# Towards Diverse and Accurate Image Captions via Reinforcing Determinantal Point Process 

Qingzhong Wang and Antoni B.Chan<br>Department of Computer Science, City University of Hong Kong<br>qingzwang2-c@my.cityu.edu.hk, abchan@cityu.edu.hk


#### Abstract

Although significant progress has been made in the field of automatic image captioning, it is still a challenging task. Previous works normally pay much attention to improving the quality of the generated captions but ignore the diversity of captions. In this paper, we combine determinantal point process (DPP) and reinforcement learning (RL) and propose a novel reinforcing DPP (R-DPP) approach to generate a set of captions with high quality and diversity for an image. We show that R-DPP performs better on accuracy and diversity than using noise as a control signal (GANs, VAEs). Moreover, R-DPP is able to preserve the modes of the learned distribution. Hence, beam search algorithm can be applied to generate a single accurate caption, which performs better than other RL-based models.


## 1 Introduction

Image captioning, which combines the fields of computer vision (CV) and natural language processing (NLP), is a challenging task, which has drawn much attention from the two communities and significant progress has been achieved. Earlier works (Kulkarni et al., 2013; Farhadi et al., 2010; Fang et al., 2015) generally directly employ vision and language models. However, these two-stage models cannot be trained in a end-to-end manner, which limits their performance.

Recently, CNN-LSTM models have become popular (Vinyals et al., 2015; Xu et al., 2015). CNN-LSTM models are typically composed of three modules: (1) a visual CNN , (2) a language LSTM, and (3) the connection module between them, which can be trained in an end-to-end manner. More powerful captioning models are later proposed (Anderson et al., 2017; Rennie et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2019), and trained using reinforcement learning (RL) where the evaluation
metric (e.g., CIDEr) is used as the reward function. As a result, the generated captions obtain high quality according to the most popular metrics, such as BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002), METEOR (Denkowski and Lavie, 2014), ROUGLE (Lin, 2004), CIDEr (Vedantam et al., 2015) and SPICE (Anderson et al., 2016).

However, most of the above models do not focus on the diversity of captions. While directly maximizing the metrics using RL (Rennie et al., 2017) significantly improves the metric scores, they lack diversity even though they are randomly drawn from the learned distribution (Wang and Chan, 2019). The lack of diversity in the captions is further exacerbated when using beam search to find the mode of the learned distribution.

The main issue of RL-based methods that leads to generating less diverse captions is they only consider the quality (as measured by BLEU or CIDEr) of samples during training. To address this issue, in this paper, we propose a novel approach that combines RL and determinantal point processes (DPP) (Kulesza and Taskar, 2012) that generates both accurate and diverse image captions. Inspired by DPPs, which account for the quality and diversity of subsets, we first propose a new metric that is able to reflect the quality and diversity of a set of captions. We then maximize the proposed metric score using RL, which is equivalent to a DPP training process. We evaluate our model using the diversity metrics from (Wang and Chan, 2019), and our proposed R-DPP model achieves both high accuracy and high diversity scores. In addition, R-DPP preserves the modes of the learned distribution - applying the beam search algorithm to generate one high-quality caption yields better performance than the baseline captioning model. Moreover, R-DPP outperforms its counterparts on the oracle test (see Table 2).

## 2 Related Work

Diverse image captioning. Recently, generating diverse captions receives much attention, and a variety of captioning models are developed, such as CVAE (Wang et al., 2017), CGAN (Dai et al., 2017), GroupTalk (Wang et al., 2016), GroupCap (Chen et al., 2018a), POS (Deshpande et al., 2018) and SCT (Cornia et al., 2018). CVAE and CGAN employ random noise vectors to control the difference among the generated captions. However, the diversity is highly related to the variance of the noise, which makes it difficult to balance diversity and accuracy. GroupTalk employ multiple captioners ${ }^{1}$ and a classifier to generated diverse captions. Each captioner generate one caption and the classifier is used to control the diversity among the captions. However the computational cost is high due to its use of multiple captioners. GroupCap considers the structure relevance and diversity constraint to generate both accurate and diverse captions, in which VP-trees are constructed. POS introduces part-of-speech (POS) tags to control the difference among captions, which contains two branches: 1) POS tag prediction, 2) word prediction. The same POS tag could result in using different words (synonyms), leading to diversity. Instead of employing POS tags as control signals, SCT applies noun chunks that are obtained by dependency parsing (Chen and Manning, 2014). Compared with the above captioning models, our proposed RL using DPP is much simpler and more efficient, does not require any other branches or control signals, and can be applied to any baseline captioning model.

Determinantal point process (DPP). Given a discrete set $\mathcal{X}=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, \cdots, x_{N}\right\}$, a DPP $\mathcal{P}$ measures the probability of each subset $\mathbf{X}$ of $\mathcal{X}$, which is defined as (Kulesza and Taskar, 2012):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{P}_{L}(\mathbf{X})=\frac{\operatorname{det}\left(L_{\mathbf{X}}\right)}{\operatorname{det}(L+I)}, \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $L$ is a positive semidefinite matrix, representing an L-ensemble, $I$ denotes the $N \times N$ identity matrix and $\operatorname{det}(L+I)=\sum_{\mathbf{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}} \operatorname{det}\left(L_{\mathbf{X}}\right)$.

Generally, $L=\left[L_{i j}\right]$ can be decomposed as a Gram matrix with elements $L_{i j}=q_{i} \phi_{i}^{T} \phi_{j} q_{j}$, where $q_{i}$ denotes the quality of the $i$ th element and $s_{i j}=\phi_{i}^{T} \phi_{j}$ denotes the similarity between the $i$ th and $j$ th elements, where $\left\|\phi_{i}\right\|=1$.

[^0]A DPP is trained by maximizing the loglikelihood $\log \mathcal{P}_{L}(\mathbf{X})$, where the subset with larger $\operatorname{det}\left(L_{\mathbf{X}}\right)$ will be assigned a higher probability. Inference involves finding the subset with highest posterior probability (MAP). DPP has been used in applications that require both quality and diversity: text summarization (Kulesza and Taskar, 2012), video summarization (Zhang et al., 2016), recommendation (Chen et al., 2018b) and neural conversation (Song et al., 2018).

## 3 DPP-based Reinforcement Learning for Image Captioning

We consider each caption as an item, and define the quality of a caption using CIDEr,

$$
\begin{equation*}
q_{i}=\mathbf{C I D E r}\left(c_{i}, \mathcal{C}_{G T}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c_{i}$ denotes the $i$ th caption in a subset, $\mathcal{C}_{G T}$ denotes human annotations and $\mathbf{C I D E r}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the CIDEr score. We define the similarity between captions as (i.e., "self-CIDEr" in (Wang and Chan, 2019)),

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{i j}=\mathbf{C I D E r}\left(c_{i}, c_{j}\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The $L$ matrix in DPP is then

$$
\begin{equation*}
L=\mathbf{q}^{T} \mathbf{q} \odot \mathbf{S} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathbf{q}=\left[q_{1}, \cdots, q_{N}\right], \mathbf{S}=\left[s_{i j}\right]$, and $\odot$ denotes element-wise multiplication.

Let $M(\theta)$ be the captioning model and $\mathcal{C}=$ $\left\{c_{1}, c_{2}, \cdots, c_{m}\right\}$ a subset of $m$ captions sampled from $M(\theta)$. The probability of $\mathcal{C}$ can be measured with (1), using the determinants of $L_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $L+I$. Unfortunately, to compute $L$ is intractable since the number of possible captions $N$ is huge, roughly $|D|^{l_{m}}$, where $|D|$ is the dictionary size $(10,000)$ and $l_{m}$ is the caption length $(16)$. Although computing $L$ is intractable, we note that $L$ is a constant w.r.t. $\theta$ for a fixed dictionary $D$ and caption length $l_{m}$. Thus, the denominator in (1) can be ignored when maximizing the likelihood of the generated captions $\mathcal{C}$ w.r.t. $\theta$,

$$
\theta^{*}=\operatorname{argmax} \mathcal{P}_{L}(\mathcal{C})=\operatorname{argmax} \log \left(\boldsymbol{\operatorname { d e t }}\left(L_{\mathcal{C}}\right)\right)
$$

To compute the quality scores and similarity matrix, we should sample a set of captions $\mathcal{C}$ from $M(\theta)$, and thus we cannot directly calculate the gradient of $\log \left(\operatorname{det}\left(L_{\mathcal{C}}\right)\right)$ w.r.t. $\theta$. Alternatively, we can first compute the derivative $\frac{\partial \log \left(\operatorname{det}\left(L_{\mathcal{C}}\right)\right)}{\partial L_{i j}^{C}}=$
$\hat{L}_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}$, where $L_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}$ is the element of $L_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\hat{L}_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}$ is the element of $L_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1} .^{2}$ Considering the derivative $\hat{L}_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}$, its sign indicates whether we should reduce or increase $L_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}$ to enlarge $\log \left(\operatorname{det}\left(L_{\mathcal{C}}\right)\right)$.

Recall that the reward function in (Rennie et al., 2017) is the expectation of CIDEr,

$$
\begin{equation*}
R(\theta)=\sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i} p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the corresponding policy gradient is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nabla_{\theta} R(\theta)=\sum_{i=1}^{m} q_{i} \nabla_{\theta} \log \left(p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right)\right) \cdot p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

(6) shows that the probability of the high-quality captions will increase, and finally the model could tend to generate captions that have high quality but lack diversity.

The main issue of using (5) is that it only accounts for the quality of captions. To promote diversity, we employ a new reward function that considers each pair of captions in $\mathcal{C}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
R(\theta)=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i g n }}\left(\hat{L}_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}\right) L_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}} p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right) p_{\theta}\left(c_{j}\right), \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\operatorname{sign}(x)$ is the $\operatorname{sign}$ of $x$, and $p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right)$ is the probability of the $i$ th caption according to $M(\theta)$. Note that $p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right) p_{\theta}\left(c_{j}\right)$ is the joint probability of the $i$ th and $j$ th captions, since the captions are sampled independently. Our reward function considers both the quality of captions as well as the similarity among captions (see Eq. (4)) ${ }^{3}$, thus is able to balance the quality and diversity. The corresponding policy gradient is (see supplemental for derivation):

$$
\begin{align*}
& \nabla_{\theta} R(\theta)= \\
& 2 \sum_{i=1}^{m} \nabla_{\theta} \log \left(p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right)\right) p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right) \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \operatorname{sign}\left(\hat{L}_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}\right) L_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}} p_{\theta}\left(c_{j}\right)}_{\mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{sign}\left(\hat{L}_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}\right) L_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}\right]}, \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

which has the same form as (6), but here we consider both quality and similarity among captions.

## 4 Experiments

Experimental setup. We conduct our experiments on MSCOCO dataset, which has 123,287 annotated images, each with at least 5 captions.

[^1]

Figure 1: Performance on diversity and accuracy. The captions are generated via random sampling from the learned distribution. For each model we sample 10 captions to compute the self-CIDEr diversity scores (Wang and Chan, 2019), and the accuracy score is the average of CIDEr scores. CGAN- $\{1,10\}$ use standard deviations of 1 and 10 to train CGANs, and greedy search is used for inference. $m$ is the number of samples used to train our R-DPP.

Following (Rennie et al., 2017), we use 5k images for validation, 5 k for testing and the remaining for training. Our baseline captioning model is based on Att2in (Rennie et al., 2017). We first train the model for 100 epochs using cross-entropy loss, and then refine it for another 100 epochs using our policy gradient in (8). During training, we apply Adam with learning rate 0.0004 . For comparison, we also refine the baseline model for 100 epochs using original policy gradient in (6). We also compare with CGAN ${ }^{4}$, GMM-CVAE (Wang et al., 2017), SCST (Rennie et al., 2017), and XE $+\lambda$ CIDEr (Wang and Chan, 2019). The diversity metric is self-CIDEr diversity, which is shown to be more correlated to human judgment (Wang and Chan, 2019).

Results. Fig. 1 shows the performance of different models in the diversity-accuracy space. Human annotations achieve relatively high diversity and accuracy ${ }^{5}$, and there is still a large gap between the proposed models and human annotations. Our R-DPP model slightly improves the accuracy of SCST and the baseline model (Att2in), when $m=2$, but the diversity score roughly doubles ( 0.2 to 0.4 ). Our R-DPP achieves comparable

[^2]| Model | $b w$ | $\mathrm{~B}-4$ | M | R | C | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adaptive-XE (Lu et al., 2017) | 3 | 0.332 | 0.266 | - | 1.085 | - |
| Updown-XE (Anderson et al., 2017) | 5 | 0.362 | 0.270 | 0.564 | 1.135 | 0.203 |
| Updown-RL (Anderson et al., 2017) | 5 | 0.363 | 0.277 | 0.569 | 1.201 | 0.214 |
| DISC-RL (Luo et al., 2018) | 2 | 0.363 | 0.273 | 0.571 | 1.141 | 0.211 |
| Hieratt-XE (Wang et al., 2019) | 3 | 0.362 | 0.275 | 0.566 | 1.148 | 0.206 |
| Hieratt-RL (Wang et al., 2019) | 3 | 0.376 | 0.278 | 0.581 | 1.217 | 0.215 |
| SCST (Rennie et al., 2017) | - | 0.333 | 0.263 | 0.553 | 1.114 | - |
| Att2in-XE (Rennie et al., 2017) | - | 0.313 | 0.260 | 0.543 | 1.013 | - |
| XE+5CIDEr (Wang and Chan, 2019) | 3 | 0.382 | 0.277 | 0.579 | 1.172 | 0.206 |
| XE+10CIDEr (Wang and Chan, 2019) | 3 | 0.378 | 0.276 | 0.580 | 1.174 | 0.207 |
| XE+20CIDEr (Wang and Chan, 2019) | 3 | 0.375 | 0.276 | 0.579 | 1.173 | 0.209 |
| Our R-DPP $(m=2)$ | 3 | 0.371 | 0.279 | 0.579 | $\mathbf{1 . 2 2 2}$ | 0.214 |
| Our R-DPP $(m=3)$ | 3 | 0.369 | 0.278 | 0.577 | 1.216 | 0.214 |
| Our R-DPP $(m=4)$ | 3 | 0.360 | 0.280 | 0.572 | 1.198 | 0.214 |
| Our R-DPP $(m=5)$ | 3 | 0.357 | 0.278 | 0.568 | 1.179 | 0.212 |
| Our R-DPP $(m=6)$ | 3 | 0.352 | 0.276 | 0.566 | 1.146 | 0.208 |
| Our R-DPP $(m=7)$ | 3 | 0.347 | 0.272 | 0.562 | 1.124 | 0.206 |

Table 1: Performance on single caption generation. The caption is generated using beam search ( $b w$ is the beam width). $m$ is the number of samples used during training of our R-DPP. The "-XE" suffix indicates training using cross-entropy loss, and "-RL" means finetuned with RL. $\{\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{S}\}$ are abbreviations for BLEU, METEOR, ROUGE, CIDEr, and SPICE.
diversity scores as $\mathrm{XE}+\lambda \mathrm{CIDEr}$, but the captions generated by XE $+\lambda$ CIDEr have lower accuracy compared to R-DPP. By maximizing $\operatorname{det}\left(L_{\mathcal{C}}\right)$, our R-DPP can simultaneously improves the quality and suppresses the similarity among captions (improves diversity). Comparing GMM-CVAE and R-DPP, both methods can generate captions with similar diversity, while R-DPP $(m=6)$ has higher accuracy ( 0.8 vs 0.95 ), which indicates that RDPP better approximates the modes of the groundtruth distribution. Finally, the R-DPP curve shows that the number of samples $m$ used during training balances the diversity and accuracy of the model. A larger $m$ leads to a more diverse set of captions, although it also incurs higher training computational cost.

Another advantage of R-DPP is that it can be used to generate a single high-quality caption for an image. Table 1 shows the comparison between R-DPP and the state-of-the-art models. Compared with SCST, R-DPP improves the CIDEr score from 1.114 to 1.222 , and the other metric scores are also improved by around 5\% or larger. Comparing with Hieratt-RL (state-of-the-art), R-DPP obtains similar CIDEr score, however, the Hieratt model cannot generate diverse captions.

Fig. 1 and Table 1 show the effectiveness of RDPP on generating both diverse and accurate captions, whereas they do not consider the optimal selection of $m$. Hence, we conduct experiments on oracle test (see Table 2) -the upper bound of each metric. R-DPP outperforms other methods, pro-

| Model | $\#$ | B-4 | M | R | C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AG-CVAE (Wang et al., 2017) | 20 | 0.471 | 0.309 | 0.638 | 1.308 |
| GMM-CVAE (Wang et al., 2017) | 20 | 0.449 | 0.299 | 0.624 | 1.251 |
| POS (Deshpande et al., 2018) | 20 | 0.449 | 0.365 | 0.678 | 1.468 |
| SCT (Cornia et al., 2018) | 20 | 0.448 | 0.366 | 0.689 | 1.565 |
| SCST (Rennie et al., 2017) | 20 | 0.332 | 0.322 | 0.630 | 1.383 |
| Att2in-XE (Rennie et al., 2017) | 20 | 0.329 | 0.326 | 0.621 | 1.216 |
| XE+5CIDEr (Wang and Chan, 2019) | 20 | 0.462 | 0.372 | 0.682 | 1.512 |
| XE+10CIDEr (Wang and Chan, 2019) | 20 | 0.465 | 0.372 | 0.689 | 1.568 |
| XE+20CIDEr (Wang and Chan, 2019) | 20 | 0.427 | 0.359 | 0.673 | 1.525 |
| Our R-DPP $(m=2)$ | 10 | 0.407 | 0.349 | 0.659 | 1.495 |
|  | 20 | 0.443 | 0.365 | 0.677 | 1.563 |
| Our R-DPP $(m=3)$ | 10 | 0.442 | 0.367 | 0.677 | 1.567 |
|  | 20 | 0.494 | 0.388 | 0.702 | 1.656 |
| Our R-DPP $(m=4)$ | 10 | 0.455 | 0.374 | 0.686 | 1.585 |
|  | 20 | 0.518 | 0.400 | 0.713 | 1.691 |
| Our R-DPP $(m=5)$ | 10 | 0.463 | 0.375 | 0.688 | 1.585 |
|  | 20 | 0.527 | $\mathbf{0 . 4 0 5}$ | 0.717 | $\mathbf{1 . 7 0 0}$ |
| Our R-DPP $(m=6)$ | 10 | 0.458 | 0.374 | 0.686 | 1.585 |
|  | 20 | 0.528 | 0.403 | $\mathbf{0 . 7 1 8}$ | 1.690 |
| Our R-DPP $(m=7)$ | 10 | 0.452 | 0.373 | 0.683 | 1.545 |
|  | 20 | $\mathbf{0 . 5 2 9}$ | 0.404 | $\mathbf{0 . 7 1 8}$ | 1.684 |

Table 2: Oracle (upper bound) performance based on each metric. \# represents the number of samples during inference. For Att2in-XE, XE $+\lambda$ CIDEr, SCST and our R-DPP models, we randomly sample captions from the trained model and the results of other models are from their papers. The blue numbers are the highest scores when sample 10 captions and the bold ones are the highest scores when sample 20 captions.
viding the highest-quality caption based on generating 20 captions. Even sampling 10 captions, R-DPP obtains higher scores. With the increase of $m$, the scores increase in the beginning, but then fall, e.g., when we sample 20 captions, CIDEr score rises from 1.563 to 1.700 when $m$ increases from 2 to 5 , after that it falls to 1.684 . Also, when we sample 10 captions, $\operatorname{R-DPP}(m=5)$ performs better. Thus, using $m=5$ could be a better choice to well balance diversity and accuracy, which also obtains the highest-quality caption. We show more qualitative examples in the supplemental.

## 5 Conclusion

We have presented the reinforcing DPP (R-DPP) model, which is a simpler but efficient method for training a caption model to generate both diverse and accurate captions. Compared with other models, R-DPP obtains similar diversity score, but much higher accuracy score. In addition, the state-of-the-art oracle performance is significantly improved by R-DPP. In the future, we believe that more quality and diversity measurements should be introduced into R-DPP. It is also possible to extend R-DPP to other text generation tasks, such as dialog and machine translation, in order to provide diverse high-quality choices to the users.
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The supplemental is arranged as follows:

- Details of the gradient computation.
- Qualitative examples of diverse image captions.


## A Gradient Computation

We show how to compute the policy gradient in Eq. (11) in our paper. Recall that the reward function is defined as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
R(\theta)=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i g n }}\left(\hat{L}_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}\right) L_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}} p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right) p_{\theta}\left(c_{j}\right) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that only $p_{\theta}(\cdot)$ is a function of $\theta$, then we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\nabla_{\theta} R(\theta) & =\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \operatorname{sign}\left(\hat{L}_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}\right) L_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}\left(\nabla_{\theta} p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right) p_{\theta}\left(c_{j}\right)+\nabla_{\theta} p_{\theta}\left(c_{j}\right) p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right)\right)  \tag{10}\\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \operatorname{sign}\left(\hat{L}_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}\right) L_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}} \nabla_{\theta} p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right) p_{\theta}\left(c_{j}\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \operatorname{sign}\left(\hat{L}_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}\right) L_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}} \nabla_{\theta} p_{\theta}\left(c_{j}\right) p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right)  \tag{11}\\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \operatorname{sign}\left(\hat{L}_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}\right) L_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}} \nabla_{\theta} \log \left(p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right)\right) p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right) p_{\theta}\left(c_{j}\right)+\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \operatorname{sign}\left(\hat{L}_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}\right) L_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}} \nabla_{\theta} \log \left(p_{\theta}\left(c_{j}\right)\right) p_{\theta}\left(c_{j}\right) p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right)  \tag{12}\\
& =2 \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \operatorname{sign}\left(\hat{L}_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}\right) L_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}} \nabla_{\theta} \log \left(p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right)\right) p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right) p_{\theta}\left(c_{j}\right)  \tag{13}\\
& =2 \sum_{i=1}^{m} \nabla_{\theta} \log \left(p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right)\right) p_{\theta}\left(c_{i}\right) \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^{m} \operatorname{sign}\left(\hat{L}_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}\right) L_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}} p_{\theta}\left(c_{j}\right)}_{\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{s i g n}\left(\hat{L}_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}\right) L_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}\right]} \tag{14}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $L^{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\hat{L}^{\mathcal{C}}$ are symmetric mtrices, we can derive Eq. (13) from Eq. (12). Note that $\frac{\partial \log p_{\theta}}{\partial \theta} \equiv \frac{1}{p_{\theta}} \frac{\partial p_{\theta}}{\partial \theta}$ for $p_{\theta}>0$, hence, we obtain Eq (12) from Eq. (11).

## B Qualitative Examples

We show more qualitative results of R-DPP. Fig. 2 to 5 show the comparison between R-DPP and other models, and Fig. 6 to 9 show the generated captions by R-DPP with different numbers of samples during training. Compared with other methods, our R-DPP could generate more fluent and diverse captions. We find that R-DPP is able to generate captions with different sentence structures (syntactic diversity), such as using synonyms, redundant and concise descriptions.


## MM-CVAE :

. a man is eating a meal at a restaurant
. a man taking a bite of a pizza with a fork
. a man is eating a meal at a restaurant
. a man is eating a piece of bread
. a man is taking a bite of a pizza
. a man is taking a picture of a man in a white shirt
. a man is holding a bowl of food on a table
8. a man in a red shirt is looking at a pizza 9. a man sitting at a table with a plate of food 10. a large plate of food on a table

1. the man takes a picture in front on a bowl
2. a man taking a selfie of a view of a white pizza
3. person with close photo of a personal reflection on the pizza
lady in a taking in picture in front of
a woman takes a camera of a very glass window
4. a man in the waiting taking while woman
5. a man sits in a chair holding a white and a pair of wine sitting around
6. a person looking at himself and sitting on a table
7. a guy looking at something grilled black topping pizza
8. a man taking a photo of a small slice of pizza

## XE+5CIDEr:

1. a man taking a picture of a pizza with a pizza
a man taking a picture of a pizza with a slice of pizza
a man taking a picture of a pizza with a pizza
a man taking a picture of pizza on a table
a man taking a picture of pizza on a plate
a man taking a picture of a pizza with a pizza
a man taking a picture of a pizza with a
2. a man taking a picture of a pizza on a table
3. a man taking a picture of a pizza with a pizza 9. a man taking a picture of a pizza with a pizza R-DPP (m=5) :
a man taking a photo of a pizza in a restaurant a man taking a photo of a pizza in a restaurant a woman taking a selfie in front of a pizza
a close up of a person taking a picture of a pizza a person taking a picture of a pizza in a restaurant a man taking a picture of a pizza on a table . a woman taking a picture of a pizza in the camera a man taking a photo of a pizza on a plate 9. a man taking a picture of a pizza on a plate 10. a woman taking a picture of a pizza in a restaurant 9

## SCST:

1. a man taking a picture of a pizza 2. a woman taking a picture of a pizza 3. a man taking a picture of a pizza 4. a man taking a picture of a pizza 5. a woman taking a picture of a pizza 6. a man taking a picture of a pizza 7. a man taking a picture of a pizza 8. a man taking a picture of a pizza 9. a man taking a picture of a pizza 10. a man taking a picture of a pizza"

XE+10CIDEr:

1. a man taking a picture of a pizza with a camera
2. a man taking a picture of pizza on a table with a camera
3. a man taking a picture of a pizza with a camera
4. a man taking a picture of pizza with a persons of
5. a man taking a picture of a pizza with a knife
6. a man taking a picture of a pizza with a salad
7. a person taking a picture of a pizza with a salad
8. a man taking a picture of a pizza with a salad
9. a person taking a picture of a pizza with a salad
10. a person taking a camera of a pizza with a salad

R-DPP (m=7) :
a man taking a photo of a pizza with his side
. a man taking a picture of a pizza
a man taking a picture of a pizza on a plate
a man taking a selfie at a restaurant
a man taking a picture of a pizza on a plate
. a person holding a camera in front of a pizza on a plate
a man taking a photo of a pizza
. a man taking a photo of a pizza on a plate
. a man taking a photo of a pizza while

1. a man in a suit holding a camera in front of a pizza with wine

Figure 2:

Human annotations:

1. different assortment of noodles and vegetables sitting in a pot and tray 2. a pot of pasta cooking on the stove next to a tray
2. a large pot of water and pasta sits on top of a stove
3. an image of food items on top of the stove
4. a pot of noodles is being cooked with more ingredients beside it

GMM-CVAE :

1. a pot of food is being cooked in a pan
2. a blender
. a pot of food is cooking
3. bt a <UNK>
. a tray of food cooking on a stove
. print a pot of soup and a pot with a pot of food 7. a bowl of soup with a bowl of food
4. alight from a window a stove a stove and a metal ladle
5. a pot of food is on a stove
6. a pot of food is cooking on a stove

Att2in-XE:

1. a trey of water and some fruit on it that
an food is cup sits on a table
. the large meal during even a red mixture
. hot plate displays a built into a bowl of sauces and a wood in top of
a piled next to a spoon and giving a fruit in a spoon
a countertop meal on a fork over in and sink
some bowl of stuff with pudding and man
a closeup is into a table that is left as has mustard and
. a plate of food with some mexican
2. a measuring bowl of with front of a bowls and a

## XE+5CIDEr:

a bowl of food and cooking on a counter with utensils a bowl of food and apples on a pan with a pot
a bowl of food and spoons on a pan with a pan
a spoon of food and cups on a pan with dishes
a pot of ingredients and an on a stove with a spoon
a bowl of food and vanilla dishes on a stove
a bowl of food and dishes on a pan with bowls
a bowl of food and fruit on a stove with a spoon
9. a bowl of food and fruit on a pan with a pot
10. a bowl of food and spoons on a stove with a bowl R-DPP (m=5) :

1. a bowl of food is sitting on a table
a toaster oven next to a bowl of food on a table
a bowl of food with a spoon on a table
a bowl of food sitting on a table next to a UNK
a tray of food with a spoon on a table
a plate of food with a spoon on top of a table
a bowl of food on a table with a bowl of food
a plate of food sitting on a table with a spoon
2. a bowl of food is sitting on a counter
3. a bowl of food on a table next to a bowl of fruit

## SCST:

1. a bowl of food and sitting on a table
2. a bowl of fruit and sitting on a table
3. a bowl of food and sitting on a table 4. a bowl of food and sitting on a counter 5. a bowl of food and sitting on a stove 6. a bowl of food and sitting on a table 7. a bowl of food and sitting on a counter 8. a bowl of food and sitting on a table 9. a bowl of food and sitting on a table 10. a bowl of food and sitting on a table

XE+10CIDEr:

1. a bowl of food and spoon on a wooden shelf with a spoon
2. a bowl of food carrots and a pan on a stove
3. a bowl of food and fruit on a pan with utensils
4. a bowl of food sitting pan on a pan with food bowl
5. a bowl of food bowls and dishes on a pan
6. a bowl of food rice and spoons on a pan with spoons
7. a bowl of food dishes and other dishes on a pan
8. a bowl of food dishes and other dishes on a pan
9. a bowl of food and spoon on a pan with bowls
10. a bowl of food and fruit on a pan with fruit
11. a bowl of food and strawberries on a tray with food R-DPP (m=7) :
12. a bowl with a bowl of food and a stove
a bowl of food sitting on a table next
a bowl of food sitting on a table next to a spoon
a bowl of food and a spoon on a table
a bowl of food and rice on a kitchen counter
a plate of food is sitting on a table
. a person sitting on the stove with a bowl of food
. a bowl of fruit and a spoon on a kitchen counter
13. a bowl of cereal and a spoon on a table
14. a close up of a bowl of food on a table
15. a bowl of food and a microwave on a counter

Figure 3:


Human annotations: 1. a table with a sandwich and two cups of coffee
2. sliced sandwich with tomatoes on a plate on a table
3. theres a ham sandwich and coffee for lunch on the table 4. a sandwich on a lace table cloth with coffee cups 5. two mugs next to a white plate with a sandwich on it

Att2in-XE:

GMM-CVAE:
a sandwich and a cup of coffee on a table . a close up of a plate of food
a table with a sandwich and a cup of coffee a meal of eggs and a sandwich 5. a sandwich and a cup of coff
a sandwich and a cup of coffee on a table a close up of a plate of food a table with a plate of food and a cup of coffee a couple of plates that are sitting on a table 9. a plate with a sandwich and a cup of coffee 10. a table with a sandwich and a cup of coffee

1. a cheese and ice cream sit on a table 2. a sandwich is cut at and a styrofoam cup of coffee the 3. two pieces of beer on on a plate with coffee and cake cup
2. cups of coffee with a cup of coffee a coffee mug in one and tiny cup
3. a plate of a pizza sitting next to a cup of coffee on a white table
4. a table with papers and cup of coffee
5. a slice of ice tea is and a beverage of coffee
6. a white sandwich with egg and eggs on and a cup
7. a baked with white plate top a cup a coffee cup of coffee
8. a coffee on a plate with some tea and and two cups

## XE+5CIDEr:

. a sandwich and coffee on a table with a cup of coffee . a sandwich and coffee on a table with a cup of coffee . a sandwich and coffee on a table with a cup of coffee 4. a sandwich and coffee sitting on a table with a cup of coffee
5. a sandwich and coffee sitting on a table with a cup of coffee
6. a sandwich and coffee on a table with a cup of coffee 7. a sandwich and coffee on a table with a cup of coffee 8. a sandwich and coffee sitting on a table with a cup of coffee
9. a sandwich and coffee on a table with a cup of coffee 10. a sandwich and coffee on a table with a cup of coffee

R-DPP(m=5)

1. a sandwich on a plate with a cup of coffee on it
2. a plate of food that is sitting on a table
3. a sandwich sitting on top of a table next to a cup of coffee
4. a sandwich sits on a table next to a cup of coffee
5. a sandwich sitting on a desk next to a cup of coffee
6. a sandwich and a cup of coffee on a table
7. a plate of food sitting next to a cup of coffee
8. a sandwich on a table with a cup of coffee on it
9. a plate of breakfast are sitting on a table with a cup of coffee
10. a plate of food on top of a table

XE+10CIDEr: coffee coffee table coffee coffee

SCST:

1. a sandwich and sitting on a plate with a cup of coffee 2. a plate of food and sitting on a table
2. a cup of coffee and sitting on a table
. a sandwich and sitting on a plate with a cup of coffee a sandwich and sitting on a plate with a cup
a plate of food and sitting on a table
a plate of food and sitting on a table
a cup of coffee and sitting on a table
. a cup of coffee and sitting on a table
3. a sandwich and sitting on a table with a cup of coffee 10. a cup of coffee and sitting on a table
4. a plate of breakfast and breakfast coffee on a table with
5. a breakfast and coffee breakfast on a table with a cup of
6. a white plate with a sandwich and coffee coffee on a table 4. a plate of breakfast and coffee on a table with cups 5. a breakfast plate of breakfast and coffee coffee on a table 6. a plate with breakfast plates of coffee and coffee on a
7. a breakfast of breakfast and coffee on a table with coffee
8. a breakfast plate with breakfast and drinks on a table next coffee cups
9. a plate of breakfast and coffee coffee on a table with
10. a breakfast with breakfast breakfast on a table with coffee cup and coffee

R-DPP(m=7):

1. a plate of food is sitting on a table
2. a sandwich on a plate next to a coffee cup of coffee
3. a sandwich is sitting on a plate on a table
4. a plate with a sandwich and a cup of coffee on it
5. a sandwich that is sitting on a plate
6. a large plate of food on a table
7. a plate of food and a coffee mug on the table
8. a sandwich is on a plate on a table
9. a sandwich sitting on top of a table with a cup of
coffee
10. an egg and a plate of food on a wooden table

Figure 4:


Human annotations:

1. a man and a woman cross country skiing on a snow covered trail with mountain peaks in the background 2. a couple of skiers are going down a snowy mountain
2. a lady skiing looking back at a man skiing
3. two snow skiers coming down a snowy hill
4. a man and a woman cross country skiing in deep snow

Att2in-XE:

1. two people riding skis on a snowy surface
2. a couple of people standing on top of a snow covered slope
slope
3. two skiers cross country on beneath a mountain
4. two skiers are carrying their snow on a snowy slope
5. the people are racing skiing in the snow
6. two skiers on poles a to finish the run down the mountain way
7. two a number of skiers in snow with umbrellas
8. three people are skiing across a mountain covered land
9. two people skiing skis down on snowy mountain
10. a group and skiers are gathered their the snow XE+5CIDEr:
11. two people standing on skis in the snow covered mountain
12. two people standing on skis in the snow covered mountain
13. two people cross country skiing on a snow covered mountain
14. two people standing on skis in the snow covered mountain
15. two people cross country skiing on a snow covered mountain
16. two women standing on skis in the snow covered mountain
17. two people standing on skis in the snow covered mountain
18. two people standing on skis in the snow covered mountain
19. two people standing on skis in the snow covered mountain
20. two people standing on skis in the snow covered mountain
R-DPP(m=5):
21. two people cross country skiing in the snow
. two people cross country skiing on a snowy mountain
two people on skis standing in the snow
22. two skiers are standing on skis in the snow
23. two people are riding skis on a snowy mountain
24. two people standing on skis in the snow
25. two people skiing skis on top of a snow covered mountain
26. two people on skis standing in the snow
27. two people are standing in the snow on skis
28. two people are standing in the snow on skis
29. a couple of people riding skis down a snow covered ski slopele that are standing on skis in the snow
30. a couple of people riding skis down a snow covered ski slope10. two people on skis in the snow

GMM-CVAE:

1. a group of three men standing on top of a snow covered slope
2. a couple of men standing on top of a snow covered slope
3. a couple of people on a snowy mountain
4. users of a group of people on skis
5. a group of three men standing next to each other on a snow covered slope
6. three people standing on a snow covered slope
7. three men on skis are standing in the snow
8. a group of people standing on top of a snow covered slope
9. a group of three men standing next to each other on
a snow covered slope
10. a group of people standing on a snowy surface

SCST:

1. a couple of people on skis in the snow
2. a couple of people on skis in the snow
3. a couple of people on skis in the snow a couple of people on skis in the snow
two people are on skis in the snow two people are skiing on skis in the snow a couple of people on skis in the snow 8. a group of people on skis in the snow 9. a couple of people on skis in the snow 10. a couple of people on skis in the snow

XE+10CIDEr:

1. two people standing country skiing on a mountain mountain with
2. two people standing country skiing in the snow covered mountain
3. two people standing country skiing in the snow mountain slope
4. two people standing country skiing in a mountain slope 5. two people standing country skiing on a mountain slope 6. two people cross country skiing on a snow mountain mountain 7. two people standing on skis in the snow mountain mountain 8. two people standing country skiing on a mountain mountain 9. two people standing country skiing on a mountain mountain 10. two people standing country skiing in the snow covered mountain

R-DPP ( $m=7$ ) :

1. two people are cross country skiing in the snow
2. two people in the back of a ski slope
3. two people are riding skis on a snowy slope
4. two people on skis in the snow
5. a couple of people riding skis down a snow covered

## slope

6. two skiers on skis in the snow
7. two people holding skis on a snowy slope
8. two skiers are on skis on top of a snow covered
slope

Figure 5:


Human annotations:

1. a lady that has a tennis racket in hand
2. a young female swinging at a tennis ball coming in low
3. the woman is playing tennis on the court
4. the female tennis player is wearing red and white 5. a girl reaches for a ball with her tennsi racket

R-DPP(m=2):

1. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racket
a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racquet
. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racquet
. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racket
a woman is swinging a tennis ball on a tennis court
a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racket
a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racket
2. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racket
3. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racket
4. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racquet

R-DPP(m=4):
. a woman swinging a tennis racquet at a tennis ball
2. a woman swinging a tennis racket at a ball
3. a woman is on a tennis ball with her racket
4. a woman holding a tennis racquet at a ball
5. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racket
6. a woman is swinging a tennis racket at a ball
7. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racket
8. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racquet
9. a woman is playing tennis on a court
10. a woman swinging a tennis racket at a ball

R-DPP(m=6):

1. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racquet
2. a woman playing tennis on a tennis court
3. a woman swinging a tennis racket on a court
4. a woman is trying to hit a tennis ball
5. a woman is swinging a tennis racket at a ball
6. a woman swinging a tennis racket at a ball
7. a girl is trying to hit a tennis ball
8. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racquet
9. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racquet
10. a female tennis player swinging a racket at a ball

R-DPP(m=3)

1. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racket
2. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racquet
3. a woman swinging a tennis racket at a ball
4. a woman swinging a tennis ball on a court
5. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racquet
6. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racket
7. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racket
8. a woman swinging a tennis racquet on a tennis ball
9. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racquet
10. a woman is playing with a tennis ball

R-DPP(m=5):
a woman swinging a tennis racket at a ball
a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racquet
a woman swinging a tennis racquet on a tennis ball
a woman swinging a tennis racquet on a tenn
a female tennis player getting ready to hit the ball
a female tennis player getting ready to hit
a woman is playing tennis on a tennis court
. a woman swinging a tennis racquet on
9. a woman hitting a tennis ball with her racket
10. a female tennis player getting ready to hit the ball

R-DPP(m=7)

1. a girl swinging a tennis racket at a ball
a woman is playing tennis on the court
a woman playing tennis on a clay court
a woman on a court holding a tennis racket
a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racket
a female tennis player hitting a ball with the ball
a woman in a red shirt is playing tennis
2. a woman hitting a tennis ball with a racquet
3. a woman is about to hit a tennis ball
4. a female tennis player getting ready to hit the ball

Figure 6:


Human annotations:

1. a large pile of a variety of donuts seen from above
2. a large stack of a variety of donuts all set on top of each other to make a pyramid like design
3. a pile of different flavored donuts topped with chocolate and coconut 4. overhead shot of a pyramid of assorted cake donuts
4. various decorated donuts are stacked on top of each other

R-DPP(m=2):

1. a pile of donuts sitting on top of a table
a pile of donuts are sitting on a table
a pile of donuts are sitting on a table
2. a box of donuts are sitting on a table
3. a box of donuts sitting on a table
4. a box of donuts are on a table
5. a pile of donuts sitting on a table
6. a box of donuts are on a table
7. a box of donuts are sitting on a table
8. a pile of donuts sitting on a table

R-DPP (m=4):

1. a bunch of glazed donuts in a box 2. a box filled with lots of donuts in it 3. a bunch of doughnuts are sitting on a plate 4. a bunch of glazed donuts sitting on a table 5. a pile of glazed donuts on a white plate 6. a pile of donuts that are sitting on a table 7. a pile of glazed donuts sitting on a table
2. a bunch of donuts are sitting on a box 9. a bunch of doughnuts sitting on a table 10. a bunch of glazed donuts in a box

R-DPP(m=6):

1. a variety of donuts sitting on a table 2. a close up of a bunch of glazed donuts 3. a close up of a bunch of doughnuts
2. a bunch of doughnuts are on a plate
3. a close up of a bunch of doughnuts
4. a box filled with different types of doughnuts
5. a box filled with different types of doughnuts 7. a box filled with different types of doughnuts 8. a variety of donuts that are s
6. a box filled with two donuts and doughnuts

R-DPP(m=3):
a box of donuts sitting on top of a table
a pile of doughnuts on a table
a pile of doughnuts on a
a pile of donuts on a plate
a box of doughnuts on a table
a box of doughnuts on top of a table
a close up of a box filled with donuts
a plate of donuts sitting on a table
a pile of donuts on a plate
10. a box of donuts in a table

R-DPP ( $\mathrm{m}=5$ ) :
a box filled with lots of donuts sitting in it
a bunch of donuts sitting on a glass
a close up of a pile of doughnuts
a box of different types of donuts
a pile of donuts with a on a plate
a pile of donuts sitting on a box
a pile of donuts sitting on a box
a close up of a white of doughnuts
9. a group of doughnuts are sitting on a plate
10. a variety of glazed donuts on a table

R-DPP(m=7):

1. a close up of a bunch of donuts
a variety of doughnuts that are sitting on a table
a close up of three doughnuts on a plate
a box of donuts that are sitting on a table
a pile of donuts sitting on top of a stack of doughnuts
. a box filled with donuts in the background
a close up of a group of doughnuts
a glazed donuts on a plate next to a UNK
2. a bunch of donuts are in a display
3. a bunch of glazed donuts on a plate

Figure 7:


Figure 8:


Figure 9:


[^0]:    ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~A}$ captioner could be a captioning model.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Adding a small constant $\epsilon I$ to $L_{\mathcal{C}}$ ensures invertability.
    ${ }^{3}$ Note that the expectation of $L_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}$ could be enlarged or reduced based on $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { s i g n }}\left(\hat{L}_{i j}^{\mathcal{C}}\right)$, which is different with Eq. (5) where the expectation of $q_{i}$ is always enlarged.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ We train CGAN without using rollout, which is different from (Dai et al., 2017)
    ${ }^{5}$ The accuracy score of human annotations is the leave-one-out CIDEr score as in (Wang and Chan, 2019).

