

Resilience through Scene Context in Visual Referring Expression Generation

Simeon Junker and Sina Zarriß

Bielefeld University

{simeon.junker,sina.zarriess}@uni-bielefeld.de


Abstract

Scene context is well known to facilitate humans’ perception of visible objects. In this paper, we investigate the role of context in Referring Expression Generation (REG) for objects in images, where existing research has often focused on distractor contexts that exert pressure on the generator. We take a new perspective on scene context in REG and hypothesize that contextual information can be conceived of as a resource that makes REG models more resilient and facilitates the generation of object descriptions, and object types in particular. We train and test Transformer-based REG models with target representations that have been artificially obscured with noise to varying degrees. We evaluate how properties of the models’ visual context affect their processing and performance. Our results show that even simple scene contexts make models surprisingly resilient to perturbations, to the extent that they can identify referent types even when visual information about the target is completely missing.

1 Introduction

Objects do not appear randomly in the world that surrounds us, but they occur in predictable spatial, semantic, or functional configurations and relations to their environment. Research on human perception shows that we “see the world in scenes” (Bar, 2004), and that prior experience and knowledge of the world helps us to efficiently process visual stimuli. Even with an extremely short glimpse at an image, humans remember essential semantic aspects of the scene and object arrangement (Oliva and Torralba, 2006). This rapid scene understanding allows us to handle the complexity of the visual world and to recognize objects in context, e.g., when they are not fully visible (Vö, 2021).

In this paper, we take a new perspective on how visual context facilitates the automatic generation of descriptions for visual objects, a task well-known as Referring Expression Generation



TRF_{v-0.0} couch on right (A)
 TRF_{v-0.5} right brown chair (F)
 TRF_{v-1.0} right couch (A)
 TRF_{t-0.0} right couch (A)
 TRF_{t-0.5} right couch (A)
 TRF_{t-1.0} right elephant (F)
 TRF_{s-0.0} couch on right (A)
 TRF_{s-0.5} right couch (A)
 TRF_{s-1.0} right couch (A)

Figure 1: Example from RefCOCO testB (displayed with noise level 0.5) with generated expressions and human judgements. Scene context enables target identification even with full occlusion (TRF_{v-1.0}, TRF_{s-1.0})

(REG). In past years, datasets have become available that provide referring expressions for objects in images, with objects appearing in relatively complex real-world contexts (Kazemzadeh et al., 2014; Mao et al., 2016). Yet, recent work in this area has largely followed the traditional REG paradigm by Dale and Reiter 1995, where (visual) context is mainly considered in terms of so-called distractor objects, that are similar to the target and must therefore be excluded by naming differences (Krahmer and van Deemter, 2012).

These distractors do not facilitate the description task, but even exert “contextual pressure”, as the speaker needs to reason about which attributes and words make the expression unambiguous (Cohn-Gordon et al., 2018; Schüz and Zarriß, 2021). The main goal of this paper is to widen this commonly accepted view on the role of visual context in visual REG and investigate how contextual information can be conceived as a resource that makes the generation of descriptions easier rather than harder.

In *visual REG* from images, scene and object in-

formation is not available a priori: Whereas classical REG algorithms mostly rely on symbolic scene representations, neural generation models in visual REG have to extract object properties from low-level visual representations of the target and its context (Schüz et al., 2023). This even applies to properties as fundamental as the *type* of an object, i.e. how it is *named* in the expression. Under ideal conditions, determining a referent’s type and properties can be regarded as a relatively simple task, but it becomes non-trivial in the presence of imperfect visual information, occlusion or noise. At the same time, global visual scene context can be expected to be of great support in this task, in light of previous findings on human scene understanding (cf. Section 2). However, to date, little is known as to how processes of scene understanding and object type identification interact in REG.

In this work, we hypothesize that visual scene context makes REG models more *resilient*, i.e., it allows them to recalibrate predictions that were based on imperfect target representations. To test this, we adopt a novel experimental setup for REG: we train and test different model architectures with target representations that have been artificially obscured with varying degrees of noise (cf. Figure 1). We provide the models with different context representations and compare their performance concerning common quality metrics and a focused human evaluation of their ability to determine referent types. We test how certain properties of the visual context affect the processing and performance of REG models, and verify our results with experiments using further datasets that are substantially different from the ones commonly used in existing REG research. Our results show that context makes models surprisingly resilient to perturbations in target representations, to the extent that they can identify referent types even when information about the objects themselves is completely missing. We believe that these results offer new perspectives on the role of scene context in visual REG.

2 Background

Human scene understanding Research on human vision and perception emphasizes the fact that scenes are not mere collections of objects (Vö, 2021). When humans *view* a scene, they do not simply recognize the objects in it, but they *understand* it is a coherent whole. Oliva and Torralba (2006) observe that humans perceive the so-called gist of

a scene rapidly and even when local information is missing (e.g. blurred). Experiments in this field indicate that contextual information can facilitate the recognition of visible objects across different tasks (Oliva and Torralba, 2007; Divvala et al., 2009; Galleguillos and Belongie, 2010; Parikh et al., 2012), and that, on the other hand, incongruent context can also be misleading (Zhang et al., 2020; Gupta et al., 2022). This means that the human vision exploits learned knowledge about these regularities of the visual word for visual processing (Biederman, 1972; Bar, 2004; Greene, 2013; Pereira and Castelhamo, 2014; Sadeghi et al., 2015). To model these regularities, Vö (2021) proposed the notion of a “scene grammar” that can account for the interaction of global and local visual perception and understanding in humans.

Scenes, objects, and image captioning Much research on V&L is currently concerned with modeling the generation and understanding of image descriptions, e.g. in tasks like image captioning or retrieval. Yet, many captioning tasks focus on rather object-centric descriptions that mention objects and their spatial relationships (Cafagna et al., 2021). A common representation of scene context in image captioning is scene graphs, cf. (Yang et al., 2023), which are usually modeled via spatial relations between bounding boxes of objects. Cafagna et al. 2023 propose a new task and dataset that foregrounds scene-level instead of object-centric descriptions. Another perspective on scene knowledge in captioning models is coming from work that focuses on probing them with perturbed or systematically varied images: Yin and Ordonez (2017) found that captioning with extremely reduced inputs of labeled object layouts performs surprisingly well. Related to this, Nikolaus et al. (2019) find that image captioning models often rely on regularities in object occurrences, to the extent that they fail to generalize to new combinations of objects. Their solution is to generate unseen combinations and challenge models on these. Our goal in this work is complementary: we aim to understand how exactly generation models may be able to leverage regular scene knowledge and patterns of object co-occurrence, and how this may facilitate the handling of imperfect visual information.

REG and scene context REG is concerned with the generation of descriptions that distinguish a particular object in a given visual context, cf. Krah-

mer and van Deemter 2012. Recent visual REG models usually build on image captioning models but are adapted to generate more pragmatically informative expressions, using e.g. training objectives (Mao et al., 2016), comprehension modules (Luo and Shakhnarovich, 2017), reinforcement agents (Yu et al., 2017) or decoding strategies (Schüz and Zarriß, 2021). REG models usually process different forms of context information. Whereas some models encode differences in appearance between targets and surrounding objects (Yu et al., 2016, 2017; Tanaka et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2020), others use representations of the global image (Mao et al., 2016; Luo and Shakhnarovich, 2017; Zarriß and Schlangen, 2018; Panagiaris et al., 2020, 2021). Visual context is often supplemented with the relative position and size of the target in the image (Mao et al., 2016; Yu et al., 2017; Luo and Shakhnarovich, 2017; Li and Jiang, 2018; Tanaka et al., 2019; Kim et al., 2020; Panagiaris et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2020).

Research gap Little is known about how visual REG models internally exploit their context representations and in what way context exactly enhances the generation of expressions. Here, the implicit assumption often is that models exploit context in a similar way as symbolic REG models, e.g. the Incremental Algorithms by (Reiter and Dale, 2000). However, a key difference to symbolic REG is that in visual REG failures in the scene and object understanding can arise from model hallucination or imperfect visual input, cf. (Schüz et al., 2023). This is especially evident for the *type* of objects: this attribute had a privileged role in early works (Dale and Reiter, 1995) as they are essential as the heads of referential noun phrases. In visual REG, referents must first be correctly identified to *name* them appropriately (Zarriß and Schlangen, 2017; Silberer et al., 2020a,b), which is challenging in cases of deficient input, e.g. small or partially occluded objects (Yao and Fei-Fei, 2010). In this paper, we aim to close this gap and investigate how visual context information helps REG models to be more resilient to deficits in their target inputs.

3 Experimental Set-Up

3.1 Outline and Research Hypotheses

The main idea of this work is to train and test standard REG models on visual target representations occluded with varying amounts of noise, to investi-

gate how different combinations of target and context can compensate for this perturbation. For this, we draw on existing model architectures, and evaluate the trained models using both out-of-the-box quality metrics and more fine-grained human evaluation capturing the validity of assigned referent type labels. The evaluation results are also supported by supplementary analyses as well as further experiments with an additional data set.

Generally, we expect that automatic metrics and human evaluation scores will drop for increasing amounts of target noise. However, we also hypothesize that visual context makes models more resilient, i.e., for the same amount of noise, models supplied with context outperform variants with only target information. While we expect this general effect across all conditions, it should be more pronounced as the amount of occlusion increases.

3.2 Models

We set up two transformer-based REG models: TRF and CC. TRF is a transformer trained from scratch on REG data, CC builds upon a pre-trained language model. We define variants of both models using a) different combinations of target and context representations, as the respective model inputs, and b) the amount of target noise during training and inference. Implementation and training details for our models can be found in appendix B.

Target representations include the visual contents of the target bounding box (V_t), its location, and size relative to the global image (Loc_t). As context representations, we use the embedding of the global image with the target masked out (V_c). For TRF, which is our better performing model, we also experiment with scene-level information (or *scene summaries*) about *what kinds of objects* are present in the surrounding scene (S_c), which are derived from panoptic segmentations (Kirillov et al. 2018, see Section 3.3). Models processing only target information are indicated with the subscript t , whereas models processing V_c and S_c context information are indexed with v and s , respectively.

To test our systems for perturbed target representations, we randomly replaced a fixed proportion of the pixels in the bounding box contents with random noise during both training and inference. All systems are trained and tested with three noise settings: 0.0 as our baseline setting, where no pixels are perturbed; 0.5, where 50% of the pixels are replaced with noise; and 1.0, where the entire

content of the target bounding box is occluded, i.e. no visual information about the target is available. Noise levels for training and evaluation are shown in the index of the model identifiers.

Vanilla Transformer (TRF) We use the model from Schüz and Zarrieß (2023), which is based on an existing implementation for image captioning.¹ The model builds on ResNet (He et al., 2015) encodings for targets and context, which are passed on to an encoder/decoder transformer in the style of Vaswani et al. (2017). The model is largely comparable to the system in Panagiaris et al. (2021), but without self-critical sequence training and layer-wise connections between encoder and decoder. Unlike e.g. Mao et al. (2016), we train the model using Cross Entropy Loss.

We compare three variants of this model, which take as input concatenated feature vectors comprised of the representations described above. TRF_t receives only target information, i.e. the input vector is composed as $[V_t; \text{Loc}_t]$. In addition to this, TRF_v receives representations of the global image, with the input vector structure $[V_t; \text{Loc}_t; V_c]$. Finally, TRF_s takes scene-level representations about the relative area occupied by different object classes in the visual context, i.e. $[V_t; \text{Loc}_t; S_c]$.

For both V_t and V_c , the respective parts of the image are scaled to 224×224 resolution (keeping the original ratio and masking out the padding) and encoded with ResNet-152 (He et al., 2015), resulting in representations with 196 features (14×14) and hidden size 512 for both target and context. Loc_t is a vector of length 5 with the corner coordinates of the target bounding box and its area relative to the whole image, projected to the model’s hidden size. The scene summary input for TRF_s consists of 134 features, which represent the relative area all of the 134 object or stuff types in COCO occupy in the visual context. To use this information in our model, we embed each of the object and stuff types in an additional embedding layer with 512, which is jointly trained with the model. In the model’s forward pass, we weight each of the individual category embeddings with the relative area it occupies in the respective input image, and form S_c by concatenating the embeddings.

Fine-tuned GPT-2 (CC) We adapt the *ClipCap* model in Mokady et al. (2021) to the REG task. The authors use a simple MLP-based mapping net-

work to construct fixed-size prefixes for GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019) from CLIP encodings (Radford et al., 2021), and fine-tune both the mapping network and the language model for the image captioning task. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first model tested for REG which utilizes a pre-trained language model.

As for the TRF model, we compare different variants of this base architecture. First, in CC_t , the GPT-2 prefix is constructed as $[V_t; \text{Loc}_t]$, where V_t is computed like the CLIP prefix in the original paper (but for the contents of the target bounding box) and Loc_t is the location features described above, projected into a single prefix token. For CC_v , we again add the global image (minus the target) as context: V_c is computed in the same way as V_t , but with a separate mapping network and with the global image as the visual input. Here, the final prefix is $[V_t; V_c; \text{Loc}_t]$.

3.3 Data

We use RefCOCO (Kazemzadeh et al., 2014) for training and evaluation, which contains bounding boxes and expressions for MSCOCO images (Lin et al., 2014). The dataset contains separate *testA* and *testB* splits (1.9k and 1.8k items), where *testA* only contains humans as referential targets and *testB* all other object classes (but not humans).

We also conduct experiments on the detection dataset PACO-EGO4D (Ramanathan et al., 2023), which contains annotations for objects and object parts in first-person video frames (Grauman et al., 2022). In comparison to RefCOCO, PACO is larger (75k items in test split), data is less standardized and objects are often harder to recognize.

To construct the scene summaries for our TRF_s model and analyze attention allocation patterns, we rely on annotations for panoptic segmentation (Kirillov et al., 2018), i.e. dense pixel-level segmentation masks for both *thing* and *stuff* classes in MSCOCO images (Caesar et al., 2016).

3.4 Evaluation

Generation Quality / N-Gram Metrics To estimate the general generation capabilities of our models we rely on BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002) and CIDEr (Vedantam et al., 2014) as established metrics for automatic evaluation.

Referent Type Assignment / Human Evaluation To test whether our models succeed in assigning valid types to referents, we collect human judge-

¹<https://github.com/saahiluppal/catr>

ments for generated expressions for a subset of 200 items from the RefCOCO *testB* split. This split contains only non-human referents, and was chosen due to preliminary tests indicating that judgments about the validity of type labels for human referents are often difficult, e.g. due to ambiguity regarding the gender of depicted individuals. The annotators were instructed to rate only those parts of the expressions that refer to the type of the referential target. For example, “the black dog” should be rated as correct if the target is of the type dog, but is actually white. All items should be assigned exactly one of the following categories:

- **Adequate / A:** The generated expression contains a valid type description for the referent.
- **Misaligned / M:** Type designators do not apply to the intended target, but to other objects (partially) captured by the bounding box.
- **Omission / O:** Omission of the target type, e.g. description via non-type attributes, pronominalization or general nouns such as “thing”.
- **False / F:** Type designations that do not apply to the intended target or other objects captured by the bounding box.

Previous research has shown considerable variation in object naming (Silberer et al. 2020a,b, among others). Therefore, for the A category, type descriptions do not have to match the ground truth annotations, but different labels can be considered adequate if they represent valid descriptions of the target type. For example, *dog*, *pet* and *animal* would be considered equally correct for depicted dogs. Subsequent to the human evaluation, we investigate correlations between the evaluation results and further properties of the visual context.

Referent Type Assignment / Classification Accuracy We complement the human evaluation with RefCOCO with further experiments using PACO-EGO4D. While PACO does not provide referring expressions, we treat the object and object-part annotations similarly, i.e. our models generate the category strings (instead of predicting the respective category in a multiclass classification scheme). We evaluate the identification of object and part types by measuring the accuracy of the models in exactly reproducing the respective category strings (for entire objects) or the strings in the object-part tuples (for object parts).

Attention Allocation We also examine how our TRF_v model allocates attention over different parts of the input as a result of different noise levels during training. First, we follow Schüz and Zarriß (2023) in measuring the ratio between *target* and *context* partitions, i.e. the summed attention weights directed to the target and its context in both the encoder and decoder multi-head attention. For this, we compute α_t , α_l and α_c as the cumulative attention weights directed to V_t , Loc_t and V_c , respectively, by calculating the sum of the attention weights assigned to each input partition, normalized such that $\alpha_t + \alpha_l + \alpha_c = 1$. We also quantify the attention difference between α_t and α_c as $\Delta_{t,c}$, by excluding α_l and normalizing the target and context scores such that $\alpha_t + \alpha_c = 1$. Then, we calculate $\Delta_{t,c} = \alpha_t - \alpha_c$, i.e. $0 < \Delta_{t,c} \leq 1$ if there is relative focus on the target, $-1 \leq \Delta_{t,c} < 0$ if there is relative focus on the context, and $\Delta_{t,c} = 0$ when both parts are weighted equally.

Second, we measure the model attention allocated to different classes of objects in the visual context, using the panoptic segmentation data described in Section 3.3. Here, we first interpolate the model attention map to fit the original dimensions of the image, and retrieve the segmentation masks for the respective image. For each category $x \in X$, we then compute the cumulative attention weight α_x by computing the sum of pixels attributed to this category, weighted by the model attention scores over the image and normalized such that $\sum_{x \in X} \alpha_x = 1$. We report $\alpha_{x=tgt}$, i.e. attention allocated to areas of the visual context assigned *the same category as the referential target*. As the covered area varies between object categories, we get different scores even if the model attention is perfectly balanced over the image. To address this, we also report scores that are normalized by the area covered by the category. Scores > 1 indicate that the category is attended more than to be expected based on the coverage area.

4 Results on RefCOCO

4.1 Automatic Quality Metrics

Table 1 shows the results of the automatic evaluation of our systems on RefCOCO testA and testB. Interestingly, throughout all conditions, the simpler TRF model outperforms CC, although the latter builds on pre-trained CLIP and GPT-2 which are known to be effective for image captioning (Mokady et al., 2021). It is possible that CC can-

system	testA			testB		
	Bl ₁	Bl ₂	CDr	Bl ₁	Bl ₂	CDr
TRF _{t-0.0}	0.55	0.35	0.86	0.57	0.35	1.28
TRF _{t-0.5}	0.49	0.32	0.73	0.51	0.32	1.04
TRF _{t-1.0}	0.35	0.17	0.34	0.30	0.14	0.20
TRF _{v-0.0}	0.58	0.39	0.93	0.61	0.39	1.36
TRF _{v-0.5}	0.54	0.35	0.81	0.56	0.36	1.24
TRF _{v-1.0}	0.46	0.29	0.60	0.55	0.36	1.14
TRF _{s-0.0}	0.54	0.34	0.84	0.57	0.35	1.27
TRF _{s-0.5}	0.52	0.35	0.81	0.56	0.35	1.28
TRF _{s-1.0}	0.42	0.24	0.51	0.53	0.33	1.12
CC _{t-0.0}	0.48	0.30	0.70	0.47	0.28	0.88
CC _{t-0.5}	0.38	0.22	0.48	0.36	0.20	0.52
CC _{t-1.0}	0.35	0.16	0.37	0.29	0.12	0.16
CC _{v-0.0}	0.57	0.38	0.92	0.58	0.37	1.25
CC _{v-0.5}	0.51	0.32	0.77	0.49	0.31	0.97
CC _{v-1.0}	0.40	0.23	0.46	0.38	0.21	0.46

Table 1: BLEU₁, BLEU₂ and CIDEr scores on RefCOCO testA and testB for all TRF and CC variants. Systems indicated with *t* can only access target information, *v* and *s* models are supplied with visual context and *scene summaries*, respectively. Target noise proportions (0.0, 0.5, 1.0) are denoted in the indices. Generally, context information leads to improved results, especially for high noise settings.

not fully benefit from CLIP pre-training due to the structural differences between bounding box contents and full images, or that performance drops result from higher compression when constructing the GPT prefixes. Also, TRF achieves a considerably larger performance gain than CC when adding scene context, indicating that this model is more effective at exploiting contextual information.

For both TRF and CC, scores consistently drop with increasing target noise. However, this is mitigated if context is available: For both model types, variants incorporating visual context are substantially more robust against target noise, even in cases where target representations are entirely occluded by noise (1.0 in the subscripts). A striking example is RefCOCO testB, where CIDEr drops to 0.20 for TRF_{t-1.0} and 0.16 for CC_{t-1.0}, but TRF_{v-1.0} achieves scores as high as 1.14. Here, CC_{v-1.0} drastically underperforms with CIDEr 0.46, but still outperforms its no-context counterpart.

Interestingly, we see considerable differences between testA and testB. Both TRF_{t-1.0} and CC_{t-1.0} achieve better results on testA, but the scores are generally higher on testB. Importantly, testA is restricted to human referents, while testB encom-

passes all non-human object classes. Therefore, models without any access to meaningful visual input could often *guess right* on the frequent human classes, but struggle with the higher variation in testB. This is supported by the inverse pattern that visual context particularly improves the testB results. Here, differences between *t* and *v* variants are much higher, suggesting that context is more informative for non-human objects, i.e. there are stronger associations between certain types of objects and the contexts in which they occur.

Another striking result is that the same patterns emerge if we exchange visual context representations with more abstract *scene summaries*: TRF_{s-1.0} achieves CIDEr 1.12 for entirely occluded targets in testB, comparable to TRF_{v-1.0}. Interestingly, between TRF_{s-0.0} and TRF_{s-0.5} the scene model slightly *improves* in CIDEr scores, i.e. it can fully compensate for partial target occlusion.

4.2 Target Identification

Human judgements were collected from 5 expert annotators, including the first author. Every system was evaluated independently by three annotators, with a Fleiss’ Kappa of 0.85, indicating *almost perfect* agreement (Landis and Koch, 1977). The final judgments are determined by majority vote.

The human evaluation results for the 200-item subset of RefCOCO testB are shown in Table 2 and illustrated in Figure 2. Generally, the results mirror the pattern in the BLEU and CIDEr scores discussed previously: Across all conditions, *A* scores drop if noise ratios increase, while *F* scores increase at the same time. For *M* and *O* the results are less clear, but higher noise settings generally lead to higher rates than the baseline setting for both categories. This holds for TRF and CC, but TRF again performs better throughout all conditions. Again, visual context clearly allows the models to compensate for deficient target representations: While CC_{v-1.0} assigns adequate types in almost 20% of all cases (as compared to 0.5% without context information), TRF_{v-1.0} scores an impressive 66%, only 15.5% less than without any target noise.

Interestingly, *scene summaries* allow the model to compensate for deficient target representations even more effectively. Across all noise settings, TRF_s achieves the highest *A* scores and the lowest *F* and *O* rates, even without any target noise, unlike for BLEU and CIDEr (cf. Section 4.1).

	% A	% F	% O	% M
TRF _{t-0.0}	84.0	10.5	5.0	0.5
TRF _{t-0.5}	66.0	27.5	4.0	2.5
TRF _{t-1.0}	1.5	75.5	19.5	3.5
TRF _{v-0.0}	81.5	12.0	5.5	1.0
TRF _{v-0.5}	70.5	18.5	7.0	4.0
TRF _{v-1.0}	66.0	26.5	4.0	3.5
TRF _{s-0.0}	89.0	7.0	3.5	0.5
TRF _{s-0.5}	81.0	14.5	2.5	2.0
TRF _{s-1.0}	68.0	22.0	1.5	8.5
CC _{n-0.0}	45.5	46.5	7.0	1.0
CC _{n-0.5}	23.0	61.0	13.0	3.0
CC _{n-1.0}	0.5	84.5	11.0	4.0
CC _{v-0.0}	76.0	21.0	3.0	0.0
CC _{v-0.5}	55.0	36.0	6.5	2.5
CC _{v-1.0}	19.5	68.5	9.0	3.0
human	91.0	2.0	6.5	0.5

Table 2: Results of the human evaluation on 200 items from RefCOCO-testB. Generally, contextual information leads to more *adequate* type descriptions, even if target representations are entirely occluded.

4.3 How do models exploit scene context?

So far, our results indicate that the scene context of referential targets greatly improves the resilience of REG, to the extent that correct predictions are possible to a surprising rate even if target information is missing. Here, we aim to analyze how exactly contextual information is exploited by the models. As discussed in Section 2, previous research indicates that regularities of object co-occurrence and scene properties facilitate e.g. object recognition in context. However, qualitative inspection of our data indicates that for high noise, our systems often *copy* from context, i.e. correctly predict referent types that are also present in the surrounding scene, given that many classes of objects tend to appear in groups. We investigate this in more detail and (a) perform statistical tests to check whether similar objects in context support identification performance and (b) analyze the attention distribution for TRF_v to see whether the model learns to attend to the respective objects in context.

Statistical analysis: Target categories in context

We hypothesize that recalibration through context should be more effective when the target class is also present in the scene. To test this, we conduct a correlation analysis between identification accuracy and the relative coverage of the target class in the context. For this, we again rely on panoptic

segmentation annotations (cf. Section 3.3) to compute the proportion of pixels of the same class as the referential target, normalized by the total size of the context. We binarize the human evaluation scores (*True* if rated as *A*, else *False*) and compute the Point-biserial correlation coefficient between the relative coverage of the target class in context and the identification accuracy.

For both TRF_{v-1.0} (corr: 0.321, $p < 0.001$) and TRF_{s-1.0} (corr: 0.277, $p < 0.001$) we found that a higher prevalence of the target class in the visual context leads to significantly higher scores in human evaluation, i.e. systems can easier compensate a lack of visual target information if the context contains similar objects. For CC_{v-1.0}, we see the same trend, but without statistical significance (corr: 0.136, $p = 0.055$). For cases, where neither system can identify the target class, we see a strong inverse correlation (corr: -0.267, $p < 0.001$).

Model attention to target category in context

To see whether the TRF_v model has indeed learned the hypothesized copying strategy, we compute the distribution of attention mass directed to target, location and context partitions as well as to objects sharing the target category in the visual context, as described in Section 3.4.

In Table 3, we report the analysis results, averaged for all items in the RefCOCO testB split. The $\Delta_{t,c}$ scores show that the context partition receives more attention if the target is occluded with noise during the training, in line with our previous results. However, surprisingly, more attention is allocated to the context in the 0.5 noise setting than if no target information is accessible. The α scores also indicate that location features are especially focused in this case, suggesting that this source of information is especially helpful if visual target information is reduced, but not entirely missing.

As shown by the $\alpha_{x=tgt}$ scores in Table 3, target noise during model training does not seem to have a consistent effect on encoder attention to context objects sharing the target category. For the decoder, however, we see a notable increase: Whereas the baseline model assigns an average of 26.94 % of its attention mass on context objects with the target class, this is significantly increased for higher noise settings (40.56 % and 43.66 %). The normalized results exhibit the same patterns, i.e. as a result of target noise, context objects sharing the target class receive more than double of the attention mass as to be expected based on their size in the image.

	Encoder						Decoder					
	$\alpha_{x=tgt}$	norm.	α_t	α_l	α_c	$\Delta_{t,c}$	$\alpha_{x=tgt}$	norm.	α_t	α_l	α_c	$\Delta_{t,c}$
TRF _{v-0.0}	36.70	1.77	44.49	9.20	46.31	-0.02	26.94	1.20	52.65	9.69	37.67	0.16
TRF _{v-0.5}	35.27	1.64	18.90	16.06	65.04	-0.55	40.56	2.05	32.65	14.41	52.94	-0.24
TRF _{v-1.0}	35.63	1.70	41.05	0.67	58.28	-0.17	43.66	2.26	43.75	0.48	55.78	-0.12

Table 3: Attention allocation scores for TRF_v, averaged over all RefCOCO testB items. α scores are reported in %.

These results suggest that the TRF model learns to exploit the occurrence of similar objects in target and context as a common property of scenes in RefCOCO. However, due to the prevalence of frequent object classes and the reliance on published photos, it is unclear how representative these results are. In the next section, we examine whether these patterns can be replicated for the PACO dataset.

5 Results on PACO

In our experiments on the EGO4D portion of the PACO dataset (Section 3.3), we treat the category strings in the detection dataset as expressions and train TRF_t and TRF_c to generate those strings given the contents of the target bounding box and (for the latter variant) the visual context (see Section 3.4). We report accuracy scores for the test split in Table 4. Here, notably, the TRF_t variant achieves higher accuracy scores than TRF_v, unless the entire visual target representation is covered with random noise. This suggests that visual context is less informative or more difficult to process in PACO than RefCOCO. However, the (comparably small) gain of TRF_{v-1.0} over TRF_{t-1.0} indicates that the model can leverage the visual context to a certain degree. While some of the differences to RefCOCO may result from different experimental settings (e.g. class strings instead of expressions), the PACO results also hint towards general problems with datasets relying on scraped images such as RefCOCO, in that they may not be sufficiently representative of the visual complexity in everyday scenes.

6 Discussion and Conclusion

Our findings show that contextual information about the surroundings of referential targets makes REG models more resilient against perturbations in visual target representations. Even for conditions where no target information is present at all, REG models maintain good results in automatic quality metrics and identify referent types with high accuracy, as shown in the human evaluation results. This holds for different kinds of

	acc_{obj}	$acc_{obj-part}$
TRF _{t-0.0}	60.93	34.03
TRF _{t-0.5}	45.30	25.57
TRF _{t-1.0}	16.47	7.55
TRF _{v-0.0}	56.97	33.22
TRF _{v-0.5}	34.92	20.31
TRF _{v-1.0}	22.34	11.11

Table 4: Results for TRF_t and TRF_v on PACO-EGO4D. acc_{obj} describes the accuracy for reproducing object category strings, $acc_{obj-part}$ for reproducing (*object*, *part*) tuples for annotated object parts.

context: While especially the TRF_v model is able to leverage ResNet encodings of image contents outside the target bounding box, the same applies to scene-level representations of depicted objects, as included in the TRF_s model.

Interestingly, our subsequent analysis suggest that our context models implicitly learned to *copy* from the visual context, i.e. assign labels to referents which also apply to visible context objects. While the weaker context effects in our PACO results suggest that this strategy is not universally applicable, it appears to be highly effective the more regular RefCOCO data. This is in stark contrast to basic assumptions of the REG paradigm, where context information is considered important mainly to ensure that references can be resolved without ambiguity. Here, we show, that is also a valuable source for further communicative goals, i.e. the *truthfulness* of generated expressions.

Overall, our results indicate that the influence of visual context in REG is more multifaceted than reflected in previous studies. Importantly, however, this study only provides an initial spotlight, as research in related fields suggests that there are other and more complex ways in which visual scene context may facilitate reference production. With this in mind, we strongly advocate further research into scene context at the interface of perceptual psychology, computer vision and language generation.

7 Limitations

We identify the following limitations in our study:

First, in both training and evaluation, we do not consider pragmatic informativeness as a core criterion for the REG task. We train our models using Cross Entropy Loss and do not test whether the generated expressions unambiguously describe the referential target, instead focusing on semantic adequacy as an important prerequisite for the generation of successful referential expressions. However, we acknowledge that a comprehensive view would require the consideration of both semantic and pragmatic aspects.

Also, we do not consider recent developments such as multimodal LLMs, although the high diversity of their training data would contribute an interesting aspect to this study. Here, we selected our models with a focus on both modifiability and transparent processing.

Finally, additional vision and language datasets such as VisualGenome (Krishna et al., 2016) would have made the results more representative. However, due to time and space constraints, we leave this for future research.

References

- Moshe Bar. 2004. [Visual objects in context](#). *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 5(8):617–629.
- Irving Biederman. 1972. [Perceiving real-world scenes](#). *Science*, 177(4043):77–80.
- Holger Caesar, Jasper Uijlings, and Vittorio Ferrari. 2016. [Coco-stuff: Thing and stuff classes in context](#).
- Michele Cafagna, Kees van Deemter, and Albert Gatt. 2021. [What vision-language models ‘see’ when they see scenes](#).
- Michele Cafagna, Kees van Deemter, and Albert Gatt. 2023. [HL dataset: Visually-grounded description of scenes, actions and rationales](#). In *Proceedings of the 16th International Natural Language Generation Conference*, pages 293–312, Prague, Czechia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Reuben Cohn-Gordon, Noah Goodman, and Christopher Potts. 2018. [Pragmatically informative image captioning with character-level inference](#).
- Robert Dale and Ehud Reiter. 1995. [Computational interpretations of the gricean maxims in the generation of referring expressions](#). *Cognitive Science*, 19(2):233–263.
- Santosh K. Divvala, Derek Hoiem, James H. Hays, Alexei A. Efros, and Martial Hebert. 2009. [An empirical study of context in object detection](#). In *2009 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. IEEE.
- Carolina Galleguillos and Serge Belongie. 2010. [Context based object categorization: A critical survey](#). *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, 114(6):712–722.
- Kristen Grauman, Andrew Westbury, Eugene Byrne, Zachary Chavis, Antonino Furnari, Rohit Girdhar, Jackson Hamburger, Hao Jiang, Miao Liu, Xingyu Liu, Miguel Martin, Tushar Nagarajan, Ilija Radosavovic, Santhosh Kumar Ramakrishnan, Fiona Ryan, Jayant Sharma, Michael Wray, Mengmeng Xu, Eric Zhongcong Xu, Chen Zhao, Siddhant Bansal, Dhruv Batra, Vincent Cartillier, Sean Crane, Tien Do, Morrie Doulaty, Akshay Erapalli, Christoph Feichtenhofer, Adriano Fragomeni, Qichen Fu, Abrahm Gebreselasie, Cristina Gonzalez, James Hillis, Xuhua Huang, Yifei Huang, Wenqi Jia, Weslie Khoo, Jachym Kolar, Satwik Kottur, Anurag Kumar, Federico Landini, Chao Li, Yanghao Li, Zhenqiang Li, Karttikeya Mangalam, Raghava Modhugu, Jonathan Munro, Tullie Murrell, Takumi Nishiyasu, Will Price, Paola Ruiz Puentes, Merey Ramazanova, Leda Sari, Kiran Somasundaram, Audrey Southerland, Yusuke Sugano, Ruijie Tao, Minh Vo, Yuchen Wang, Xindi Wu, Takuma Yagi, Ziwei Zhao, Yunyi Zhu, Pablo Arbelaez, David Crandall, Dima Damen, Giovanni Maria Farinella, Christian Fuegen, Bernard Ghanem, Vamsi Krishna Ithapu, C. V. Jawahar, Hanbyul Joo, Kris Kitani, Haizhou Li, Richard Newcombe, Aude Oliva, Hyun Soo Park, James M. Rehg, Yoichi Sato, Jianbo Shi, Mike Zheng Shou, Antonio Torralba, Lorenzo Torresani, Mingfei Yan, and Jitendra Malik. 2022. [Ego4d: Around the world in 3,000 hours of egocentric video](#). In *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. IEEE.
- Michelle R. Greene. 2013. [Statistics of high-level scene context](#). *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4.
- Vipul Gupta, Zhuowan Li, Adam Kortylewski, Chenyu Zhang, Yingwei Li, and Alan Yuille. 2022. [Swapmix: Diagnosing and regularizing the over-reliance on visual context in visual question answering](#). In *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. IEEE.
- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2015. [Deep residual learning for image recognition](#).
- Sahar Kazemzadeh, Vicente Ordonez, Mark Matten, and Tamara Berg. 2014. [ReferItGame: Referring to objects in photographs of natural scenes](#). In *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 787–798, Doha, Qatar. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Jungjun Kim, Hanbin Ko, and Jialin Wu. 2020. [CoNAN: A complementary neighboring-based attention network for referring expression generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 1952–1962, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- Alexander Kirillov, Kaiming He, Ross Girshick, Carsten Rother, and Piotr Dollár. 2018. [Panoptic segmentation](#).
- Emiel Krahmer and Kees van Deemter. 2012. [Computational generation of referring expressions: A survey](#). *Computational Linguistics*, 38(1):173–218.
- Ranjay Krishna, Yuke Zhu, Oliver Groth, Justin Johnson, Kenji Hata, Joshua Kravitz, Stephanie Chen, Yannis Kalantidis, Li-Jia Li, David A Shamma, Michael Bernstein, and Li Fei-Fei. 2016. [Visual genome: Connecting language and vision using crowdsourced dense image annotations](#).
- J. Richard Landis and Gary G. Koch. 1977. [The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data](#). *Biometrics*, 33(1):159.
- Xiangyang Li and Shuqiang Jiang. 2018. [Bundled object context for referring expressions](#). *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 20(10):2749–2760.
- 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*, pages 740–755, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- Jingyu Liu, Wei Wang, Liang Wang, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. 2020. [Attribute-guided attention for referring expression generation and comprehension](#). *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 29:5244–5258.
- R. Luo and Gregory Shakhnarovich. 2017. [Comprehension-guided referring expressions](#). *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 3125–3134.
- Junhua Mao, J. Huang, A. Toshev, Oana-Maria Camburu, A. Yuille, and Kevin Murphy. 2016. [Generation and comprehension of unambiguous object descriptions](#). *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 11–20.
- Ron Mokady, Amir Hertz, and Amit H. Bermano. 2021. [Clipcap: Clip prefix for image captioning](#).
- Mitja Nikolaus, Mostafa Abdou, Matthew Lamm, Rahul Aralikkatte, and Desmond Elliott. 2019. [Compositional generalization in image captioning](#). In *Proceedings of the 23rd Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL)*, pages 87–98, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aude Oliva and Antonio Torralba. 2006. [Chapter 2 building the gist of a scene: the role of global image features in recognition](#). In *Progress in Brain Research*, pages 23–36. Elsevier.
- Aude Oliva and Antonio Torralba. 2007. [The role of context in object recognition](#). *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11(12):520–527.
- Nikolaos Panagiaris, Emma Hart, and Dimitra Gkatzia. 2020. [Improving the naturalness and diversity of referring expression generation models using minimum risk training](#). In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 41–51, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nikolaos Panagiaris, Emma Hart, and Dimitra Gkatzia. 2021. [Generating unambiguous and diverse referring expressions](#). *Computer Speech & Language*, 68:101184.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. [Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Devi Parikh, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Tsuhan Chen. 2012. [Exploring tiny images: The roles of appearance and contextual information for machine and human object recognition](#). *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 34(10):1978–1991.
- Fabian Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. 2011. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2825–2830.
- Effie J. Pereira and Monica S. Castelhana. 2014. [Peripheral guidance in scenes: The interaction of scene context and object content](#). *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 40(5):2056–2072.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. 2021. [Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision](#). In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. [Language models are unsupervised multitask learners](#). *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9.

- Vignesh Ramanathan, Anmol Kalia, Vladan Petrovic, Yi Wen, Baixue Zheng, Baishan Guo, Rui Wang, Aaron Marquez, Rama Kovvuri, Abhishek Kadian, Amir Mousavi, Yiwen Song, Abhimanyu Dubey, and Dhruv Mahajan. 2023. [Paco: Parts and attributes of common objects](#). In *2023 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. IEEE.
- Ehud Reiter and Robert Dale. 2000. *Building natural language generation systems*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K. New York.
- Zahra Sadeghi, James L. McClelland, and Paul Hoffman. 2015. [You shall know an object by the company it keeps: An investigation of semantic representations derived from object co-occurrence in visual scenes](#). *Neuropsychologia*, 76:52–61.
- Simeon Schüz and Sina Zarrieß. 2021. [Decoupling pragmatics: Discriminative decoding for referring expression generation](#). In *Proceedings of the Reasoning and Interaction Conference (ReInAct 2021)*, pages 47–52, Gothenburg, Sweden. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Simeon Schüz and Sina Zarrieß. 2023. [Keeping an eye on context: Attention allocation over input partitions in referring expression generation](#). In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Multimodal, Multilingual Natural Language Generation and Multilingual WebNLG Challenge (MM-NLG 2023)*, pages 20–27, Prague, Czech Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Simeon Schüz, Albert Gatt, and Sina Zarrieß. 2023. [Rethinking symbolic and visual context in referring expression generation](#). *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 6.
- Carina Silberer, Sina Zarrieß, and Gemma Boleda. 2020a. [Object naming in language and vision: A survey and a new dataset](#). In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference*, pages 5792–5801, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Carina Silberer, Sina Zarrieß, Matthijs Westera, and Gemma Boleda. 2020b. [Humans meet models on object naming: A new dataset and analysis](#). In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 1893–1905, Barcelona, Spain (Online). International Committee on Computational Linguistics.
- M. Tanaka, Takayuki Itamochi, K. Narioka, Ikuro Sato, Y. Ushiku, and T. Harada. 2019. Generating easy-to-understand referring expressions for target identifications. *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 5793–5802.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. [Attention is all you need](#).
- Ramakrishna Vedantam, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. 2014. [Cider: Consensus-based image description evaluation](#).
- Melissa Le-Hoa Võ. 2021. [The meaning and structure of scenes](#). *Vision Research*, 181:10–20.
- Xu Yang, Jiawei Peng, Zihua Wang, Haiyang Xu, Qinghao Ye, Chenliang Li, Songfang Huang, Fei Huang, Zhangzikang Li, and Yu Zhang. 2023. [Transforming visual scene graphs to image captions](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 12427–12440, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bangpeng Yao and Li Fei-Fei. 2010. [Modeling mutual context of object and human pose in human-object interaction activities](#). In *2010 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. IEEE.
- Xuwang Yin and Vicente Ordonez. 2017. [Obj2Text: Generating visually descriptive language from object layouts](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 177–187, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Licheng Yu, Patrick Poirson, Shan Yang, Alexander C. Berg, and Tamara L. Berg. 2016. Modeling context in referring expressions. In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2016*, pages 69–85, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- Licheng Yu, Hao Tan, Mohit Bansal, and Tamara L. Berg. 2017. A joint speaker-listener-reinforcer model for referring expressions. In *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, volume 2.
- Sina Zarrieß and David Schlangen. 2017. [Obtaining referential word meanings from visual and distributional information: Experiments on object naming](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 243–254, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sina Zarrieß and David Schlangen. 2018. [Decoding strategies for neural referring expression generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 503–512, Tilburg University, The Netherlands. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mengmi Zhang, Claire Tseng, and Gabriel Kreiman. 2020. [Putting visual object recognition in context](#). In *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 12982–12991.

A Risks and Ethical Considerations

We do not believe that there are significant risks associated with this work, as we consider the generation of general expressions for generic objects in

freely available datasets with limited scale. When selecting samples for human evaluation, we refrain from descriptions of people (that could potentially be perceived as hurtful). No ethics review was required. Our data (published upon acceptance) does not contain any protected information and will be fully anonymized prior to publication.

B Model implementation and training

For the hyperparameters of our models, we largely followed Panagiaris et al. (2021) (TRF) and Mokady et al. (2021) (CC). During inference, we relied on (deterministic) greedy decoding.

The TRF model has 3 encoder and 3 decoder layers with 8 attention heads, hidden dimension and feedforward dimension of 512, and was trained with a initial learning rate of 0.0001 for the transformer encoder and decoder, and 0.00001 for the pre-trained ResNet-152 backbone. Our TRF models have approximately 103,000,000 parameters.

For our CC model, we kept the settings defined by Mokady et al. (2021). From the two models proposed in this work, we used the variant where a simple MLP is used as a mapping network and the GPT-2 language model is fine-tuned during training. However, we have different prefix sizes than in the original paper: For CC_t , we have a prefix size of 11, i.e. 10 for the visual target representation and 1 for the target location information. For CC_v , our prefix size is 21, with additional 10 tokens for the visual context representation. The model was trained using a learning rate of 0.00001. CC_v has approximately 338,000,000 and CC_t has 307,000,000 parameters.

We trained our models on an Nvidia RTX A40. RefCOCO contains 42k and PACO-EGO4D contains 116k items for training. The number of training epochs per system and the final CIDEr scores over the validation sets are displayed in Table 5. We trained all our models for a maximum of 15 epochs, with early stopping if no new maximum for CIDEr over the validation set has been achieved for three consecutive epochs. Per epoch, the compute time was approximately 2.30 h for TRF and CC on RefCOCO and 4.30 h for TRF on PACO.

C Scientific Artifacts

In our work, we mainly used scientific artifacts in the form of existing model implementations, all of which are cited or referenced in Section 3. The model implementations were published under per-

	dataset	epochs	CIDEr (val)
TRF _t − 0.0	RefCOCO	8	1.074
TRF _t − 0.5	RefCOCO	11	0.936
TRF _t − 1.0	RefCOCO	5	0.302
TRF _v − 0.0	RefCOCO	6	1.156
TRF _v − 0.5	RefCOCO	9	1.035
TRF _v − 1.0	RefCOCO	6	0.869
TRF _s − 0.0	RefCOCO	8	1.075
TRF _s − 0.5	RefCOCO	14	1.032
TRF _s − 1.0	RefCOCO	12	0.818
CG _t − 0.0	RefCOCO	7	0.824
CG _t − 0.5	RefCOCO	8	0.554
CG _t − 1.0	RefCOCO	2	0.294
CG _v − 0.0	RefCOCO	4	1.103
CG _v − 0.5	RefCOCO	10	0.894
CG _v − 1.0	RefCOCO	7	0.526
TRF _t − 0.0	PACO	3	3.236
TRF _t − 0.5	PACO	8	2.662
TRF _t − 1.0	PACO	7	0.814
TRF _v − 0.0	PACO	3	3.554
TRF _v − 0.5	PACO	14	3.047
TRF _v − 1.0	PACO	5	2.15

Table 5: Training information for all TRF and CC variants.

missive licences, i.e. *MIT* (TRF) and *Apache 2.0* (CC). Upon acceptance, we will publish our modifications to the model implementations using the same licences, and our other code and data using permissive licences. Apart from this, we relied on scikit-learn (version 1.2.0, Pedregosa et al. 2011) for our statistic analysis and the RefCOCO API (Kazemzadeh et al., 2014; Yu et al., 2016)² for computing BLEU and CIDEr scores.

D Human Evaluation

We conducted a human evaluation in which the adequacy of assigned referent types in English referring expressions was assessed. The annotation guidelines are published as supplementary material. Our annotators were undergrad student assistants from linguistics and computational linguistics, which were paid by the hour according to the applicable pay scale. The annotators were informed about the intended use of their produced data. Along with our code, upon acceptance, we will publish the fully anonymized raw and aggregated results of the human evaluation.

Figure 2 illustrates the results of the human evaluation described in Section 4.2.

²<https://github.com/lichengunc/refer>




Figure 2: Visualization of human evaluation results for all tested systems and a sample of human annotations in RefCOCO testB.