

Modeling Text with Graph Convolutional Network for Cross-Modal Information Retrieval

Jing Yu¹, Yuhang Lu^{1,2}, Zengchang Qin³, Yanbing Liu¹, Jianlong Tan¹, Li Guo¹, Weifeng Zhang⁴

¹Institute of Information Engineering, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

²School of Cyber Security, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

³Intelligent Computing & Machine Learning Lab, School of ASEE, Beihang University, China

⁴Hangzhou Dianzi University, China

{yujing02, luyuhang, liuyanbing, tanjianlong, guoli}@iie.ac.cn, zcquin@buaa.edu.cn, zwf.zhang@gmail.com

Abstract

Cross-modal information retrieval aims to find heterogeneous data of various modalities from a given query of one modality. The main challenge is to map different modalities into a common semantic space, in which distance between concepts in different modalities can be well modeled. For cross-modal information retrieval between images and texts, existing work mostly uses off-the-shelf Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) for image feature extraction. For texts, word-level features such as bag-of-words or word2vec are employed to build deep learning models to represent texts. Besides word-level semantics, the semantic relations between words are also informative but less explored. In this paper, we model texts by graphs using similarity measure based on word2vec. A dual-path neural network model is proposed for couple feature learning in cross-modal information retrieval. One path utilizes Graph Convolutional Network (GCN) for text modeling based on graph representations. The other path uses a neural network with layers of nonlinearities for image modeling based on off-the-shelf features. The model is trained by a pairwise similarity loss function to maximize the similarity of relevant text-image pairs and minimize the similarity of irrelevant pairs. Experimental results show that the proposed model outperforms the state-of-the-art methods significantly, with 17% improvement on accuracy for the best case.

1 Introduction

For past a few decades, online multimedia information in different modalities, such as image, text, video and audio, has been increasing and accumulated explosively. Information related to the same content or topic may exist in various modalities and has heterogeneous properties, that makes it difficult for traditional uni-modal information retrieval systems to acquire comprehensive information. There is a growing demand for effective and efficient search in the data across different modalities. Cross-modal information retrieval [Rasiwasia *et al.*, 2010; Yu *et al.*, 2012; Wang *et al.*, 2016b] enables users




Figure 1: Comparison of classical cross-modal retrieval models to our model. (a) Classical models adopt feature vectors to represent grid-structured multimodal data; (b) Our model can handle both irregular graph-structured data and regular grid-structured data simultaneously.

to take a query of one modality to retrieve data in relevant content in other modalities. However, there is no natural correspondence between different modalities. Previous research has made continuous effort on designing appropriate distance measure of similarity and gained great progress. A common solution is to learn a common latent semantic space to compare all modalities of data directly, typically using probabilistic models [Blei and Jordan, 2003], metric learning [Zheng and Yeung, 2012], subspace learning [Hardoon *et al.*, 2004; Rasiwasia *et al.*, 2010; Sharma *et al.*, 2012], and joint modeling methods [Wang *et al.*, 2016b]. A brief survey is available in [Wang *et al.*, 2016b].

Feature representation is the footstone for cross-modal information retrieval. In the case of text-image retrieval, off-the-shelf features learnt by deep models are widely used to represent images. Most methods [Zhang *et al.*, 2017; Wang *et al.*, 2016d] use Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) [Lecun *et al.*, 1998] to learn the visual features obtained from the pre-trained model for object recognition on ImageNet.

CNN can effectively extract hierarchies of visual feature vectors and the fixed CNN feature can be directly used for text-image semantic space mapping. In this paper, we also employ the same routine to use pre-trained CNN for visual feature learning. For text representation, the popular *vector-space* model is usually adopted to convert a text to a textual vector for learning high-level semantic representations. In this kind of models, *bag-of-words* (BOW) is commonly used in cross-modal information retrieval [Liu *et al.*, 2016; Wang *et al.*, 2016c]. Intuitively, the text document is represented by a word-frequency vector regardless of the word order. Although some weighting schemes based on word frequency have been proposed to enhance the feature discrimination [Wang *et al.*, 2016b], one common problem is that the relations among words are not considered. Recently, *word2vec* [Mikolov *et al.*, 2013] becomes one of the best models for semantical modeling of word semantics. It’s pre-trained on GoogleNews to learn the vector representation from the context information. [Wang *et al.*, 2016d] extracts word vectors via *word2vec* model and adopts Fisher vector encoding to obtain the sentence representation. [Zhang *et al.*, 2017] represents a text by calculating a mean vector of all the word *word2vec* vectors in a text. Although this kind of word vector is enriched by learning from neighboring words, it still ignores the global structural information inherent in the texts and only treat the word as “flat” features. In light of the common weakness in *vector-space* models, recent research has found that the relations among words could provide rich semantics of the texts and can effectively promote the text classification performance [Wang *et al.*, 2016a].

In this paper, we represent a text as a structured and featured graph and learn text features by a graph-based deep model, i.e. Graph Convolutional Network (GCN) [Kipf and Welling, 2017; Defferrard *et al.*, 2016]. Such a graph can well capture the semantic relations among words. GCN allows convolutions to be dealt as multiplication in the graph spectral domain, rendering the extension of CNN to irregular graphs. (Figure 1 shows the comparison of our model to classical cross-modal retrieval models.) The GCN model has a great ability to learn local and stationary features on graphs, which was successfully used in text categorization [Kipf and Welling, 2017] and brain network matching [Ktena *et al.*, 2017]. Based on this graph representation for texts, we propose a dual-path neural network, called **Graph-In-Network (GIN)**, for cross-modal information retrieval. The text modeling path contains a GCN on the top of graph representations. The image modeling path contains a neural network with layers of nonlinearities on the top of off-the-shelf image representations. To train the model, we employ a pairwise similarity loss function [Kumar BG *et al.*, 2016], that maximizes the similarity between samples in the same semantic concept and minimizes the similarity between samples in different semantic concepts.

The main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a cross-modal retrieval model to model text data by graph convolutional network, which realizes the cross-modal retrieval between irregular graph-structured data and regular grid-structured data;

- The model can jointly learn the textual and visual representations as well as text-image similarity metric, providing an end-to-end training mode;
- Experimental results on five benchmark datasets show the superior performance of our model over the state-of-the-art methods, verifying the benefits of using graphs to model the irregular textual data.

2 Methodology

In this paper, we propose a dual-path neural network to simultaneously learn multi-modal representations and similarity metric in an end-to-end mode. In the text modeling path (top in Figure 2, that the convolution part is referred to the blog of GCNs¹), each text is represented by a featured graph and the text GCN is used to learn the feature representation. It has two key steps: *graph construction* and *GCN modeling*.

2.1 Text Modeling

Graph Construction: Classical methods semantically model the fundamental features of a text only by word vectors regardless of the structural information. In this work, we represent a text by a featured graph to combine the strengths of structural information with semantic information together. Given a set of text documents, we extract the most common words, denoted as $W = [w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N]$, from all the unique words in this corpus and represent each word by a pre-trained *word2vec* embedding. For the graph structure, we construct a k -nearest neighbor graph, denoted as $G = (V, E)$. Each vertex $v_i \in V$ is corresponding to a unique word and each edge $e_{ij} \in E$ is defined by the *word2vec* similarity between two words:

$$e_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } w_i \in N_k(w_j) \text{ or } w_j \in N_k(w_i) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $N_k(\cdot)$ denotes the set of k -nearest neighbors by computing the cosine similarity between word *word2vec* embeddings. k is the parameter of neighbor numbers (set to 8 in our following experiments). The graph structure is stored by an adjacent matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$. For the graph features, each text document is represented by a *bag-of-words* vector and the frequency value of word w_i serves as the 1-dimensional feature on vertex v_i . In this way, we combine structural information of word similarity relations and semantic information of word vector representation in a featured graph. Note that the graph structure is identical for a corpus and we use different graph features to represent each text in a corpus.

GCN Modeling: In modeling text corpora, deep network models have become increasingly popular and achieved breakthroughs in many machine learning areas. However, classical deep network models are defined for grid-structured data and can not be easily extended to graphs. It’s challenging to define the local neighborhood structures and the vertex orders for graph operations. Recently, Graph Convolutional Network (GCN) is proposed to generalize Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) to irregular-structured graphs.

¹<http://tkipf.github.io/graph-convolutional-networks/>




Figure 2: The structure of the proposed model is a dual-path neural network: i.e., text Graph Convolutional Network (text GCN) (top) and image Neural Network (image NN) (bottom). The text GCN for learning text representation contains two layers of graph convolution on the top of constructed featured graph. The image NN for learning image representation contains layers of non-linearities initialized by off-the-shelf features. They have the same dimension in the last fully connected layers. The objective is a global pairwise similarity loss function.

The basic idea is that, based on spectral graph theory, the graph convolutions can be dealt as multiplications in the graph spectral domain. The feature maps can be obtained by inverse transform from the graph spectral domain to original graph domain. In this paper, the text features are learnt by GCN given the graph representation of a text document.

Given a text, we define its input graph feature vector by F_{in} and we denote the output feature vector after graph convolution by F_{out} . Firstly F_{in} is transformed to the spectral domain via graph Fourier transform. This transform is based on the normalized graph Laplacian, defined as $L = I_N - D^{-1/2}AD^{-1/2}$, where I_N and D are respectively the identity matrix and diagonal degree matrix of the graph structure G . Then L can be eigendecomposed as $L = U\Lambda U^T$, where U is a set of eigenvectors and Λ is a set of real, non-negative eigenvalues. The Fourier transform of F_{in} is a function of U defined as:

$$\widehat{F}_{in} = U^T F_{in} \quad (2)$$

While the inverse transform is defined as:

$$F_{in} = U\widehat{F}_{in} \quad (3)$$

The convolution of F_{in} with a spectral filter g_θ is given by:

$$F_{out} = g_\theta * F_{in} = U g_\theta U^T F_{in} \quad (4)$$

where parameter θ is a vector to learn. In order to keep the filter K -localized in space and computationally efficient, [Defferrard *et al.*, 2016] proposes a approximated polynomial filter defined as:

$$g_\theta = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta_k T_k(\tilde{L}) \quad (5)$$

where $T_k(x) = 2xT_{k-1}(x) - T_{k-2}(x)$ with $T_0(x) = 1$ and $T_1(x) = x$, $\tilde{L} = \frac{2}{\lambda_{max}}L - I_N$ and λ_{max} denotes the largest eigenvalue of L . The filtering operation can then be written as $F_{out} = g_\theta F_{in}$. In our model, we use the same filter as in [Defferrard *et al.*, 2016]. For the graph representation of a text document, the i^{th} input graph feature $f_{in,i} \in F_{in}$ is the word frequency of vertex v_i . Then the i^{th} output feature $f_{out,i} \in F_{out}$ is given by:

$$f_{out,i} = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \theta_k T_k(\tilde{L}) f_{in,i} \quad (6)$$

where we set $K=3$ in the experiments to keep each convolution at most 3-steps away from a center vertex.

Our text GCN contains two layers of graph convolutions, each followed by Rectified Linear Unit (ReLU) activation to increase non-linearity. A fully connected layer is successive with the last convolution layer to map the text features to the common latent semantic space. Given a text document T , the text representation f_t learnt by the text GCN model $H_t(\cdot)$ is denoted by:

$$f_t = H_t(T) \quad (7)$$

2.2 Image Modeling

For modeling images, we adopt a neural network (NN) containing a set of fully connected layers (bottom in Figure 2). We have three options of initializing inputs by hand-crafted feature descriptors, pre-trained neural networks, or jointly trained end-to-end neural networks. In this paper, the first two kinds of features are used for fair comparison with other models. The input visual features are followed by a set of fully

connected layers for fine-tuning the visual features. Similar to text modeling, the last fully connected layer of image NN maps the visual features to the common latent semantic space with the same dimension as text. In experimental studies, we tune the number of layers and find that only keeping the last semantic mapping layer without feature fine-tuning layers can obtain satisfactory results. Given an image I , the image representation f_{img} learnt by the model from image NN $H_{img}(\cdot)$ is represented by:

$$f_{img} = H_{img}(I) \quad (8)$$

2.3 Objective Function

Distance metric learning is applied to estimate the relevance of features learned from the dual-path model. The outputs of the two paths, i.e. f_t and f_{img} , are in the same dimension and combined by an inner product layer. The successive layer is a fully connected layer with one output $score(T, I)$, denoting the similarity score function between a text-image pair. The training objective is a pairwise similarity loss function proposed in [Kumar BG *et al.*, 2016], which outperforms existing works in the problem of learning local image features. In our research, we maximize the mean similarity score u^+ between text-image pairs of the same semantic concept and minimize the mean similarity score u^- between pairs of different semantic concepts. Meanwhile, we also minimize the variance of pairwise similarity score for both matching σ^{2+} and non-matching σ^{2-} pairs. The loss function is formally by:

$$Loss = (\sigma^{2+} + \sigma^{2-}) + \lambda \max(0, m - (u^+ - u^-)) \quad (9)$$

where λ is used to balance the weight of the mean and variance, and m is the margin between the mean distributions of matching similarity and non-matching similarity. $u^+ = \sum_{i=1}^{Q_1} \frac{score(T_i, I_i)}{Q_1}$ and $\sigma^{2+} = \sum_{i=1}^{Q_1} \frac{(score(T_i, I_i) - u^+)^2}{Q_1}$ when text T_i and image I_i are in the same class. While $u^- = \sum_{j=1}^{Q_2} \frac{score(T_j, I_j)}{Q_2}$ and $\sigma^{2-} = \sum_{j=1}^{Q_2} \frac{(score(T_j, I_j) - u^-)^2}{Q_2}$ when T_j and I_j are in different classes. We train the model by mini-batch gradient descent with mini-batch size 200. In other words, we sequentially select $Q_1 + Q_2 = 200$ text-image pairs from the training set for each mini-batch in the experiments.

3 Experimental Studies

To evaluate the performance of our proposed model, we conduct extensive experiments to investigate cross-modal retrieval tasks, i.e. text-query-images and image-query-texts.

3.1 Datasets

Experiments are conducted on four English benchmark datasets, i.e. English Wikipedia, NUS-WIDE, Pascal VOC, and TVGraz. To verify the extensibility of our model, we also conduct experiments on the Chinese Wikipedia dataset. Each dataset contains a set of text-image pairs. Images are represented by off-the-shelf feature vectors while texts are represented by featured graphs.

English Wikipedia dataset (Eng-Wiki for short)[Rasiwasia

et al., 2010] contains 2,866 image-text pairs divided into 10 classes, where 2,173 pairs are for training and 693 pairs are for testing. Each image is represented by a 4,096-dimensional vector extracted from the last fully connected layer of VGG-19 model [Simonyan and Zisserman, 2015]. Each text is represented by a graph with 10,055 vertices.

NUS-WIDE dataset consists of 269,648 image-tag pairs, which are pruned from the NUS dataset by keeping the pairs belonging to one or more of the 10 largest classes. We select samples in the 10 largest classes as adopted in [Zhang *et al.*, 2017]. For images, we use 500-dimensional bag-of-features. For tags, we construct a graph with 5,018 vertices.

Pascal VOC dataset consists of 9,963 image-tag pairs belonging to 20 classes. The images containing only one object are selected in our experiments as [Sharma *et al.*, 2012; Wang *et al.*, 2013; Wang *et al.*, 2016c], obtaining 2,808 training and 2,841 testing samples. For the features, 512-dimensional Gist features are adopted for the images and a graph with 598 vertices is used for the tags.

TVGraz dataset contains 2,594 image-text pairs [Pereira *et al.*, 2014]. We choose the texts that have more than 10 words in our experiments and results in 2,360 image-text pairs, where 1,885 pairs for training and 475 pairs for testing. Each image is represented by a 4,096-dimensional VGG-19 feature and each text is represented by a graph with 8,172 vertices.

Chinese Wikipedia dataset (Ch-Wiki for short) [Qin *et al.*, 2016] is collected from Chinese Wikipedia articles. It contains 3,103 image-text pairs divided into 9 classes, where 2,482 pairs are for training and 621 pairs are for testing. Each image is represented by a 4,096-dimensional output of VGG-19. Each text is represented by a graph with 9,613 vertices.

3.2 Evaluation and Implementation

We compare our proposed GIN with a number of state-of-the-art models, including CCA & SCM [Rasiwasia *et al.*, 2010], TCM & w-TCM & c-TCM [Qin *et al.*, 2016], GMLDA & GMMFA [Sharma *et al.*, 2012], LCFS [Wang *et al.*, 2013], MvDA [Kan *et al.*, 2016], LGCFL [Kang *et al.*, 2017], ml-CCA [Ranjan *et al.*, 2015], AUSL [Zhang *et al.*, 2017], JFSSL [Wang *et al.*, 2016b], PLS [Sharma and Jacobs, 2011], BLM [Sharma *et al.*, 2012], CDFE [Lin and Tang, 2006], CCA-3V [Gong *et al.*, 2014], CM & SM [Pereira *et al.*, 2014], and TTI [Qi *et al.*, 2011]. For the same settings with [Zhang *et al.*, 2017], principal component analysis is performed on the original features for CCA, SCM, GMLDA and MvDA.

CCA, PLS and BLM are three popular un-supervised models that adopt pairwise information to maximize the correlation between projected vectors. AUSL and CCA-3V are semi-supervised models that leverage both labelled and unlabelled data to learn the common space. GMLDA, GMMFA, ml-CCA, TCM, LCFS, JFSSL, CDFE, and MvDA are supervised models that use the semantic class information to directly make data from one modality to correlate with data from another modality.

The mean average precision (MAP) is used to evaluate the performance of all the algorithms on the five datasets. Higher MAP indicates better retrieval performance. Meanwhile, the precision-recall (PR) curve [Rasiwasia *et al.*, 2010] is also

utilized for evaluation. In our implementation, we set $k = 8$ in k -nearest neighbors for text graph construction. In this work, positive samples denote the image-text pairs belonging to the same class while negative samples correspond to image-text pairs from different classes. So the ground truth labels are binary denoting whether the input pairs are from the same class or not. For all the datasets, we randomly select matched and non-matched text-image pairs and form about 40,000 positive samples and 40,000 negative samples for training. We train the model for 50 epochs with mini-batch size 200. We adopt the dropout ratio of 0.2 at the input of the last FC layer, learning rate 0.001 with an Adam optimisation, and regularisation 0.005. m and λ in the loss function are set to 0.6 and 0.35, respectively. In the last semantic mapping layers of both text path and image path, the reduced dimensions are set to 1,024, 500, 256, 1,024, 1,024 for Eng-Wiki, NUS-WIDE, Pascal, TVGraz, and Ch-Wiki, respectively. The code will be released on github upon the acceptance of the paper.

3.3 Experimental Results

The MAP scores of all the methods on the five benchmark datasets are shown in Table 1. All the other models are well cited work in this field. Since not all the papers have tested these five datasets, for fair comparison, we compare our model to methods on their reported datasets with the same preprocessing conditions. From Table 1, we can have the following observations:

First, GIN outperforms all the compared methods over the five datasets for the text-query-image task. On the Eng-Wiki and Pascal datasets, the MAP scores of GIN are 76.72% and 45.15%, which are about 35.70% and 17.14% higher than the second best result from JFSSL. For the NUS-WIDE dataset, the MAP score of GIN is 54.18% and 12.9% higher than the second best result from AUSL. It’s obvious that no matter for the rich text, e.g. Eng-Wiki and TVGraz, or for the sparse tags, e.g. NUS-WIDE and Pascal, our model gains the superior performance for the text-query-image task. The reason is that the proposed model effectively keeps the inter-word semantic relations by representing the texts with graphs, which has been ignored by other methods that represent the texts with only feature vectors, no matter skip-gram vectors or word frequency vectors. Such inter-word relations are enhanced and more semantically relevant words are activated with the successive layers of graph convolutions, resulting in discriminative representations of the text modality.

Second, the MAP score of GIN for the image-query-text task is superior to most of the compared methods. GIN ranks the second best on Eng-Wiki and NUS-WIDE, the third best on Pascal and the best on TVGraz and Chi-Wiki. Table 1 indicates that GIN is only inferior to JFSSL by 1.44% on Eng-Wiki and 4.37% on Pascal. GIN is just 4.54% lower than AUSL on NUS-WIDE. Since GIN uses off-the-shelf feature vectors for image view, it’s normal that the performance is comparable with state-of-the-art results. The retrieval performance can be further improved if the feature extraction network was trained together with the fully connected layers in our model. In this paper, we didn’t focus on the vector feature selection problem.

Table 1: MAP score comparison of text-image retrieval on five given benchmark datasets.

Method	Text query	Image query	Average	Dataset
CCA	0.1872	0.2160	0.2016	Eng-Wiki
SCM	0.2336	0.2759	0.2548	
TCM	0.2930	0.2320	0.2660	
LCFS	0.2043	0.2711	0.2377	
MvDA	0.2319	0.2971	0.2645	
LGCFL	0.3160	0.3775	0.3467	
ml-CCA	0.2873	0.3527	0.3120	
GMLDA	0.2885	0.3159	0.3022	
GMMFA	0.2964	0.3155	0.3060	
AUSL	0.3321	0.3965	0.3643	
JFSSL	0.4102	0.4670	0.4386	
GIN	0.7672	0.4526	0.6099	
CCA	0.2667	0.2869	0.2768	NUS-WIDE
LCFS	0.3363	0.4742	0.4053	
LGFL	0.3907	0.4972	0.4440	
ml-CCA	0.3908	0.4689	0.4299	
AUSL	0.4128	0.5690	0.4909	
JFSSL	0.3747	0.4035	0.3891	
GIN	0.5418	0.5236	0.5327	
PLS	0.1997	0.2757	0.2377	Pascal
BLM	0.2408	0.2667	0.2538	
CCA	0.2215	0.2655	0.2435	
CDFE	0.2211	0.2928	0.2569	
GMLDA	0.2448	0.3094	0.2771	
GMMFA	0.2308	0.3090	0.2699	
CCA3V	0.2562	0.3146	0.2854	
LCFS	0.2674	0.3438	0.3056	
JFSSL	0.2801	0.3607	0.3204	
GIN	0.4515	0.3170	0.3842	
TTI	0.1530	0.2160	0.1845	TVGraz
CM	0.4500	0.4600	0.4550	
SM	0.5850	0.6190	0.6020	
SCM	0.6960	0.6930	0.6945	
TCM	0.7060	0.6940	0.6950	
GIN	0.7196	0.8188	0.7692	
w-TCM	0.2980	0.2410	0.2695	Ch-Wiki
c-TCM	0.3170	0.3100	0.3135	
GIN	0.3847	0.3343	0.3595	

Third, GIN achieves the best average MAP over all the competitors, especially outperforming the second best method JFSSL by 17.13% on Eng-Wiki. That’s mainly because that our learning framework can jointly seek a common latent semantic space and correlated feature representations of multi-modal data, which can be trained end-to-end. The parameters in the path of graph convolutional networks are learnt referring to the features in the image branch, which enhances the relations between different modal features in their original data domain. Moreover, the learnt distance metric is also improving the separation between matching and non-matching image-text pairs.

Finally, on TVGraz dataset, GIN obtains the best results for both retrieval tasks. The improvement for the image-query-text task is greater than that for the text-query-image




Figure 3: Precision-recall curves on the five datasets.

task, which is quite different from the observations on other datasets. The reason is that, for the image view, the existing algorithms represent images simply by bag-of-features with SIFT descriptors while we utilize the 4096-dimensional CNN features, which are proved to be much more powerful than the hand-crafted feature descriptors. In addition to English, the representative alphabetic language, we also conduct experiments on Chinese dataset to show the generalization ability of our model. On Ch-Wiki, GIN gains 6.77% and 2.43% improvement for the text query and image query, respectively.

The precision-recall (PR) curves of image-query-text and text-query-image are plotted in Figure 3. Since the competitive models, i.e. w-TCM and c-TCM, haven't reported PR curves on Ch-Wiki, we compare GIN with random baseline on this dataset. For JFSSL, we show its best MAP after feature selection (see Table 7 in [Wang *et al.*, 2016b]). Since JFSSL hasn't reported the PR curves corresponding to the best MAP, we use its reported PR curves in [Wang *et al.*, 2016b].

For the text-query-image task, it's obvious that GIN achieves the highest precision than the compared methods with almost all the recall rate on the five benchmark datasets. For the image-query-text task, GIN outperforms other competitors with almost all the recall rate on Eng-Wiki. For NUS-WIDE dataset, GIN is only inferior to AUSL and LGCFL. For Pascal dataset, GIN is just slightly inferior to JFSSL. On the whole, GIN is comparable with state-of-the-art methods for the image-query-text task.

Discussion. In general, the proposed model shows superior performance for the text-query-image task in all the comparison experiments, especially on the three widely used benchmark datasets (i.e. Eng-Wiki, NUSE-WIDE, and Pascal), achieving about 17%~35% remarkable improvement on MAP. It's mainly because that the graph representation for text can well reserve the inherent property of semantic relations between different words, which provides an effective global prior knowledge for the successive GCN to model each text with distinctive feature input. In the graph convolutional procedure, such global prior knowledge guides the convolution to adaptively propagate the distinctive vertex features along semantic paths, which guarantees good generalization ability at conceptual level for the learnt text representation. The remarkable performance on text query proves that, compared with *vector-space* models, the incorporation of semantic structure is a great benefit and gains better generalization ability for un-seen data.

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel cross-modal retrieval model named GIN that takes both irregular graph-structured textual representations and regular vector-structured visual representations into consideration to jointly learn coupled feature and common latent semantic space. A dual path neural network with graph convolutional networks and layers of nonlinearities is trained using a pairwise similarity loss function. Extensive experiments on five benchmark datasets demonstrate that our model considerably outperform the state-of-the-art models. Besides, our model can be widely used in analyzing heterogeneous data lying on irregular or non-Euclidean

domains.

References

- [Blei and Jordan, 2003] David M. Blei and Michael I. Jordan. Modeling annotated data. In *SIGIR*, pages 127–134, 2003.
- [Defferrard *et al.*, 2016] Michael Defferrard, Xavier Bresson, and Pierre Vandergheynst. Convolutional neural networks on graphs with fast localized spectral filtering. In *NIPS*, pages 3837–3845, 2016.
- [Gong *et al.*, 2014] Yunchao Gong, Qifa Ke, Michael Isard, and Svetlana Lazebnik. A multi-view embedding space for internet images, tags, and their semantics. *TPAMI*, 106(2):210–233, 2014.
- [Hardoon *et al.*, 2004] David R. Hardoon, Sándor Szedmak, and John Shawe-Taylor. Canonical correlation analysis: An overview with application to learning methods. *Neural Computation*, 16(12):2639–2664, 2004.
- [Kan *et al.*, 2016] Meina Kan, Shiguang Shan, Haihong Zhang, Shihong Lao, and Xilin Chen. Multi-view discriminant analysis. *TPAMI*, 38(1):188–194, 2016.
- [Kang *et al.*, 2017] Cuicui Kang, Shiming Xiang, Shengcai Liao, Changsheng Xu, and Chunhong Pan. Learning consistent feature representation for cross-modal multimedia retrieval. *TMM*, 17(3):276–288, 2017.
- [Kipf and Welling, 2017] Tomas N. Kipf and Max Welling. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. In *ICLR*, 2017.
- [Ktena *et al.*, 2017] Sofia Ira Ktena, Sarah Parisot, Enzo Ferrante, Martin Rajchl, Matthew Lee, Ben Glocker, and Daniel Rueckert. Distance metric learning using graph convolutional networks: Application to functional brain networks. In *arXiv*, 1703.02161, 2017.
- [Kumar BG *et al.*, 2016] Vijay Kumar BG, Gustavo Carneiro, and Ian Reid. Learning local image descriptors with deep siamese and triplet convolutional networks by minimizing global loss functions. In *CVPR*, pages 5385–5394, 2016.
- [Lecun *et al.*, 1998] Y. Lecun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied to document recognition. *IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, 1998.
- [Lin and Tang, 2006] Dahua Lin and Xiaoou Tang. Inter-modality face recognition. In *ECCV*, pages 13–26, 2006.
- [Liu *et al.*, 2016] Hong Liu, Rongrong Ji, Yongjian Wu, and Gang Hua. Supervised matrix factorization for cross-modality hashing. In *IJCAI*, pages 1767–1773, 2016.
- [Mikolov *et al.*, 2013] Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. In *ICLR*, pages 1–12, 2013.
- [Pereira *et al.*, 2014] Jose Costa Pereira, Emanuele Coviello, Gabriel Doyle, Nikhil Rasiwasia, , Gert R.G. Lanckriet, Roger Levy, and Nuno Vasconcelos. On the role of correlation and abstraction in cross-modal multimedia retrieval. *TPAMI*, 36(3):521–535, 2014.
- [Qi *et al.*, 2011] Guojun Qi, Charu Aggarwal, and Tomas Huang. Towards semantic knowledge propagation from text corpus to web images. In *WWW*, pages 297–306, 2011.
- [Qin *et al.*, 2016] Zengchang Qin, Jing Yu, Yonghui Cong, and Tao Wan. Topic correlation model for cross-modal multimedia information retrieval. *Pattern Analysis and Applications*, 19(4):1007–1022, 2016.
- [Ranjan *et al.*, 2015] Viresh Ranjan, Nikhil Rasiwasia, and C. V. Jawahar. Multi-label cross-modal retrieval. In *ICCV*, pages 4094–4102, 2015.
- [Rasiwasia *et al.*, 2010] Nikhil Rasiwasia, Jose Costa Pereira, Emanuel Coviello, Gabriel Doyle, Gert R. G. Lanckriet, Roger Levy, and Nuno Vasconcelos. A new approach to cross-modal multimedia retrieval. In *ACM-MM*, pages 251–260, 2010.
- [Sharma and Jacobs, 2011] Abhishek Sharma and David W Jacobs. Bypassing synthesis: Pls for face recognition with pose, low-resolution and sketch. In *CVPR*, pages 593–600, 2011.
- [Sharma *et al.*, 2012] Abhishek Sharma, Abhishek Kumar, Hal Daume, and David W Jacobs. Generalized multiview analysis: A discriminative latent space. In *CVPR*, pages 2160–2167, 2012.
- [Simonyan and Zisserman, 2015] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. In *ICLR*, 2015.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2013] Kaiye Wang, Ran He, Wei Wang, Liang Wang, and Tieniu Tan. Learning coupled feature spaces for cross-modal matching. In *ICCV*, pages 2088–2095, 2013.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2016a] Chenguang Wang, Yangqiu Song, Hao-ran Li, Ming Zhang, and Jiawei Han. Text classification with heterogeneous information network kernels. In *AAAI*, pages 2130–2136, 2016.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2016b] Kaiye Wang, Ran He, Liang Wang, Wei Wang, and Tieniu Tan. Joint feature selection and subspace learning for cross-modal retrieval. *TPAMI*, 38(10):2010–2023, 2016.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2016c] Liang Wang, Ran He, Zhenan Sun, and Tieniu Tan. Group-invariant cross-modal subspace learning. In *IJCAI*, pages 1739–1745, 2016.
- [Wang *et al.*, 2016d] Liwei Wang, Yin Li, and Svetlana Lazebnik. Learning deep structure-preserving image-text embeddings. In *CVPR*, pages 5005–5013, 2016.
- [Yu *et al.*, 2012] Jing Yu, Yonghui Cong, Zengchang Qin, and Tao Wan. Cross-modal topic correlations for multimedia retrieval. In *ICPR*, pages 246–249, 2012.
- [Zhang *et al.*, 2017] Liang Zhang, Bingpeng Ma, Jianfeng He, Guorong Li, Qingming Huang, and Qi Tian. Adaptively unified semi-supervised learning for cross-modal retrieval. In *IJCAI*, pages 3406–3412, 2017.
- [Zheng and Yeung, 2012] Yi Zheng and Dit-Yan Yeung. Co-regularized hashing for multimodal data. In *NIPS*, pages 1376–1384, 2012.