

RANKCLIP: Ranking-Consistent Language-Image Pretraining

Yiming Zhang*
HFIPS, Chinese Academy of Sciences
University of Science and Technology
of China
Hefei, China
yimingzhang@mail.ustc.edu.cn

Zhuokai Zhao*
University of Chicago
Chicago, IL, United States
zhuokai@uchicago.edu

Zhaorun Chen
University of Chicago
Chicago, IL, United States
zhaorun@uchicago.edu

Zhili Feng
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA, United States
zhilif@andrew.cmu.edu

Zenghui Ding†
HFIPS, Chinese Academy of Sciences
Hefei, China
dingzenghui@iim.ac.cn

Yining Sun
HFIPS, Chinese Academy of Sciences
Hefei, China
yinsun@iim.ac.cn

Abstract

Among the ever-evolving development of vision-language models, contrastive language-image pretraining (CLIP) has set new benchmarks in many downstream tasks such as zero-shot classifications by leveraging self-supervised contrastive learning on large amounts of text-image pairs. However, its dependency on rigid one-to-one mappings overlooks the complex and often multifaceted relationships between and within texts and images. To this end, we introduce **RANKCLIP**, a novel pretraining method that extends beyond the rigid one-to-one matching framework of CLIP and its variants. By leveraging both in-modal and cross-modal ranking consistency, RANKCLIP improves the alignment process, enabling it to capture the nuanced many-to-many relationships between and within each modality. Through comprehensive experiments, we demonstrate RANKCLIP’s enhanced capability to effectively improve performance across various downstream tasks, notably achieving significant gains in zero-shot classifications over state-of-the-art methods, underscoring the potential of RANKCLIP in further advancing vision-language pretraining. Code and model checkpoints are available at <https://github.com/Jam1ezhang/RankCLIP>.

1 Introduction

In the realm of computer vision (CV) [61], natural language processing (NLP) [9], and multimodal deep learning [27, 67], the alignment between visual and textual modalities [7, 56] has emerged as a cornerstone for downstream applications, ranging from image captioning [20] to zero-shot classification [50]. Contrastive Language-Image Pretraining (CLIP) [51] marks a significant advancement in this field, demonstrating incredible performance from training on large amounts of text-image pairs to create self-supervised models that understand [8, 24, 25] and generate [13, 52] descriptions of visual contents. Despite its superior performance, CLIP’s reliance on strict one-to-one mappings between images and texts overlooks the nuanced and often many-to-many relationships inherent in the real-world data [10], leaving rooms for further improvements.

Following the success of CLIP and its contrastive learning paradigm, numerous recent works have been developed and built upon the original CLIP. More specifically, these enhancements focus on optimizing data efficiency through intrinsic supervision within the

text-image pairs [33], as well as improving general performance, including zero-shot classification and retrieval accuracy, via cross-modal late interaction mechanism [66], hierarchical feature alignment [18], additional geometric consistency regularization [21], additional self-supervised learning [42], adaptive loss [65], hierarchy-aware attentions [19], and softer cross-modal alignment [17].

However, in spite of the improvements, these methods do not fully recognize the many-to-many relationships between and within the image and text modalities, or leverage it to further enhance the model’s understanding of complex visual-textual information. For example, while the existing pretrained model, such as CLIP, is able to correctly classify dog from cat and airplane, as shown in Fig. 1, they can not necessarily learn that dog and cat are supposed to be more similar than dog and airplane in terms of both in-modal (i.e., dog text and cat text are more similar than dog text and airplane text) and cross-modal (i.e., dog text and cat image are more similar than dog text and airplane image) similarity. Because it is rooted from the current contrastive loss that only the correct pairs are identified while the rest of the unmatched pairs are treated the same, resulting in a large amount of information not used and unknown to the model during the training process.

Moreover, although very recent work such as SoftCLIP [17] proposes to relax this hard-label relationship, it focuses only on the fine-grained cross-modal similarity, and use it as the softened target. Under its setting, continuing with the earlier example, the cross-modal similarity between the dog image and cat text will be smaller than the similarity between the matched pairs (e.g., dog image and dog text), but larger than some of the unmatched pairs, such as the dog image and airplane text. However, they miss on the in-modal relationships, which could also be very informative, as the dog and cat may both have "coat" in their images, as well as in the corresponding texts. We hypothesize that the similarity relationships between text-text, image-image, and image-text should be *consistent*, based on the observation that similar images are more likely to have similar corresponding texts, and vice versa.

Recognizing the many-to-many relationships inherent in the real-world data, as well as the rich information contained both in-modal and cross-modal, we propose **Ranking-Consistent Language-Image Pretraining**, or **RANKCLIP** in short, which leverages *ranking consistency* as a proxy to characterize the similarity level consistency between and within the text-image pairs in addition to the matched

*Equal contribution.

†Corresponding author.




Figure 1: An overview comparison between (a) CLIP and (b) RANKCLIP. Three text-image pairs (dog, cat, and airplane) are shown, where matched pairs share the same-color boundary line, i.e., **red** for **dog**, **blue** for **cat**, and **magenta** for **airplane**. Pairwise cross-modal relationships are indicated by solid lines, while pairwise in-modal relationships are denoted by the dotted (image-image) and dashed (text-text) lines respectively. In (a) CLIP, as all the unmatched pairwise information, both in-modal and cross-modal, are treated the same during training, the model does not learn that dog and cat are more similar to each other in terms of both image and text modality than airplane. On the other hand, this problem is fixed with RANKCLIP through training with ranking consistency, as more secondary relationships were grasped, achieving deeper level of understanding.

pairs during the self-supervised contrastive training. More specifically, ranking consistency builds upon simple observations that similar texts often correspond to similar images, such as the dog, cat and airplane example discussed above and shown in Fig. 1, and can be used to represent secondary similarity relationships (i.e., relationships between the unmatched pairs) to help model learn *for free* in addition to the matched pairs. And this is conveniently achieved through incorporating the *ranking consistency* as an additional loss term added to the contrastive loss function, without the need of including any additional external modules, so that this new loss function can be seen as a drop-in improvement to many existing methods, including the one focusing more on data-efficiency [33], which may help achieve better performance in both aspects.

The main contributions of this paper are: (1) RANKCLIP, a novel contrastive language-image pretraining method that leverages ranking consistency to recognize and utilize the many-to-many relationship of the real-world data to achieve better performance in downstream tasks such as zero-shot classification and retrieval accuracy; and (2) through extensive experiments conducted on multiple datasets, we demonstrate RANKCLIP’s effectiveness on improving pretraining model performance without the need of any additional data or extra computational resources.

2 Related Work

2.1 Vision-Language Pretraining

Vision-language pretraining has witnessed significant advancements over the past years. Despite the large number of different

approaches [6, 16, 37], they can be predominantly divided into two categories [21], which are generative and contrastive. Of the two, generative models are not described further here since they have little methodological connection to the proposed RANKCLIP.

In terms of the contrastive approaches, models such as CLIP [51], ALIGN [28] and their combined scaled-up version, BASIC [47], have revolutionized contrastive learning applied to text-image pairs, showcasing remarkable abilities in zero-shot classification and robustness. Many follow-up works have then been proposed continuing the success of CLIP and its contrastive learning paradigm. Li et al. [33] introduced DeCLIP, which is a more data-efficient training approach that improves zero-shot performance with fewer data by leveraging intrinsic supervision within the text-image pairs. Meanwhile, FILIP [66] enhances the expressiveness between image patches and textual words upon CLIP through a cross-modal late interaction mechanism that provides finer alignment between the tokens from the two modalities.

Encouraged by the improvements, Gao et al. [18] further proposed PyramidCLIP using hierarchical feature alignment between visual and textual elements across different semantic levels to improve both efficiency and performance of the pretrained model. Besides, SLIP [42] combines self-supervised learning and CLIP pre-training to enhance visual representation learning and demonstrates additional accuracy improvements across multiple benchmarks. And Goel et al. [21] introduced a framework, CyCLIP, that augments CLIP with additional geometric consistency regularizers for cycle consistent representation learning, aiming to improve the performance and robustness on both standard and distribution-shifted benchmarks.

Very recently, Yang et al. [65] introduces an adaptive pre-training model, ALIP, that integrates both raw text and synthetic captions for language-image alignment, employing dynamic adjustment mechanisms to enhance pre-training efficiency and performance on downstream tasks. HiCLIP [19] enhances the CLIP model by integrating hierarchy-aware attentions into both its visual and language branches, enabling it to progressively uncover semantic hierarchies in images and texts in an unsupervised manner. And SoftCLIP [17] relaxes CLIP’s strict one-to-one constraint, achieving a softer cross-modal alignment by introducing a softened target generated from fine-grained cross-modal alignments.

Compared with existing approaches, RANKCLIP further exploits the many-to-many relationships inherent in each batch of the text-image pairs and encourages the model to learn not only the matched pairs, but also the unmatched pairs that share either high or low similarities through incorporating both in-modal and cross-modal ranking consistencies into the contrastive training objective. More importantly, unlike all existing approaches, RANKCLIP focuses on global optimization that considers the rankings of all the images and texts as a whole within each batch, instead of pairwise similarities as seen in the existing works.

2.2 Learning to Rank

Among the initial development in learning to rank (LTR) is the pairwise approach, which computes losses based on the relative ordering of item pairs [2, 29, 36]. Despite the computational efficiency and scalability of pairwise losses, they fall short by not accounting for the global ranking context, often leading to suboptimal ranking outcomes [3, 36]. To address these limitations, list-wise approaches such as ListNet [4] and ListMLE [64] were proposed, focusing on optimizing the entire ranking sequence instead. More specifically, these strategies employ Plackett-Luce (PL) ranking models [38, 48] to enhance the likelihood of achieving the most accurate item ordering. In RANKCLIP, we incorporate ListMLE [4] as part of our training objective to optimize both in-modal and cross-modal ranking consistencies.

3 Methodology

3.1 CLIP Preliminaries

CLIP [51] has been a prominent method for learning detailed multimodal representations through the alignment of images and texts. Given a set $\mathcal{D} = \{(I_j, T_j)\}_{j=1}^N$ of N image-text pairs, where I_j denotes an image and T_j is the corresponding text, the goal is to learn representations that map semantically similar images and texts closer in the embedding space, while dissimilar pairs are distanced apart. More specifically, the foundational CLIP model employs two encoders: an image encoder $f_I : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ that processes raw images into visual embeddings and a text encoder $f_T : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ which encodes textual data into text embeddings. Then both the text and visual features are projected to a latent space with identical dimension. Formally, the embeddings for a text-image pair (I_j, T_j) are denoted as $v_j = f_I(I_j)$ and $t_j = f_T(T_j)$, respectively. The embeddings are then normalized to lie on a unit hypersphere by enforcing l_2 -norm constraint:

$$\hat{v}_j = \frac{v_j}{\|v_j\|_2}, \quad \hat{t}_j = \frac{t_j}{\|t_j\|_2}. \quad (1)$$

so that the magnitude information is erased and only direction is preserved.

To align the image and text representations, a contrastive loss function, typically a variant of the InfoNCE loss [45], which optimizes the similarity of the matched pair against unmatched pairs, is utilized, i.e.:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{CLIP}} = -\frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\underbrace{\log \frac{\exp(\hat{v}_j^\top \hat{t}_j / \tau)}{\sum_{k=1}^N \exp(\hat{v}_j^\top \hat{t}_k / \tau)}}_{\textcircled{1}} + \log \frac{\exp(\hat{t}_j^\top \hat{v}_j / \tau)}{\sum_{k=1}^N \exp(\hat{t}_j^\top \hat{v}_k / \tau)} \right] \quad (2)$$

where the first term $\textcircled{1}$ contrasts images with the texts, the second term $\textcircled{2}$ contrasts texts with the images, and τ denotes a temperature scaling parameter that adjusts the concentration of the distribution. The optimization of Eqn. (2) results in embeddings where the cosine similarity between matched image-text pairs is maximized in comparison to unmatched pairs, thus achieving the desired alignment in the joint embedding space.

Despite the efficacy of CLIP in learning correlated multimodal embeddings, it inherently relies on strict pairwise matched comparisons and fails to capture the more complex, fine-grained nature of semantic similarity within and across modalities that are generally treated as unmatched. This observation motivates the development of RANKCLIP, which innovates beyond binary pairwise contrasts to consider holistic listwise consistency within and across modalities.

3.2 RANKCLIP

The key insight of RANKCLIP is to more efficiently leverage the many-to-many relationships inherent in the real-world data that are usually underrepresented as secondary similarity relationships, which is less explored by previous self-supervised contrastive methods [17, 51]. Thus to incorporate the latent consistency, RANKCLIP seeks not only to discern whether a pair of image and text are a match but also to understand their relative semantic similarity to other pairs in the dataset by considering ranking consistency.

3.2.1 Ranking Model Formulation. RANKCLIP leverages the Plackett-Luce (PL) ranking model [22, 38, 48] to estimate the probability distribution over rankings for image-text pair (I_i, T_j) , so that the consistency in their relative ordering w.r.t. a reference ranking can be measured. Specifically, for a given data pair (e.g. image-image, text-text, image-text), we calculate its in-/cross-modal cosine similarity d_j to serve as the score $m(d_j)$ to measure the alignment of its ranking w.r.t. another reference ranking y_{ref} . Following [48], we first sort the reference ranking in a descending order to construct the optimal ranking y^* , and assume that the ego ranking y is sampled from y^* . Thus the probability that item d_j is ranked k^{th} in the ego ranking y from a set of items D is the score of $e^{m(d_j)}$ divided by the sum of scores for the items that have not been placed yet:

$$\pi(d \mid y_{1:k-1}, y_{\text{ref}}, D) = \frac{e^{m(d)}}{\sum_{d' \in D \setminus y_{1:k-1}} e^{m(d')}} \quad (3)$$

where $y_{1:k-1} = [y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{k-1}]$ denotes the set of items ranked before d_j . Specifically, we incorporate a decaying factor μ to scale

the loss, so that the top-ranked items can obtain higher weights:

$$\mu = \frac{1}{\log(k+1)} \quad (4)$$

Consequently, the probability of the entire ranking y is the product of individual placement probabilities:

$$\mathcal{P}(y, y_{\text{ref}}) = \prod_{k=1}^K \mu \cdot \pi(y_k | y_{1:k-1}, y_{\text{ref}}, D). \quad (5)$$

RANKCLIP’s objective is to maximize the consistency log-likelihood of the list ranking in one modality towards the reference ranking (in the same/different modality), which aligns with minimizing the negative log-likelihood loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{PL}} = -\log \mathcal{P}(y, y_{\text{ref}}) \quad (6)$$

where y can be in either modality. Specifically, RANKCLIP considers in-modal and cross-modal consistency with Eq. (6), respectively.

3.2.2 In-modal Consistency Ranking. RANKCLIP first seeks to align the semantic consistency within each modality, i.e. image-image and text-text, such that the secondary relationships within each modality can be more efficiently exploited (e.g. in Fig. 1, while dog image/text is different from cat image/text, they are both more similar than to the plane image/text). Mathematically, we can reformulate Eq. (6) as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{in-modal}} = -\log \mathcal{P}(y_{\text{text-text}}, y_{\text{image-image}}) \quad (7)$$

$$= -\log \mathcal{P}(\hat{\mathbf{t}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{t}}^T, \hat{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}}^T) \quad (8)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{t}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ are the text and image batch embedding matrix, respectively. Via Eq. (7), the model can efficiently leverage the nuanced in-modal relationships to learn a richer and more structured semantic representation.

3.2.3 Cross-modal Consistency Ranking. RANKCLIP further prioritizes the alignment of semantic consistencies across different modalities to leverage the secondary relationships between visual and textual representations (e.g. in Fig. 1, while dog image/text is far from cat text/image, they are more similar than to the plane text/image). Mathematically, we can reformulate Eqn. (6) as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{cross-modal}} = -\log \mathcal{P}(y_{\text{image-text}}, y_{\text{text-image}}) \quad (9)$$

$$= -\log \mathcal{P}(\hat{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{t}}^T, \hat{\mathbf{t}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}}^T) \quad (10)$$

Thus by optimizing Eq. (9), RANKCLIP enhances its ability to bridge the semantic gap across modalities by leveraging the more nuanced secondary correlations between modalities. We can also interpret Eq. (9) as learning a *symmetric* cosine-similarity matrix to further enforce the semantic consistency between both modalities.

3.2.4 RANKCLIP loss. Combining both in- and out-modal consistency, the RANKCLIP loss can be formulated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{RANKCLIP}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{CLIP}} + \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{\text{in-modal}} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{\text{cross-modal}} \quad (11)$$

By augmenting the pairwise contrastive loss with in-/cross-modality ranking consistency loss, RANKCLIP systematically arranges embeddings such that both global and fine-grained secondary relationships can be fully leveraged to learn a more informative and accurate representations, which can better serve the subsequent multi-modal tasks (e.g. classification).

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

4.1.1 Baselines. The most direct baseline to RANKCLIP is the original CLIP [51], as RANKCLIP is built and developed upon it. In addition, to further demonstrate the superior performance of RANKCLIP, we also include ALIP [65], a very recent pretraining method that is also based on CLIP. However, ALIP shares no similarity with RANKCLIP, as it leverages synthetic captions to enhance vision-language representation learning. More specifically, it employs a unique architecture that dynamically adjusts sample and pair weights to mitigate the impact of noisy or irrelevant data, which is quite orthogonal to our approach.

4.1.2 Pretraining dataset. All the models present through this paper, including CLIP [51], ALIP [65] and the proposed RANKCLIP are pretrained on the Conceptual Captions 3M (CC3M) dataset [55], which contains around 3.3 million text-image pairs. While CC3M is admittedly much smaller than CLIP’s original dataset, which hypothetically has a pretraining data size of at least 400 millions [26], it is adequately comprehensive in creating pretrained models that have relatively strong zero-shot capabilities for performance evaluation and comparisons. In fact, training with CC3M has been widely adopted in many language-image pretraining research [5, 21, 33, 42, 60].

4.1.3 Implementation details. For CLIP [51], we use the official implementation released by OpenAI¹. And for ALIP [65], we also use the official implementation released by the paper authors². As the proposed RANKCLIP essentially shares the same model architecture (separate vision, text encoders, projection layer, and a classification head) as CLIP, we build upon the CLIP code repository for our model construction³. We set the scaling parameters for cross-modal (λ_c) and in-modal (λ_i) ranking consistency to 1/16 and 1/16 respectively throughout all the experiments unless otherwise noted. All CLIP, ALIP and RANKCLIP models are initialized from scratch without loading any existing weights. And the embedding sizes for both modalities all project to 1024 across the three models.

4.1.4 Training parameters. Following CLIP [51], we adopt the ResNet-50 [23] and transformer architectures [15] for image and text encoding, respectively. Training is conducted from scratch over 64 epochs using a single NVIDIA A100 GPU, with a batch size of 512, an initial learning rate of 0.0005 employing cosine scheduling, and 10,000 warm-up steps.

4.2 Zero-shot Classification

Zero-shot capability is one of the most significant and iconic improvements that CLIP [51] achieves. Thus in this section, we first evaluate the zero-shot classification performance of CLIP [51], ALIP [65] and the proposed RANKCLIP. Following [21], we conduct our experiments on CIFAR-10 [31], CIFAR-100 [31], and ImageNet1K [14, 54] dataset.

As shown in Table 1, RANKCLIP achieves significant advancements consistently across CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and ImageNet1K over the original CLIP, resulting in an average accuracy top-1,

¹CLIP repository on GitHub: <https://github.com/openai/CLIP>.

²ALIP repository on GitHub: <https://github.com/deepglint/ALIP>.

³RANKCLIP repository will be released upon acceptance.

Table 1: Zero-shot top-1, top-3 and top-5 classification accuracy on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and ImageNet1K. RANKCLIP achieves higher accuracy than CLIP with an *average* top-1, top-3, and top-5 improvements of +18.95%, +12.5%, and +9.73% respectively. RANKCLIP also outperforms the state-of-the-art ALIP consistently across the datasets.

	CIFAR-10			CIFAR-100			ImageNet1K		
	Top1	Top3	Top5	Top1	Top3	Top5	Top1	Top3	Top5
CLIP [51]	36.35%	70.28%	85.02%	12.22%	24.93%	33.56%	12.08%	21.86%	27.48%
ALIP [65]	35.71%	72.39%	88.77%	13.67%	27.10%	34.76%	15.62%	26.90%	32.50%
RANKCLIP	37.03%	67.67%	83.09%	13.98%	27.70%	36.17%	17.02%	28.44%	33.99%
	(+1.87%)	(-3.71%)	(-2.27%)	(+14.40%)	(+11.11%)	(+7.78%)	(+40.89%)	(+30.10%)	(+23.69%)

Table 2: Zero-shot top-1, top-3 and top-5 classification accuracy on variants of ImageNet1K that have *natural distribution shifts*. RANKCLIP achieves higher accuracy than CLIP with an *average* top-1, top-3, and top-5 improvements of +45.55%, +30.24%, and +25.83% respectively. Notice that the average improvements are more significant than when tested on ImageNet1K without distribution shift, indicating higher robustness of RANKCLIP.

	ImageNetV2			ImageNetSketch			ImageNet-A			ImageNet-R		
	Top1	Top3	Top5	Top1	Top3	Top5	Top1	Top3	Top5	Top1	Top3	Top5
CLIP [51]	12.11%	22.66%	28.57%	3.20%	7.00%	9.83%	3.16%	8.81%	13.04%	11.34%	21.38%	27.10%
ALIP [65]	15.62%	27.34%	32.82%	5.10%	10.37%	14.01%	3.53%	9.14%	13.61%	14.25%	25.74%	32.43%
RANKCLIP	17.03%	28.60%	34.18%	5.82%	11.35%	14.87%	3.82%	9.16%	13.77%	15.74%	27.51%	34.36%
	(+40.63%)	(+26.21%)	(+19.64%)	(+81.88%)	(+62.14%)	(+51.27%)	(+20.89%)	(+3.97%)	(+5.60%)	(+38.80%)	(+28.67%)	(+26.79%)

top-3 and top-5 increments of +18.95%, +12.5%, and +9.73% respectively. Notably, on the more challenging ImageNet1K [54] dataset, RANKCLIP achieves +40.89% better top-1 accuracy than the baseline CLIP, demonstrating that the proposed ranking consistency terms truly help induce much more effective language-image alignment and deeper understandings with the same amount of training samples and iterations. The only two places that RANKCLIP falls short are the top-3 and top-5 accuracy on CIFAR-10. However, we believe this is due to the fact that CIFAR-10 by definition is a much simpler task, where top-3 and top-5 metrics further lower the difficulties, making it less challenging and less demanding for model’s deeper understanding, making RANKCLIP less advantageous.

We observe that RANKCLIP consistently outperforms ALIP [65] as well, indicating that our ranking consistency helps model learn better text-image representations and alignments, even without modifications made to synthetic captions, as proposed in ALIP.

Another trend we notice is that the most significant improvement of RANKCLIP is in the top-1 accuracy (compared to top-3 and top-5). Given the common practice in real-world applications to prioritize the topmost option, we believe that RANKCLIP stands to deliver significant advantages in practical settings.

4.3 Robustness to Distribution Shifts

Besides the strong zero-shot performance, another highlight of CLIP [51] is its resilience to natural distribution shifts, showcasing how its robustness to unconventional image types, ranging from sketches [62] and cartoons to images adversarially [25] designed to trick the models. To assess the robustness of RANKCLIP under these distribution shifts, we test CLIP [51], ALIP [65] and RANKCLIP across four benchmarks, ImageNetV2 [53], ImageNetSketch [62],

ImageNet-A [25], and ImageNet-R [24], which are variants of the ImageNet1K dataset with different types of distribution shifts.

As shown in Table 2, we see that RANKCLIP achieves consistently better performance than both CLIP and ALIP. More importantly, an examination of both the zero-shot results (Table 1) and zero-shot results under distribution shifts (Table 2) reveals that, on average, RANKCLIP achieves more significant improvements in accuracy over CLIP with top-1: +45.55%, top-3: +30.24% and top-5: +25.83% in scenarios with distribution shifts. These gains surpass those seen in non-shifted conditions, which are top-1: +40.89%, top-3: +30.1%, and top-5: +23.69%, indicating that RANKCLIP is more robust towards distribution shifts than CLIP [51]. Once again, this indicates that the introduced ranking consistency is important for model to learn the fine-grained knowledge between texts and images.

4.4 Linear Probing

In addition to the zero-shot generalization performance without and with natural distribution shifts reported in §4.2 and §4.3, we also evaluate whether the introduced ranking consistency retains its advantages when supplemented with additional in-domain supervision. More specifically, we employ a technique widely known as linear probing [51], where the pretrained encoders of CLIP [51], ALIP [65], and RANKCLIP remain unchanged, and only the logistic regression classifier is trained using a dataset that is specific to the domain under investigation.

We evaluate on a suite of 11 standard image classification datasets as our in-domain datasets, which include CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 [31], Describable Textures Dataset (DTD) [11], Fine-Grained Visual Classification of Aircraft (FGVG-Aircraft) [39], Food101 [1], German Traffic Sign Detection Benchmark (GTSDB) [59], ImageNet1K [14],

Table 3: Linear probing top-1 accuracy on 11 downstream datasets. RANKCLIP achieves higher accuracy than CLIP with an average improvement of +2.31%. RANKCLIP also outperforms ALIP, although the improvement is marginal on average.

	<i>CLIPAR-10</i>	<i>CLIPAR-100</i>	<i>DTD</i>	<i>FGVGAircraft</i>	<i>Food101</i>	<i>GTSRB</i>	<i>Imagenet1K</i>	<i>OxfordPets</i>	<i>SST2</i>	<i>STL10</i>	<i>SVHN</i>	Average
CLIP [51]	72.40%	48.43%	49.89%	26.10%	48.59%	65.20%	77.49%	49.74%	53.71%	83.59%	44.80%	56.37%
ALIP [65]	73.87%	51.00%	58.09%	27.72%	49.74%	60.34%	73.14%	59.36%	53.98%	87.94%	38.07%	57.56%
RANKCLIP	72.54% (+0.20%)	49.16% (+1.50%)	53.24% (+6.71%)	24.99% (-4.25%)	47.11% (-3.05%)	63.37% (-2.81%)	86.40% (+11.50%)	54.10% (+8.77%)	54.09% (+3.00%)	86.10% (+0.71%)	43.30% (-3.35%)	57.67% (+2.31%)

Table 4: Zero-shot image and text retrievals on Flickr30K and MSCOCO. RANKCLIP achieves higher accuracy than both CLIP and ALIP on most cases.

	Flickr30K						MSCOCO					
	Text Retrieval			Image Retrieval			Text Retrieval			Image Retrieval		
	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R5	R@10
CLIP [51]	84.00%	88.70%	91.0%	8.70%	16.90%	21.20%	82.06%	85.24%	87.82%	5.04%	12.98%	18.32%
ALIP [65]	84.40%	90.00%	92.50%	9.40%	17.60%	21.30%	82.56%	86.04%	88.26%	6.08%	13.96%	19.38%
RANKCLIP	84.10% (+0.12%)	89.40% (+0.79%)	91.90% (+0.99%)	8.10% (-6.90%)	16.40% (-2.96%)	21.70% (+2.36%)	82.90% (+1.02%)	85.68% (+0.52%)	88.00% (+0.20%)	5.60% (+11.11%)	13.20% (+1.69%)	18.02% (-1.64%)

54], OxfordPets [46], Stanford Sentiment Treebank v2 (SST2) [57], STL-10 [12], and Street View House Numbers (SVHN) [43] dataset.

The results are shown in Table 3. We can see that RANKCLIP outperforms the baseline CLIP [51] in most domains, yielding an improvement of 0.2% to 11.5%, and resulting in a 2.31% accuracy increment on average. Comparing with ALIP [65], our proposed RANKCLIP also performs better on average, although the advancement is relatively marginal.

4.5 Zero-shot Image-text Retrieval

In the last part of our experiments section, we assess the performance of RANKCLIP on zero-shot cross-modal retrieval tasks, which includes both image-to-text and text-to-image retrievals. Following Goel et al. [21], Yang et al. [65], we conduct zero-shot image-text retrieval using Flickr30k [49] and MSCOCO [35] datasets. After Karpathy split [30], the sizes of the test sets of Flickr30K and MSCOCO are 1k and 5k respectively. It is worth noting that, as each image features five paired captions, text retrieval is inherently less challenging than image retrieval, simply due to the richer context provided by multiple captions.

The results are shown in Table 4. We observe that on average, RANKCLIP outperforms the two baseline methods. However, the advancements are less significant than previous tasks as seen in Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3. We think the relatively lower improvements may be because that the retrieval tasks require models to discern image-text similarities across various resolutions, including different object sizes and different numbers of objects per image. This is dramatically different from image classification tasks, which typically involves matching a singular object to a straightforward captions. And it makes sense for ALIP to have advantages on this

task, as the additional generated synthetic captions may aid in alleviating this shift. In addition, ResNet-50, as the vision backbone, may not be able to capture all the details during training, making it not only an alignment issue between two modalities that the contrastive training paradigm could fix. Nevertheless, the on-average improvement still indicate that, despite all the uncertainties, RANKCLIP still has its advantage due to deeper understanding that ranking consistency brings into the language-image training process.

5 Ablation Studies


5.1 Ablation on Components

To better understand the effectiveness of the proposed ranking consistency, we train two variants of RANKCLIP, where one contains only the cross-modal (RANKCLIP_C with $\lambda_i = 0$) ranking consistency, while the other only contains the in-modal (RANKCLIP_I with $\lambda_c = 0$) consistency. We train both RANKCLIP_C and RANKCLIP_I following the same pretraining procedure from §4.1.4 and conduct the zero-shot classification experiment on ImageNet1K as in §4.2.

The results are shown in Table 5, with bold font indicating the best performance, and blue color representing the second best results. We can see that, while RANKCLIP achieves the best performance, RANKCLIP_C and RANKCLIP_I always achieve the second-best results, outperforming the original CLIP [51], which can be seen as RANKCLIP without neither cross-modal or in-modal ranking consistency, by an obvious margin. More importantly, we observe that RANKCLIP_I, which is the model trained with only the *in-modal* ranking consistency, achieves performance as good as RANKCLIP_C, underscoring the significance of in-modal consistency that is often overlooked by existing literature [17].

Table 5: Ablation zero-shot classification accuracy of cross-modal-only model RANKCLIP_C and in-modal-only model RANKCLIP_I on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and ImageNet1K datasets. Bold indicates the best performance, while blue indicates the second best.

	CIFAR-10			CIFAR-100			ImageNet1K		
	Top1	Top3	Top5	Top1	Top3	Top5	Top1	Top3	Top5
CLIP [51]	36.35%	70.28%	85.02%	12.22%	24.93%	33.56%	12.08%	21.86%	27.48%
RANKCLIP	37.03%	67.67%	83.09%	13.98%	27.70%	36.17%	17.02%	28.44%	33.99%
RANKCLIP _I	37.47%	69.89%	84.53%	13.89%	27.34%	35.90%	16.66%	27.63%	33.15%
RANKCLIP _C	28.26%	59.65%	75.45%	13.29%	26.85%	34.71%	16.98%	28.25%	33.90%

**Figure 2: Ablation studies of CLIP and RANKCLIP trained with different data sizes. (a): zero-shot top-1 classification accuracy on ImageNet1K with various data sizes randomly sampled from CC3M. RANKCLIP consistently outperforms CLIP with significant margins. (b): zero-shot top-1 classification accuracy on ImageNet1K (horizontal axis) and ImageNet1K-R (vertical axis). RANKCLIP demonstrates better robustness as well as general accuracy.**

5.2 Ablation on Data Sizes

To further demonstrate the performance of RANKCLIP, in this section, we ablate on the size of the dataset and train both CLIP [51] and RANKCLIP with 500K, 750K, 1M, and 3M text-image pairs randomly sampled from CC3M dataset, following the same training procedure detailed in §4.1.4.

Fig. 3(a) shows the zero-shot top-1 classification accuracy of both models tested on ImageNet1K. We observe that RANKCLIP consistently outperforms CLIP with significant margins. More notably, stepping from 1M to 3M, we observe a higher performance increase of RANKCLIP than CLIP, indicating that RANKCLIP has better potential when scaled to larger datasets, which is one of the most important characteristics for language-image pretraining.

Next, we illustrate the robustness of RANKCLIP with varying dataset sizes. As shown in Fig. 3(b), the plot has the horizontal axis represent the top-1 accuracy on standard ImageNet1K, while the vertical axis denotes the accuracy on the shifted ImageNet1K-R. Ideally, a robust model would not have performance downgrade from normal to shifted. Graphically, this is referenced as a black diagonal line denoting the $y = x$ relationship. Any deviations downwards from this line indicates non-perfect robustness. Besides CLIP, another baseline is the red line fit to standard training [41], which represents a known correlation between in-distribution and out-of-distribution generalization of models trained on ImageNet1K.

Graphically, staying above the red line indicates better robustness. Quite significantly, we can see that our proposed RANKCLIP stays well above the baseline, and behaves very closely to the perfect $y = x$ relationship, indicating excellent robustness towards distribution shifts consistently across different data sizes.

6 Analysis

6.1 Modality Gap

Modality gap [34] refers to a geometric phenomenon observed in the representation spaces of multimodal models, where different data modalities (e.g., images and texts, in our case) are embedded at a noticeable distance from each other, despite ideally they are supposed to be uniformly distributed in a pairwise fashion. This gap, present even at the initialization of models and preserved through the contrastive learning process as in CLIP [51], remains a fundamental challenge in language-image pretraining, as it affects how different types of data are jointly modeled and understood. More recent studies [32, 44, 58] show that this modality gap should be alleviated in order to improve the multimodal representation as well as the model performance on downstream tasks.

In this section, we visualize the modality gaps of CLIP and our proposed RANKCLIP. We randomly sampled 250 text-image pairs, where each image and its corresponding text are encoded into embedding space, and then reduced to two dimensions using




Figure 3: Scatter and histograms plots illustrating modality gaps of (a) CLIP and (b) RANKCLIP.

UMAP [40]. We also plot the histogram of all the gaps for each method as a complement. The results are shown in Fig. 3. We observe that RANKCLIP has significantly smaller modality gap when compared to the original CLIP, indicating that our proposed ranking consistency helps model learn more effectively about the text-image semantics, boosting deeper understandings.

6.2 Alignment and Uniformity

Besides alleviating modality gap and learning representation space through driving closer the embeddings of matched pairs, it is also commonly believed that a successful contrastive learning method should as well ensure a broad and uniform distribution covering an hypersphere in space [63]. These two goals, characterized as similarity and uniformity, can be assessed with alignment and uniformity scores respectively. More specifically, following [21] and notations defined in §3, we calculate the alignment score S_A , and uniformity score S_U as:

$$S_A = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{I}_j^T \hat{T}_j, \quad S_U = \log \left(\frac{1}{N(N-1)} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=1, j \neq k}^N \exp^{-\hat{I}_j^T \hat{T}_k} \right) \quad (12)$$

where with N being the total number of text-image pairs, S_A simply represents the averaged cosine similarity between text and image embeddings, and S_U essentially averages the dissimilarity measures (exponentiated negative dot products) between all unique pairs of text-image embeddings in the dataset, quantifying how evenly these embeddings are distributed across the space.

A high alignment score represents a strong correlation or similarity between pairs of text-image embeddings, indicating that the images and their textual descriptions are closely aligned in the embedding space. A high uniformity score suggests that embeddings are not uniformly distributed; they may be clustering together or

Table 6: Alignment and Uniformity scores of CLIP, RANKCLIP, and its ablated variants RANKCLIP_I and RANKCLIP_C.

	CIFAR-10			CIFAR-100			ImageNet1K		
	S_A	S_U	ZS-Top1	S_A	S_U	ZS-Top1	S_A	S_U	ZS-Top1
CLIP [51]	0.40	-0.35	36.35%	0.42	-0.35	12.22%	0.44	-0.29	12.08%
RANKCLIP	0.23	-0.17	37.03%	0.26	-0.16	13.98%	0.33	-0.11	17.02%
RANKCLIP _I	0.24	-0.16	37.47%	0.26	-0.15	13.89%	0.32	-0.10	16.66%
RANKCLIP _C	0.18	-0.12	28.26%	0.18	-0.10	13.29%	0.26	-0.09	16.98%

not utilizing the embedding space efficiently, which can indicate redundancy in the representations or a lack of diversity. On the other hand, a low uniformity score suggests that the embeddings are well spread out across the space, indicating a diverse and efficient use of the embedding space, which is generally desirable for tasks like retrieval, where a wide and diverse coverage of possible queries are preferred.

As shown in Table 6, we observe that, although CLIP learns representations that are better aligned, as evidenced by its top-ranking alignment scores, these representations fail to achieve uniform distribution across the hypersphere, as highlighted by its significantly higher absolute uniformity scores. On the other hand, RANKCLIP, along with two of its ablated version, RANKCLIP_I and RANKCLIP_C, presents much better balance between alignment and uniformity, which results in improved downstream task performance as illustrated in previous experiments as well as in the representative ZS-Top1 results in Table 6. We also find the results to be informative on a higher level where it indicates that optimizing contrastive learning towards single objective such as alignment or uniformity would not intuitively result in higher downstream task performance.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce RANKCLIP, a novel language-image pretraining method that incorporates ranking consistency into contrastive learning paradigm to pretrain models that better understand the more complex, many-to-many relationships inherent within wildly-sourced text-image pairs. Through a suite of comprehensive experiments across diverse datasets and tasks, including zero-shot classification, robustness to distribution shifts, linear probing, and zero-shot image-text retrieval, RANKCLIP has not only exhibited enhanced performance but also showcased improvements in model robustness and the understanding of nuanced semantic similarities, outperforming the baseline CLIP as well as another state-of-the-art approach by significant margins. Through ablation studies and additional analysis, we reveal the importance of each component of RANKCLIP in augmenting the model’s performance and semantic comprehension, thereby further illustrating that a holistic modeling of relationships within and across modalities is imperative for the advancement of vision-language pretraining. Moving forward, we hope the principles and methodologies introduced by RANKCLIP can inspire further research, driving the development of models that not only excel across a wide array of tasks but also possess a deeper, more nuanced understanding of the complex interplay between visual and linguistic data.

References

- [1] Lukas Bossard, Matthieu Guillaumin, and Luc Van Gool. 2014. Food-101 – Mining Discriminative Components with Random Forests. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*.
- [2] Chris Burges, Tal Shaked, Erin Renshaw, Ari Lazier, Matt Deeds, Nicole Hamilton, and Greg Hullender. 2005. Learning to rank using gradient descent. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning*. 89–96.
- [3] Christopher JC Burges. 2010. From ranknet to lambdarank to lambdamart: An overview. *Learning* 11, 23–581 (2010), 81.
- [4] Zhe Cao, Tao Qin, Tie-Yan Liu, Ming-Feng Tsai, and Hang Li. 2007. Learning to rank: from pairwise approach to listwise approach. In *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on Machine learning*. 129–136.
- [5] Nicholas Carlini and Andreas Terzis. 2021. Poisoning and backdooring contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09667* (2021).
- [6] Fei-Long Chen, Du-Zhen Zhang, Ming-Lun Han, Xiu-Yi Chen, Jing Shi, Shuang Xu, and Bo Xu. 2023. Vlp: A survey on vision-language pre-training. *Machine Intelligence Research* 20, 1 (2023), 38–56.
- [7] Zhaorun Chen, Zhuokai Zhao, Hongyin Luo, Huaxiu Yao, Bo Li, and Jiawei Zhou. 2024. HALC: Object Hallucination Reduction via Adaptive Focal-Contrast Decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.00425* (2024).
- [8] Zhaorun Chen, Zhuokai Zhao, Zhihong Zhu, Ruiqi Zhang, Xiang Li, Bhiksha Raj, and Huaxiu Yao. 2024. AutoPRM: Automating Procedural Supervision for Multi-Step Reasoning via Controllable Question Decomposition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11452* (2024).
- [9] KR1442 Chowdhary and KR Chowdhary. 2020. Natural language processing. *Fundamentals of artificial intelligence* (2020), 603–649.
- [10] Sanghyuk Chun. 2023. Improved probabilistic image-text representations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18171* (2023).
- [11] M. Cimpoi, S. Maji, I. Kokkinos, S. Mohamed, , and A. Vedaldi. 2014. Describing Textures in the Wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*.
- [12] Adam Coates, Andrew Ng, and Honglak Lee. 2011. An analysis of single-layer networks in unsupervised feature learning. In *Proceedings of the fourteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, 215–223.
- [13] Katherine Crowson, Stella Biderman, Daniel Kornis, Dashiell Stander, Eric Hallahan, Louis Castricato, and Edward Raff. 2022. Vqgan-clip: Open domain image generation and editing with natural language guidance. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 88–105.
- [14] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. 2009. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. Ieee, 248–255.
- [15] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- [16] Yifan Du, Zikang Liu, Junyi Li, and Wayne Xin Zhao. 2022. A survey of vision-language pre-trained models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.10936* (2022).
- [17] Yuting Gao, Jinfeng Liu, Zihan Xu, Tong Wu, Enwei Zhang, Ke Li, Jie Yang, Wei Liu, and Xing Sun. 2024. Softclip: Softer cross-modal alignment makes clip stronger. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 38. 1860–1868.
- [18] Yuting Gao, Jinfeng Liu, Zihan Xu, Jun Zhang, Ke Li, Rongrong Ji, and Chunhua Shen. 2022. Pyramidclip: Hierarchical feature alignment for vision-language model pretraining. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022), 35959–35970.
- [19] Shijie Geng, Jianbo Yuan, Yu Tian, Yuxiao Chen, and Yongfeng Zhang. 2023. HiCLIP: Contrastive language-image pretraining with hierarchy-aware attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.02995* (2023).
- [20] Taranekh Ghandi, Hamidreza Pourreza, and Hamidreza Mahyar. 2023. Deep learning approaches on image captioning: A review. *Comput. Surveys* 56, 3 (2023), 1–39.
- [21] Shashank Goel, Hritik Bansal, Sumit Bhatia, Ryan Rossi, Vishwa Vinay, and Aditya Grover. 2022. Cyclip: Cyclic contrastive language-image pretraining. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 6704–6719.
- [22] John Guiver and Edward Snelson. 2009. Bayesian inference for Plackett-Luce ranking models. In *proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning*. 377–384.
- [23] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 770–778.
- [24] Dan Hendrycks, Steven Basart, Norman Mu, Saurav Kadavath, Frank Wang, Evan Dorundo, Rahul Desai, Tyler Zhu, Samyak Parajuli, Mike Guo, et al. 2021. The many faces of robustness: A critical analysis of out-of-distribution generalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 8340–8349.
- [25] Dan Hendrycks, Kevin Zhao, Steven Basart, Jacob Steinhardt, and Dawn Song. 2021. Natural adversarial examples. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 15262–15271.
- [26] Gabriel Ilharco, Mitchell Wortsman, Ross Wightman, Cade Gordon, Nicholas Carlini, Rohan Taori, Achal Dave, Vaishaal Shankar, Hongseok Namkoong, John Miller, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Ali Farhadi, and Ludwig Schmidt. 2021. *OpenCLIP*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.5143773> If you use this software, please cite it as below..
- [27] Summaira Jabeen, Xi Li, Muhammad Shoib Amin, Omar Bourahla, Songyuan Li, and Abdul Jabbar. 2023. A review on methods and applications in multimodal deep learning. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications and Applications* 19, 2s (2023), 1–41.
- [28] Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. 2021. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 4904–4916.
- [29] Thorsten Joachims. 2002. Optimizing search engines using clickthrough data. In *Proceedings of the eighth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. 133–142.
- [30] Andrej Karpathy and Li Fei-Fei. 2015. Deep visual-semantic alignments for generating image descriptions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 3128–3137.
- [31] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. 2009. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. (2009).
- [32] Yogesh Kumar and Pekka Marttinen. 2024. Improving Medical Multi-modal Contrastive Learning with Expert Annotations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10153* (2024).
- [33] Yangguang Li, Feng Liang, Lichen Zhao, Yufeng Cui, Wanli Ouyang, Jing Shao, Fengwei Yu, and Junjie Yan. 2021. Supervision exists everywhere: A data efficient contrastive language-image pre-training paradigm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.05208* (2021).
- [34] Victor Weixin Liang, Yuhui Zhang, Yongchan Kwon, Serena Yeung, and James Y Zou. 2022. Mind the gap: Understanding the modality gap in multi-modal contrastive representation learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 17612–17625.
- [35] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. 2014. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, Proceedings, Part V 13*. Springer, 740–755.
- [36] Tie-Yan Liu et al. 2009. Learning to rank for information retrieval. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval* 3, 3 (2009), 225–331.
- [37] Siyu Long, Feiqi Cao, Soyeon Caren Han, and Haiqin Yang. 2022. Vision-and-language pretrained models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.07356* (2022).
- [38] R Duncan Luce. 2005. *Individual choice behavior: A theoretical analysis*. Courier Corporation.
- [39] S. Maji, J. Kannala, E. Rahtu, M. Blaschko, and A. Vedaldi. 2013. *Fine-Grained Visual Classification of Aircraft*. Technical Report. arXiv:1306.5151 [cs-cv]
- [40] Leland McInnes, John Healy, and James Melville. 2018. Umap: Uniform manifold approximation and projection for dimension reduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.03426* (2018).
- [41] John P Miller, Rohan Taori, Aditi Raghunathan, Shiori Sagawa, Pang Wei Koh, Vaishaal Shankar, Percy Liang, Yair Carmon, and Ludwig Schmidt. 2021. Accuracy on the line: on the strong correlation between out-of-distribution and in-distribution generalization. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 7721–7735.
- [42] Norman Mu, Alexander Kirillov, David Wagner, and Saining Xie. 2022. Slip: Self-supervision meets language-image pre-training. In *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 529–544.
- [43] Yuval Netzer, Tao Wang, Adam Coates, Alessandro Bissacco, Baolin Wu, Andrew Y Ng, et al. 2011. Reading digits in natural images with unsupervised feature learning. In *NIPS workshop on deep learning and unsupervised feature learning*, Vol. 2011. Granada, Spain, 7.
- [44] Changdae Oh, Junhyuk So, Hoyoon Byun, Yongtaek Lim, Minchul Shin, Jong-June Jeon, and Kyungwoo Song. 2024. Geodesic multi-modal mixup for robust fine-tuning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [45] Aaron van den Oord, Yazhe Li, and Oriol Vinyals. 2018. Representation learning with contrastive predictive coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.03748* (2018).
- [46] Omkar M Parkhi, Andrea Vedaldi, Andrew Zisserman, and CV Jawahar. 2012. Cats and dogs. In *2012 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. IEEE, 3498–3505.
- [47] Hieu Pham, Zihang Dai, Golnaz Ghiasi, Kenji Kawaguchi, Hanxiao Liu, Adams Wei Yu, Jiahui Yu, Yi-Ting Chen, Minh-Thang Luong, Yonghui Wu, et al. 2023. Combined scaling for zero-shot transfer learning. *Neurocomputing* 555 (2023), 126658.
- [48] Robin L Plackett. 1975. The analysis of permutations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series C: Applied Statistics* 24, 2 (1975), 193–202.
- [49] Bryan A Plummer, Liwei Wang, Chris M Cervantes, Juan C Caicedo, Julia Hockenmaier, and Svetlana Lazebnik. 2015. Flickr30k entities: Collecting region-to-phrase correspondences for richer image-to-sentence models. In *Proceedings of*

- the IEEE international conference on computer vision. 2641–2649.
- [50] Farhad Pourpanah, Moloud Abdar, Yuxuan Luo, Xinlei Zhou, Ran Wang, Chee Peng Lim, Xi-Zhao Wang, and QM Jonathan Wu. 2022. A review of generalized zero-shot learning methods. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 45, 4 (2022), 4051–4070.
 - [51] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 8748–8763.
 - [52] Aditya Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. 2021. Zero-shot text-to-image generation. In *International conference on machine learning*. Pmlr, 8821–8831.
 - [53] Benjamin Recht, Rebecca Roelofs, Ludwig Schmidt, and Vaishaal Shankar. 2019. Do imagenet classifiers generalize to imagenet?. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 5389–5400.
 - [54] Olga Russakovsky, Jia Deng, Hao Su, Jonathan Krause, Sanjeev Satheesh, Sean Ma, Zhiheng Huang, Andrej Karpathy, Aditya Khosla, Michael Bernstein, Alexander C. Berg, and Li Fei-Fei. 2015. ImageNet Large Scale Visual Recognition Challenge. *International Journal of Computer Vision (IJCV)* 115, 3 (2015), 211–252. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11263-015-0816-y>
 - [55] Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, Sebastian Goodman, and Radu Soricut. 2018. 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)*. 2556–2565.
 - [56] Amanpreet Singh, Ronghang Hu, Vedanuj Goswami, Guillaume Couairon, Wojciech Galuba, Marcus Rohrbach, and Douwe Kiela. 2022. Flava: A foundational language and vision alignment model. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 15638–15650.
 - [57] Richard Socher, Alex Perelygin, Jean Wu, Jason Chuang, Christopher D Manning, Andrew Y Ng, and Christopher Potts. 2013. Recursive deep models for semantic compositionality over a sentiment treebank. In *Proceedings of the 2013 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*. 1631–1642.
 - [58] Siddharth Srivastava and Gaurav Sharma. 2024. Omnivec: Learning robust representations with cross modal sharing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. 1236–1248.
 - [59] J. Stallkamp, M. Schlupsing, J. Salmen, and C. Igel. 2012. Man vs. computer: Benchmarking machine learning algorithms for traffic sign recognition. *Neural Networks* 0 (2012), -. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2012.02.016>
 - [60] Ajinkya Tejankar, Maziar Sanjabi, Bichen Wu, Saining Xie, Madian Khabza, Hamed Pirsiavash, and Hamed Firooz. 2021. A fistful of words: Learning transferable visual models from bag-of-words supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.13884* (2021).
 - [61] Athanasios Voulodimos, Nikolaos Doulamis, Anastasios Doulamis, and Eftychios Protopapadakis. 2018. Deep learning for computer vision: A brief review. *Computational intelligence and neuroscience* 2018 (2018).
 - [62] Haohan Wang, Songwei Ge, Zachary Lipton, and Eric P Xing. 2019. Learning robust global representations by penalizing local predictive power. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32 (2019).
 - [63] Tongzhou Wang and Phillip Isola. 2020. Understanding contrastive representation learning through alignment and uniformity on the hypersphere. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 9929–9939.
 - [64] Fen Xia, Tie-Yan Liu, Jue Wang, Wensheng Zhang, and Hang Li. 2008. Listwise approach to learning to rank: theory and algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*. 1192–1199.
 - [65] Kaicheng Yang, Jiankang Deng, Xiang An, Jiawei Li, Ziyong Feng, Jia Guo, Jing Yang, and Tongliang Liu. 2023. Alip: Adaptive language-image pre-training with synthetic caption. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 2922–2931.
 - [66] Lewei Yao, Runhui Huang, Lu Hou, Guansong Lu, Minzhe Niu, Hang Xu, Xiaodan Liang, Zhenguo Li, Xin Jiang, and Chunjing Xu. 2021. Filip: Fine-grained interactive language-image pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.07783* (2021).
 - [67] Zhuokai Zhao, Harish Palani, Tianyi Liu, Lena Evans, and Ruth Toner. 2023. Multi-Modality Guidance Network For Missing Modality Inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03452* (2023).