redundancy is both a blessing and a curse. Datasets that have very high sample redundancy will tend to have high performance on leave-one-out ground truth metrics, as most of the ground truth captions will share large amounts of information. This means that pair-wise metrics such as the standard n-gram metrics will often perform well, as any generated sample should also lie close to at least one ground truth sample. Unfortunately, as we increase the number of diverse ground truths (increase the sample variance), the minimum distance between samples increases (See the




Figure 2. Histogram of within-sample minimum distances under the MP-Net [34] BERT-style embeddings. MSVD and MSR-VTT both have a high number of descriptions which have 0 within-sample minimum distance, while MS-COCO and VATEX have a higher within-sample diversity.




Figure 3. Plot showing the relationship between semantic variance and the performance of leave-one-out ground truth estimates of human performance on the BLEU@4 metrics. As we increase semantic variance, the average minimum distance between ground truth samples increases, and metric performance falls.

supplementary materials for a figure). Because of this increase in distance, the leave-one-out performance of ground truths decreases, as shown in Figure 3, leading to a breakdown of the n-gram metrics (and all metrics that rely on a single-sample pairwise comparison to the set of ground truths). This effect is what causes SOTA models to outperform leave-one-out samples as demonstrated in section 3. While ideally, metrics should be independent of the variance in the ground truth data, for the datasets we analyze in the paper it is clear the sample variance is sufficient that this is not the case. Interestingly, the leave-one-out fall-off occurs at different rates for the different datasets, suggesting that some datasets are more-redundant to semantic variance than others: while we hypothesize that this is due to the choice of tokens and distribution of semantic structure, it is

interesting future work to confirm this hypothesis.

Why are SOTA models immune to the effects of sample variance? It’s important to note that when evaluating models, we only look at *a single sample from the model distribution*. We hypothesize that instead of attempting to approximate the full distribution of captions, models are picking up on trends between samples in the data, such as a wealth of descriptions that contain simple semantic structures (as described in section 4) or individually strong training descriptions (which we will discuss in section 6) which allow the model to reduce the effective variance of the ground truth dataset during the evaluation phase by ignoring most of the ground truth captions, and only focusing on a specific subset of descriptions. While these trends are likely model-specific, we believe it is important future work to quantify and understand the kinds of descriptions that models learn to approximate, and more closely monitor the effects of over-fitting to a small subset of captions to reduce the effects of ground-truth sample variance.

The effect of reducing semantic variance appears in practice via a training trick exploited by both Perez *et al.* [27] and Liu *et al.* [21] who find that *decreasing* the number of reference captions during training leads to improved evaluation performance on n-gram metrics. By artificially restricting the semantic variance of the training dataset, models are able to over-fit to a smaller subset of semantically redundant captions, and exploit current pairwise metrics.

Thus, we are stuck in a catch-22 when it comes to adding more captions per sample. If we increase the number of captions, we decrease our metrics’ ability to accurately discern caption quality, however if we reduce the number of captions, we can improve the accuracy of current metrics, and obtain models that achieve higher metric scores, at the cost of bland and generic captions.

6. Dataset Level Diversity

Not only do sample level diversity and within-sample diversity have important impacts on models and metrics, but dataset-level conceptual diversity matters as well. A common criticism of captioning models is that they are not generative, but instead, reproduce captions from the training set based on a set of global criteria. In general, we hypothesize that a lack of diversity in the dataset, both in the lack of overall visual concept diversity, and the exact distribution of that diversity in the dataset itself leaves models vulnerable to choosing classification over generation. We further hypothesize that a lack of conceptual diversity leads models to produce a few generic captions based on high-level visual features, instead of generating semantically detailed captions. In order to support this hypothesis, we attempt to answer two questions: “how much performance can we achieve with classification alone?” and “how much does the explicit selection of visual samples encourage models to-



Dataset: MSR-VTT (Video 6641)
Inter-Sample BERT-Embedding Distance [Min, Avg., Max]: [0.41, 0.58, 0.66]
Mean Leave One Out BLEU@4 Score: 0.4028

- there is a woman is talking about a simple recipe (BLEU@4: 0.920)
- there is a woman is serving a dish on the table
- a plate of food is displayed with two chopsticks next to it
- a woman is making a singapore style noodle dish in a pot
- a noodle dish with sprouts and shrimp sits on a countertop
- a pair of black chopsticks with decorative bands rests on a bowl of noodles with shrimp white bean sprouts and leafy green garnish
- some singapore noodles of egg is kept on the plate and the stick is placed on it
- there is a woman is talking about noodles
- the narrator tells about making singapore style fried noodles with prawns in a prawn-based broth
- noodles kept on the plate along with the sticks to eat it
- a woman describing a noodle dish in a white bowl (BLEU@4: 0.978)
- a noodles is been placed in the plate and a girl is describing about it
- delicious noodles are in a bowl with chopsticks
- a lady is explaining how to make a singapore dish which consists of fried noodles and prawns
- a woman describes an elegant recipe consisting of fried noodles with prawns in a prawn-based broth garnished with fresh lime wedges
- a bowl of vegetables prawns and noodles is shown chop sticks rest on the edge of the bowl while a woman's voice talks about the dish
- a lady is presenting fried noodles with prawns in a prawn broth
- there is a bowl on the table with a singapore style dish of fried noodles with prawn in a prawn broth

O2NA Baseline: there is a man is talking about a dish (BLEU@4: 0.467)

Figure 4. A qualitative example from MSR-VTT demonstrating several diversity effects. The blue description is a description with the minimum distance from the sentence embedding mean, while the red description maximizes the mean BLEU@4 score to all other captions in the sample. Notably, both captions are much more generic than the other captions in the data, a trend which is consistent across all samples. We can see that the variance within this sample is high, however the tokens themselves are similar (annotators select similar tokens for the same sample). Captions are ordered from top to bottom by similarity to the mean caption embedding (See section 5).

wards classification over generation?”

6.1. How many captions make up a dataset?

One interesting question to ask is, how many captions do you reasonably need to use in order to solve a dataset to a particular score? This metric is a reasonable proxy for concept-level diversity, and can more globally measure the performance of a model. To answer this question, we used a greedy approximation algorithm for optimal set cover to approximate the minimum number of captions from the training set that need to be chosen for MSR-VTT and MSVD in order to achieve a particular BLEU@4 score on the validation set. We don’t compute this number for VATEX/MSCOCO or metrics beyond BLEU due to the computational cost of computing a full matrix of caption distances. Figure 5 demonstrates the results of this experiment. We can see here that to achieve SOTA BLEU@4 performance, we need only to select optimally from a set of 43 captions in the case of MSVD, and 156 captions in the case of MSR-VTT. Even further, it’s interesting to see that with only 58 captions in MSVD and 289 captions in MSR-VTT, we can achieve almost optimal BLEU scores.

This particular result, combined with the fact that models only need to make a few token-level decisions when generating language (See subsection 4.2) appears to be a real cause for models producing generic captions. Not only do models not have to make many decisions, but overall, they don’t have to select from many visual concepts either.

6.2. Does the feature set matter?

Caption models are limited not only by a classification effect but also by the concept-level diversity of the feature extractors that they use. When models rely on particular feature extraction methods, we expect pre-initialized features to bias models towards classification over generation, particularly classification among the concepts present in the

Dataset	ImageNet	Kinetics	COCO	Places
MSVD	98.27%	38.88%	89.03%	55.68%
MSR-VTT	68.88%	23.51%	59.82%	46.44%
VATEX	98.60%	40.12%	76.86%	60.55%
MS-COCO	93.22%	8.83%	91.70%	60.49%

Table 3. Percentage of samples in the visual description datasets which contain at least one description that has a sub-string matching a label from the pre-training dataset.

Dataset	GT	ImageNet	Kinetics	COCO	Places
MSVD	0.453	0.652	0.442	0.634	0.470
MSR-VTT	0.210	0.678	0.467	0.650	0.521
VATEX	0.234	0.576	0.460	0.547	0.485
COCO	0.152	0.680	0.515	0.704	0.292

Table 4. Performance on BLEU@4 score when using the best core-set ground truth from overlapping categories. Performance remains surprisingly high when using shared captions, implying that models are able to leverage template captions instead of scene understanding. GT: random within-sample leave-one-out ground truth performance.

pre-training data. Recently, Srinivasan *et al.* [35] showed that these biases can compound - so it seems natural to ask the question: how much do we expect biases in our datasets to compound with feature extractor bias?

In order to measure how much particular datasets are biased towards particular feature extractors, we compute a concept-level “overlap” between several popular feature datasets [7, 12, 20, 53], and the visual description datasets. Table 3 demonstrates the percentage of samples in the visual description datasets which contain at least one description that has a sub-string matching a label from the pre-training dataset. While exact overlap from labels to descriptions may exclude some cases (for example the label “playing baseball” does not overlap with any description which has

only the word “baseball”), we found that fuzzy matching induced significant numbers of false-positives. This metric thus, represents a lower-bound on the overlap (as can be seen in the case of MS-COCO, where only 91% of the descriptions contain an object from the official label set).

We can see that in datasets except for MSR-VTT, the dataset overlap with ImageNet is relatively high, likely leading to models which achieve performance based solely on the use of ImageNet features, as the classification effect detailed in both [subsection 6.1](#) and [subsection 4.2](#) can be exaggerated. Similarly, for datasets besides MSR-VTT, adding object detection features is likely to exaggerate the classification effect, as the model will be pre-disposed to split samples into object-category bins.

To explore exactly how much classification performance can be achieved splitting only along feature extractor boundaries, we generate sets of captions that match (using exact matching) a particular label in the feature extractor pre-training dataset. For each sample, we generate a hypothesis using a randomly sampled caption from the union of the matching concepts and compute the metric score of that hypothesis (See the supplementary materials for a detailed discussion). The results of this experiment are given in [Table 4](#), and we can see that without sufficient conceptual diversity, models can achieve strong performance by segmenting samples among higher-order labels instead of leveraging visual understanding.

7. Recommendations & Limitations

Our aim in this work is to demonstrate that there are three unique levels of diversity that need to be maintained when collecting a dataset: Token-level diversity, within-sample diversity, and dataset conceptual diversity.

In [section 4](#) we showed that a lack of token diversity can lead to simple captions from a core data level: few decisions need to be made to generate captions, and a large number of the tokens responsible for this generation are relatively common, opening the door for potential limits to model diversity. Token-level diversity is primarily controlled during the labeling phase of dataset collection, so we believe that both when researchers collect novel data, and when they are building splits for current datasets, they should focus on token diversity. Primarily, to encourage models to generate from a diverse set of captions, we recommend maximizing the ED@N score from [section 4](#), along with increasing token EVS by improving the diversity of collected captions. Prompts encouraging crowd-source workers to include higher semantic detail and limits on sentence complexity (such as those introduced in VATEX [\[42\]](#) and Barbosa *et al.* [\[4\]](#)) could help prevent token-diversity effects from appearing in downstream models.

On the other hand, collecting too many ground truths, as discussed in [section 5](#) presents a model training issue.

Currently, models are trained to reduce semantic variance, which can lead to captions which are less complex than we expect. We believe that it is essential future research to explore how to account for the fact that variance in ground truth video descriptions is signal and not noise. Methods for managing multi-modal conditional distributions such as Slade *et al.* [\[32\]](#) or multi-label learning such as Tsoumakas *et al.* [\[39\]](#) may represent step towards such methods. Further, metrics that we use reinforce semantic variance effects by computing maximums with single samples. We believe that investigating metrics which focus on comparing multiple model samples to the full set of ground truth samples represents a possible solution. By forcing models to approximate the entire ground truth distribution we may avoid creating models which optimize away variance in the data.

Finally in [section 6](#), we discussed how a lack of diversity at a concept level can impact the performance of models. When metrics have fewer global concepts, or high overlap with feature extraction methods, they are more likely to trend towards classification over generation. In order to remedy this effect, we recommend the creation of datasets through sampling independent from the label sets of feature models. We additionally recommend that when creating training, validation, and testing splits in the dataset, the concept-level diversity is monitored to avoid introducing potential feature or concept biases with respect to popular feature extraction methods.

Visual Description Toolkit: Alongside this work, we are releasing a new toolkit² for visual description dataset evaluation, which is designed to analyze the performance of models (or ground truths) across the axes explored in this work. We hope that by making tools for evaluating visual description datasets easily accessible, we can encourage the field to deeply investigate the sample diversity in their data and predictions. Further, as part of the analysis toolkit, we are also releasing a set of splits and of the validation and test data for the given datasets, designed to test the performance of models along several of the axes that we discuss in this work, including conceptual labels and caption length among others. We hope that such methods for evaluation can help uncover the deviations of the model from the ground truth data, and paint a more complete picture of our descriptive models beyond n-gram scores.

Limitations: While we have demonstrated how diversity at several levels directly impacts the performance of downstream models, we believe that additional research is required to further understand how the problem of visual description differs from classification and natural language processing. In [section 5](#), we use several proxies for caption complexity, however it is not immediately clear that such proxies are good measures for the semantic complexity of

²Toolkit available at <https://github.com/CannyLab/vdtk>




Figure 5. For several datasets, how many captions from the training dataset are required to achieve a particular BLEU@4 score on the test set. We can see that in the optimal case, only a few (58 for MSVD, 197 for MSR-VTT, 1578 for MS-COCO) captions are required to achieve SOTA performance on the dataset. Notably, MS-COCO uniquely requires a unique description for each image.

a caption. As far as we are aware, no such measure of the “usefulness” of a caption to a visually impaired user exists, that we can use to evaluate our current caption data. Figure 4 and the additional qualitative examples in the supplementary material) demonstrate some correlations between caption complexity, and the mean caption, however we believe that deeper analysis is necessary.

Our methods are also limited by the choice of metrics used in this work. Explorations of recent metrics such as FAIer [41] may indicate that they alleviate diversity effects by focusing on visual information over textual information, and leveraging pre-trained grounding models. While novel metrics may solve some of the problems, the training effects observed in section 5 remain common between all models, and the diversity in section 4 and section 6 are local to the datasets, and will remain regardless of the metric used.

8. Background & Related Work

This is not the first work to analyze video description data from a dataset and metric perspective, however, we believe that it is the first to focus on how dataset diversity and metric choices directly affect caption generalization. Hendricks *et al.* [14], Bhargava *et al.* [5], Tang *et al.* [38] and Zhao *et al.* [52] have all demonstrated that visual description data is often biased with respect to protected attributes (such as race, gender or religion), and introduced new methods for handling specific biases - however, they do not discuss the impact of general biases on model performance. Both Smeaton *et al.* [33] and Yang *et al.* [46] demonstrate poor cross-dataset generalization in visual description, and demonstrate that the choice of dataset directly affects model generalization ability, as well as introduce additional model-centric methods for mitigating the impact of dataset effects. These works complement our own, and they support our core hypotheses that we discuss in section 7.

Outside of visual description, the evaluation of how linguistic data and metrics affects the performance of downstream vision and language models is prevalent. Cadene *et al.* [6] demonstrate unimodal language biases in visual

question answering and Choi *et al.* [10] do the same for action recognition. While many papers [11, 16, 18, 29, 31, 45] make recommendations for reducing linguistic bias based on the modeling framework, these works do not focus on the quality of generation, and instead, focus on the equally important trend of models relying heavily on language priors to solve tasks. Barbosa *et al.* [4] introduce methods for dataset collection which attempt to reduce linguistic bias, which represents a great leap forward from standard Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT) collection methods, but does not discuss how the diversity impacts the performance of downstream models beyond balancing language priors.

9. Conclusion

In this work we have taken a close look at linguistic diversity in common visual description datasets, and detailed how diversity can impact models and metrics. At the token level, we showed that a lack of diversity impacts the ability of metrics to assess the quality of captions, and the ability of models to generate diverse descriptions. At the sample level, we demonstrated that high within-sample diversity is both a blessing and a curse, leaving us with either a failure of metrics to correctly measure performance, or leaving us with correct metrics, but bland and generic captions. Finally, at the dataset level, we demonstrated that even when single sample and within-sample diversity is maintained, a lack of conceptual diversity at the dataset level can bias models towards visual classification over language generation, opening the door for models which can use a few, generic, samples to solve the visual description task instead of generating captions which are rich in semantics.

While this work demonstrates the potential pitfalls of a lack of diversity in visual description datasets, we believe that by introducing new tools for analysis, and additional recommendations for data collection and model evaluation, the field will be able to investigate the sources of poor model generalization more closely, and build models which are both robust to visual diversity and can generate diverse, high quality, and semantically meaningful captions.

References

- [1] Nayyer Aafaq, Ajmal Mian, Wei Liu, Syed Zulqarnain Gilani, and Mubarak Shah. Video description: A survey of methods, datasets, and evaluation metrics. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 52(6):1–37, 2019. 1, 2
- [2] Peter Anderson et al. Bottom-up and top-down attention for image captioning and visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6077–6086, 2018. 3
- [3] Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. Meteor: An automatic metric for mt evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the acl workshop on intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation measures for machine translation and/or summarization*, pages 65–72, 2005. 2
- [4] Natã M Barbosa and Monchu Chen. Rehumanized crowdsourcing: a labeling framework addressing bias and ethics in machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–12, 2019. 7, 8
- [5] Shruti Bhargava and David Forsyth. Exposing and correcting the gender bias in image captioning datasets and models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.00578*, 2019. 8
- [6] Remi Cadene, Corentin Dancette, Matthieu Cord, Devi Parikh, et al. Rubi: Reducing unimodal biases for visual question answering. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32:841–852, 2019. 8
- [7] Joao Carreira, Eric Noland, Andras Banki-Horvath, Chloe Hillier, and Andrew Zisserman. A short note about kinetics-600. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.01340*, 2018. 6
- [8] David Chen and William B Dolan. Collecting highly parallel data for paraphrase evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 49th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies*, pages 190–200, 2011. 2
- [9] Shaoxiang Chen and Yu-Gang Jiang. Motion guided region message passing for video captioning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1543–1552, 2021. 1, 2
- [10] Jinwoo Choi, Chen Gao, Joseph CE Messou, and Jia-Bin Huang. Why can’t i dance in the mall? learning to mitigate scene bias in action recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.05534*, 2019. 8
- [11] Christopher Clark, Mark Yatskar, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Learning to model and ignore dataset bias with mixed capacity ensembles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.03856*, 2020. 8
- [12] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 248–255. Ieee, 2009. 6
- [13] Joshua Feinglass and Yezhou Yang. Smurf: Semantic and linguistic understanding fusion for caption evaluation via typicality analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.01444*, 2021. 2
- [14] Lisa Anne Hendricks, Kaylee Burns, Kate Saenko, Trevor Darrell, and Anna Rohrbach. Women also snowboard: Overcoming bias in captioning models. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 771–787, 2018. 3, 8
- [15] Ming Jiang, Qiuyuan Huang, Lei Zhang, Xin Wang, Pengchuan Zhang, Zhe Gan, Jana Diesner, and Jianfeng Gao. Tiger: text-to-image grounding for image caption evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.02050*, 2019. 1, 2
- [16] Jungseock Joo and Kimmo Kärkkäinen. Gender slopes: Counterfactual fairness for computer vision models by attribute manipulation. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Fairness, Accountability, Transparency and Ethics in Multimedia*, pages 1–5, 2020. 8
- [17] Ranjay Krishna, Kenji Hata, Frederic Ren, Li Fei-Fei, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Dense-captioning events in videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 706–715, 2017. 2
- [18] Yi Li and Nuno Vasconcelos. Repair: Removing representation bias by dataset resampling. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9572–9581, 2019. 8
- [19] Chin-Yew Lin. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81, 2004. 2
- [20] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 740–755. Springer, 2014. 1, 2, 6
- [21] Fenglin Liu, Xuancheng Ren, Xian Wu, Bang Yang, Shen Ge, and Xu Sun. O2na: An object-oriented non-autoregressive approach for controllable video captioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.02359*, 2021. 1, 4, 5
- [22] Haley MacLeod, Cynthia L Bennett, Meredith Ringel Morris, and Edward Cutrell. Understanding blind people’s experiences with computer-generated captions of social media images. In *Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 5988–5999, 2017. 1
- [23] Stephen Merity, Caiming Xiong, James Bradbury, and Richard Socher. Pointer sentinel mixture models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.07843*, 2016. 4
- [24] Antoine Miech, Dimitri Zhukov, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Makarand Tapaswi, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Howto100m: Learning a text-video embedding by watching hundred million narrated video clips. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 2630–2640, 2019. 1, 2
- [25] Mathew Monfort, SouYoung Jin, Alexander Liu, David Harwath, Rogerio Feris, James Glass, and Aude Oliva. Spoken moments: Learning joint audio-visual representations from video descriptions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14871–14881, 2021. 1, 2
- [26] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting on association for computational linguistics*, pages 311–318. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2002. 2
- [27] Jesus Perez-Martin, Benjamin Bustos, and Jorge Pérez. Improving video captioning with temporal composition of a visual-syntactic embedding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF*

- Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision, pages 3039–3049, 2021. 1, 2, 5
- [28] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.00020*, 2021. 2
- [29] Deven Shah, H Andrew Schwartz, and Dirk Hovy. Predictive biases in natural language processing models: A conceptual framework and overview. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.11078*, 2019. 8
- [30] Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, Sebastian Goodman, and Radu Soricut. Conceptual captions: A cleaned, hypernymed, image alt-text dataset for automatic image captioning. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2556–2565, 2018. 2
- [31] Krishna Kumar Singh, Dhruv Mahajan, Kristen Grauman, Yong Jae Lee, Matt Feiszli, and Deepti Ghadiyaram. Don’t judge an object by its context: Learning to overcome contextual bias. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 11070–11078, 2020. 8
- [32] P Slade and Tamás D Gedeon. Bimodal distribution removal. In *International Workshop on Artificial Neural Networks*, pages 249–254. Springer, 1993. 7
- [33] Alan F Smeaton, Yvette Graham, Kevin McGuinness, Noel E O’Connor, Seán Quinn, and Eric Arazo Sanchez. Exploring the impact of training data bias on automatic generation of video captions. In *International Conference on Multimedia Modeling*, pages 178–190. Springer, 2019. 1, 2, 8
- [34] Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Jianfeng Lu, and Tie-Yan Liu. Mpnnet: Masked and permuted pre-training for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.09297*, 2020. 4, 5
- [35] Tejas Srinivasan and Yonatan Bisk. Worst of both worlds: Biases compound in pre-trained vision-and-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08666*, 2021. 6
- [36] Matteo Stefanini, Marcella Cornia, Lorenzo Baraldi, Silvia Cascianelli, Giuseppe Fiameni, and Rita Cucchiara. From show to tell: A survey on image captioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06912*, 2021. 1, 2
- [37] Kaihua Tang, Jianqiang Huang, and Hanwang Zhang. Long-tailed classification by keeping the good and removing the bad momentum causal effect. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.12991*, 2020. 3
- [38] Ruixiang Tang, Mengnan Du, Yuening Li, Zirui Liu, Na Zou, and Xia Hu. Mitigating gender bias in captioning systems. In *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*, pages 633–645, 2021. 8
- [39] Grigorios Tsoumakas and Min-Ling Zhang. Learning from multi-label data. 2009. 7
- [40] Ramakrishna Vedantam, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. Cider: Consensus-based image description evaluation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4566–4575, 2015. 2
- [41] Sijin Wang, Ziwei Yao, Ruiping Wang, Zhongqin Wu, and Xilin Chen. Faier: Fidelity and adequacy ensured image caption evaluation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14050–14059, 2021. 1, 2, 8
- [42] Xin Wang, Jiawei Wu, Junkun Chen, Lei Li, Yuan-Fang Wang, and William Yang Wang. Vatec: A large-scale, high-quality multilingual dataset for video-and-language research. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4581–4591, 2019. 1, 2, 3, 7
- [43] Jun Xu, Tao Mei, Ting Yao, and Yong Rui. Msr-vtt: A large video description dataset for bridging video and language. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5288–5296, 2016. 1, 2
- [44] Bang Yang, Yuexian Zou, Fenglin Liu, and Can Zhang. Non-autoregressive coarse-to-fine video captioning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pages 3119–3127, 2021. 4
- [45] Kaiyu Yang, Klint Qinami, Li Fei-Fei, Jia Deng, and Olga Russakovsky. Towards fairer datasets: Filtering and balancing the distribution of the people subtree in the imagenet hierarchy. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 547–558, 2020. 1, 8
- [46] Xu Yang, Hanwang Zhang, and Jianfei Cai. Deconfounded image captioning: A causal retrospect. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2021. 2, 8
- [47] Ilmi Yoon, Umang Mathur, Brenna Gibson, Tirumalashetty Pooyan Fazli, and Joshua Miele. Video accessibility for the visually impaired. In *International Conference on Machine Learning AI for Social Good Workshop*, 2019. 1
- [48] Ke Zhang, Wei-Lun Chao, Fei Sha, and Kristen Grauman. Video summarization with long short-term memory. In *ECCV*, pages 766–782, 2016. 1
- [49] Pengchuan Zhang, Xiujuan Li, Xiaowei Hu, Jianwei Yang, Lei Zhang, Lijuan Wang, Yejin Choi, and Jianfeng Gao. Vinvl: Revisiting visual representations in vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5579–5588, 2021. 1, 2
- [50] Tianyi Zhang*, Varsha Kishore*, Felix Wu*, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. 2
- [51] Ziqi Zhang, Yaya Shi, Chunfeng Yuan, Bing Li, Peijin Wang, Weiming Hu, and Zheng-Jun Zha. Object relational graph with teacher-recommended learning for video captioning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 13278–13288, 2020. 3
- [52] Dora Zhao, Angelina Wang, and Olga Russakovsky. Understanding and evaluating racial biases in image captioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.08503*, 2021. 8
- [53] Bolei Zhou, Agata Lapedriza, Aditya Khosla, Aude Oliva, and Antonio Torralba. Places: A 10 million image database for scene recognition. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 40(6):1452–1464, 2017. 6
- [54] Luowei Zhou, Chenliang Xu, and Jason J Corso. Towards automatic learning of procedures from web instructional videos. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018. 2

What’s in a Caption? Visual Description Linguistic Patterns and Their Effects on Models and Metrics

Supplementary Material

A. Datasets

We investigate four primary datasets in this work. An overview of the datasets is given in [Table S1](#).

MSR-VTT: The MSR-VTT (MSR Video to Text) [\[XMYR16\]](#) dataset is a medium-scale open domain benchmark for visual description. It was originally collected using 257 YouTube search queries across 20 categories, with 118 videos collected for each query (41.2 Hours). The dataset is annotated with 20 captions per video by 1,327 Amazon Mechanical Turk workers. Each video has a duration between 10 and 30 seconds, with an average of two shots per clip.

VATEX: The VATEX dataset [\[WWC+19\]](#) is a medium-scale open domain video description benchmark, based on a subset of the Kinetics-600 dataset for action recognition. VATEX consists of 41,269 video clips, and each clip is annotated with 10 unique descriptive captions by 2,159 Amazon Mechanical Turk workers.

MSVD: The MSVD (Microsoft Video Description) dataset [\[CD11\]](#) is a small-scale open domain benchmark for video description comprised of 1,970 YouTube clips of 4-10 seconds each, collected by asking Amazon Mechanical Turk workers to link a video, start time, and end time from YouTube that depicts a specific, short action. Each video is then annotated with an average of 41 ground truth descriptions by 835 Amazon Mechanical Turk workers.

MSCOCO: The Microsoft Common Objects in Context (MS-COCO) [\[LMB+14\]](#) dataset is a large-scale open-domain benchmark for image description. MSCOCO consists of more than 120,000 images of complex scenes including people, animals, and common objects. Each image is annotated with five ground truth descriptions.

B. Experimental Details

In this section, we present detailed experimental details corresponding to our experiments. Along with these experimental details, we make the code for our work available at <https://github.com/CannyLab/vdtk>. Note that numbers may differ slightly between the released code, and our presented experiments due to the tokenization scheme. For our released code, we use the Spacy³ tokenizer to compute all metrics, as it is significantly more efficient in prac-

³<https://spacy.io/>

tice than the Stanford tokenizer⁴, however for academic purposes, we compute the metrics with the Stanford tokenizer to avoid tokenization shift. In most cases, the difference in the metrics between tokenization methods is negligible (or very small).

B.1. Motivation: Leave One Out Ground Truth Performance

To generate an estimate of human performance on the selected datasets, we use a procedure called “leave one out” performance. Let a dataset $\mathcal{D}$ be composed of N samples $S_0 \dots S_N$. For each sample S_i , there may be K_i possible reference captions, $C_0^i \dots C_{K_i}^i$. In order to compute the leave one out performance of human samples for the dataset, we first select a hypothesis caption $H_i \in \{C_0^i \dots C_{K_i}^i\}$. We then compute the updated reference set $R_i = \{C_0^i \dots C_{K_i}^i\} / \{H_i\}$. In the case that H_i is duplicated within R_i , we allow the duplicate to remain to maximize the possible human score. In the case that there is only one (or fewer) captions for a video, we drop those captions from the computation. We then use the reference sets $R_0 \dots R_N$ and hypotheses $H_0 \dots H_N$ to compute the “leave-one-out” score for the dataset. Clearly, this is an estimate of the ground truth performance, as it is a random sample of the possible “leave-one-out” hypotheses sets.

Because some of the metrics (particularly CIDEr) are dataset dependent, it would be intractable to compute all possible hypotheses sets. Instead of computing all possible hypotheses sets, we perform 750 iterations of this sampling procedure and use the mean of the iterations to achieve our final “leave-one-out” estimates presented in the paper. We found empirically that 750 iterations were sufficient across all of the datasets to achieve a stable mean. The raw values of the “leave-one-out” estimates are presented in [Table S2](#), alongside the state of the art results.

B.2. Motivation: Semantically Masked Leave One Out performance

To test the performance of ground truths without semantic information, we devised an experiment based on the leave-one-out experiments above, however, focused on removing semantic information. To compute this value, we select hypotheses as in [subsection B.1](#), however for both the captions in the reference and the captions in the ground truth, we replace any token identified by the Spacy part of speech

⁴<https://nlp.stanford.edu/software/tokenizer.html>

Dataset	Domain	Categories	Videos	Avg. Length	Length (hrs)	Annotations / Video	Annotation Method
MSR-VTT	open	20	10K	20s	41.2	20	AMT
VATEX	open	600	42K	-	-	10	AMT
MSVD	open	218	1970	10s	41	35.5	AMT
MS-COCO	open	-	120K	-	-	5	AMT

Table S1. An overview of the datasets that we analyze in this paper. All of the datasets are open-domain, with a focus on video description. Additionally, each of the datasets include more than one ground truth description per video, which we use to validate the performance of ground truth data, without collecting additional human results. Notably, all of these methods use AMT as their annotation method.

Dataset	BLEU@4	METEOR	ROUGE	CIDEr
MSVD	0.453 (0.644)	0.370 (0.419)	0.689 (0.795)	1.038 (1.115)
MSR-VTT	0.209 (0.472)	0.247 (0.312)	0.487 (0.648)	0.426 (0.600)
VATEX	0.234 (0.342)	0.249 (0.235)	0.478 (0.503)	0.611 (0.576)
MS-COCO	0.152 (0.410)	0.228 (0.311)	0.438 (0.609)	0.788 (1.409)

Table S2. Raw leave-one-out score estimates for each of the datasets (SOTA in parentheses).

Dataset	BLEU@4	METEOR	ROUGE	CIDEr
MSVD	0.289 (0.453)	0.097 (0.370)	0.442 (0.689)	0.502 (1.038)
MSR-VTT	0.123 (0.209)	0.085 (0.247)	0.387 (0.487)	0.327 (0.426)
VATEX	0.132 (0.234)	0.201 (0.249)	0.391 (0.478)	0.511 (0.611)
MS-COCO	0.079 (0.152)	0.198 (0.228)	0.396 (0.438)	0.684 (0.788)

Table S3. Raw leave-one-out score estimates under semantic masking for each of the datasets (Non-masked in parentheses).

analysis as a noun, proper noun, or verb with a *unique* mask token. This means that this unique mask token will achieve a 0 in any associated token-based metric, as it will not match any semantic token in the ground truth. Table [Table S3](#) gives the full performance on each of the datasets in the masked setup.

B.3. Caption Diversity: Token Metrics

In this work, we compute several metrics based on token-level diversity, demonstrated in [Table 1](#) from the main paper. The number of unique tokens is equal to the number of tokens in the dataset as computed by the Stanford PTB tokenizer. This number does not do any lemmatizing or stemming, thus, is an upper bound for the vocabulary complexity. We then compute three additional metrics, the within-sample uniqueness, the between-sample uniqueness, and the 90% head of the vocabulary. The within-sample uniqueness corresponds to the percentage of tokens that are unique within a sample - i.e. the percentage of tokens that appear exactly once among the references for any particular image or video. We then average this number over all of the samples to get the number presented in [Table 1](#). The between-sample uniqueness is a measure of the percentage of tokens in each sample that are unique at the *dataset* level, i.e. the percentage of tokens among the tokens in the refer-

Dataset	Unique	BS-Unique	WS-Unique	Head
MSVD	9455	1.21%	11.8%	944
MSR-VTT	22780	0.76%	21.55%	1636
VATEX	31364	0.33 %	24.87%	1363
MS-COCO	35341	0.22%	33.76%	824

Table S4. Vocabulary metrics for each of the datasets. Unique: The number of unique tokens. BS-Unique: Average percent of tokens per description that are unique. WS-Unique: Average percent of of tokens that are unique within a sample. Head: The number of unique tokens comprising 90% of the total tokens.

ence set of a single sample that do not appear in any other caption in the dataset. These per-sample numbers are then averaged across the dataset to get the number presented in [Table S4](#). Finally, the 90% head corresponds to the number of tokens that make up 90% of the mass of the total number of tokens in the dataset. This is an approximate measure of how long-tailed the distribution is. The 90% number is selected empirically (further analysis could look at the full cumulative distribution of the token counts). [Table S4](#) replicates [Table 1](#) from the main paper, however includes between-sample token uniqueness.

We also compute many of the same metrics restricted to counting nouns and verbs (as identified by the Spacy POS tagger). Each of the above metrics is computed the same way, however instead of considering all tokens, we consider only tokens that are tagged as either nouns or verbs during the computation of the metrics. [Table S5](#) demonstrates the full results of this experiment, plus an additional metric: the average number of tokens per caption which also appears in [Table 2](#) in the main paper.

B.4. Caption Diversity: N-Gram Metrics

To explore the diversity of samples at an n-gram level, we introduce two novel metrics, the Expected Vocab Size @ N (EVS@N), and the Expected Number of Decisions @ N (ED@N). Both of these metrics measure the diversity of the language at an n-gram level by exploring the properties of an n-gram language model trained on the dataset. In this section, we discuss the explicit definition of these metrics. For all n-grams, we use an n-gram language model based on tokens extracted with the Stanford PTB tokenizer. In all

Dataset	WSNU	BSNU	WSVU	BSVU	NC	VC	NH	VH	NPC	VPC	TPC
MSVD	12.6%	1.9%	14.8%	1.5%	4985	1773	755	229	2.39	1.10	7.03
MSR-VTT	23.1%	1.2%	29.4%	0.8%	12697	3639	1512	293	3.28	1.32	9.32
VATEX	26.9%	0.67%	35.7%	0.3%	16670	4975	1161	338	4.37	2.10	15.29
MS-COCO	34.9%	0.41%	55.8%	0.2%	20155	4200	723	184	3.71	1.02	11.33

Table S5. Part of speech distributions for each of the datasets. DS: Dataset. WSNU: Within sample noun uniqueness. BSNU: Between sample noun uniqueness. WSVU: Within sample verb uniqueness. BSVU: Between sample verb uniqueness. NC: Unique noun count. VC: Unique verb count. NH: Noun head (90% of mass). V: Verb Head (90% of mass). VPC: Average number of verbs per caption. NPC: Average number of nouns per caption. TPC: Average number of tokens per caption.

cases, we pad the references with $[BOS]$ and $[EOS]$ tokens to allow the model to handle the beginning and end of the sequences. For WikiText-103, we create individual reference sentences by splitting on ‘.’ tokens, and pad each of these references individually with $[BOS]$ and $[EOS]$ tokens.

B.4.1 Expected Vocab Size @ N

The EVS@N metric is a measure of how many n-grams *do not* act as 1-grams in practice in the dataset. This measure is computed by looking at the entropy of the next-token distribution of an n-gram language model. For a sequence of words $w_0, \dots, w_{n-1}$, we first compute the distribution $P(w_n | w_0, \dots, w_{n-1})$. If this distribution has 0 entropy (i.e. it assigns all of the probability mass to a single next token), then we consider this n-gram a “static n-gram”. If the entropy is non-zero, then we consider it a “dynamic n-gram”. The EVS@N can then be computed as the proportion of dynamic n-grams

$$\text{EVS@N} = \frac{|\text{dynamic n-grams}|}{|\text{static n-grams}| + |\text{dynamic n-grams}|}$$

This measures a set of effective n-grams in the data (i.e. the size of the n-gram vocab), as it coalesces n-grams where no decisions are made into a single logical unit.

B.4.2 Expected Decisions @ N

The ED@N metric is a measure of how many decisions an n-gram language model has to make for a sequence of N tokens. ED@N is a counting measure of the EVS@N - i.e. how many dynamic n-grams are expected in a sequence of length n . For a K -gram language model, this measure is explicitly computed as:

$$\text{ED@N} = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} (1 - \text{EVS@K})(0) + (\text{EVS@K})(1)$$

In this work, for the first token we use a 2-gram language model ($K = 2$), for the second token we use a 3-gram language model ($K = 3$), and for any additional tokens, we use a 4-gram language model ($K = 4$).

B.5. Sample Diversity: Within Sample Diversity

We use several techniques to measure the within-sample semantic diversity of the data. In all of these cases, the notion of semantics is somewhat subjective. In this work, we use a BERT-style embedding trained for sentence similarity, called MP-Net [STQ+20] to embed each reference description as a 384-dimensional vector. We leverage the implementation in Sentence Transformers⁵, which is pre-trained on over 1 billion sentence pairs.

Figure 2 measures the minimum within-sample distances, i.e. it looks for the closest pair of references in each sample, and plots the distance between them. Thus, for a dataset of length N with a set of samples $S_0 \dots S_N$ and captions $S_i^0 \dots S_i^{K_i}$, this histogram plots the distribution over all descriptions of

$$H_{ij} = \min_{k \neq n} \|S_i^k - S_i^j\|$$

In order to avoid obvious issues with repetition in the semantics, we use only the unique set of captions in a sample, as opposed to allowing for duplicates, which would force H_i to zero for any sample with repeated captions (actually exaggerating the effect in Figure 2). We don’t allow this in order to avoid biasing our experiments to datasets such as VATEX, which explicitly remove exact duplicates. Close duplicates are not affected, as can clearly be seen by MSVD, which contains a lot of semantic redundancy. Note that this is a distribution over all references (as opposed to samples).

Another method of measuring semantic diversity is by looking at the spread of the semantics in the sample. While we use the literal variance of the within-sample pairwise distance distribution in Figure 3, we can also look at other measures of spread. Figure S1 demonstrates the difference (as a percent of the mean) between the mean of the inter-sample distances and the closest inter-sample distance. When this percentage is high, the descriptions are relatively spread out for a sample, with clusters of descriptions that are close together in semantic space. If the percentage is low, the descriptions for a sample are well-distributed (mostly equidistant) in the semantic space.

⁵<https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/all-mpnet-base-v2>




Figure S1. Plot demonstrates the difference between the closest semantic vector, and the mean of the semantic vectors. In all cases, the mean will always be further than the closest sample, however, a low delta suggests a more equal spread of references, while a high delta represents highly redundant samples.




Figure S2. Violin plot demonstrating the distribution of caption novelty - i.e. how many captions in each sample are not exact matches in the text space. As we can see, while the vast majority of captions are novel in some datasets, in datasets like MSVD, there are some samples which have high *exact* redundancy.

Figure S2 gives a general overview for the video description datasets of the exact-duplicate distribution of the descriptions. While most of the samples have high within-sample uniqueness, there are some samples that are highly redundant (and in the case of MSVD, have exact-redundancy of as much as $\sim 50\%$).

B.6. Dataset Diversity: Number of Ground Truths

To investigate how the number of ground truth metrics impacts the computation of the metrics, we performed several leave one out experiments as in subsection B.1 where we restricted the size of R_i for each sample to a certain number of references r by randomly sampling r elements without

replacement from the original reference set. This allows us to measure the approximate performance of the methods if the number of ground truths was reduced. The results of this experiment are given in Figure S3. We can see from Figure S3 that except for CIDEr, increasing the number of ground truths increases the leave one out performance of the metrics. In fact, we can see that in most cases, the performance is nowhere near saturated, and collecting more ground truths will allow metrics to better capture the semantic variance of a scene. The standout among the group is CIDEr, in which the score does not increase as we increase the number of ground truths. This is primarily due to the IDF component of the CIDEr score, which penalizes increasing the number of tokens harshly. We can see that here, as we increase the number of ground truths, the CIDEr score *decreases*! This suggests that CIDEr is relatively robust to adding more ground truth, however cannot capture as much semantic variance as the other metrics, as the CIDEr score does not materially account for new information from the ground truth samples.

B.7. Concept-Diversity: Captions Required for BLEU Score

One of the key experiments we perform is designed to measure the minimum number of captions from the training set that are required to “solve” the test set of the dataset for a particular BLEU score. We first compute a set of all hypothesis descriptions from the training set. Then, for each sample in the test set, we compute the BLEU@4 score using that hypothesis for every sample in the test set. In the case of large datasets such as MS-COCO, which contains 591,435 unique hypothesis captions, this can be time-consuming, even for the (relatively quick) BLEU@4 metrics. Each hypothesis thus has a score for each sample in the test dataset. Finding the minimal core-set of captions that covers this test dataset to a specified BLEU threshold is a weighted set-cover problem, which can be solved to an $O(\log N)$ approximation with a randomized rounding algorithm [Vaz01], however, we found that it was sufficient to use the greedy approximation algorithm for set cover, which selects the caption which covers the largest number of new samples at each iteration. Thus, the results in Figure 5 provide an upper bound on the possible number of captions required.

Figure 5 plots the required number of captions to achieve a BLEU@4 score of X (the value on the X-axis) on every sample. Note that this requirement is *more restrictive* than the plotted SOTA scores, which achieve a mean of X . Thus, the effect of this figure may be even more dramatic than is pictured. The reason for this discrepancy is we compute the core-set using a greedy set cover, and due to our implementation details, it is difficult to terminate the cover efficiently when a mean score is reached.




Figure S3. Performance of different metrics with respect to the number of ground truths considered in leave-one-out experiments. Raw scores are normalized to a maximum of 1, so we can compare the different datasets on the same plot.

While our work only computes the core-set for BLEU@4, we believe it would be interesting to see the numbers for other metrics, however, with current implementations, it may be intractable, as the computations require a full pairwise computation of the metrics between the hypotheses and the test-set samples. Additionally, metrics such as CIDEr which have dataset-wide effects would have to be estimated, requiring several hundred iterations of this experiment to achieve high-quality estimates of the performance. It thus remains interesting (and important) future work to explore how many captions are required to perform well on any given dataset for other metrics.

B.8. Concept-Diversity: Feature Sets

To measure the diversity of the datasets at a concept level, we look at how the ground truth captions overlap with the label sets from common feature extractors. If we find that this overlap is high, it suggests that features may have the ability to bias the model along the classification lines of the feature-extractor label set (since a lot of the time, the information extracted by the features is useful primarily for segmenting data along feature class boundaries).

B.8.1 Computing Label-Set overlap

We discuss two methods for computing label-set overlap in the main paper: exact match and fuzzy matching. Exact match is implemented as a string substring: i.e. does the label string appear as a direct substring of the caption. This method provides a lower bound on the true conceptual overlap, as it does not account for misspellings (which are surprisingly common in datasets such as MSR-VTT, and others collected using AMT without additional review steps), and other close matches. While this is a lower bound, it has the benefit of not introducing false-positive matches (as any match is guaranteed to be label overlap). We also discuss the use of fuzzy matching, which we implement using the `fuzzywuzzy`⁶ library for approximate string matching with a threshold of 90. This library uses Levenshtein distance to compute approximate matching, however introduces false-positives which makes it difficult to analyze the overlap. In all cases, the numbers in Table 3 represent the percentage of samples that have at least one reference description that has exact overlap with a label from the dataset.

⁶<https://github.com/seatgeek/thefuzz>

We explore overlap on four common datasets for feature extraction:

ImageNet-1K: [DDS⁺09] is a popular image classification dataset consisting of 1K labels for object classification ranging across a very wide variety of objects. We can see this from the overlap scores in Table 3, which are relatively high on almost all of the datasets. MSR-VTT is relatively low, suggesting that it is one of the most open-domain datasets among the datasets we explore.

Kinetics-600: [CNBH⁺18] is a popular dataset for action recognition, which contains 600 activities. We can see that the video datasets have a much higher overlap with kinetics, but even though MS-COCO is an image dataset only, there is still some overlap, suggesting that captions of static data still contain human inferences about motion and activity.

MS-COCO: [LMB⁺14] is a dataset for object detection (and also for visual description) containing object-detection labels over 80 object classes from everyday life. Even though COCO has a relatively restricted object set, we can see that it consists of a set of very popular objects, as the overlap is more than 50% for all captions. Additionally, it's interesting that the object labels for MS-COCO don't always appear in the captions themselves (as the self-overlap is only 92%).

Places-365: [ZLK⁺17] is a dataset for scene recognition, consisting of 365 labels of scenes or settings for an image. We find empirically that the overlap for places is likely low, not due to a lack of descriptions of setting, but rather a lack of wide coverage of the variance of settings in Places.

B.8.2 Feature-Set Core-Sets and BLEU@4 performance

To directly measure how transferable descriptions are along feature-extractor label axes, we explore the leave-one-out performance of captions sharing the same feature label, but from different samples in the dataset. The results of this experiment using BLEU@4 scores are given in Table 4. In order to compute the leave-one-out performance, we begin by computing a set of reference captions R_c for each label in each feature-extractor label set, drawing from the training dataset. These concept-level reference sets consist of all captions containing that label as an exact sub-string. Then, for each sample S_i with references R_i , we compute the set of all concepts overlapping that sample's references C_i . We then compute the hypothesis set for sample S_i as

$$H_i = \left[\bigcup_{c \in C_i} R_c \right] / \{R_i\}$$

Next, for each hypothesis in H_i , we compute the BLEU@4 score for that hypothesis using ground truths R_i . The table Table 4 reports the mean over all samples of the maximum across H_i for each sample in the test set. The results of this metric are clear - when you use the best caption from another sample along feature boundaries, then these captions are relatively transferable (and almost always outperform samples from even the same sample).

B.9. Tools & Hardware

The experiments in this paper are computed using the metric implementations provided by the MSCOCO evaluation toolkit in order to compute numeric metric values that are comparable with state of the art methods. In the experiments in the paper, we use the Stanford PTB⁷ tokenizer provided as part of the toolkit for tokenization and standardization. Unfortunately, because the MSCOCO toolkit does not explicitly specify a tokenization scheme and most works in video description do not subscribe to a standard tokenization tool, we are unable to be certain that the metric is consistent between our work, and the work presented in the state of the art papers.

The experiments are run in parallel on a machine with 96 AMD EPYC 7B12 cores and 378 GB of RAM running on Google Cloud Platform. Notably, the caption concept-overlap experiments require a very large amount of compute, with this machine requiring almost 10 hours to compute the BLEU score for the core-set concept overlap. We found scores such as METEOR [AL08] and SPICE [AFJG16] to be computationally prohibitive (requiring several months of sustained compute) for some of these experiments, thus, we do not include those scores in this work. We also do not report several modern metrics for this reason - as a major downside to many of the automated metrics that have recently been developed is their forward inference speed (up to 1000s of times slower than the computation of the BLEU score). A key area of future work is improving the computational performance of metrics, as this will allow such metrics to not only be used for more detailed analysis but will allow such metrics to be optimized directly using techniques such as self-critical sequence training [RMM⁺17].

⁷<https://nlp.stanford.edu/software/tokenizer.html>

C. Additional Qualitative Examples

Additional qualitative examples are selected at random from the datasets using a random number generator over the length of each dataset. Some randomly selected samples are omitted due to explicit content in the visual data or descriptions (which is an additional cause for concern, but out of scope of the current research).



- a person mixing potatoe salad in a bowl (Dist: 0.10) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- someone mixes a potato salad (Dist: 0.13) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)
- this is someone stirring a bowl of potato salad (Dist: 0.13) (BLEU@4: 0.3156)
- a person in a kitchen is mixing a bowl of potato salad with a spatula in a white bowl on a cutting board (Dist: 0.14) (BLEU@4: 0.1613)
- the bowl of potato salad is stirred (Dist: 0.18) (BLEU@4: 0.3267)
- someone is mashing potato salad together (Dist: 0.19) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- someone is making food (Dist: 0.22) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a women stirring and mixing some egg salad (Dist: 0.23) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a person is cooking (Dist: 0.24) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a bowl is being stirred (Dist: 0.26) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a person stirring food (Dist: 0.26) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- someone mixing pieces of boiled eggs and yogurt in a bowl (Dist: 0.27) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- mixing up food in a bowl in the kitchen (Dist: 0.30) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- making some potato salad (Dist: 0.30) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a great way to make potato salad (Dist: 0.36) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- how to prepare a potato salad (Dist: 0.36) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)
- preparation of some egg dish (Dist: 0.44) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)

msrvtt+train+video481

Within-Sample mean BERT Embedding distances [Min, Mean, Max]: [0.10,0.24,0.44]

Mean Leave One Out BLEU@4 score: 0.0473

Figure S4. Qualitative example of metrics presented in the paper. The blue description is a description with the minimum distance from the sentence embedding mean, while the red description maximizes the mean BLEU@4 score to all other captions in the sample. Captions are ordered from top to bottom by similarity to the mean caption embedding (See section 5).



- baby muppets are talking to a judge kermit (Dist: 0.18) (BLEU@4: 0.3457)
- cartoon muppets are having a court proceeding (Dist: 0.18) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- kermit is a judge and is talking to 2 other muppet babies (Dist: 0.20) (BLEU@4: 0.1499)
- some muppet characters are interacting with each other (Dist: 0.22) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a scene from the muppet babies where baby kermit is a judge in a court room is playing in a movie theater (Dist: 0.24) (BLEU@4: 0.1336)
- a cartoon clip of baby muppets in a court room (Dist: 0.24) (BLEU@4: 0.0876)
- muppets are talking to each other (Dist: 0.25) (BLEU@4: 0.3641)
- the scene is from baby muppets the green frog character kermit is a judge and two other characters are standing before him (Dist: 0.26) (BLEU@4: 0.1759)
- muppet babies playing in a theater (Dist: 0.29) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- kermit judges gonzo and another muppet baby (Dist: 0.31) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- some cartoon characters speak to a judge (Dist: 0.32) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- cartoon babies standing in front of a judge (Dist: 0.34) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- the muppets are being shown in a theater (Dist: 0.35) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- the muppet babies are on a theater screen (Dist: 0.36) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- cartoon characters are talking in a tv show (Dist: 0.38) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a cartoon frog is talking to other cartoon characters (Dist: 0.41) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a clip taken from the cartoon the muphets (Dist: 0.42) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- cartoons are being displayed (Dist: 0.43) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)

msrvtt+train+video1902

Within-Sample mean BERT Embedding distances [Min, Mean, Max]: [0.18,0.30,0.43]

Mean Leave One Out BLEU@4 score: 0.0698

Figure S5. Qualitative example of metrics presented in the paper. The blue description is a description with the minimum distance from the sentence embedding mean, while the red description maximizes the mean BLEU@4 score to all other captions in the sample. Captions are ordered from top to bottom by similarity to the mean caption embedding (See section 5).



- a man is playing guitar and singing (Dist: 0.07) (BLEU@4: 0.4468)
- a man playing the guitar and singing (Dist: 0.07) (BLEU@4: 0.5314)
- a man is playing the guitar and singing outside (Dist: 0.09) (BLEU@4: 0.5874)
- a man is singing while playing his guitar (Dist: 0.09) (BLEU@4: 0.7071)
- a man is singing while playing the guitar (Dist: 0.09) (BLEU@4: 0.7071)
- a man playing a guitar in various locations singing a song (Dist: 0.13) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a man plays a guitar and sings a song outside (Dist: 0.13) (BLEU@4: 0.4111)
- a man sings while playing the acoustic guitar (Dist: 0.16) (BLEU@4: 0.4214)
- a man is singing on a doorstep and playing his guitar (Dist: 0.18) (BLEU@4: 0.3393)
- a man singing a song (Dist: 0.19) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- man is playing a guitar (Dist: 0.22) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)
- a man sings while playing a guitar throughout a town (Dist: 0.22) (BLEU@4: 0.4111)
- a man is playing the guitar (Dist: 0.23) (BLEU@4: 0.6065)
- a man plays a guitar outside (Dist: 0.25) (BLEU@4: 0.4083)
- this is a video of a man playing guitar and singing (Dist: 0.25) (BLEU@4: 0.2900)
- a man is singing a melodious song (Dist: 0.29) (BLEU@4: 0.3564)
- guy performing music on building (Dist: 0.40) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)

msrvtt+train+video5073

Within-Sample mean BERT Embedding distances [Min, Mean, Max]: [0.07, 0.18, 0.40]

Mean Leave One Out BLEU@4 score: 0.3661

Figure S6. Qualitative example of metrics presented in the paper. The blue description is a description with the minimum distance from the sentence embedding mean, while the red description maximizes the mean BLEU@4 score to all other captions in the sample. Captions are ordered from top to bottom by similarity to the mean caption embedding (See section 5).



- a football coach talking to his players on the sideline (Dist: 0.16) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)
- a person talking to football players (Dist: 0.18) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a coach is talking to his team of football players (Dist: 0.19) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a football coach talks on the sideline (Dist: 0.23) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)
- a football coach watches the players (Dist: 0.26) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)
- football players are on the field (Dist: 0.27) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)
- football players on the field (Dist: 0.28) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)
- a coach is speaking with his team (Dist: 0.29) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a man on the sidelines at a football game is talking continuously (Dist: 0.29) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a football coach is shown losing his patience with his players (Dist: 0.36) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a football player is on the sidelines (Dist: 0.37) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- people are playing sports (Dist: 0.38) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- footage of a football game (Dist: 0.39) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- there are men at a sports match (Dist: 0.44) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- players playing soccer game (Dist: 0.49) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a man is chewing and watching football players (Dist: 0.50) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a trainer guide a player (Dist: 0.52) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a man is talking (Dist: 0.54) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- some guys are getting ready to play rugby in a ground (Dist: 0.57) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a man talking or yelling with his lid backward (Dist: 0.71) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)

msrvtt+train+video63

Within-Sample mean BERT Embedding distances [Min, Mean, Max]: [0.16, 0.37, 0.71]

Mean Leave One Out BLEU@4 score: 0.0000

Figure S7. Qualitative example of metrics presented in the paper. The blue description is a description with the minimum distance from the sentence embedding mean, while the red description maximizes the mean BLEU@4 score to all other captions in the sample. Captions are ordered from top to bottom by similarity to the mean caption embedding (See section 5).




- While outside, a man is using a chainsaw to cut through a wood log. (Dist: 0.07) (BLEU@4: 0.2804)
- A man cuts into a large log with a chainsaw. (Dist: 0.10) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A man using a chain saw to cut a board out of a log. (Dist: 0.11) (BLEU@4: 0.4547)
- A man uses a chainsaw to cut a log into smaller segments. (Dist: 0.12) (BLEU@4: 0.3787)
- A man holds a chainsaw and carves a log with the saw. (Dist: 0.14) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A man is outside using a chainsaw to shape a large tree trunk. (Dist: 0.15) (BLEU@4: 0.4002)
- A man is using a chain saw to cut a large tree trunk. (Dist: 0.17) (BLEU@4: 0.4575)
- A man uses a chainsaw to carve a fallen tree in the woods. (Dist: 0.19) (BLEU@4: 0.3760)
- A man is using an electric saw to cut a block of wood. (Dist: 0.22) (BLEU@4: 0.3662)
- A man is taking a video showing us how to cut a good lumber. (Dist: 0.37) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)

vatex+train+c7R_RDH6s_A_000122_000132

Within-Sample mean BERT Embedding distances [Min, Mean, Max]: [0.07, 0.16, 0.37]

Mean Leave One Out BLEU@4 score: 0.2714


Figure S8. Qualitative example of metrics presented in the paper. The blue description is a description with the minimum distance from the sentence embedding mean, while the red description maximizes the mean BLEU@4 score to all other captions in the sample. Captions are ordered from top to bottom by similarity to the mean caption embedding (See section 5).



- A man demonstrates a lunge with a barbell with weights on the end. (Dist: 0.14) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A man is using barbells to teach how to do a lunge with them. (Dist: 0.16) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A man is in the gym performing a barbell single side lunge. (Dist: 0.18) (BLEU@4: 0.1623)
- A man in a gym is demonstrating how to properly do an exercise (Dist: 0.18) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A person demonstrates the proper technique for a barbell exercise while text explains the technique. (Dist: 0.19) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A man place a set of barbells on his shoulder and steps forward. (Dist: 0.21) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- The guy is in the gym lifting some barbel on the back of his shoulders. (Dist: 0.25) (BLEU@4: 0.1956)
- A man is holding a barbell on his shoulders as he steps forward. (Dist: 0.26) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A person doing exercises and telling how to do them the right way. (Dist: 0.29) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A man is standing in the gym lifting weights from the ground to his shoulders (Dist: 0.36) (BLEU@4: 0.1967)

vatex+train+j53UDMQ8mxo_000000_000010
Within-Sample mean BERT Embedding distances [Min, Mean, Max]: [0.14, 0.22, 0.36]
Mean Leave One Out BLEU@4 score: 0.0555

Figure S9. Qualitative example of metrics presented in the paper. The blue description is a description with the minimum distance from the sentence embedding mean, while the red description maximizes the mean BLEU@4 score to all other captions in the sample. Captions are ordered from top to bottom by similarity to the mean caption embedding (See section 5). The visual content of this video is missing (as the video has become private since the collection of the dataset), however we include the video as it is one of the randomly sampled instances.



- A man is pouring tea from a tea kettle into two mugs while keeping his other hand in his pocket. (Dist: 0.17) (BLEU@4: 0.1573)
- Man places hand in pocket before pouring water from kettle into two mugs. (Dist: 0.18) (BLEU@4: 0.1492)
- A man in a kitchen puts his hand in his pocket while pouring a beverage and explains why. (Dist: 0.23) (BLEU@4: 0.1579)
- The man is pouring something from the kettle into the two coffee mugs on the counter. (Dist: 0.26) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- He places his hand in his pant pocket then pours coffee into the cups. (Dist: 0.29) (BLEU@4: 0.1395)
- A man wearing a gray tank top is pouring tea into a cup. (Dist: 0.29) (BLEU@4: 0.1880)
- A man wearing a tee shirt pours coffee in two cups. (Dist: 0.29) (BLEU@4: 0.1898)
- A man in his kitchen has a kettle pouring himself hot water (Dist: 0.30) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- There is a man making tea and he is explaining where to put your arms so you don't burn them while pouring the water. (Dist: 0.31) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A guy is talking about a cooking video that he saw a couple weeks ago. (Dist: 0.53) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)

vatex+train+DbJWd2K2Hw0_000229_000239
Within-Sample mean BERT Embedding distances [Min, Mean, Max]: [0.17, 0.29, 0.53]
Mean Leave One Out BLEU@4 score: 0.0982

Figure S10. Qualitative example of metrics presented in the paper. The blue description is a description with the minimum distance from the sentence embedding mean, while the red description maximizes the mean BLEU@4 score to all other captions in the sample. Captions are ordered from top to bottom by similarity to the mean caption embedding (See section 5).



- A person peels and slices an apple using a knife onto a plate. (Dist: 0.07) (BLEU@4: 0.3161)
- A person peels an apple and chops it to tiny pieces. (Dist: 0.09) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A person is cutting up an apple with a knife onto a green plate. (Dist: 0.11) (BLEU@4: 0.2460)
- A person is peeling apples and then cutting out the cores. (Dist: 0.11) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A person is cutting a peeled and cored red apple into slices. (Dist: 0.12) (BLEU@4: 0.1907)
- A person is taking the skin off of some apples using a small knife. (Dist: 0.12) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A person peeling an apple using a knife while sitting at a table (Dist: 0.13) (BLEU@4: 0.3184)
- A man uses a knife to peel of the side of apple. (Dist: 0.13) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A person inside sitting at a table peels an apple on a green plate. (Dist: 0.18) (BLEU@4: 0.2289)
- A person cuts an onion into pieces using a knife. (Dist: 0.30) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)

vatex+train+W3orrcZAb2w_000200_000210
Within-Sample mean BERT Embedding distances [Min, Mean, Max]: [0.07, 0.14, 0.30]
Mean Leave One Out BLEU@4 score: 0.1300

Figure S11. Qualitative example of metrics presented in the paper. The blue description is a description with the minimum distance from the sentence embedding mean, while the red description maximizes the mean BLEU@4 score to all other captions in the sample. Captions are ordered from top to bottom by similarity to the mean caption embedding (See section 5).



- On a beach three men are doing cartwheels after another (Dist: 0.07) (BLEU@4: 0.1949)
- Three young men are doing cartwheels across the beach, towards the surf. (Dist: 0.09) (BLEU@4: 0.1967)
- **Three males are doing cartwheels down the beach towards the ocean.** (Dist: 0.09) (BLEU@4: 0.4125)
- Three guys do cartwheels on a beach toward the water until the stop and fall. (Dist: 0.11) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- Three men wearing shorts are doing cartwheels on the sand on the beach. (Dist: 0.12) (BLEU@4: 0.1967)
- Group of men doing numerous cartwheels down the beach towards the water. (Dist: 0.13) (BLEU@4: 0.4090)
- Three kids do cartwheels down the beach together. (Dist: 0.17) (BLEU@4: 0.2367)
- Three men doing cart wheels across a beach, stop then laughing. (Dist: 0.20) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A group of people are successively doing cart wheels on the beach. (Dist: 0.23) (BLEU@4: 0.1982)
- Three boys are doing cart wheeling on the beach all by themselves. (Dist: 0.33) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)

vatex+train+qyHurkZF0p0_000002_000012
 Within-Sample mean BERT Embedding distances [Min, Mean, Max]: [0.07, 0.15, 0.33]
 Mean Leave One Out BLEU@4 score: 0.1845

Figure S12. Qualitative example of metrics presented in the paper. The blue description is a description with the minimum distance from the sentence embedding mean, while the red description maximizes the mean BLEU@4 score to all other captions in the sample. Captions are ordered from top to bottom by similarity to the mean caption embedding (See section 5).



- **A man is using specialized ice climbing gear and metal cleats on his shoes to climb an icy cliff.** (Dist: 0.10) (BLEU@4: 0.1532)
- A man using proper equipment and shoe's to ice climb. (Dist: 0.10) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- **A man is climbing up the side of an icy mountains using climbing shoes and tools.** (Dist: 0.11) (BLEU@4: 0.4925)
- A man is wearing shoes with spikes and using a ice pick to climb a wall of ice. (Dist: 0.12) (BLEU@4: 0.3709)
- A man is attached to a harness as he is climbing a wall of snow and ice. (Dist: 0.13) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A man is climbing up the side of an ice wall. (Dist: 0.14) (BLEU@4: 0.4808)
- A man wearing a harness and spiked shoes climbs up a snow covered wall. (Dist: 0.14) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A man uses a pick and a harness to scale an icy cliff. (Dist: 0.18) (BLEU@4: 0.1480)
- a person tries their best to climb up a snowy mountain (Dist: 0.30) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A man cheers as another man is using crampons to climb a wall of ice. (Dist: 0.30) (BLEU@4: 0.3714)

vatex+train+keBAoE5tC44_000011_000021
 Within-Sample mean BERT Embedding distances [Min, Mean, Max]: [0.10, 0.16, 0.30]
 Mean Leave One Out BLEU@4 score: 0.2017

Figure S13. Qualitative example of metrics presented in the paper. The blue description is a description with the minimum distance from the sentence embedding mean, while the red description maximizes the mean BLEU@4 score to all other captions in the sample. Captions are ordered from top to bottom by similarity to the mean caption embedding (See section 5).



msvd+train+_WRC7HXBjPjU_360_370
Within-Sample mean BERT Embedding distances [Min, Mean, Max]: [0.09, 0.30, 0.74]
Mean Leave One Out BLEU@4 score: 0.2693

- someone is melting butter in a pan (Dist: 0.09) (BLEU@4: 0.7014)
- butter is being melted in a pan (Dist: 0.09) (BLEU@4: 0.4889)
- the butter is melting in the pan (Dist: 0.10) (BLEU@4: 0.5329)
- a man melts a piece of butter in a pan (Dist: 0.10) (BLEU@4: 0.5170)
- a person melts butter on a pan (Dist: 0.10) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- butter is melted in a pan (Dist: 0.11) (BLEU@4: 0.5115)
- a man is heating butter in a pan (Dist: 0.12) (BLEU@4: 0.5000)
- a man is melting butter in a pan (Dist: 0.12) (BLEU@4: 0.8409)
- someone is melting a piece of butter in a skillet (Dist: 0.13) (BLEU@4: 0.5170)
- butter is melting in a pan (Dist: 0.14) (BLEU@4: 0.6732)
- a man is stirring melting butter in a pan (Dist: 0.14) (BLEU@4: 0.5969)
- butter melts in a pan (Dist: 0.14) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)
- butter is melting in a frying pan (Dist: 0.15) (BLEU@4: 0.6435)
- melting the butter on the frying pan (Dist: 0.15) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)
- some butter is melting in a hot skillet (Dist: 0.16) (BLEU@4: 0.5170)
- butter melted in the pan (Dist: 0.16) (BLEU@4: 0.8187)
- the butter melted in the pan (Dist: 0.16) (BLEU@4: 0.7598)
- a man is melting butter in a skillet (Dist: 0.17) (BLEU@4: 0.8409)
- butter is melting on a skillet (Dist: 0.17) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)
- a cook spreads melted butter around a pan (Dist: 0.18) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a man is spreading some butter in a pan (Dist: 0.19) (BLEU@4: 0.4317)
- the man mmelted butter in the frying pan (Dist: 0.19) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)
- a man demonstrates how to prepare a pan with butter (Dist: 0.21) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- the man is melting butter in the pan (Dist: 0.22) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)
- a man is pressing a butter with mixing utensil in a black pan (Dist: 0.26) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- somebody is cooking (Dist: 0.36) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a man is cooking (Dist: 0.39) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)
- a cheese cub is melting in the pan (Dist: 0.39) (BLEU@4: 0.5170)
- he is cooking on the plate (Dist: 0.48) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a man is melting the cheese (Dist: 0.50) (BLEU@4: 0.3641)
- a man coking pork chops (Dist: 0.52) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a man makes food for him self (Dist: 0.54) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- cheese in the oil (Dist: 0.55) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a man cooking his kichen (Dist: 0.58) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a person is making pork chops (Dist: 0.59) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- cooking the pork chops (Dist: 0.60) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- anyone is frying (Dist: 0.61) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a man in a blue shirt and yellow cap preparing pork chops (Dist: 0.67) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- clear cooking details for pork chops (Dist: 0.70) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)
- recipe for pork chops (Dist: 0.74) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)

Figure S14. Qualitative example of metrics presented in the paper. The blue description is a description with the minimum distance from the sentence embedding mean, while the red description maximizes the mean BLEU@4 score to all other captions in the sample. Captions are ordered from top to bottom by similarity to the mean caption embedding (See section 5).



msvd+test+pzq5IPfsPZg_51_57
Within-Sample mean BERT Embedding distances [Min, Mean, Max]: [0.06, 0.26, 0.75]
Mean Leave One Out BLEU@4 score: 0.4139

- a woman is hugging a little boy (Dist: 0.06) (BLEU@4: 0.6435)
- a woman is hugging a boy (Dist: 0.08) (BLEU@4: 0.7598)
- a woman hugs a little boy (Dist: 0.08) (BLEU@4: 0.6732)
- a woman is hugging a child (Dist: 0.10) (BLEU@4: 0.7598)
- a young woman hugs a little boy (Dist: 0.11) (BLEU@4: 0.6435)
- the woman is hugging the boy (Dist: 0.11) (BLEU@4: 0.0001)
- a woman is hugging her child (Dist: 0.12) (BLEU@4: 0.7598)
- the lady hugged her little boy close to her (Dist: 0.16) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- a woman is hugging her son (Dist: 0.18) (BLEU@4: 0.7598)
- a woman is hugging a toddler (Dist: 0.21) (BLEU@4: 0.7598)
- a girl hugs a little boy (Dist: 0.23) (BLEU@4: 0.5373)
- a girls is hugging a little boy (Dist: 0.23) (BLEU@4: 0.6435)
- a woman hugs a small boy then sets him down on the floor (Dist: 0.25) (BLEU@4: 0.2045)
- the mother is hugging the baby (Dist: 0.28) (BLEU@4: 0.5373)
- a teenage girl is hugging a little boy (Dist: 0.29) (BLEU@4: 0.5411)
- two people are hugging (Dist: 0.33) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- the girl hugged the little boy tightly (Dist: 0.34) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- the girl is hugging the baby (Dist: 0.44) (BLEU@4: 0.5373)
- whitney is hugging her son in her house (Dist: 0.44) (BLEU@4: 0.3457)
- a lady is playing with child (Dist: 0.47) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- one lady and child are standing together (Dist: 0.50) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- the baby is doing the something (Dist: 0.75) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)

Figure S15. Qualitative example of metrics presented in the paper. The blue description is a description with the minimum distance from the sentence embedding mean, while the red description maximizes the mean BLEU@4 score to all other captions in the sample. Captions are ordered from top to bottom by similarity to the mean caption embedding (See section 5).



- Young boy leaping into air with tennis racket with dog below him. (Dist: 0.05) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A boy jumping into the air with a tennis racket. (Dist: 0.10) (BLEU@4: 0.3352)
- A boy with a tennis racket jumping in the air. (Dist: 0.10) (BLEU@4: 0.3352)
- A young man with a tennis racket jumping high into the air near a dog on a street side. (Dist: 0.19) (BLEU@4: 0.2195)
- A kid is in the air with a dog looking on (Dist: 0.32) (BLEU@4: 0.2481)

mscoco+train+174229
 Within-Sample mean BERT Embedding distances [Min, Mean, Max]: [0.05, 0.15, 0.32]
 Mean Leave One Out BLEU@4 score: 0.2276

Figure S16. Qualitative example of metrics presented in the paper. The blue description is a description with the minimum distance from the sentence embedding mean, while the red description maximizes the mean BLEU@4 score to all other captions in the sample. Captions are ordered from top to bottom by similarity to the mean caption embedding (See section 5).



- Grey cat laying on a green floor near a sandel. (Dist: 0.10) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A small gray and white cat laying on the floor (Dist: 0.11) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- White and grey kitten lying on a messy green carpet. (Dist: 0.15) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- A young cat on a mat with a flip flop shoe. (Dist: 0.20) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)
- The grey and white cat is beside a rubber show. (Dist: 0.22) (BLEU@4: 0.0000)

mscoco+validate+186296
 Within-Sample mean BERT Embedding distances [Min, Mean, Max]: [0.10, 0.16, 0.22]
 Mean Leave One Out BLEU@4 score: 0.0000

Figure S17. Qualitative example of metrics presented in the paper. The blue description is a description with the minimum distance from the sentence embedding mean, while the red description maximizes the mean BLEU@4 score to all other captions in the sample. Captions are ordered from top to bottom by similarity to the mean caption embedding (See section 5).

References [Supplementary]

- [AFJG16] Peter Anderson, Basura Fernando, Mark Johnson, and Stephen Gould. Spice: Semantic propositional image caption evaluation. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 382–398. Springer, 2016. [S6](#)
- [AL08] Abhaya Agarwal and Alon Lavie. Meteor, m-bleu and m-ter: Evaluation metrics for high-correlation with human rankings of machine translation output. In *Proceedings of the Third Workshop on Statistical Machine Translation*, pages 115–118, 2008. [S6](#)
- [CD11] David Chen and William B Dolan. Collecting highly parallel data for paraphrase evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 49th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies*, pages 190–200, 2011. [S1](#)
- [CNBH⁺18] Joao Carreira, Eric Noland, Andras Banki-Horvath, Chloe Hillier, and Andrew Zisserman. A short note about kinetics-600. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.01340*, 2018. [S6](#)
- [DDS⁺09] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 248–255. Ieee, 2009. [S6](#)
- [LMB⁺14] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 740–755. Springer, 2014. [S1](#), [S6](#)
- [RMM⁺17] Steven J Rennie, Etienne Marcheret, Youssef Mroueh, Jerret Ross, and Vaibhava Goel. Self-critical sequence training for image captioning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7008–7024, 2017. [S6](#)
- [STQ⁺20] Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Jianfeng Lu, and Tie-Yan Liu. Mpnnet: Masked and permuted pre-training for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.09297*, 2020. [S3](#)
- [Vaz01] Vijay V Vazirani. *Approximation algorithms*, volume 1. Springer, 2001. [S4](#)
- [WWC⁺19] Xin Wang, Jiawei Wu, Junkun Chen, Lei Li, Yuan-Fang Wang, and William Yang Wang. VateX: A large-scale, high-quality multilingual dataset for video-and-language research. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4581–4591, 2019. [S1](#)
- [XMYR16] Jun Xu, Tao Mei, Ting Yao, and Yong Rui. Msr-vtt: A large video description dataset for bridging video and language. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5288–5296, 2016. [S1](#)
- [ZLK⁺17] Bolei Zhou, Agata Lapedriza, Aditya Khosla, Aude Oliva, and Antonio Torralba. Places: A 10 million image database for scene recognition. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 40(6):1452–1464, 2017. [S6](#)