

ACE: A Generative Cross-Modal Retrieval Framework with Coarse-To-Fine Semantic Modeling

Minghui Fang, Shengpeng Ji, Jialong Zuo, Hai Huang, Yan Xia, Jieming Zhu, Xize Cheng
Xiaoda Yang, Wenrui Liu, Gang Wang, Zhenhua Dong, Zhou Zhao[†]
Zhejiang University, Huawei Noah's Ark Lab
Hang Zhou, Shen Zhen

ABSTRACT

Generative retrieval, which has demonstrated effectiveness in text-to-text retrieval, utilizes a sequence-to-sequence model to directly generate candidate identifiers based on natural language queries. Without explicitly computing the similarity between queries and candidates, generative retrieval surpasses dual-tower models in both speed and accuracy on large-scale corpora, providing new insights for cross-modal retrieval. However, constructing identifiers for multimodal data remains an untapped problem, and the modality gap between natural language queries and multimodal candidates hinders retrieval performance due to the absence of additional encoders. To this end, we propose a pioneering generative Cross-modal rEtrieval framework (ACE), which is a comprehensive framework for end-to-end cross-modal retrieval based on coarse-to-fine semantic modeling. We propose combining K-Means and RQ-VAE to construct coarse and fine tokens, serving as identifiers for multimodal data. Correspondingly, we design the coarse-to-fine feature fusion strategy to efficiently align natural language queries and candidate identifiers. ACE is the first work to comprehensively demonstrate the feasibility of generative approach on text-to-image/audio/video retrieval, challenging the dominance of the embedding-based dual-tower architecture. Extensive experiments show that ACE achieves state-of-the-art performance in cross-modal retrieval and outperforms the strong baselines on Recall@1 by 15.27% on average.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Information systems** → **Multimedia and multimodal retrieval**; **Language models**.

KEYWORDS

Cross-Modal Retrieval, Generative Retrieval, Semantic Identifier, Feature Fusion

1 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, multimedia data has exploded both in quantity and form, under such background, cross-modal retrieval [25, 42, 71, 85] has become a research hot spot. Cross-modal retrieval tasks, which aim to retrieve relevant data from one modality (e.g. image [9, 52], audio [15, 16] or video [45, 70]) based on a query from another modality (e.g. text [63]), play a crucial role in various multimedia applications. Traditional approaches [13, 16, 21, 44, 52, 83] rely on dual-tower architectures that map the different modalities into a joint embedding space, as shown in Figure 1 (a), then compute the similarities between queries and candidates. However, these methods often struggle to effectively align multimodal data [71] due




Figure 1: Generative retrieval, which without explicitly calculating the similarity between queries and candidates, generates candidate identifiers directly based on the query.

to the modality gap, as well as suffer from huge retrieval latency and inefficiency issues [20] when the corpus is large.

In contrast, generative retrieval [39, 46, 55, 60, 65, 86], which is a promising paradigm in text-to-text retrieval, seeks to replace the whole process [50, 74] using a sequence-to-sequence model. Specifically, generative retrieval assigns unique identifiers [2, 12, 39] to all candidates in the corpus, and then the language model utilizes beam search to generate identifiers based on the input query. Compared to the dual-tower architecture, as shown in Figure 1 (b), generative retrieval eliminates the process of computing similarity, which ensures that the model does not need additional space to save candidate embeddings while accelerating the retrieval speed [58] on large-scale corpus.

While such generative framework has shown impressive performance in document retrieval, little work has explored the potential for generative cross-modal retrieval. Combining generative retrieval with cross-modal retrieval faces some challenges. Firstly, image, video and audio are primarily represented by visual or auditory patterns, whereas documents can explicitly extract titles [39, 82], substrings [2, 59] or keywords [12, 79, 81] to construct identifiers, which not only coarse-fine grained semantics, but also align with natural language queries. This means that we need to propose an effective scheme to construct semantic identifiers for multimodal data. Furthermore, there exists an asymmetry in the

amount of information between multimodal data. In other words, natural language queries may focus only on local information while identifiers contain all information, which makes it difficult for retrieval models to learn the full semantics of identifiers during the training stage. Meanwhile, without additional encoders, all candidates are directly encoded as model parameters, which means that the model needs efficient mechanisms for processing natural language queries to retrieve candidates.

In this work, we propose a generative Cross-modal rETrieval framework, **ACE**, to leverage the power of generative retrieval to enhance the performance of cross-modal retrieval. This framework is the first work to support end-to-end text-to-image/audio/video retrieval via a sequence-to-sequence model, which is based on coarse-fine semantic modeling. To address the previously mentioned problems, we propose three modules including semantic identifier generation, query generation and feature fusion. Specifically, we combine the K-Means algorithm and the Residual Quantized Variational Autoencoder (RQ-VAE) algorithm to generate identifiers with hierarchical semantic information for candidates. Meanwhile, we maintain an ID table to ensure the uniqueness of each identifier. Secondly, to alleviate cross-modal information asymmetry, we employ multimodal large language models for query generation to obtain sufficient number of query and candidate pairs. More perspectives of descriptions ensure that the model learns the rich features of multimodal data. Finally, we design a coarse-to-fine feature fusion strategy in the encoder-decoder architecture, which is consistent with the hierarchical structure of semantic identifiers. In the coarse-grained fusion stage, the model can preliminarily perceive the query semantic information. while in the fine-grained fusion stage, the model adaptively sets different weights for the outputs of each encoder layer to capture detailed information.

We conduct extensive experiments to demonstrate that ACE has state-of-the-art performance in text-to-image/audio/video retrieval. Meanwhile ACE has stable retrieval speed on both CPU and GPU, meaning it is not affected by the number of candidates. Ablation experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of the individual modules of ACE, while further analysis proves the robustness of coarse-to-fine modeling strategy. ACE enables end-to-end generative cross-modal retrieval based on a unified differentiable framework, providing a new solution for information retrieval in multimedia applications.

Our **contributions** are highlighted as follows.

- To the best of our knowledge, ACE is the first work to comprehensively demonstrate the feasibility of generative cross-modal retrieval on text-to-image/audio/video retrieval. Extensive experiments show that ACE achieves state-of-the-art performance and outperforms the strong baselines on Recall@1 by 15.27% on average.
- We propose to generate coarse-fine semantic identifiers for multimodal data, which hierarchically disentangles the semantics of the data.
- We propose coarse-to-fine feature fusion mechanism for bridging the semantic gap between natural language queries and identifiers, which corresponds to the hierarchical properties of semantic identifiers.

2 RELATED WORKS

2.1 Cross-modal Retrieval

Cross-modal retrieval is used for implementing a retrieval task across different modalities, such as text-image [9, 52] retrieval, text-audio [15, 16] retrieval or text-video [17, 70] retrieval. The main challenge in cross-modal retrieval is addressing the modality gap [71, 80] and the key solution to this challenge involves generating new representations from distinct modalities within a shared subspace [24]. Such that new generated features can be applied in the computation of distance metrics, including cosine distance and Euclidean distance.

Currently, the mainstream approach to cross-modal retrieval utilizes the dual-tower framework, which maps dual-modality data into a joint feature space and then computing their similarity through a distance function. The dual-tower framework formulates cross-modal retrieval as a discriminative problem [38], which relies on discriminative loss and negative samples to learn the embedding space. CLIP [52], CLAP [15] and CLIP2Video [17] follow this setting and complete the pre-training on large-scale datasets, achieving remarkable outcomes in text-image retrieval [3], text-audio retrieval [33] and text-video retrieval [84], respectively. Recent works, e.g., ImageBind [21] and LanguageBind [83], have attempted to align multiple other modalities using one modality, and without explicit supervision, the models recognize the inner connections between multiple modalities. However, due to saving all the candidate embeddings and computing the similarity between queries and candidates, the dual-tower framework is hindered by huge inference latency and memory footprint when facing web-scale data. In addition, several works [22, 68] have attempted to utilize a generative model to assist the dual-tower model for retrieval. In contrast, ACE utilizes a sequence-to-sequence model that generates candidate identifiers only based on the query.

2.2 Generative Retrieval

Generative retrieval, as introduced in the work by [43, 60, 65], represents an innovative paradigm in text retrieval, focusing primarily on document retrieval. Unlike traditional sparse and dense retrieval, the core idea of this approach is to construct an index for a vast number of documents. Specifically, generative retrieval utilizes a sequence-to-sequence model, effectively substituting the traditional approach of searching for relevant documents with generating identifiers. Consequently, it eliminates the process of computing the similarity between queries and the entire document corpus, streamlining the retrieval process significantly.

The performance of generative retrieval is heavily influenced by candidate identifiers, past studies have delved into the application of various identifier types across diverse scenarios, including keywords-based [12, 79, 81, 82], Web URLs [55, 87], and substrings of paragraphs [2, 39, 59, 82]. Considering the absence of explicit document content, DSI [60] and NCI [65] recognize the challenge in generating document identifiers solely based on input queries. Therefore, they advocate using the hierarchical K-Means algorithm to inject prior knowledge into identifiers. In other words, documents sharing close semantic ties are assigned similar docids. This methodology seamlessly embeds the semantic information of documents into the decoding process, which facilitates the learning




Figure 2: Coarse-Fine semantic identifier generation strategy. We use the K-Means algorithm to generate coarse token and the RQ-VAE algorithm to generate fine token, while we maintain an ID table to ensure that each identifier is unique.

process of the retrieval model. And this methodology has furnished novel perspectives for subsequent works[18, 47, 51, 57]. Vector quantization [27–30, 34] is another approach to constructing document identifiers from a semantic perspective [5, 53, 78]. In contrast to the hierarchical K-Means algorithm, it can efficiently compress the document embedding representation within a fixed step length, which is especially effective when dealing with large-scale corpora. ACE proposes the novel coarse token and fine token, which combine the advantages of the K-Means algorithm and the RQ-VAE algorithm, to generate identifiers with hierarchical semantics for multimodal data. In addition, ACE has the coarse-to-fine feature fusion mechanism, which effectively aligns queries with identifiers to enhance retrieval performance.

3 METHOD

3.1 Overview

ACE, which is an end-to-end generative cross-modal retrieval framework, takes natural language queries as input and generates target identifiers. We use $\langle \text{query}, \text{identifier} \rangle$ pairs to train a sequence-to-sequence model, which means eliminating visual or auditory inputs while retaining the capability for cross-modal retrieval. We propose a novel approach for the hierarchical extraction of semantics from multimodal data by generating coarse-fine semantic identifiers. To mitigate the asymmetry in the amount of information from different modalities, we employ multimodal large language models for query generation. Furthermore, We design a coarse-to-fine feature fusion strategy to perceive natural language queries and match the properties of semantic identifiers. To enhance the robustness of ACE, we incorporate consistency loss to suppress overfitting, and guarantee to generate valid identifiers via constrained beam search.

3.2 Coarse-Fine Identifier Generation

For image, audio and video, we can not utilize titles [12], substrings [2] or keywords [39] to generate identifiers as in previous work. DSI [60] and NCI [65] construct hierarchical K-Means trees for candidate embeddings, but the length of the unbalanced tree structure identifiers is not consistent, which affects the retrieval efficiency. TIGER [53] propose using RQ-VAE to extract the semantics at different hierarchical levels within fixed steps, but the embeddings

after dimensionality reduction lose part of the original semantics. We propose to combine K-Means algorithm and RQ-VAE algorithm to construct coarse-fine semantic identifiers, as shown in Figure 2, which include full semantic information as well as hierarchical attributes, and can represent large-scale corpora in fixed steps.

3.2.1 Coarse Token. Intuitively, the first token of identifier is critical, if the first token of identifier is generated incorrectly, subsequent generation will be meaningless. With this in mind, we hope that the first token of the identifier captures the full semantic information of the item, so that the retrieval model can easily predict the semantically closest information based on a natural language query. We utilize K-Means [23] to cluster the embeddings of all the items, which are encoded from ImageBind [21], and the clustering result is considered as the first token of the semantic identifier. Although the K-Means algorithm can finish item categorization rapidly in the whole data space, it is difficult to consider the subtle gaps between items effectively. Therefore, we denote the clustering result k of K-Means as the coarse token.

3.2.2 Fine Token. Subsequently, we utilize original embeddings to subtract the embedding from the clustering center of the K-Means algorithm, in order to highlight the subtle differences between items. Then we use RQ-VAE [?] to construct the remaining tokens in the semantic identifier. RQ-VAE combines the advantages of variational autoencoder and residual quantization, where the autoencoder is jointly trained by updating the DNN encoder-decoder parameters and the quantization codebook. The encoder $E(\cdot)$ first downsamples the input x to learn the latent representation $z = E(x)$, which removes noise and unimportant information and preserves the most meaningful features of the data. The quantizer $Q = \{C_1, C_2, \dots, C_M\}$ where M is the number of codebooks. The codebook $C_m = \{e_m^1, e_m^2, \dots, e_m^N\}$ where N is the codebook size and e_m^n denotes the n -th entry in the m -th codebook. The initial residual of the quantizer is defined as $r_0 = z$, then r_0 is quantized by mapping it to the nearest embedding e_1^k from the first codebook C_1 . The index of the closest embedding, i.e., $v_1 = \text{argmin}_k \|r_0 - e_1^k\|$, represents the token of the semantic identifier obtained in codebook C_1 , the residual is updated to $r_1 = r_0 - e_1^{v_1}$. This process is executed recursively m times and we obtain the index list $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_M\}$




Figure 3: Architecture of the ACE. We process the semantics of the input query using multiple encoder layers hierarchically. In decoder, we use coarse-to-fine fusion strategy, which is based on cross attention, to process the output of encoder.

denoting the semantic identifier produced by the RQ-VAE. Note that all codebooks do not share parameters, they are updated independently to distinguish between the different semantics of each hierarchy. Finally $Q(z) = \sum_{i=1}^M e_i^{v_i}$ is passed to the decoder $D(\cdot)$ to try to reconstruct the input x . We train the RQ-VAE using two loss functions $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{recon} + \alpha \mathcal{L}_{commit}$, where:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{recon} &= \|x - D(Q(E(x)))\|_2^2, \\ \mathcal{L}_{commit} &= \sum_{i=1}^M \|sg[r_i] - e_{v_i}^i\|_2^2 + \beta \|r_i - sg[e_{v_i}^i]\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here, both α and β are hyperparameters, and sg is the stop-gradient operation [61]. RQ-VAE hierarchically computes the residuals of the features for each item. In the refinement process, it focuses on the variation of the features at different levels and can capture the subtle features of the items. Therefore, we denote the quantization result of RQ-VAE as the fine token.

3.2.3 Unique Token. In large-scale corpora, it is common to have semantically close items, which makes it difficult to avoid identifier collisions [53]. In order to assign unique identifiers to each item, we maintain an ID table to detect conflicts. We perform a "search and count" operation on all identifiers, if the identifier already exists, increase its counter by one, on the contrary, insert the identifier into the ID table with an initial counter value of 0. The value of the counter u will be appended to the end of the identifier as an additional token to ensure that each identifier is unique. Note that search, insert or update of the ID table is so efficient compared to high level embedding that its time spent is even negligible.

Finally, we concatenate coarse token, fine token and unique token as identifiers for items, i.e. $(k, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_M, u)$.

3.3 Query Generation

As mentioned previously, the amount of information between different modalities may be asymmetric, especially when the complex semantics of the candidate is fully compressed into the semantic identifier, which consists of only several tokens. In other words, one huge challenge of generating item identifiers via natural language queries is how to make the retrieval model aware of the semantic information represented [6–8, 26, 31] by the identifiers. Since the

content of each item is not explicitly known at inference, it must be incorporated into the model parameters during training, as indicated in previous work [65, 78, 86]. To bridge this gap, we use the query generation module to generate multiple queries for each item and train the retrieval model with the generated queries and their corresponding identifiers, so that the model fully recognizes the semantic information of each identifier.

To generate diverse queries, we utilize the power of the multi-modal large language model (MLLM) to generate sufficient queries. We use Qwen-VL [1] and BLIP-2 [36] to generate descriptions for the images. We handcrafted the prompts, which asking MLLMs to try to describe the content in the images from different perspectives, avoiding redundancy and aiming for diversity in the generated descriptions. As for audios, we use Qwen-Audio [10] to recognize audio content, such as prominent sounds or ambient noise, and generate diverse descriptions based on the content. For videos, we used Video-LLaMA [77] and Video-LLaVa[40] to generate as detailed descriptions for the videos as possible.

3.4 Coarse-to-Fine Feature Fusion

ACE utilizes a standard encoder-decoder architecture, both made of stacks of attention layers. The encoder is in charge of capturing the semantics of the input query, and the decoder reads the output of the encoder and generates semantic identifier token by token. Given an input query q , the output of an encoder with S layers can be defined as $E(q) = (E_1, E_2, \dots, E_S)$. Each encoder layer can capture different semantic representations [11] of queries. The lower layer can capture some basic regional relevance, and the higher layer can further refine and optimize the semantic representations based on the output of the lower layer, this layer-wise relevance is exactly consistent with the hierarchical properties of semantic identifier. In light of this, we propose the coarse-to-fine feature fusion strategy to correspond to coarse-fine semantic identifier. As shown in Figure 3, we process the encoder output in two branches.

3.4.1 Coarse Fusion. The outputs from each encoder layer are concatenated and passed through a fusion layer, to integrate information from different levels of the encoding process. Because of the simple "concatenate-then-fusion" method, we naturally call it

coarse fusion, which is similar to the idea of coarse token. Formally,

$$Z = W[E_1, E_2, \dots, E_S] + b, \quad (2)$$

where $[\cdot, \cdot]$ denotes connecting the outputs of all encoder layers from the last dimension, W and b are the learnable weights and bias, respectively. Subsequently, Z interacts with the decoder input Y through cross-attention and completes the post-processing using self-gating [54]. The whole process of coarse fusion $G(\cdot, \cdot)$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} C(Y, Z) &= \text{Attention}(W_q Y, W_k Z, W_v Z), \\ G(Y, Z) &= \frac{1}{S} \sigma(C(Y, Z)), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $C(\cdot, \cdot)$ stands for the encoder-decoder cross-attention, S is the number of encoder layers and $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the sigmoid activation. W_q , W_k and W_v are matrices of learnable weights.

3.4.2 Fine Fusion. The purpose of fine fusion is for more careful deciding which subtle features to use. Intuitively, similar to mixture-of-experts [56], this design treats each encoder layer as an expert and aligns with the design philosophy of semantic identifiers. The outputs of each layer in the encoder interact independently with the inputs of the decoder through cross-attention, while utilizing the weights α_i regulate both the single contribution of each encoder layer and the relative importance between different layers. The decision-making process $L(\cdot, \cdot)$ can be written as

$$L(Y, E(q)) = \sum_{i=1}^S \alpha_i \odot C(Y, E_i), \quad (4)$$

and inspired by [11], we introduce the memory-augmented mechanism for weight computation, as follows

$$\alpha_i = \sigma(W_i[Y, C(Y, E_i)] + b), \quad (5)$$

where $[\cdot, \cdot]$ indicates concatenation, $\sigma(\cdot)$ is the sigmoid activation, W_i is the learnable weight matrices and b is bias.

Finally, we add the coarse feature and fine feature as input to the next decoder layer.

3.5 Training and Inference

We use <query, identifier> pairs to train a sequence-to-sequence model. Given an input query q , the probability of generating the semantic identifier T can be written:

$$p(T | E(q), \theta) = \prod_{i=1}^J p(t_i | E(q), t_{<i}, \theta_i), \quad (6)$$

where t_i is the i -th token in the semantic identifier T , J denotes the length of T and $E(\cdot)$ denotes the encoder, θ denotes the total parameters and θ_i is the parameter for the i -th step.

To mitigate the overfitting problem, we introduce a bidirectional KL divergence loss [69] to train the decoding process. For the user query, we denote the decoder representations by two forward passes with independent dropouts before softmax as P and Q , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_{KL} = \sum_i P(i) \log \left(\frac{P(i)}{Q(i)} \right) + \sum_i Q(i) \log \left(\frac{Q(i)}{P(i)} \right), \quad (7)$$

Given a collection of training examples $\mathcal{D} = \{(q, d)\}$ composed of queries (training queries and augmented queries) and identifiers,

the loss function can be written as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \sum_{(q,d) \in \mathcal{D}} (\log p(d | E(q), \theta) + \omega \mathcal{L}_{KL}), \quad (8)$$

where $p(d | E(q), \theta)$ denotes the probability of generating d with q as the input and ω denotes a scaling factor of KL divergence loss.

In the inference stage, we execute a constrained beam search on the decoder network. Benefiting from the ID table constructed when generating identifiers, we can effectively build a prefix tree for all identifiers, which will restrict the model to generating only valid identifiers. Due to the hierarchical nature of identifiers, it is convincing [65] to constrain the beam search decoding process with a prefix tree.

4 EXPERIMENTS

4.1 Datasets & Baselines

We evaluate the performance of ACE on text-to-image retrieval, text-to-audio retrieval, and text-to-video retrieval respectively.

Text to Image Retrieval. Flickr30K [75] contains 31,783 images and each image is associated with 5 human-annotated sentences. We select 29,783 images for training, 1000 images for validation and 1000 images for testing. MS-COCO [41] comprises 123,287 images, and each image comes with 5 sentences of annotations. We followed the data split proposed in [35] and utilized 113,287 images for training, 5000 images for validation and 5000 images for testing. All captions for each image in Flickr30K and in MS-COCO are used as queries for that image.

Text to Audio Retrieval. Each audio in Clotho [14] has 5 manually annotated captions, and there are 3839 audios for training, 1045 audios for validation, and 1045 audios for testing. Since some of the videos in YouTube are no longer available, we do not have the full collection of AudioCaps [32]. Finally, we have 37,869 audios for training, 384 audios for validation, and 737 audios for testing. Note that the training set has only one caption per audio, while the validation and test sets have five captions per audio.

Text to Video Retrieval. MSR-VTT [72] is a dataset composed of 10,000 videos, each with a length that ranges from 10 to 32 seconds and 200,000 captions. We use 9,000 videos for training that follows the data split of [19], and the test set consists of 1,000 video-text pairs from [76]. MSVD [4] contains 1,970 videos, each with a length that ranges from one to 62 seconds. Train, validation and test splits contain 1,200, 100, and 670 videos, respectively. Each video has approximately 40 associated sentences in English.

Baselines. We consider several traditional dual-tower models as baselines, all of which have been trained on the above datasets. CLIP [52] has been pre-trained on large-scale text-image corpora to achieve excellent results in cross-modal retrieval, becoming a cornerstone of the cross-modal domain. OpenCLIP [9], MobileCLIP [62], CLAP [16], CLIP2Video [17], CLIP4Clip [45], UMT-B [37], Cap4Video [70] are all refer to the idea of CLIP [52] to perform text-image retrieval, text-audio retrieval and text-video retrieval, respectively. ImageBind [21], LanguageBind [83] and ONE-PEACE [64] utilize a joint embedding space to bind several modalities, which allows them to perform multiple retrieval tasks with only one

Table 1: Performance comparison on text-to-image/audio/video retrieval. Results annotated with * are taken from the original paper, and other results are from our reproduction through its official implementation.

Task	Method	Flickr30k				MS-COCO			
		R@1	R@5	R@10	MRR@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	MRR@10
Text-to-Image Retrieval	CLIP[52]	55.86	82.76	90.60	67.34	30.48	55.95	66.84	41.31
	OpenCLIP [9]	63.91	87.28	93.22	74.05	39.35	65.41	75.62	50.44
	MobileCLIP [62]	74.86	92.88	96.30	82.59	50.36	74.92	82.36	60.81
	ONE-PEACE(Pretrained) [64]	73.36	91.48	95.38	81.18	48.02	71.64	79.51	57.99
	ImageBind(Huge) [21]	74.88	92.96	96.06	82.68	49.41	73.31	81.53	59.64
	LanguageBind(Image) [83]	69.50	90.80	94.90	78.66	45.31	69.78	78.63	55.76
	ACE(ours)		81.78	96.14	98.38	88.04	52.42	77.53	86.11
Task	Method	Clotho				AudioCaps			
		R@1	R@5	R@10	MRR@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	MRR@10
Text-to-Audio Retrieval	CLAP-HTSAT[16]	15.92	39.04	50.80	25.51	16.79	48.42	64.88	30.15
	ONE-PEACE(Pretrained) [64]	11.11	28.11	38.35	18.49	24.17	54.87	69.74	37.51
	ImageBind(Huge) [21]	4.89	13.72	17.86	8.63	8.87	24.21	28.73	15.06
	LanguageBind(Audio) [83]	16.36	40.44	53.93	26.53	15.16	49.76	67.57	29.76
	ACE(ours)	48.44	74.58	83.02	59.46	32.94	63.45	75.39	45.67
Task	Method	MSR-VTT				MSVD			
		R@1	R@5	R@10	MRR@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	MRR@10
Text-to-Video Retrieval	CLIP2Video*[17]	45.6	72.5	81.7	-	47.0	76.8	85.9	-
	CLIP4Clip*[45]	44.5	71.4	81.6	-	46.2	76.1	84.6	-
	UMT-B*[37]	46.3	72.7	82.0	-	47.4	76.8	84.0	-
	Cap4Video*[70]	49.3	74.3	83.8	-	51.8	80.8	88.3	-
	ImageBind(Huge) [21]	36.8	61.8	70.0	46.41	39.25	67.48	78.51	53.41
	LanguageBind(Video) [83]	42.7	67.1	77.0	54.38	53.5	80.5	87.5	60.61
	ACE(ours)	52.6	75.4	84.2	61.77	63.58	87.91	92.84	73.59

model. Cross-modal retrieval also exists with one-tower approaches, which typically have high computational overhead and focus mainly on the ranking stage rather than the retrieval stage [38]. Therefore, they are not included in the baselines. More information about baselines is provided in the Appendix.

4.2 Implementation Details

Semantic Identifier Generation Model. Considering that it would be more efficient to process multiple modal data uniformly, we use pre-trained ImageBind [21] to extract the semantic embedding of each item in the dataset. We employ the default mini batch K-Means algorithm in scikit-learn [49], where $K = 128$, to cluster 1024-dimensional item embeddings. The encoder in RQ-VAE has three intermediate layers of size 512, 256 and 128 with ELU activation, and final latent representation dimension of 64, with which the decoder is completely symmetric. There are 2 levels of codebook in the quantizer, and for each level, a codebook with cardinality 128 is maintained, where each vector in the codebook has a dimension of 64. Because we use an ID table to ensure that each identifier is unique, this means at least $128^3 = 2,097,152$ items can be represented. We train the RQ-VAE using the Adam optimizer with an initial learning rate of $1e-6$ and Inverse Square Root scheduler integrated in fairseq [48]. The learning rate increases to $1e-4$ after 300 warm-up epochs, and then gradually decreases until 500 epochs.

All experiments are based on one NVIDIA V100 GPU with training batch size set to 2048.

Retrieval Model. We initialize all parameters in the transformer with Xavier uniform distribution. We use Adam optimizer with an initial learning rate of $1e-6$, while increasing the learning rate to $1e-4$ in 5 epochs using the Cosine Annealing Warmup Restarts scheduler. We set the scaling factor of the consistency-based regularization loss as $\omega = 0.15$ and the dropout ratio as 0.1. All experiments are based on 4 NVIDIA V100 GPUs with training batch size set to 512. The inference stage uses constrained beam search where the beam sizes are set to 5, 25 and 50, respectively.

4.3 Empirical Results

Consistent with prior studies [60, 65], we use widely accepted metrics for information retrieval, including Recall@ K and Mean Reciprocal Rank (MRR). Recall@ K measures how often the desired item is hit in the top K retrieved candidates, where we set K to 1, 5 and 10 in experiments. MRR calculates the reciprocal of the rank at which the first relevant item is retrieved. A high MRR indicates that the relevant item has a high ranking position.

In Table 1, we report the retrieval results for ACE and the corresponding baselines. In text-to-image retrieval, ACE demonstrates remarkably competitive performance compared to the powerful ImageBind [21] and up-to-date MobileCLIP [62], with all metrics

Table 2: Ablation Study on Text-to-Image retrieval task. We leave the ablation results for the other retrieval tasks in Appendix.

Setting	Flickr30k				MS-COCO			
	R@1	R@5	R@10	MRR@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	MRR@10
w/o constrained beam search	49.72	66.96	73.51	57.11	16.79	32.38	39.95	23.43
w/o consistency loss	81.64	95.94	98.04	87.85	49.86	75.69	83.73	60.02
w/o fusion strategy	75.54	93.54	96.72	83.11	43.41	69.27	79.12	54.34
w/o K-Means token	79.50	94.92	97.52	86.12	48.11	74.87	84.08	59.53
w/o RQ-VAE token	76.22	92.86	96.16	83.31	51.03	76.94	84.97	62.12
ACE	81.78	96.14	98.38	88.04	52.42	77.53	86.11	63.19

Table 3: Results with different number of encoder layers.

Layers	R@1	R@5	R@10	MRR@10
1	76.16	94.48	97.78	84.11
2	80.52	95.16	97.92	86.87
3	81.84	96.38	98.44	88.51
4	82.1	95.68	98.22	88.11
5	81.08	95.64	97.78	87.37


ahead of baselines. In text-to-audio retrieval, we observe that the baseline has generally low retrieval results on Clotho [14]. Our analysis suggests that since the audio durations in Clotho range from 15-30 seconds, while all the audio in Audiocaps [32] is unified at 10 seconds in duration, this leads to the gap between the retrieval results of the baselines on the two datasets. In contrast, ACE only needs to predict the identifiers of each audio and is not sensitive to audio durations, so our metrics far outperform the baseline, which demonstrates the advantages of generative retrieval. In text-to-video retrieval, there is inequality of information between captions and videos, which greatly increases the retrieval difficulty. However, with the power of semantic identifiers and feature fusion, ACE still has performance beyond the baselines.

Furthermore, to investigate the effect of each component, we report the ablation results in Table 2. Overall, all components are able to improve the retrieval performance of ACE as detailed below.

w/o constrained beam search. In this setting the decoder does not have a tree-based prior structure, meaning that all tokens in the vocabulary can be generated autoregressively. We observe a severe degradation in retrieval performance, which is consistent with previous work [57, 65]. This indicates that it is difficult to directly memorize all information about valid identifiers, which occupy only a small fraction of the complete decoding space, and that explicit prior knowledge can be effective in improving the quality of beam search.

w/o consistency loss. This setting removes the consistency-based regularization loss, and we observe that the model is more prone to overfitting, which leads to degradation of retrieval performance.

w/o fusion strategy. This setting removes the process of feature fusion in the decoder, which leads to a degradation of the retrieval performance. Experiments show that it is meaningful to consider the output of each encoder layer comprehensively.

**Figure 4: The efficiency of CLIP, CLAP and ACE are measured by throughput (queries processed per second).**

w/o K-Means token. This setting removes the process of K-Means and uses only RQ-VAE to construct semantic identifiers. Experiments show that clustering the original embeddings via K-Means algorithm brings prior knowledge that is effective for retrieval.

w/o RQ-VAE token. This setting removes the process of RQ-VAE and uses only the hierarchical K-Means algorithm [60] to construct hierarchical K-fork trees for the original embeddings, where the paths from the root node to the leaf nodes are considered as identifiers of the items. Experiments show that hierarchical K-Means loses semantic information between different clusters, which is consistent with [53], and demonstrate that the property of RQ-VAE to compute residuals hierarchically helps the model to understand the semantics of items.

4.4 Analysis

Efficiency Analysis. We respectively compare the retrieval efficiency of CLIP [52], CLAP [16] and ACE on a CPU and an NVIDIA V100 GPU, to measure the performance of dual-tower model and generative model. We simulate 100 concurrent queries and vary the number of candidates. The metric is throughput (Queries/per second) and the detailed results are shown in Figure 4. CLIP and CLAP can encode candidates as embeddings in advance, where the time cost mainly comes from text encoding, computing the similarity between text embeddings and candidate embeddings, and ranking.




Figure 5: The t-SNE visualization of item embeddings which have the same token prefixes.

In contrast, ACE utilizes beam search (beam size is set to 5) to generate identifiers, which merges the retrieval and ranking stages. Obviously, the retrieval efficiency of dual-tower model gradually decreases with the increasing number of candidate items, which is due to the increase in computational effort. The retrieval efficiency of ACE is stable on both GPU and CPU and the advantage of ACE grows as the number of candidate items increases, which is the result of directly encoding all the items as its parameters.

Feature Fusion Configuration. As previously mentioned, the coarse-to-fine feature fusion is closely related to the number of encoder layers. We choose the number of layers from $\{1,2,3,4,5\}$ and the results are shown in Table 3. We note that the overall performance of the metrics continues to improve as the number of layers increases, which demonstrates the effectiveness of coarse-to-fine feature fusion. However, when the number of layers is increased too much, the model may be overfitted thus leading to performance degradation. Therefore, we adopt the encoder with a 3-layers in ACE.

Distribution of Semantic Identifiers. To validate that identifiers have semantic information, we analyze the distribution of item embeddings with the same token prefix. Figure 5 (a) shows four groups of embeddings with the same coarse token, demonstrating a closer distribution within groups and a more dispersed distribution between groups. Further, Figure 5 (b) shows the distribution of embeddings with different fine token within the same group, which shows similar result. This demonstrates that the identifier learns the semantics of the items.

Identifier Configuration. We explore the effect of the length and size of semantic identifiers on retrieval performance by conducting experiments on the Flickr30k. We try to vary the K in K-Means as well as the codebook size in RQ-VAE, and observe that the retrieval performance of the model is more robust for most settings, as shown in Table 4. Only when K is set to 64 or codebook size is set to 64, the model performance shows a more significant degradation. We analyze that too small a cluster category will lead to lower differentiation of K-Means and fail to achieve good clustering effect, and too small codebook size will likewise lead to limited semantic differentiation ability, resulting in larger information loss. Furthermore, it will also lead to an increase in the amount of items with the same identifiers, thus the model can only rely on the unique token which do not have any semantic information. We try to add codebook in RQ-VAE to increase the length of semantic identifiers and we observe that the retrieval performance fluctuates only slightly, as shown in Table 5. This demonstrates the effectiveness of the

Table 4: Results with different identifier sizes.

K	Codebook	Capacity	R@1	R@5	R@10	MRR@10
64	64*64	262,144	75.76	92.91	96.48	83.12
	128*128	1,048,576	81.22	95.52	97.54	87.39
	256*256	4,194,304	79.84	95.58	98.18	86.44
128	64*64	524,288	78.64	93.96	97.08	85.31
	128*128	2,097,152	81.78	96.14	98.38	88.04
	256*256	8,388,608	80.86	95.61	98.01	87.26
256	64*64	1,048,576	77.68	94.81	97.62	84.93
	128*128	4,194,304	81.54	95.81	98.31	87.68
	256*256	16,777,216	80.48	95.96	98.34	87.21

Table 5: Results with different identifier lengths.

Length	R@1	R@5	R@10	MRR@10
4	81.78	96.14	98.38	88.04
5	81.84	96.38	98.44	88.51
6	80.54	95.44	98.06	87.57

semantic identifiers and the stability of the retrieval model. Considering that too long semantic identifiers lead to lower codebook utilization and increased decoding steps, we only use four tokens. It is worth noting that retrieval performance exceeds the baseline in all settings, despite varying the length and size of the identifiers.

5 LIMITATIONS & FUTURE WORK

Despite the fact that we leverage the power of generative retrieval to enhance text-centric cross-modal retrieval, ACE faces several limitations. First of all, items collections are dynamically updated in real scenarios, which means that the item identifiers needs to be dynamically updated. Second, semantic identifier generation model and retrieval model are still trained independently. Finally, ACE currently supports only natural language queries, for cross-modal retrieval we need to extend the support for multimodal queries. In our future work, we can address these problems through the following techniques. 1) Utilizing continuous learning [5] to train models to cope with the dynamic updates of the items. 2) We plan to design a joint framework [73] to support end-to-end identifier generation and document retrieval. 3) We plan to explore a unified semantic space [66, 67] for processing multimodal queries.

6 CONCLUSION

In this work, we propose ACE, a novel generative cross-modal retrieval framework. Based on the design of coarse-fine semantic identifiers and coarse-to-fine feature fusion, ACE can efficiently understand user queries and accurately retrieve candidate identifiers. With the generative framework, ACE has the speed and accuracy to outperform the traditional dual-tower model, while extensive experiments prove that ACE achieves state-of-the-art performance.

REFERENCES

- [1] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. Qwen-vl: A frontier large vision-language model with versatile abilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12966* (2023).
- [2] Michele Bevilacqua, Giuseppe Ottaviano, Patrick Lewis, Scott Yih, Sebastian Riedel, and Fabio Petroni. 2022. Autoregressive search engines: Generating substrings as document identifiers. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 31668–31683.
- [3] Min Cao, Shiping Li, Juntao Li, Liqiang Nie, and Min Zhang. 2022. Image-text retrieval: A survey on recent research and development. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.14713* (2022).
- [4] David Chen and William B Dolan. 2011. Collecting highly parallel data for paraphrase evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 49th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies*. 190–200.
- [5] Jianguo Chen, Ruqing Zhang, Jiafeng Guo, Maarten de Rijke, Wei Chen, Yixing Fan, and Xueqi Cheng. 2023. Continual learning for generative retrieval over dynamic corpora. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 306–315.
- [6] Xize Cheng, Rongjie Huang, Linjun Li, Tao Jin, Zehan Wang, Aoxiong Yin, Minglei Li, Xinyu Duan, Zhou Zhao, et al. 2023. TransFace: Unit-Based Audio-Visual Speech Synthesizer for Talking Head Translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15197* (2023).
- [7] Xize Cheng, Tao Jin, Rongjie Huang, Linjun Li, Wang Lin, Zehan Wang, Ye Wang, Huadai Liu, Aoxiong Yin, and Zhou Zhao. 2023. Mixspeech: Cross-modality self-learning with audio-visual stream mixup for visual speech translation and recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 15735–15745.
- [8] Xize Cheng, Tao Jin, Linjun Li, Wang Lin, Xinyu Duan, and Zhou Zhao. 2023. Opensr: Open-modality speech recognition via maintaining multi-modality alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.06410* (2023).
- [9] Mehdi Cherti, Romain Beaumont, Ross Wightman, Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Cade Gordon, Christoph Schuhmann, Ludwig Schmidt, and Jenia Jitsev. 2023. Reproducible scaling laws for contrastive language-image learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2818–2829.
- [10] Yunfei Chu, Jin Xu, Xiaohuan Zhou, Qian Yang, Shiliang Zhang, Zhijie Yan, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. Qwen-audio: Advancing universal audio understanding via unified large-scale audio-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07919* (2023).
- [11] Marcella Cornia, Matteo Stefanini, Lorenzo Baraldi, and Rita Cucchiara. 2020. Meshed-memory transformer for image captioning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 10578–10587.
- [12] Nicola De Cao, Gautier Izacard, Sebastian Riedel, and Fabio Petroni. 2020. Autoregressive entity retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.00904* (2020).
- [13] Soham Deshmukh, Benjamin Elizalde, and Huaming Wang. 2022. Audio retrieval with wavtext5k and clap training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14275* (2022).
- [14] Konstantinos Drossos, Samuel Lipping, and Tuomas Virtanen. 2020. Clotho: An audio captioning dataset. In *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 736–740.
- [15] Benjamin Elizalde, Soham Deshmukh, Mahmoud Al Ismail, and Huaming Wang. 2023. Clap learning audio concepts from natural language supervision. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [16] Benjamin Elizalde, Soham Deshmukh, and Huaming Wang. 2023. Natural Language Supervision for General-Purpose Audio Representations. *arXiv:2309.05767* [cs.LG]. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.05767>
- [17] Han Fang, Pengfei Xiong, Luhui Xu, and Yu Chen. 2021. Clip2video: Mastering video-text retrieval via image clip. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.11097* (2021).
- [18] Chao Feng, Wuchao Li, Defu Lian, Zheng Liu, and Enhong Chen. 2022. Recommender forest for efficient retrieval. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 38912–38924.
- [19] Valentin Gabeur, Chen Sun, Kartek Alahari, and Cordelia Schmid. 2020. Multi-modal transformer for video retrieval. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part IV* 16. Springer, 214–229.
- [20] Gregor Geigle, Jonas Pfeiffer, Nils Reimers, Ivan Vulic, and Iryna Gurevych. 2021. Retrieve Fast, Rerank Smart: Cooperative and Joint Approaches for Improved Cross-Modal Retrieval. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 10 (2021), 503–521. https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00473
- [21] Rohit Girdhar, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, Zhuang Liu, Mannat Singh, Kalyan Vasudev Alwala, Armand Joulin, and Ishan Misra. 2023. Imagebind: One embedding space to bind them all. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 15180–15190.
- [22] Juxiang Gu, Jianfei Cai, Shafiq R Joty, Li Niu, and Gang Wang. 2018. Look, imagine and match: Improving textual-visual cross-modal retrieval with generative models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 7181–7189.
- [23] John A Hartigan and Manchek A Wong. 1979. Algorithm AS 136: A k-means clustering algorithm. *Journal of the royal statistical society. series c (applied statistics)* 28, 1 (1979), 100–108.
- [24] Mariya Hendriksen, Svitlana Vakulenko, Ernst Kuiper, and Maarten de Rijke. 2023. Scene-centric vs. object-centric image-text cross-modal retrieval: a reproducibility study. In *European Conference on Information Retrieval*. Springer, 68–85.
- [25] Hai Huang, Yan Xia, Shengpeng Ji, Shulei Wang, Hanqing Wang, Jieming Zhu, Zhenhua Dong, and Zhou Zhao. 2024. Unlocking the Potential of Multimodal Unified Discrete Representation through Training-Free Codebook Optimization and Hierarchical Alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05168* (2024).
- [26] Rongjie Huang, Huadai Liu, Xize Cheng, Yi Ren, Linjun Li, Zhenhui Ye, Jinzheng He, Lichao Zhang, Jinglin Liu, Xiang Yin, et al. 2023. Av-transpeech: Audio-visual robust speech-to-speech translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15403* (2023).
- [27] Shengpeng Ji, Minghui Fang, Ziyue Jiang, Rongjie Huang, Jialong Zuo, Shulei Wang, and Zhou Zhao. 2024. Language-Codec: Reducing the Gaps Between Discrete Codec Representation and Speech Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12208* (2024).
- [28] Shengpeng Ji, Ziyue Jiang, Hanqing Wang, Jialong Zuo, and Zhou Zhao. 2024. MobileSpeech: A Fast and High-Fidelity Framework for Mobile Zero-Shot Text-to-Speech. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09378* (2024).
- [29] Shengpeng Ji, Jialong Zuo, Minghui Fang, Ziyue Jiang, Feiyang Chen, Xinyu Duan, Baoxing Huai, and Zhou Zhao. 2024. Textrolspeech: A text style control speech corpus with codec language text-to-speech models. In *ICASSP 2024-2024 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 10301–10305.
- [30] Shengpeng Ji, Jialong Zuo, Minghui Fang, Siqi Zheng, Qian Chen, Wen Wang, Ziyue Jiang, Hai Huang, Xize Cheng, Rongjie Huang, et al. 2024. ControlSpeech: Towards Simultaneous Zero-shot Speaker Cloning and Zero-shot Language Style Control With Decoupled Codec. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01205* (2024).
- [31] Tao Jin, Xize Cheng, Linjun Li, Wang Lin, Ye Wang, and Zhou Zhao. 2023. Re-thinking missing modality learning from a decoding perspective. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. 4431–4439.
- [32] Chris Dongjoo Kim, Byeongchang Kim, Hyunmin Lee, and Gunhee Kim. 2019. Audiocaps: Generating captions for audios in the wild. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*. 119–132.
- [33] A Sophia Koepke, Andreea-Maria Oncescu, Joao Henriques, Zeynep Akata, and Samuel Albanie. 2022. Audio retrieval with natural language queries: A benchmark study. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* (2022).
- [34] Doyup Lee, Chihyeon Kim, Saehoon Kim, Minsu Cho, and Wook-Shin Han. 2022. Autoregressive image generation using residual quantization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 11523–11532.
- [35] Kuang-Huei Lee, Xi Chen, Gang Hua, Houdong Hu, and Xiaodong He. 2018. Stacked cross attention for image-text matching. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*. 201–216.
- [36] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. 2023. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 19730–19742.
- [37] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yinan He, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. 2023. Unmasked teacher: Towards training-efficient video foundation models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 19948–19960.
- [38] Yongqi Li, Wenjie Wang, Leigang Qu, Liqiang Nie, Wenjie Li, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2024. Generative Cross-Modal Retrieval: Memorizing Images in Multimodal Language Models for Retrieval and Beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10805* (2024).
- [39] Yongqi Li, Nan Yang, Liang Wang, Furu Wei, and Wenjie Li. 2023. Multiview identifiers enhanced generative retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16675* (2023).
- [40] Bin Lin, Bin Zhu, Yang Ye, Munan Ning, Peng Jin, and Li Yuan. 2023. Video-LLaVA: Learning United Visual Representation by Alignment Before Projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10122* (2023).
- [41] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. 2014. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, Proceedings, Part V* 13. Springer, 740–755.
- [42] Jing Liu, Xinxin Zhu, Fei Liu, Longteng Guo, Zijia Zhao, Mingzhen Sun, Weining Wang, Hanqing Lu, Shiyu Zhou, Jiajun Zhang, et al. 2021. OPT: Omniperspective pre-trainer for cross-modal understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.00249* (2021).
- [43] Xinwei Long, Jiali Zeng, Fandong Meng, Zhiyuan Ma, Kaiyan Zhang, Bowen Zhou, and Jie Zhou. 2024. Generative Multi-Modal Knowledge Retrieval with Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08206* (2024).
- [44] Huaishao Luo, Lei Ji, Ming Zhong, Yang Chen, Wen Lei, Nan Duan, and Tianrui Li. 2021. CLIP4Clip: An Empirical Study of CLIP for End to End Video Clip Retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08860* (2021).
- [45] Huaishao Luo, Lei Ji, Ming Zhong, Yang Chen, Wen Lei, Nan Duan, and Tianrui Li. 2022. Clip4clip: An empirical study of clip for end to end video clip retrieval

- and captioning. *Neurocomputing* 508 (2022), 293–304.
- [46] Sanket Vaibhav Mehta, Jai Gupta, Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, Vinh Q Tran, Jinfeng Rao, Marc Najork, Emma Strubell, and Donald Metzler. 2022. DSI++: Updating transformer memory with new documents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.09744* (2022).
- [47] Usama Nadeem, Noah Ziemis, and Shaoen Wu. 2022. Codedsi: Differentiable code search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.00328* (2022).
- [48] Myle Ott, Sergey Edunov, Alexei Baevski, Angela Fan, Sam Gross, Nathan Ng, David Grangier, and Michael Auli. 2019. fairseq: A fast, extensible toolkit for sequence modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.01038* (2019).
- [49] Fabian Pedregosa, Gaël Varoquaux, Alexandre Gramfort, Vincent Michel, Bertrand Thirion, Olivier Grisel, Mathieu Blondel, Peter Prettenhofer, Ron Weiss, Vincent Dubourg, et al. 2011. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *the Journal of machine Learning research* 12 (2011), 2825–2830.
- [50] Ronak Pradeep, Kai Hui, Jai Gupta, Adam D Lelkes, Honglei Zhuang, Jimmy Lin, Donald Metzler, and Vinh Q Tran. 2023. How Does Generative Retrieval Scale to Millions of Passages? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11841* (2023).
- [51] Ronak Pradeep, Kai Hui, Jai Gupta, Adam D Lelkes, Honglei Zhuang, Jimmy Lin, Donald Metzler, and Vinh Q Tran. 2023. How Does Generative Retrieval Scale to Millions of Passages? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11841* (2023).
- [52] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 8748–8763.
- [53] Shashank Rajput, Nikhil Mehta, Anima Singh, Raghunandan Hulikal Keshavan, Trung Vu, Lukasz Heldt, Lichan Hong, Yi Tay, Vinh Tran, Jonah Samost, et al. 2024. Recommender systems with generative retrieval. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [54] Prajit Ramachandran, Barret Zoph, and Quoc V Le. 2017. Searching for activation functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.05941* (2017).
- [55] Ruiyang Ren, Wayne Xin Zhao, Jing Liu, Hua Wu, Ji-Rong Wen, and Haifeng Wang. 2023. TOME: A two-stage approach for model-based retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11161* (2023).
- [56] Noam Shazeer, Azalia Mirhoseini, Krzysztof Maziarz, Andy Davis, Quoc Le, Geoffrey Hinton, and Jeff Dean. 2017. Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.06538* (2017).
- [57] Zihua Si, Zhongxiang Sun, Jiale Chen, Guozhang Chen, Xiaoxue Zang, Kai Zheng, Yang Song, Xiao Zhang, and Jun Xu. 2023. Generative Retrieval with Semantic Tree-Structured Item Identifiers via Contrastive Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13375* (2023).
- [58] Weiwei Sun, Lingyong Yan, Zheng Chen, Shuaiqiang Wang, Haichao Zhu, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Dawei Yin, Maarten Rijke, and Zhaochun Ren. 2024. Learning to tokenize for generative retrieval. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [59] Yubao Tang, Ruqing Zhang, Jiafeng Guo, Jianguo Chen, Zuowei Zhu, Shuaiqiang Wang, Dawei Yin, and Xueqi Cheng. 2023. Semantic-enhanced differentiable search index inspired by learning strategies. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 4904–4913.
- [60] Yi Tay, Vinh Tran, Mostafa Dehghani, Jianmo Ni, Dara Bahri, Harsh Mehta, Zhen Qin, Kai Hui, Zhe Zhao, Jai Gupta, et al. 2022. Transformer memory as a differentiable search index. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 21831–21843.
- [61] Aaron Van Den Oord, Oriol Vinyals, et al. 2017. Neural discrete representation learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [62] Pavan Kumar Anasosalu Vasu, Hadi Pouransari, Fartash Faghri, Raviteja Vemulapalli, and Oncel Tuzel. 2023. MobileCLIP: Fast Image-Text Models through Multi-Modal Reinforced Training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17049* (2023).
- [63] Bokun Wang, Yang Yang, Xing Xu, Alan Hanjalic, and Heng Tao Shen. 2017. Adversarial cross-modal retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, 154–162.
- [64] Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Junyang Lin, Shuai Bai, Xiaohuan Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Xinggang Wang, and Chang Zhou. 2023. One-peace: Exploring one general representation model toward unlimited modalities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11172* (2023).
- [65] Yujing Wang, Yingyan Hou, Haonan Wang, Ziming Miao, Shibin Wu, Qi Chen, Yuqing Xia, Chengmin Chi, Guoshuai Zhao, Zheng Liu, et al. 2022. A neural corpus indexer for document retrieval. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 25600–25614.
- [66] Zehan Wang, Ziang Zhang, Xize Cheng, Rongjie Huang, Luping Liu, Zhenhui Ye, Haifeng Huang, Yang Zhao, Tao Jin, Peng Gao, et al. 2024. Molecule-Space: Free Lunch in Unified Multimodal Space via Knowledge Fusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04883* (2024).
- [67] Zehan Wang, Yang Zhao, Haifeng Huang, Jiageng Liu, Aoxiong Yin, Li Tang, Linjun Li, Yongqi Wang, Ziang Zhang, and Zhou Zhao. 2023. Connecting multimodal contrastive representations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 22099–22114.
- [68] Xi Wei, Tianzhu Zhang, Yan Li, Yongdong Zhang, and Feng Wu. 2020. Multi-modality cross attention network for image and sentence matching. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 10941–10950.
- [69] Lijun Wu, Juntao Li, Yue Wang, Qi Meng, Tao Qin, Wei Chen, Min Zhang, Tie-Yan Liu, et al. 2021. R-drop: Regularized dropout for neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 10890–10905.
- [70] Wenhao Wu, Haipeng Luo, Bo Fang, Jingdong Wang, and Wanli Ouyang. 2023. Cap4video: What can auxiliary captions do for text-video retrieval?. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 10704–10713.
- [71] Yan Xia, Hai Huang, Jieming Zhu, and Zhou Zhao. 2024. Achieving Cross Modal Generalization with Multimodal Unified Representation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [72] Jun Xu, Tao Mei, Ting Yao, and Yong Rui. 2016. Msr-vtt: A large video description dataset for bridging video and language. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 5288–5296.
- [73] Tianchi Yang, Minghui Song, Zihan Zhang, Haizhen Huang, Weiwei Deng, Feng Sun, and Qi Zhang. 2023. Auto Search Indexer for End-to-End Document Retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12455* (2023).
- [74] Wei Yang, Haotian Zhang, and Jimmy Lin. 2019. Simple applications of BERT for ad hoc document retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.10972* (2019).
- [75] Peter Young, Alice Lai, Micah Hodosh, and Julia Hockenmaier. 2014. From image descriptions to visual denotations: New similarity metrics for semantic inference over event descriptions. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 2 (2014), 67–78.
- [76] Youngjae Yu, Jongseok Kim, and Gunhee Kim. 2018. A joint sequence fusion model for video question answering and retrieval. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 471–487.
- [77] Hang Zhang, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. 2023. Video-LLaMA: An Instruction-tuned Audio-Visual Language Model for Video Understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02858* (2023). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.02858>
- [78] Hailin Zhang, Yujing Wang, Qi Chen, Ruiheng Chang, Ting Zhang, Ziming Miao, Yingyan Hou, Yang Ding, Xupeng Miao, Haonan Wang, et al. 2024. Model-enhanced Vector Index. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [79] Peitian Zhang, Zheng Liu, Yujia Zhou, Zhicheng Dou, and Zhao Cao. 2023. Term-Sets Can Be Strong Document Identifiers For Auto-Regressive Search Engines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13859* (2023).
- [80] Liangli Zhen, Peng Hu, Xu Wang, and Dezhong Peng. 2019. Deep supervised cross-modal retrieval. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 10394–10403.
- [81] Yujia Zhou, Jing Yao, Zhicheng Dou, Ledell Wu, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2022. Dynamicretriever: A pre-training model-based IR system with neither sparse nor dense index. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.00537* (2022).
- [82] Yujia Zhou, Jing Yao, Zhicheng Dou, Ledell Wu, Peitian Zhang, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2022. Ultron: An ultimate retriever on corpus with a model-based indexer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.09257* (2022).
- [83] Bin Zhu, Bin Lin, Munan Ning, Yang Yan, Jiayi Cui, Hongfa Wang, Yatian Pang, Wenhao Jiang, Junwu Zhang, Zongwei Li, et al. 2023. Languagebind: Extending video-language pretraining to n-modality by language-based semantic alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01852* (2023).
- [84] Cunjuan Zhu, Qi Jia, Wei Chen, Yanming Guo, and Yu Liu. 2023. Deep learning for video-text retrieval: a review. *International Journal of Multimedia Information Retrieval* 12, 1 (2023), 3.
- [85] Yi Zhu and Xiu Li. 2023. Iterative Uni-modal and Cross-modal Clustered Contrastive Learning for Image-text Retrieval. In *2023 International Conference on Pattern Recognition, Machine Vision and Intelligent Algorithms (PRMIVA)*, 15–23. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PRMIVA58252.2023.00009>
- [86] Shengyao Zhuang, Houxing Ren, Linjun Shou, Jian Pei, Ming Gong, Guido Zuccon, and Daxin Jiang. 2022. Bridging the gap between indexing and retrieval for differentiable search index with query generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.10128* (2022).
- [87] Noah Ziemis, Wenhao Yu, Zhihan Zhang, and Meng Jiang. 2023. Large language models are built-in autoregressive search engines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.09612* (2023).