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Abstract

The learning objective of vision-language approach of CLIP [63] does not effectively account for the noisy many-to-many correspondences found in web-harvested image captioning datasets, which contributes to its compute and data inefficiency. To address this challenge, we introduce a novel training framework based on cross-modal contrastive learning that uses progressive self-distillation and soft image-text alignments to more efficiently learn robust representations from noisy data. Our model distills its own knowledge to dynamically generate soft-alignment targets for a subset of images and captions in every minibatch, which are then used to update its parameters. Extensive evaluation across 14 benchmark datasets shows that our method consistently outperforms its CLIP counterpart in multiple settings, including: (a) zero-shot classification, (b) linear probe transfer, and (c) image-text retrieval, without incurring extra computational cost. Analysis using an ImageNet-based robustness test-bed [70] reveals that our method offers better effective robustness to natural distribution shifts compared to both ImageNet-trained models and CLIP itself. Lastly, pretraining with datasets spanning two orders of magnitude in size shows that our improvements over CLIP tend to scale with number of training examples.

1. Introduction

The convergence of self-supervised pretraining techniques in natural language processing and computer vision have brought about a renaissance of cross-modal representation learning methods [1, 19, 30, 39, 52, 63, 68, 75] where large-scale weakly correlated multimodal data (e.g., image-text pairs) is used to learn cross-modal representations using contrastive learning techniques. In particular, the recently proposed CLIP [63] model has garnered significant attention due to its impressive zero-shot recognition ability and excellent transfer performance on downstream tasks.

However, despite their recent success, multimodal pretraining methods like CLIP [63] are data and compute inefficient. Much of CLIP’s success can be attributed to its voracious appetite for training data, utilizing 400M image-text pairs and an estimated 3, 584 GPU days for pretraining. As the scale of data increases, pretraining requirements of these methods become increasingly expensive, thereby limiting their widespread adoption in a sustainable manner.

This data and compute inefficiency of CLIP [63] can be partially attributed to the underlying assumptions it makes about the web-harvested data it uses for training. Several mainstream vision-language datasets utilize the alt-text HTML attribute of images scraped from archived web pages [9, 67, 71] where captions can often have words unrelated to their corresponding image-content [67]. However, CLIP [63] models the caption for each image to be accurately and exclusively related to only that image (see Figure 1). Moreover, when using larger batch sizes (32K used for CLIP), the likelihood of observing negatives with
high semantic similarity increases which can further degrade the learned representations especially those associated with shared semantics between faulty negatives [2].

To address this challenge, we propose to model the many-to-many relationships between images of web-harvested datasets and their corresponding captions more accurately using soft probabilities rather than hard pairing labels. Specifically, we propose a simple yet effective framework for robust contrastive language-image pretraining that uses progressive self-distillation and soft image-text alignment targets to more efficiently learn from noisy data. Instead of explicitly finding, correcting or even pruning noisy correspondences [75, 88], our joint student-teacher model dynamically generates a new set of soft-alignments for a random subset of images and captions in every minibatch. This enables our method to model many-to-many relationships while simultaneously re-calibrating potentially poorly matched instances without needing to identify them. Over the course of training, our network generates soft-alignments for increasingly large subsets of a minibatch, effectively becoming its own teacher. We identify several key elements that allow the student network to predict its targets without representation collapse or reinforcing its mistakes.

We use multiple pretraining datasets to extensively compare our approach to CLIP [63] evaluated on 14 benchmark datasets, where our approach consistently outperforms CLIP under multiple settings. Analysis using an ImageNet-based robustness test-bed [70] shows that our method offers better effective robustness to natural distribution shifts compared to both ImageNet-trained models as well as CLIP. Pretraining with datasets spanning two orders of magnitude in size shows that our improvements over CLIP tend to scale with number of training examples. Lastly, the simplicity of our approach allows it to be readily incorporated into existing and future methods.

2. Related Work

a. Self-Supervised Representation Learning: Self-supervised learning (SSL) approaches use a pretext task to automatically generate a supervision signal from the data itself, thereby eliminating the dependence on expensive manual data-labeling [31]. Pretext tasks in computer vision include spatial reasoning [15, 20, 32, 54, 59], temporal context [23, 32, 36, 48, 49], and other visual properties such as hue [13, 35, 81, 82], brightness [29, 72] or optical flow [29, 62, 73, 79], reconstruction of modified inputs [59, 74, 81], and classifying inputs with pseudo-labels [15, 16, 58] or pseudo-clusters [7, 8, 86, 87]. A promising subset of SSL methods uses a variant of instance discrimination framework [17, 77] which learns to align augmented versions of features while distinguishing them from features of other instances using a contrastive loss [8, 11, 24, 47].

b. Vision-Language Pretraining: Joint vision-language pretraining (VLP) is an active research area [1, 19, 39, 63, 68] where the availability of large-scale image-text datasets e.g., YFCC100M [71] and Conceptual Captions [9, 67] has played a key role in its progress. Although multiple concurrent works are being proposed to further improve VLP models [75], our work is different from them in a few important ways. Specifically, unlike EfficientCLIP [75] that proposes an ensemble approach to obtain a less noisy data subset for cross-modal training, our method attempts to side-step this problem altogether by re-purposing as opposed to completely removing noisy data. Similarly, DeCLIP [39] improves on the data-efficiency of CLIP [63] by leveraging intra-model contrastive learning along with a nearest-neighbor feature bank to augment negatives. However, incorporating these supervision sources can be computationally expensive. In contrast, our approach offers a simple yet effective way to improve the data-efficiency of CLIP [63] without incurring additional computational cost.

c. Learning from Noisy Data: Several techniques have been developed to increase the robustness of label noise especially in the supervised context [22, 40, 60, 65, 83]. These techniques include loss functions that reduce impact of outliers [76, 83], metalearning procedures that learn how to correct sources of label noise [1, 37, 69, 84], loss correction approaches that model label noise [50, 51, 65], regularization techniques aimed at lowering the impact of noise [61], and noise filtering processes that iteratively refine dataset labels and retrain models to obtain a more robust final model [55]. However, these works investigate noise-robust methods in the context of common object detection and classification tasks and cannot directly be applied effectively to cross-modal pretraining tasks. As it stands, noise-robust VLP pretraining methods are still a relatively unexplored topic.

d. Knowledge Distillation: Approaches for knowledge distillation (KD) [27] aim to transfer knowledge from one model (i.e., a teacher) to another (i.e., a student). While KD techniques are often motivated by certain performance and efficiency goals [6, 10, 38, 66], researchers have also found that KD methods serve as an effective regularization technique that can reduce model overfitting and improve generalization capabilities [14, 40, 43, 53]. Our approach is motivated by the recent success of self-knowledge distillation approaches [21, 78, 80] that use the student network as a teacher under supervised settings to achieve high accuracy with reduced computational cost. To the best of our knowledge, we are among the first to investigate progressive self-distillation in the context of vision-language pretraining.

3. Methods

Unlike CLIP [63], we view the problem of learning aligned vision-language representations from web-scale weakly-annotated data as the challenge of learning many-to-many
relationships from noisy image-text correspondences. To address this challenge, we propose a novel vision-language pretraining method that progressively distills a model’s own knowledge to soften its initially hard-target alignments, thereby enabling it to learn more transferable representations from the same amount of training data (see Figure 2). In the following, we first establish cross-modal contrastive learning objective and identify some of its limitations. We then introduce our novel progressive self-distillation approach and explain how it addresses these limitations.

3.1. Preliminaries

We consider a batch of N semantically paired image-text tuples \( \{(v_i, t_i)\}_{i=1}^{N} \) drawn from a cross-modal dataset. The goal of cross-modal contrastive pretraining is to learn encoders \( f_v \) for image data and \( f_t \) for text data such that for a given semantically related instance \((v_i, t_i)\), the encoded \( \ell_2 \)-normalized embeddings \( v_i = f_v(v_i) \) and \( t_i = f_t(t_i) \) with \( v_i, t_i \in \mathbb{R}^d \) are close together (i.e., “aligned”) under some distance metric, while the unpaired image and text embeddings are farther apart (i.e., “unaligned”).

3.2. Contrastive Learning with InfoNCE Loss

Recall that CLIP [63] trains these image and text encoders with a contrastive loss by minimizing the InfoNCE [56] loss \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{InfoNCE}} = \mathcal{L}_{v} + \mathcal{L}_{t} \), where \( \mathcal{L}_{v} \) is the loss for aligning images to text and \( \mathcal{L}_{t} \) is the loss for aligning text to images. Specifically, \( \mathcal{L}_{v} \) is defined as:

\[
\mathcal{L}_{v} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} I_{ij} \log P_v(v_i, t_j; \tau) \tag{1}
\]

\[
P_v(v_i, t_j; \tau) = \frac{\exp(\text{sim}(v_i, t_j)/\tau)}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} \exp(\text{sim}(v_i, t_k)/\tau)} \tag{2}
\]

where \( \text{sim}(v_i, t_j) \) is typically chosen to be the dot product (cosine similarity), \( \tau \) is a learnable softmax temperature parameter and \( I_{ij} \) is an element from the identity matrix \( I_N \). Since InfoNCE is symmetric, \( \mathcal{L}_{t} \) and \( P_t \) are defined in a similar manner.

For convenience, let \( V, T \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d} \) be matrices that contain a batch of image and text embeddings whose rows are populated with \( v_{1:N} \) and \( t_{1:N} \), respectively. Then, the InfoNCE loss can be re-written compactly in matrix form as:

\[
\mathcal{L}_{\text{InfoNCE}} = \mathcal{H}(I_N; \rho(VT^T)) + \mathcal{H}(I_N; \rho(TV^T)), \tag{3}
\]

where \( \mathcal{H} \) is the batched (row-wise) cross-entropy function with mean reduction and \( \rho \) is the standard softmax function applied row-wise such that each row sums to one.

Equation 3 shows that InfoNCE loss is simply the cross entropy between a one-hot distribution \( I_{ij} \) and estimated probability \( P_v(v_i, t_j; \tau) \). It enforces the strict assumption that an image \( v_i \) selected from a batch should be paired exclusively with text \( t_i \) while being repelled from all other \( t_j \).

However, this assumption generally does not hold for two important reasons. First, it is likely that a given image would be aligned to several text captions to different degrees especially under large batch-size settings. Second, the ground truth pairings in large-scale weakly-annotated datasets may be simply incorrect or describe loose correlations between images and their corresponding texts.

3.3. Distillation through Soft-Alignments

To address the aforementioned limitations of using the InfoNCE loss to train on noisy cross-modal data, we propose to adopt a knowledge distillation framework where the predictive probabilities produced by a teacher network are used as soft target distributions to train a student network.

Our framework offers two key advantages. First, in the process of generating target image-text alignments, a well-trained teacher can combat poorly captioned images by re-pairing them with stronger semantic matches from the batch, thereby providing a cleaner learning signal for the student network. Second, by providing soft targets, the teacher can convey many-to-many relationships in a batch.

Specifically, to estimate the correspondence between image \( v_i \) and text \( t_i \), our teacher model employs image and text encoders \( f_v \) and \( f_t \) to compute \( \ell_2 \)-normalized teacher embeddings \( \tilde{v}_i \) and \( \tilde{t}_i \) which are similarly batched as rows in the matrices \( \tilde{V} \) and \( \tilde{T} \) respectively. Our method uses a swapped prediction strategy to produce soft target distributions \( A_v^\tau \) and \( A_t^\tau \) to supervise student training. These target distributions are defined as:

\[
A_v^\tau = \rho(\tilde{V} \tilde{V}^T; \tilde{\tau}) \quad \text{and} \quad A_t^\tau = \rho(\tilde{V} \tilde{T}^T; \tilde{\tau}) \tag{4}
\]

where \( \rho \) is the standard softmax function now using a secondary teacher temperature \( \tilde{\tau} \) that transforms and re-scales raw logits into probabilities.

Swapped prediction improves on the well-established forward bootstrapping approach [65] by using predictions from opposite modality. Unlike bootstrapping, swapped prediction computes the image alignment scores \( A_v^\tau \) from the text encoder posterior probabilities and vice-versa, thus aggregating information over all other instances from the opposite modality. Intuitively, the strength of alignment from image \( v_i \) to text \( t_j \) is based on the probability that text \( t_j \) should be matched with image \( v_i \) compared to all other \( v_j \). This strategy has shown promise in related contrastive learning settings [50], which is consistent with our results.

Replacing the \( I_N \) targets in Equation 3 with estimated soft-alignment probabilities \( A_v^\tau \) and \( A_t^\tau \) allows the teacher to re-calibrate the attractive and repulsive forces between image and text embeddings in the representation space based on its estimated similarity between instances. For instance, a faulty negative pair \( \langle v_i, t_j \rangle \), which may have high semantic similarity is assigned a similarity score of zero by
the InfoNCE loss, whereas our method provides $A_{ij}$ as a target which should be larger given a well trained teacher.

### 3.4. Progressive Self-Distillation

We now explain how to start such a teacher network and how its contribution to learning process evolves over time.

#### 3.4.1 Teacher Network Selection

Conventional KD and SSL methods offer numerous potential teacher choices, e.g., larger but static pretrained teacher networks [27], or networks that share the same model architecture but use weights from a previous epoch [42], or as an exponential moving average [24]. The primary drawback to these approaches is reduced computational and memory efficiency as they require a secondary inference stage using additional model weights that must be kept in memory.

To circumvent these issues, we adopt a self-distillation strategy where the student network acts as its own teacher (i.e., $f_v = f_v, f_t = f_t$). The idea here is to update the targets of the student contrastive objective using the current state of the model. Intuitively, as the learning improves over time, its representation can be trusted to make more accurate predictions. This mitigates the negative effects of noisy pairings as incorrect pairs are increasingly likely to be inconsistent with the consensus learned from the rest of the data as training progresses. By refining inconsistent alignments, the model can develop more coherent representations, which further improves its ability to evaluate the consistency of noisy image-text pairs.

#### 3.4.2 Progressing from Student to Teacher

As our objective relies on some basic level of alignment between corresponding image and text representations, we introduce a novel procedure that progressivly increases the contribution of self-distillation to the contrastive learning process over the course of training. Our model therefore dynamically evolves into its own teacher as training progresses, which differs from the standard knowledge distillation setting where the teacher is often static and separate.

We achieve this dynamic progression by randomly partitioning a batch of $N$ image-text pairs into $N^a = \lfloor \alpha N \rfloor$ “aligned” instances and $N^u = N - \lfloor \alpha N \rfloor$ “unaligned” instances where $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ determines their relative proportions. The aligned subset is used to train the teacher network using the hard ground truth pairings and the standard InfoNCE loss. The teacher network then employs our aforementioned swapped prediction strategy to estimate soft-alignments on the unaligned instances to supervise the student. We refer to this random minibatch partitioning as dynamic as opposed to static as the global partitioning of instances into aligned and unaligned subsets is refreshed for each training epoch.

To increase the strength of the teacher’s influence on learning, we decrease the value of $\alpha$ gradually, in the same way that the learning rate can be scheduled. While there are several strategies to decrease $\alpha$ as a function of the training iteration, e.g., step-wise, linear, etc., we use a cosine-annealing schedule [38] specified by a start and end value.

To summarize our overall learning procedure, we first compute the batched student-teacher embedding with $V = \tilde{V}$ and $T = \tilde{T}$. Next, we extract the first $N^a$ rows to form aligned subset of teacher embeddings $\tilde{V}^a, \tilde{T}^a$, and the last $N^u$ rows for the unaligned student embeddings $V^u, T^u$. Altogether, our final objective function is defined as:

$$L_{PSD}^{InfoNCE} = \alpha \left[ H(I_{N_a}, \rho(\tilde{V}^a \tilde{T}^T)) + H(I_{N_a}, \rho(\tilde{T}^a \tilde{V}^T)) \right] + (1 - \alpha) \left[ H(A^v, \rho(V^u T^T)) + H(A^t, \rho(T^u V^T)) \right]$$
where $I_{N_a} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_a \times N}$ is the zero-padded identity matrix, while $A^e, A^f$ are indexed to match the unaligned student embeddings.

4. Experiments

We start by describing our experimental setup which aims to match CLIP [63] as closely as possible for fair comparison. We then demonstrate the advantages of our method over CLIP [63] for: (a) zero-shot classification, (b) finetuning (i.e., linear probe), and (c) image-text retrieval.

4.1. Pretraining Datasets

We apply our pretraining method to three image-text datasets varying in scale, scope and noise:

- **a. MS COCO Captions [41]** – A widely used standard image captioning benchmark dataset with approximately 118K images, each labeled with 5 human evaluated captions, and a testing set of 5K images.

- **b. Conceptual Captions 3M (CC3M) [67]** – A collection of over 3M images and their raw descriptions harvested from the alt-text HTML attribute associated with the web-scraped images, therefore representing a wider variety of content styles. After downloading and preprocessing, we utilized about 2.9M image-text pairs in our experiments.

- **c. Conceptual Captions 12M (CC12M) [9]** – By relaxing multiple image and text filters used in CC3M [67], CC12M is a less precise but 4× larger set of image-text pairs that covers a wider range of visual concepts. Due to unavailable URLs, we utilize about 10M examples from this dataset.

4.2. Pretraining Details

In the following experiments, the image encoders follow ViT-B/32 vision transformer architecture proposed in CLIP [63], while the text encoder’s transformer-based architecture follows modification proposed in [63]. Image and text features are projected to a shared 512-D space and L2 normalized before participating in contrastive loss.

Models are trained from scratch for 100 epochs using the Adam optimizer [33] with weight decay and a cosine annealing learning rate schedule with warmup [44]. As done in [63], the learnable temperature parameter $\tau$ is initialized to 0.07 and clamped to values less than 100. Automatic mixed-precision [45] training is used to save on memory and achieve minibatch sizes of 4096. Input images are randomly cropped and resized to $224 \times 224$ resolution during pretraining and the maximum length of the text is limited to 77 tokens via random sub-sequence sampling similar to [63]. Training is conducted on as many as 8 Nvidia A-100 GPUs with the longest experiments spanning up to several days. The partitioning factor $\alpha$ is decayed from 0.8 to 0.2 over the course of training using cosine annealing. Details regarding hyperparameter values for different datasets and models are provided in the supplementary material.

We compare our approach to a re-implementation of CLIP based on the methods and pseudo-code described in the original paper as well as open source implementations such as OpenCLIP [28]. The performance of our re-implementation is consistent with that achieved by OpenCLIP and unreleased CLIP models trained on reduced subsets of the 400M dataset; thus, we retrain a baseline CLIP model for each pretraining dataset to serve as a proxy.

4.3. Evaluation Details

**a. Evaluation Protocol** – We measure zero-shot and linear probe classification performance using Top-1 accuracy. For the linear probe experiments, we train the linear classifier with the L-BFGS optimizer on extracted visual features as described in [63]. We use standard retrieval metrics: recall at rank K ($R@K$, higher is better) and mean rank (MnR, lower is better), to evaluate the retrieval performance of our model. R@K (Recall at K) calculates the percentage of test samples for which the correct result is found in the top-K retrieved points to the query sample.

**b. Benchmark Datasets** – We evaluate the zero-shot and linear probe classification performance of proposed approach on a suite of benchmark evaluation datasets, including ImageNet [12], Places365 [85], ObjectNet [3], and several recent variants of ImageNet aimed at evaluating the robustness of trained models to natural (as opposed to synthetic) distribution shifts [25, 26, 64].

**c. Prompt Ensembling with Templates** – Consistent with previous work, we find that our approach benefits from prompt ensembling to augment the original class label for downstream tasks. For fair comparison, we use the same set of prompt templates published in CLIP [63], which generally take on the form of “a photo of a {label}.”

4.4. Zero-Shot Image Classification

Following the pretraining stage, we evaluate our method on zero-shot image classification achieved through natural language input, and compare to its CLIP counterpart trained under identical settings.

Table 1 lists the top-1 accuracy (%) of zero-shot image classification across a suite of benchmark datasets. Given a fixed amount of pretraining data, our method considerably outperforms its CLIP counterparts in terms of average top-1 accuracy over all datasets, achieving as much as a 6.19% absolute improvement in the CC3M pretraining regime. Notably, our method surpasses CLIP on ImageNet and all of the ImageNet variants. Our method also achieves substantial performance gains on ImageNet-Renditions (ImageNet-R) [25], a dataset specifically aimed at evaluating out-of-distribution robustness, with an average
Table 1. Zero-Shot Image Classification Comparison – Zero-shot top-1 accuracy (%) of our method compared to baseline CLIP on numerous ImageNet-based benchmark datasets using different pretraining datasets varying in scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COCO</td>
<td>CLIP</td>
<td>64.14</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>32.88</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>16.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3M</td>
<td>CLIP</td>
<td>73.90</td>
<td>30.60</td>
<td>54.07</td>
<td>24.54</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>28.33</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>7.827</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>23.56</td>
<td>28.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>80.15</td>
<td>38.27</td>
<td>64.45</td>
<td>28.07</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>37.31</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>27.96</td>
<td>34.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC12M</td>
<td>CLIP</td>
<td>75.29</td>
<td>41.94</td>
<td>75.86</td>
<td>31.29</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>51.34</td>
<td>31.90</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>34.89</td>
<td>37.87</td>
<td>40.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>84.84</td>
<td>51.34</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>34.08</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>59.29</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>39.16</td>
<td>42.24</td>
<td>45.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Pretraining Data Size and Relative Performance – Average zero-shot classification performance of our method compared to CLIP as number of pretraining examples from the CC12M dataset grows from 600K to 12M. Our method consistently learns representations more amenable to zero-shot classification than CLIP given same amount of pretraining data.

To better understand the relationship between the amount of pretraining data and relative differences in downstream performance between our method and CLIP, we perform a sweep of experiments that restrict pretraining to 5, 10, 25, 50, and 100% of the CC12M dataset. Figure 3 plots the average zero-shot classification score for both methods, and shows that our method maintains higher performance throughout this range. Interestingly, our method appears to provide the largest performance increases at the boundaries of the plot, suggesting that our method can improve data-efficiency in data-limited regimes, in addition to providing larger performance gains as the dataset size increases.

Figure 4. Effective Robustness Evaluation – Our method produces features more robust to natural distribution shift compared to CLIP features. When comparing models with similar ImageNet performance, our method produces representations that offer better performance on naturally shifted distributions. Mean Transfer Accuracy is computed over the ImageNet-R/O/A/V2 test sets. Best-fit trend lines suggests that the effective robustness of our method (blue) outpaces CLIP (red) as ImageNet accuracy increases.

4.5. Evaluation of Effective Robustness

CLIP models [63, 70] have been found to be more robust to natural distribution shifts when compared to standard models trained on ImageNet. This phenomena is illustrated in Figure 4 with ImageNet accuracy on the x-axis and mean accuracy on ImageNet-A, ImageNet-O, ImageNet-R, and ImageNetV2, on the y-axis. Previous work [46, 70] has found that the in-distribution and out-of-distribution accuracies of ImageNet models follow a predictable linear trend (plotted in green), and CLIP models established a trend (plotted in red) of improved effective robustness. Note that the slope of linear-fit to our model is higher than that for the CLIP model, suggesting that our effective robustness improves over CLIP with increasing scale.
4.6. Linear Probe Performance

We report our linear probe performance on 4 downstream datasets in Table 2. Our method outperforms its CLIP counterpart in every case, suggesting that our learned visual features alone (i.e., considering within-modal alignment only) are more transferable than CLIP.

4.7. Image-Text Retrieval

Given the cross-modal nature of models under investigation, image-text retrieval consists of two sub-tasks: image-to-text and text-to-image. We evaluate our method on COCO test set with 5K images, each with 5 unique captions.

Table 3 shows our zero-shot retrieval performance relative to baseline CLIP under COCO, CC3M and CC12M pretraining datasets. Relative to CLIP, our method consistently outperforms in both text-to-image and image-to-text subtasks, with both methods generally achieving slightly higher performance in text-to-image sub-task. Note that, due to data domain differences, pretraining directly on COCO produces models with higher downstream performance than pretraining on CC12M despite the 100× increase in dataset. The last four rows show that, as expected, finetuning Conceptual Captions pretrained models on COCO produces retrieval performance that exceeds corresponding baselines and the performance from training on COCO alone.

4.8. Ablation Study

We now investigate the contributions of individual components of our method, specifically the swapped prediction strategy for estimating soft-alignments over the forward bootstrapping strategy, dynamic minibatch partitioning, and progressive self-distillation to downstream performance. Following pretraining on COCO, we measure models’ performance on COCO zero-shot image-text retrieval and ImageNet zero-shot classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretraining Dataset</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Food101 [%]</th>
<th>OxfordPets [%]</th>
<th>Birds1k [%]</th>
<th>ImageNet [%]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COCO</td>
<td>CLIP</td>
<td>53.04</td>
<td>76.86</td>
<td>37.17</td>
<td>52.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>53.60</td>
<td>80.59</td>
<td>42.85</td>
<td>56.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3M</td>
<td>CLIP</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>78.11</td>
<td>37.75</td>
<td>56.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>60.69</td>
<td>80.40</td>
<td>43.17</td>
<td>61.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC12M</td>
<td>CLIP</td>
<td>67.41</td>
<td>85.17</td>
<td>41.06</td>
<td>59.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>71.87</td>
<td>86.32</td>
<td>47.16</td>
<td>65.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Linear Probe Performance – Linear probe top-1 accuracy (%) of our method compared to baseline CLIP on four benchmark datasets is given. Our method learns visual features that consistently achieve improved finetuning performance, suggesting that our loss helps to improve within-modal feature alignment.

4.9. Qualitative Analysis

a. Distribution of Similarity Scores: Our method is largely motivated by the observation that previous VLP approaches neglect potential semantic similarity between negative samples and that accounting for this phenomenon can improve learned representations. In Figure 5, we plot the distribution of similarity scores for both positive and negative samples drawn from the COCO testing set. The left subplot reveals that our method consistently yields larger similarity scores for positive pairs compared to its CLIP counterpart and the OpenAI pretrained CLIP. Interestingly, the histogram of negative similarity scores shows that our method also assigns higher similarity scores to negative pairs. While it may seem counter intuitive to assign greater similarity scores to negative samples, we argue that doing so is the very reason our method captures greater similarity between positive pairs. By allowing some degree of alignment between the right set of negative examples, our method is able to minimize the inconsistencies between shared context of related positives and negatives. This in turn allows us to learn an overall more coherent representation space, resulting in increased robustness and downstream performance.

b. Visualizing Text-Image Retrievals: In Figure 6, we show the comparative list of top ten retrieved images for 5 example text queries. Overall, these retrievals suggest that
Table 3. **Image-Text Retrieval** – Zero-shot retrieval performance on the COCO 5K testing set as measured by recall at 1, 5, 10 (higher is better) and mean rank (lower is better). The last four rows (marked with *) report the zero-shot retrieval results of the same models further finetuned on the COCO captions training set.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretraining Dataset</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Text-to-Image</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Image-to-Text</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R@1 ↑</td>
<td>R@5 ↑</td>
<td>R@10 ↑</td>
<td>MnR ↓</td>
<td>R@1 ↑</td>
<td>R@5 ↑</td>
<td>R@10 ↑</td>
<td>MnR ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCO</td>
<td>CLIP</td>
<td>27.76</td>
<td>57.34</td>
<td>70.70</td>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>27.40</td>
<td>56.31</td>
<td>68.65</td>
<td>20.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>28.42</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>68.86</td>
<td>26.11</td>
<td>28.53</td>
<td>56.75</td>
<td>68.10</td>
<td>22.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3M</td>
<td>CLIP</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>29.76</td>
<td>40.92</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>35.30</td>
<td>106.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>37.12</td>
<td>48.28</td>
<td>63.80</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>31.54</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>72.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC12M</td>
<td>CLIP</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>40.66</td>
<td>51.72</td>
<td>55.23</td>
<td>17.63</td>
<td>39.67</td>
<td>50.77</td>
<td>55.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>22.94</td>
<td>46.60</td>
<td>57.82</td>
<td>46.24</td>
<td>22.79</td>
<td>45.95</td>
<td>56.81</td>
<td>43.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3M</td>
<td>Ours*</td>
<td>31.30</td>
<td>59.54</td>
<td>71.80</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>29.18</td>
<td>58.66</td>
<td>70.23</td>
<td>17.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC12M</td>
<td>Ours*</td>
<td>33.26</td>
<td>66.70</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>60.14</td>
<td>71.96</td>
<td>17.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. **Similarity Scores** – Similarity scores distribution for positive and negative pairs in joint cross-modal space after training with original CLIP loss and our proposed loss is provided. Compared to our baseline (COCO) pretrained CLIP and OpenAI’s pretrained CLIP model, our method yields similarity scores with higher mean and lower variance for positive pairs. While COCO pretrained CLIP model concentrates negatives’ similarity scores around zero, our method concentrates them at higher levels as it allows for some degree of semantic similarity between negatives.

Figure 6. **Example Text-Image Retrievals** – Given a text query, we display the top ten most semantically related images (ranked left to right) retrieved by CLIP and our method. Compared to CLIP, our method continues to retrieve images that more holistically match the text description, even after the ground truth image has appeared in the ranking.

5. Conclusions

We proposed a novel cross-modal contrastive learning framework with progressive self-distillation and soft image-text alignments. Our approach distills its own knowledge to dynamically generate soft-alignment targets for a subset of samples in every minibatch, which enables it to efficiently learn robust representations from noisy data. Extensive evaluations across 14 benchmark datasets showed that our method consistently outperforms its CLIP counterpart in multiple settings. Moreover, our method provides better effective robustness to natural distribution shifts compared to existing state-of-the-art methods. Going forward, we plan to further improve the efficiency of our approach by investigating data redundancy, network architectures and optimization algorithms during pretraining, so that we can generalize to even larger scale with fewer resources.
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1. Summary of Datasets

1.1. Pretraining Datasets

Table 1 lists the exact number of examples used for pretraining from each dataset. During COCO pretraining, we randomly select one of five unique captions assigned to each image, effectively multiplying the total number of image-text pairs by a factor of 5. Unlike COCO, the Conceptual Captions datasets are not stored in one central location and not all of the provided URLs are still valid. Therefore, the actual number of pretraining examples is less than the advertised amount by as much as 1M+ in the case of CC12M.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>COCO</th>
<th>CC3M</th>
<th>CC12M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>118,287</td>
<td>2,884,940</td>
<td>10,707,814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Pretraining Dataset Sizes – Exact sizes of pretraining datasets employed in this work (no. of image-text pairs).

1.2. Evaluation Datasets

In Table 2, we list additional details for the evaluation datasets in this study including the number of classes and the sizes of the training-testing splits. For the last 5 rows (ObjectNet and ImageNet-{A,O,R,V2}), we list only the number of classes and the testing set size as these have been designated as “testing-only” datasets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Train Size</th>
<th>Test Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cifar10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cifar100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltech101</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2,863</td>
<td>8,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>75,750</td>
<td>25,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OxfordPets</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3,680</td>
<td>3,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdsnap</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>38,344</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImageNet</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1,281,167</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places365</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1,803,460</td>
<td>36,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ObjectNet</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImageNet-A</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImageNet-O</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImageNet-R</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImageNetV2</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Evaluation Dataset Details – The number of classes, training and testing examples present in the evaluation datasets. The size of the training set size for the last 5 rows is omitted because these datasets are designated as “testing-only” benchmarks.

2. Detailed Experimental Settings

2.1. Implementation Details

Our pretraining implementation largely follows CLIP [8] with significant deviations motivated by computational constraints or empirical observations. Table 3 summarizes common hyperparameters settings shared across experiments. Notable differences from [8] include a reduced batch size, learning rate and weight decay, but increased number of training epochs and warm-up iterations. Unlike CLIP, which computes sharded, intra-GPU embedding similarities only, we perform a global all-gather operation to compute all pair-wise similarities within a batch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hyperparameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Batch size</td>
<td>4096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary size</td>
<td>49408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training epochs</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial temperature $\tau$</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher temperature $\tilde{\tau}$</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight decay</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm-up iterations (%)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning rate</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{-5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam $\beta_1$</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam $\beta_2$</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam $\epsilon$</td>
<td>$10^{-5}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Common hyperparameters – used for both baseline CLIP pretraining and our method.
2.2. Complexity Analysis
In order to underscore how our method improves data-efficiency without incurring additional computation cost, we note that the number of trainable parameters in the ViT-B/32 (151.3M) and RN50 (102.0M) CLIP models are precisely the same under our method as the architectures remain unmodified with no additional parameters required. Also, the average time per training iteration (e.g., 0.253s for our COCO experiments using 8 Nvidia V100 GPUs) and memory requirements are effectively identical as well. Finally, we contrast our self-distillation approach to traditional knowledge-distillation methods and other choices of teacher network (e.g., a momentum teacher design), which may provide similar data-efficiency improvements, but incur significant computational costs of at least 2x compute and memory requirements or more.

2.3. Prompt Engineering
Table 4 lists the prompt templates used for zero-shot classification on the evaluation datasets. For each template, string interpolation replaces the placeholder symbol {} with a text representation of the category name, and a grammatical correction is applied to the preceding article, i.e., a → an for categories that start with a vowel.

2.4. Linear Probe Details
The linear probe evaluation involves training a logistic regression classifier on the frozen visual features extracted using the model’s image encoder. Following CLIP [8], we train the logistic regression for a maximum of 1000 iterations using the L-BFGS optimization algorithm provided by scikit-learn [7]. We use the train/test split sizes listed in Table 2.

3. Comparison to Concurrent Works
In this section, we provide a comparison of our work to unpublished concurrent works.

While the concurrent works discussed in this section are aimed at improving on CLIP, they altogether vary along several dimensions including pretraining dataset, backbone architecture, hyperparameters and training details. Due to the large number of unique experimental configurations, it is not feasible to precisely replicate the setting of each concurrent work; therefore, we provide our most closely matched experiments while acknowledging that the comparisons are not exactly one-to-one analogs.

Table 5 lists the commonly reported ImageNet zero-shot Top 1 accuracy (%) of our method compared to concurrent works.

4. Additional Quantitative Results
4.1. ResNet50 Visual Backbone Results
In order to demonstrate the effectiveness of our method to a broader experimental setting, we present results from experiments that utilize the widely adopted ResNet50 (RN50) visual backbone in Table 6. These results are highly consistent with performance trends observed with the ViT backbone (even with minimal hyperparameter tuning), suggesting that our method is amenable to CNN-based backbones as well.

4.2. Ablation Studies for α-scheduling
Our method is fairly robust to the choice of α scheduling. For example, replacing cosine annealing with a simple linear schedule produces a network with near identical performance on downstream evaluations. Specifically, for COCO the two scheduling methods result in an absolute mean difference in top1 classification of 0.13% and relative difference of 0.67% for our method using a ViT backbone. Similarly, for CC3M we observe an absolute mean difference of −0.22% and relative difference of −0.63%.
Cifar\{10,100\} & Caltech101 & ImageNet+ \\
"a photo of a {}." & "a photo of a {}.", "a painting of a {}.", "a plastic {}.", "{}" \\
"a blurry photo of a {}.", "{}" & "a sculpture of a {}.", "a sketch of a {}.", "a tattoo of a {}.", "{}" & "A photo of {}" \\
"a black and white photo of a {}.", "{}" & "a toy {}.", "a rendition of a {}.", "a embroidered {}.", "a cartoon {}.", "{}" & "A photo the {}" \\
"a low contrast photo of a {}.", "{}" & "{}", "{}" and "{}" in a video game.", "{}", "{}", "{}", "{}" & "{} in a video game." \\
"a high contrast photo of a {}.", "{}" & "{}", "{}" and "{}" in a video game.", "{}", "{}", "{}", "{}" & "{} in a video game." \\
"a bad photo of the {}.", "{}" & "{}", "{}" and "{}" in a video game.", "{}", "{}", "{}", "{}" & "{} in a video game." \\
"a good photo of a {}.", "{}" & "{}", "{}" and "{}" in a video game.", "{}", "{}", "{}", "{}" & "{} in a video game." \\
"a photo of a big {}.", "{}" & "{}", "{}" and "{}" in a video game.", "{}", "{}", "{}", "{}" & "{} in a video game." \\
"a blurry photo of the {}.", "{}" & "{}", "{}" and "{}" in a video game.", "{}", "{}", "{}", "{}" & "{} in a video game." \\
"a black and white photo of the {}.", "{}" & "{}", "{}" and "{}" in a video game.", "{}", "{}", "{}", "{}" & "{} in a video game." \\
"a low contrast photo of the {}.", "{}" & "{}", "{}" and "{}" in a video game.", "{}", "{}", "{}", "{}" & "{} in a video game." \\
"a bad photo of the {}.", "{}" & "{}", "{}" and "{}" in a video game.", "{}", "{}", "{}", "{}" & "{} in a video game." \\
"a photo of the small {}.", "{}" & "{}", "{}" and "{}" in a video game.", "{}", "{}", "{}", "{}" & "{} in a video game." \\

Table 4. Prompt templates for zero-shot evaluation – The placeholder symbol {} is replaced with a string representation of the category name. The last column “ImageNet+” corresponds to the templates used for all other datasets that appear in this work, including all of the ImageNet variants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COCO</td>
<td>CLIP</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>27.01</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>37.85</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>33.87</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC3M</td>
<td>CLIP</td>
<td>36.46</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>44.81</td>
<td>19.29</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>19.28</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>16.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ours</td>
<td>56.69</td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>61.93</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>25.96</td>
<td>31.65</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>21.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Zero-Shot Image Classification Comparison with RN50 backbone – Zero-shot Top1 accuracy (%) of our method compared to baseline CLIP on numerous downstream benchmark datasets. Note: Results are derived from published hyperparameters for the baseline and minimal hyperparameter tuning of our method to account for differences in backbone architecture.

5. Additional Qualitative Results

5.1. Additional Text-Image Retrievals

In Figures 1 and 2, we provide additional text-image retrieval results computed on the COCO test set. Consistent with the retrievals shown in Figure 6 from our main paper, our method more consistently captures the full semantic extent of the query caption, whereas the baseline CLIP model tends to narrowly focus on one particular aspect. For example, in the first row of Figure 2, CLIP does retrieve a “black and white cat,” but also retrieves a black and white dog, a black and white zebra and a black and white photograph of boxes, whereas our method retrieves images containing a cat in 9 out of the 10 top retrievals.

5.2. Additional Robust Classification Examples

In Figure 3, we show qualitative examples of the instances where our method shows improved robustness over its CLIP counterpart for out-of-distribution images drawn from the ImageNet-R dataset. While CLIP struggles to handle certain artistic styles (angular shark depicted in row 1, goldfinch in row 4, tattooed tree frog in row 6), strong color patterns (black and white colors in row 3), or subjects in unusual contexts (rows 5,7,8), our method is able to more consistently provide a reasonable set of top predictions, which is consistent with the quantitative improvement of nearly 8.5% on average when considering Conceptual Captions pretraining as reported in Table 1 of our main paper.

5.3. Similarity Matrix Visualization

In Figure 4, we show a matrix of pairwise cosine similarity scores assigned to a batch of images and corresponding text snippets by our method compared to its CLIP counterpart. This similarity matrices present concrete examples of the trends captured by the distributions shown in Figure 5 of the main paper. Namely, it shows that CLIP has been optimized to assign high similarity scores along the diagonal (positive pairs) and low similarity to off diagonal elements (negatives), even when there is non-negligible semantic similarity between unpaired instances (e.g., the text “a black-and-white silhouette...” and the black-and-white image of a photographer dressed in black clothing). In contrast, our method yields elevated scores for negative pairings that show this amount of secondary similarity. As a consequence, we empirically observe that our learned representations produce larger scores for ground truth positive pairs and lead to more robust zero-shot classification performance.

6. Ethical Considerations

6.1. Impact on ML and Related Scientific Fields

A primary motivation driving this work is to increase the robustness and efficiency of a vision-language pretraining (VLP) method that has recently given rise to a set of so-called foundation models \cite{1}. Due to the anticipated role that foundation models are to play in the immediate de-
Figure 1. Example Text-Image Retrievals – Given a text query, we display the top ten most semantically related images (ranked left to right) retrieved by CLIP and our method. Compared to CLIP, our method continues to retrieve images that more holistically match the text description, even after the ground truth image has appeared in the ranking.

Development of AI systems, contributions to advancing the core training method will have far-reaching impacts on the field and downstream application areas by definition. Since improving the efficiency and lowering the computational/environmental cost associated with this VLP method is a primary objective of our work, we would like our work to assist in providing greater accessibility to the study, development and deployment of these VLP methods.
Figure 2. Additional Text-Image Retrievals – Given a text query, we display the top ten most semantically related images (ranked left to right) retrieved by CLIP and our method. Compared to CLIP, our method continues to retrieve images that more holistically match the text description, even after the ground truth image has appeared in the ranking.

6.2. Impact on Society

Robustness to challenging, novel, and even adversarial examples is rapidly becoming an extremely important part of modern computer vision systems, which are now starting to be deployed in sensitive contexts such as autonomous vehicles [5] and medical applications [2] with life and death consequences. Additionally, the increasing diversity of data sources, ranging from massive and cumbersome datasets to extremely limited and highly sensitive information, poses
several practical and environmental challenges to consistently training robust and reliable machine learning systems. Our proposed framework aims to address these aspects jointly.
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Figure 3. Robustness Examples – Given an image from the ImageNet-R dataset (left column), we compare the predictions of CLIP (middle column) to the predictions of our method (right column) by showing the probabilities assigned to the top 5 classes.
Figure 4. Visualization of our method’s similarity scores between a batch of eight image-text pairs. The baseline CLIP is optimized to maximize the diagonal scores and minimize off-diagonal scores, even when there exists non-negligible semantic similarity between unpaired instances. In contrast, our method yields elevated similarity scores on off-diagonal elements when there is increased semantic similarity between unpaired instances (e.g., photographer-to-astronaut pairing and the black-and-white-to-photographer-to-page of text pairing). As a result, we empirically observe larger similarity scores for ground truth positive pairs with our method, which coincides with improved downstream zero-shot classification performance.