

Scene Understanding Enabled Semantic Communication with Open Channel Coding

Zhe Xiang, Fei Yu, Quan Deng, Yuandi Li, Zhiguo Wan

Abstract

As communication systems transition from symbol transmission to conveying meaningful information, sixth-generation (6G) networks emphasize semantic communication. This approach prioritizes high-level semantic information, improving robustness and reducing redundancy across modalities like text, speech, and images. However, traditional semantic communication faces limitations, including static coding strategies, poor generalization, and reliance on task-specific knowledge bases that hinder adaptability.

To overcome these challenges, we propose a novel system combining scene understanding, Large Language Models (LLMs), and open channel coding, named **OpenSC**. Traditional systems rely on fixed domain-specific knowledge bases, limiting their ability to generalize. Our open channel coding approach leverages shared, publicly available knowledge, enabling flexible, adaptive encoding. This dynamic system reduces reliance on static task-specific data, enhancing adaptability across diverse tasks and environments. Additionally, we use scene graphs for structured semantic encoding, capturing object relationships and context to improve tasks like Visual Question Answering (VQA). Our approach selectively encodes key semantic elements, minimizing redundancy and improving transmission efficiency. Experimental results show significant improvements in both semantic understanding and efficiency, advancing the potential of adaptive, generalizable semantic communication in 6G networks.

Keywords

Semantic Communication, Large Language Models (LLMs), Structured Scene Coding, Open Channel Coding, Visual Question Answering (VQA)

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY
© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

ACM Reference Format:

Zhe Xiang, Fei Yu, Quan Deng, Yuandi Li, Zhiguo Wan. 2018. Scene Understanding Enabled Semantic Communication with Open Channel Coding. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 14 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 Introduction

Communication systems have evolved from transmitting mere symbols toward conveying meaningful information to meet the growing demand for high-speed, low-latency, and reliable data transmission. As the development of sixth-generation (6G) networks advances, the focus has shifted from ensuring bit-level accuracy, as per Shannon's classical theory [1], to semantic communication [2], [3], [4]. This paradigm aims to capture, transmit, and reconstruct high-level semantic information relevant to the intended communication tasks. Semantic communication systems are gaining prominence in various modalities, including text [5], speech [6], images [7], and video [8], as they significantly reduce data redundancy and improve transmission robustness by prioritizing meaning over exact bit-level replication.

Large Language Models (LLMs) [9], such as ChatGPT [10], have demonstrated substantial progress in natural language understanding, offering unprecedented potential for semantic encoding and decoding. By leveraging these models, semantic communication systems can better align transmitted content with the intended meaning, paving the way for more intelligent and adaptive communication across various scenarios. Moreover, visual information structured into scene graphs [11] provides interpretable semantic representations, capturing objects and their relationships. Integrating these structured semantics into communication systems enables improved discrimination and more effective task-oriented performance, such as image retrieval [12] and decision-making tasks [13].

Current Issues. Despite these advancements, existing semantic communication systems face critical limitations: 1) Lack of Visual Semantic Understanding [14]: Traditional systems primarily focus on encoding low-level image features, neglecting the high-level visual semantic information such as object relationships and contextual meaning. This oversight limits the performance of tasks like Visual Question Answering (VQA) and image retrieval, where understanding




Figure 1: The Comparison of a semantic communication framework with visual scene understanding, incorporating semantic coding and knowledge-agnostic channel coding, with traditional semantic communication approaches [2].

the scene’s semantics is crucial. 2) Static Knowledge Bases: Most systems rely on static, task-specific knowledge bases that hinder adaptability and generalization across diverse tasks and dynamic environments [5, 15–20]. These fixed structures restrict the system’s ability to handle novel or evolving communication scenarios, making them less flexible in the context of 6G networks, which demand adaptive solutions. 3) Inefficient Coding and Redundancy: Existing systems often transmit redundant semantic information, leading to inefficient use of bandwidth and resources. Static encoding strategies, such as fixed-length symbols, fail to adapt to varying channel conditions, exacerbating the issue of redundant transmission and reducing overall communication efficiency [21].

Challenges. Addressing the limitations of existing semantic communication systems presents the following key challenges:

- *How to integrate high-level visual semantics* (e.g., object relationships and context) into encoding for tasks like Visual Question Answering (VQA) and image retrieval?
- *How to develop adaptive encoding mechanisms* that efficiently compress semantic information and optimize transmission under varying channel conditions?
- *How to enable systems to adapt to dynamic, task-specific scenarios* by leveraging open, shared knowledge instead of static, task-specific knowledge bases?
- *How to use structured semantic representations* (e.g., scene graphs) to improve interpretability and enhance performance in task-specific applications?

To clearly outline the existing issues in current semantic communication systems, Figure 1 illustrates the limitations

of traditional semantic communication frameworks. To address these issues, we propose a solution that involves design improvements in both the semantic encoding and channel coding components. The main goal is to enhance the interpretability of visual scene understanding within the semantic encoding phase, particularly for visual data, and to overcome the limitations found in existing research regarding the construction of shared knowledge bases in the channel coding phase. By focusing on these aspects, we aim to improve the flexibility and adaptability of semantic communication systems.

Proposed Research Solutions. To address the challenges in developing a semantic communication system with LLMs and structured semantic encoding, we propose a comprehensive strategy with the following key components: (i) an innovative multimodal semantic communication system that integrates Large Language Models (LLMs) with structured scene graph encoding, enhancing the representation of complex visual-textual relationships for tasks such as Visual Question Answering (VQA). (ii) To optimize transmission efficiency, we introduce a dynamic open channel coding mechanism that adapts in real-time to channel conditions, overcoming the limitations of static knowledge-based systems. (iii) Our selective scene graph encoding prioritizes critical objects and relationships, reducing redundancy and improving the interpretability of semantic representations, enabling more accurate, context-aware responses. (iv) Finally, through comprehensive experiments, we validate our approach, demonstrating significant improvements in semantic-level understanding and transmission efficiency. This strategy enhances the overall efficiency, accuracy, and adaptability of semantic communication systems, particularly in complex multimodal applications like VQA [22–25], and supports the shift from centralized to decentralized knowledge bases, enabling local modeling of meaning [2] while incorporating privacy-aware mechanisms.

Summary of Novel Contributions. Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- **Multimodal Semantic Integration:** We use Large Language Models (LLMs) with structured scene graph encoding. This improves the representation of visual-textual relationships for tasks like Visual Question Answering (VQA).
- **Dynamic Channel Coding:** We introduce dynamic open channel coding. It adapts to real-time channel conditions and improves transmission efficiency, overcoming static knowledge-base limitations.
- **Selective Scene Graph Encoding:** Our selective encoding prioritizes relevant objects and relationships. This reduces redundancy and improves interpretability for more accurate, context-aware responses.

- **Experimental Validation:** Through experiments, the performances show significant improvements in both semantic understanding and transmission efficiency, proving the practical potential of our approach for real-world applications.

2 Related Work

2.1 Semantic Communications

Since the introduction of semantic communication, it has attracted significant attention from both industry and academia, and has been identified as one of the core challenges in wireless communications [26]. Semantic communication aims to accurately transmit semantic information between the sender and receiver [27]. By leveraging advanced AI techniques, it can extract and convey the most relevant information, thereby enhancing transmission efficiency, reducing redundancy, and minimizing delays [28], [15]. Owing to the development of deep learning in semantic communication, it exhibits superior performance compared to traditional communication methods.

For natural language processing, H. Xie et al. [5] proposed deepSC for text transmission, which aims to maximize the reduction of semantic errors by restoring the semantics of sentences. For image processing, Huang et al. [16] proposed an image semantic communication system that uses Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN) to extract global image semantics and reconstruct images at the receiver. Yufei Bo et al. [29] introduced a joint coding modulation (JCM) framework for digital semantic communication using Variational Autoencoders (VAE). The transformation probabilities from source data to discrete constellation symbols were learned. The semantic communication system proposed by Chen et al. [17] is characterized by achieving “intelligent flow” through model propagation, introducing the concept of the Semantic Slicing Model (SeSM). Li et al. [30] proposed a cross-modal enhancement method for semantic communication as well as a trustworthy semantic communication framework.

Semantic communication has shown potential in single-modal, single-user scenarios, but it still faces certain limitations in multi-modal contexts. Although previous work has explored some aspects of multi-modal communication, for instance, Xie et al. [18] investigated a multi-user system for visual question answering (VQA) that transmits both images and text. Xie et al. [19] introduced a method for text and image transmission based on the Transformer architecture and proposed several deep learning-based frameworks for tasks such as image retrieval and machine translation. Li et al. [20] presented a cross-modal paradigm that leverages complementary information to enhance communication reliability. Luo et al. [31] specifically developed a multi-modal

data fusion scheme tailored to the characteristics of wireless channels. However, challenges remain, including the difficulty in constructing a shared knowledge base, the loss and distortion of semantic details during the semantic encoding process, and the issue of generalization across different domains.

Recent advancements in LLMs have significantly impacted semantic communication across various fields, offering potential solutions to the aforementioned issues. For example, Jiang et al. [32] addressed the challenges in semantic communication of image data by incorporating a framework that includes a knowledge base based on the Segment-Anything model, attention-based semantic integration, and adaptive compression techniques. Similarly, [33] proposed a semantic communication framework (LAM-SC) tailored for image data, utilizing LLMs as the core knowledge base. These approaches leverage the profound understanding of human knowledge by LLMs to build robust knowledge bases for different communication tasks. Shen et al. [34] harnessed the capabilities of LLM in language understanding, planning, and code generation, integrating them with joint learning strategies oriented to tasks and communication-edge. They proposed an efficient and versatile framework for coordinating edge AI models to perform edge intelligence tasks.

However, the application of LLMs in channel coding and decoding for multi-modal semantic communication, as well as in the construction of multi-modal shared knowledge bases, remains underexplored.

2.2 Visual Question Answering

The Visual Question Answering (VQA) task involves matching a natural language question posed by a user with a given image, generating an accurate answer by understanding the image content and parsing the question. VQA tasks require learning how to understand image content and answer related questions from a large dataset of image-question-answer pairs [35]. In our work, the VQA task differs from traditional VQA tasks in that it does not require image-question-answer pairs. Instead, it allows users to pose questions from four different perspectives, with no restrictions on the length or style of the questions, making it a more complex VQA task. This requires a deep understanding of both the image and the textual context, adding to the challenge of the VQA task.

Traditional VQA systems use object detection, image features, and text descriptions. These systems typically extract low-level visual features as semantic content [36]. However, the semantic representation capabilities of these methods are limited, and they often fail to capture fine details, leading to errors. In contrast, scene graphs provide a more structured and comprehensive representation of scene semantics,




Figure 2: The overall framework of scene understanding-enabled semantic communication with open-channel coding, consisting of three modules: semantic encoding, open-channel coding (encoding and decoding), and semantic decoding. The section marked as "Flame" represents the core contribution of this paper, where we propose a structured semantic encoding method to address challenges in visual information, scene understanding, and interpretability. By leveraging LLMs, we address the problem of knowledge-agnostic open-channel coding.

enabling better answers to user questions and improved semantic discrimination. Therefore, in our work, we employ scene graph-based semantic encoding for VQA tasks.

3 System Model

The scene understanding enabled semantic communication system utilizes structured semantic encoding and open channel coding to facilitate robust transmission and interpretation of multimodal data. In this section, we introduce the overall framework of the multimodal semantic communications with the structured scene semantic coding and large language model-based channel coding, as shown in Figure 2.

3.1 Semantic Transmitter

The semantic transmitter is divided into two primary components: structured semantic encoding and open channel encoding.

3.1.1 Structured Semantic Encoding. The structured semantic encoder extracts and encapsulates semantic features from the input source images. This process can be mathematically represented as:

$$a = S(I; \zeta), \quad (1)$$

where $I \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W}$ denotes the input image with height H and width W , $a \in \mathbb{R}^{L_S}$ represents the extracted structured semantic features with length L_S , and ζ signifies the trainable parameters of the network. This encoder effectively captures the latent structured semantic information from the images.

3.1.2 Open Channel Encoding. Due to constraints such as limited channel capacity and the presence of noise, the structured semantic representation is further processed by the channel encoder to produce transmitted symbols, expressed as:

$$X = C(a; \gamma), \quad (2)$$

where $X \in \mathbb{C}^{L_C}$ denotes the transmitted complex symbols with length L_C , and γ represents the trainable parameters of the channel encoder. This encoder compresses the semantic information, enhancing the robustness of the communication system against channel variations. The resulting symbols X undergo normalization of power before physical transmission through the wireless channel.

3.2 Semantic Receiver

The semantic receiver consists of two key modules: open channel decoding and structured semantic decoding.

3.2.1 Open Channel Decoding. The wireless channel receives X and outputs $Y \in \mathbb{C}^{L_C}$ as the received symbols, following the transmission model $Y = HX + N$, where $N \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_n^2)$ denotes the independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) Gaussian noise vector, and $H \in \mathbb{C}^{L_C}$ represents the channel coefficients. In a Rayleigh fading environment, the channel coefficients are modeled as $H \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

To recover the transmitted symbols, the linear minimum mean-squared error (L-MMSE) estimator is applied, yielding the estimated signals $\hat{X} \in \mathbb{C}^{L_C}$. The estimated symbols

are then processed by the channel decoder, which aims to decompress the structured semantic representations while mitigating the effects of channel fading and noise interference. The reconstruction of the structured semantic features is given by:

$$\hat{a} = C^{-1}(\hat{X}; \theta), \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{L_s}$ denotes the recovered structured semantic representation and θ are the trainable parameters of the channel decoder.

3.2.2 Scene understanding-oriented LLM-Semantic Decoding. The structured semantic decoder integrates the recovered structured semantic information to execute the downstream intelligent task, mathematically represented as:

$$q = S^{-1}(\hat{a}; \delta), \quad (4)$$

where q represents the task result and δ denotes the trainable parameters of the semantic decoder. In this work, we focus on the downstream task of visual question answering (VQA) to evaluate the performance and efficacy of the proposed multimodal semantic communication framework. In a scene understanding-oriented framework, the structured semantic decoder plays a pivotal role by interpreting the recovered structured semantic information and applying it to downstream intelligent tasks. For Visual Question Answering (VQA), the structured semantic information encompasses not only the visual elements of the scene (such as objects, relationships, etc.) but also their semantic connections with the natural language question. This process is mathematically represented as:

$$q = S^{-1}(\hat{a}; \delta), \quad (5)$$

where q represents the result of the downstream task, specifically the answer to a visual question in VQA. \hat{a} is the input to the decoder, consisting of structured features derived from the multimodal data (e.g., visual and textual information). δ denotes the trainable parameters of the semantic decoder, optimized to align with the task requirements for accurate decoding.

In this framework, scene understanding provides structured information about the objects, relationships, and spatial positions in the image, which are crucial for VQA tasks. By linking visual features from the image to the semantics of the natural language question, the structured semantic decoder extracts fine-grained information and generates contextually relevant answers.

4 Scene Understanding Enabled Semantic Communication System with LLMs Assistance

In this section, we design a scene understanding-enabled multimodal semantic communication framework with open

channel coding, referred to as **OpenSC**, to perform the VQA task for Scene Understanding. Figure 2 shows the overall framework of our proposed OpenSC.

4.1 Structure Semantic Encoding

Scene understanding is crucial for Visual Question Answering (VQA), as it provides a structured representation of the visual environment. We propose Structured Semantic Encoding, which converts raw visual data into scene graph-based representations, capturing both objects and their relationships as <subject-predicate-object> triples. This is achieved through a Prototype-based Embedding Network [37], using Faster R-CNN to extract bounding boxes and feature maps. The union of bounding boxes represents the relationships between entities, forming the foundation for semantic decoding in VQA tasks.

The structured semantic coding method generates compact and distinctive representations for subjects, objects, and predicates by combining class-specific prototypes with instance-specific transformations. For each subject s , object o , and predicate p , linear transformations map them into a shared semantic space, where both class prototypes (t_s, t_o, t_p) and instance-specific adjustments (v_s, v_o, u_p) are learned. This design captures both the unique attributes of each entity and the shared characteristics within each category. The representations are mathematically expressed as:

$$\begin{aligned} s &= W_s t_s + v_s, \\ o &= W_o t_o + v_o, \\ p &= W_p t_p + u_p. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where W_s, W_o , and W_p are learnable parameters, and t_s, t_o , and t_p are the class-specific prototypes for the subject, object, and predicate. The instance-specific components v_s, v_o , and u_p capture the variability within each category.

To align subject-object pairs with corresponding predicates in a shared semantic space, we define the matching function $F(s, o)$ as:

$$F(s, o) = \text{ReLU}(s + o) - (s - o)^2, \quad (7)$$

where $F(s, o)$ measures the similarity between the subject and object prototypes, ensuring that the relationship between them approximates the predicate p . This function aims to align the entities within the semantic space, facilitating accurate predicate prediction.

To optimize this matching, we introduce Prototype-guided Learning (PL), which utilizes a loss function to minimize the discrepancy between the predicted relationships and their true semantic representations:

$$L_{e_sim} = -\log \left(\frac{\exp(\langle r, c_i \rangle / \tau)}{\sum_{j=0}^N \exp(\langle r, c_j \rangle / \tau)} \right), \quad (8)$$

where τ is a learnable temperature hyperparameter, and r represents the relationship to be matched. This loss function encourages the model to align the subject-object pairs with their correct predicates by leveraging the prototype-based representations.

Additionally, to address the challenge of semantic overlap between predicates, we introduce Prototype Regularization (PR). This regularization term promotes the separation of predicates in the semantic space, ensuring that each prototype maintains its distinct identity:

$$L_{r_sim} = \|S\|_{2,1} = \sum_{i=0}^N \left(\sum_{j=0}^N s_{ij}^2 \right)^{1/2}, \quad (9)$$

where S is the cosine similarity matrix between predicate prototypes. By maximizing the distinction between prototypes, PR improves the model's ability to handle ambiguous cases where predicates might otherwise be difficult to distinguish.

4.2 Open Channel Condings

In semantic communication systems, addressing the challenges of traditional joint source-channel coding requires a shift towards more efficient and adaptable strategies. In this context, we introduce a novel approach based on structured scene graph encoding for scene understanding, leveraging the strengths of LLMs to tackle issues related to the complexity, generalization, and limitations of knowledge bases in current systems. Our method combines scene understanding with constellation-based token encoding and modulation techniques to optimize both semantic encoding and communication.

The scene understanding module utilizes Scene Graph Generation (SGG) to extract meaningful semantic information from images, represented as tokenized data. This data is first tokenized using the WordPiece algorithm, a subword tokenization method, to break down textual information from scene graphs into smaller, manageable tokens. The WordPiece algorithm, utilizing a vocabulary V and sentence S , splits each word w in the sentence into a sequence of subword tokens w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n , as defined by: $w = w_1 + w_2 + \dots + w_n$.

The tokenization process maximizes the matching of the substrings with the vocabulary, ensuring efficient segmentation of the sentence. For each word w , we aim to maximize the length of its matched substring from the vocabulary:

$$\text{Token} = \arg \max_{\substack{w' \subseteq w \\ w' \in V}} |w'|. \quad (10)$$

After tokenizing the scene graph information, the token IDs are extracted from a pre-trained BERT model. These token IDs represent specific positions in the predefined vocabulary, which are then converted into m -bit binary strings. The binary strings are segmented into m/n substrings, each

representing a QAM (Quadrature Amplitude Modulation) symbol:

$$d = \sum_{i=0}^{m/n-1} b_i \cdot 2^i, \quad (11)$$

where b_i are the bits in the binary string, and d is the corresponding decimal value for the QAM symbol.

These QAM symbols are mapped onto a constellation diagram for efficient modulation and demodulation in the communication system. The constellation points correspond to the symbols, allowing for robust transmission of semantic information over the communication channel.

Two modes of operation are defined for receiving the transmitted signals, ensuring the method's applicability in various scenarios.

- *When Channel State Information (CSI) is available, we use the Zero-Forcing Linear Minimum Mean Square Error (ZF-LMMSE) detector.* This method combines the advantages of Zero-Forcing and Linear Minimum Mean Square Error to eliminate multipath interference while minimizing noise amplification. The received signal Y is related to the transmitted signal X by: $Y = HX + N$, where H is the channel matrix, and N is the noise vector. The ZF-LMMSE detection matrix W is computed to estimate the transmitted signal:

$$\hat{X} = WY = \left(H^H H + \frac{\sigma_n^2}{\sigma_x^2} I \right)^{-1} H^H Y. \quad (12)$$

- *When CSI is not available, we rely on symbol demodulation by minimizing the Euclidean distance between the received signal point and predefined symbol points on the constellation diagram.* The likelihood of receiving a symbol Y from the signal X is given by:

$$\log P(Y | X) = -0.5 \cdot \frac{(Y - X)^2}{\sigma_n^2} - 0.5 \cdot \log(2\pi\sigma_n^2). \quad (13)$$

After demodulating the symbols, we reconstruct the token IDs and use the pre-trained BERT [9] model to map these back to the corresponding tokens. The final tokens are combined to reconstruct the original information, ensuring that semantic understanding is preserved during the transmission process. This approach efficiently integrates scene understanding and semantic communication, optimizing both the encoding of visual information and the transmission process, leading to improved performance in tasks like Visual Question Answering (VQA) under variable channel conditions.

4.3 Scene Understanding-oriented LLM-Semantic Decoding

In this approach, our main idea is to improve the precision and completeness of the received data, which may be corrupted or incomplete due to transmission issues, by using LLM. The key idea is to leverage the semantic knowledge embedded in structured data (such as scene graphs) to correct errors and supplement missing information, ensuring a more reliable and accurate representation of the data in a structured format, such as JSON.

4.3.1 Reconstruction of Initial Information. The first step involves the conversion of token IDs into readable text. This is done by using a tokenizer to map the numeric token IDs back to their corresponding textual tokens. The output of this step is the reconstructed initial information, which is expressed as:

$$X = [In_1, \dots, In_n], \quad (14)$$

where X represents the sequence of tokens that, when mapped, form the initial information.

4.3.2 Enhancement with Structured Information. The reconstructed information may be incomplete or contain errors, so we supplement it with previously structured knowledge. This structured information typically includes object attributes such as quantity, location, and relationships, and is organized in the form of a Scene Graph. This structured data provides additional context, allowing the LLM to correct and enrich the initial information:

$$p = [PIn_1, \dots, PIn_m]. \quad (15)$$

4.3.3 LLM-based Semantic Enhancement. The LLM is responsible for integrating the initial information with the structured data. The model processes both inputs, learning to generate a corrected and enriched version of the data. This process can be described as a series of operations through a multi-layer perceptron (MLP), where the inputs are processed in multiple hidden layers to produce the final output:

$$\mathbf{h}_1 = \sigma(W_1[X; p] + \mathbf{b}_1), \quad (16)$$

where W_1 and \mathbf{b}_1 are the weight matrix and bias vector of the first layer, respectively, and σ is the activation function (e.g., ReLU, Sigmoid, or Tanh). Subsequent hidden layers are computed similarly:

$$\mathbf{h}_L = \sigma(W_L \mathbf{h}_{L-1} + \mathbf{b}_L), \quad (17)$$

where L is the number of hidden layers, and W_i and \mathbf{b}_i are the weight matrix and bias vector of the i -th layer, respectively. The final information ($Final_In$) is then obtained from the output layer:

$$Final_In = W_{out} \mathbf{h}_L + \mathbf{b}_{out}, \quad (18)$$

where W_{out} and \mathbf{b}_{out} are the weight matrix and bias vector of the output layer, respectively. The final information ($final_information$) is a vector containing three elements: number, location, and relationship, denoted as n , l , and r :

$$final_information = [n, l, r], \quad (19)$$

where n is the object count, l is the location, and r represents the relationships between objects.

4.3.4 Conversion to JSON Format. The final enhanced information is converted into a structured JSON format for easy storage and further processing:

$$json_data = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{"number": } n \\ \text{"location": } l \\ \text{"relationship": } r \end{array} \right\}.$$

This conversion allows for the data to be easily accessed and utilized in subsequent steps.

4.3.5 Vector Database and Semantic Enhancement Prompt Generation. Organize objects, relationships, and attributes into chunks representing specific categories with their quantity, location, and relationships. Embed these chunks into a high-dimensional vector space to get dense vector representations. Store these vectors in a temporary database, linking each to its chunk. During retrieval, find the four closest pre-computed vectors with the highest cosine similarities to the query vector. Retrieve the four most relevant chunks and form a prompt to enhance the LLM's query processing. Feed the enhanced prompt into the VQALLM (Visual Question Answering-Large Language Model)¹.

4.4 Training Algorithm

The training process of the proposed system involves three modules: visual structured semantic representation, open channel coding, and VQA-oriented LLM-semantic decoding. Only the structured semantic representation module, which generates scene graphs from visual data, requires pre-training. Channel encoding and decoding use a large language model with constellation diagram tokens, enabling semantic transmission without additional training. Thus, only the structured semantic encoding at the transmitter requires training, as outlined in Algorithm 1.

The training time complexity is $O(N \cdot (H \times W \times C \times L + P))$, where N is the dataset size, H , W , and C are the image dimensions, L is the encoder depth, and P is the number of parameters. The complexity is driven by image size, encoder depth, and model parameters.

¹Utilize existing multimodal large language models to answer our Visual Questions, with the ability to switch out this component as needed to accommodate different requirements, named VQALLM.

Algorithm 1 The training algorithm of Semantic Encodings in our proposed OpenSC.

- 1: **Initialization:** The training dataset \mathcal{K} .
 - 2: **Structured Semantic Encoder Training:**
 - 3: **Input:** Sample mini-batch of input images from the training dataset \mathcal{K} .
 - 4: Extract structured semantic features from images using the encoder: $a = S(I; \zeta)$.
 - 5: **Train ζ using** gradient descent with the encoder loss.
 - 6: **Compute encoder Loss:** $L = L_{r_sim} + L_{e_sim}$.
 - 7: **Return:** Trained structured semantic encoder $S(\cdot; \zeta)$.
-

5 Experiments

In this section, we compare the proposed OpenSC with traditional source and channel coding methods, as well as mainstream approaches like DeepSC [5], in three digital modulation schemes. We also conduct an ablation study to assess the contribution of each component in the OpenSC framework and evaluate the average number of symbols transmitted and the computational complexity of our method.

5.1 Implementation Details

5.1.1 Dataset Description. In the experiments, we use the open source dataset (AUG dataset [38]), which contains 400 aerial view images of the city. On average, each image includes 63 objects and 42 relationships. Each image has a pixel dimension of 6,000 by 4,000 pixels, which is approximately 24 million pixels (24Mpx). This provides a wealth of detail in each image, making them suitable for high-resolution image analysis and processing, especially in scenarios that require precise identification and analysis of objects within the image. The objects in these images are small and more densely packed, covering 77 object categories and 63 types of relationship. On average, each image includes 63 objects and 42 relationships.

5.1.2 Evaluation Metrics. Unlike traditional VQA tasks, which involve a fixed question and corresponding ground truth answer, our approach allows for open-ended questions about the real objects, quantities, locations, and relationships in an image. To evaluate model performance, we use two metrics: recall rate and F1-score. Recall measures the ratio of correctly described real objects, quantities, locations, and relationships in the model’s answers. F1-score combines recall and precision to assess the balance between correct and incorrect object, quantity, location, and relationship descriptions provided by the model.

5.1.3 Implementation Setting. The SGG model uses GeneralizedRCNN [39] with an R-101-FPN backbone [40] and

ResNet [41] module, setting the output channel to 256, with 32 groups and a group width of 8. The Region Proposal Network (RPN) [42] is configured with FPN, anchors of sizes (32, 64, 128, 256, 512), and strides of (4, 8, 16, 32, 64), with aspect ratios (0.2323, 0.6337, 1.2848, 3.1509). During training, 12,000 candidate regions are selected pre-NMS, and 2,000 post-NMS. Testing uses 6,000 pre-NMS and 1,000 post-NMS regions. The RPN has a middle channel size of 256. The ROI Heads section has a positive sample ratio of 0.5, IoU threshold of 0.3, and a batch size of 256. The ROI Box Head has a pooling resolution of 7, scales of (0.25, 0.125, 0.0625, 0.03125). The number of categories is 77, and the MLP head dimension is 4,096. The training sets a base learning rate to 0.001, weight decay to 0.0001, warmup factor to 0.1, momentum to 0.9, and gradient clipping to 5.0. Learning rate decay occurs sets the 90,000 and 120,000 iterations.

5.2 Baselines

For performance comparison of our proposed OpenSC, we consider the following baselines selected from both traditional communication and semantic communication perspectives².

Traditional Communication:

- *Text-based Transmission.* The image’s textual description is converted into pure text. The system uses 5-bit encoding, RS encoding for transmitting text and question information, answering the question at the terminal.
- *Text-based Transmission with Huffman Encoding.* The image’s textual description is converted into pure text. Huffman coding, combined with RS encoding, is used to propagate text and question information, providing answers at the terminal.
- *Image Compression with LDPC and Lossless Text Transmission.* The original image is processed using JPEG compression and LDPC encoding. After transmission, the image is reconstructed at the receiver, assuming lossless transmission of the question text, used for answering at the terminal.

Semantic Communication:

- *Scene Graph Transmission with DeepSC.* Scene graph structure information, extracted via semantic encoding, is converted into plain text. The text and questions are encoded and transmitted using the DeepSC framework, providing answers at the terminal.
- *MJCMSC Framework for Multimodal Transmission.* Using source image and question text data, JCMSC [43] is

²In this comparative experiment, VQALLM uses the Qwen-plus model for all instances.

applied for single-modal image recovery. A new multi-modal framework, MJCMSC, is created by adding text transmission capabilities.

- *LLM-SC Framework with Semantic Encoding.* Semantic encoding-extracted scene graph information is converted to plain text, alongside question text data. The LLM-SC [44] framework is used for transmission, answering questions at the terminal.

5.3 Experimental Results and Analysis

5.3.1 Performance of Different Methods Under Varying Channels. Figure 3 to Figure 8 display the performance of different methods across four VQA question types (Category, Quantity, Location, Relationship). Unlike traditional VQA tasks with one-to-one question-answer pairs, our approach allows for four question types, evaluating performance for each. The experimental results show that DeepSC shows poor performance, with BLEU (1-gram) and Sentence Similarity values under 0.1 across SNRs from 0 to 18 dB (Table 1). This indicates that DeepSC struggles to recover semantic content when propagating text derived from scene graph structures. Additionally, its poor generalizability limits its application outside of the European Parliament dataset.

Table 1: Average BLEU (1-gram) scores under different SNR conditions on the AUG dataset using the Deep-SC method.

SNR	0dB	3dB	6dB	9dB	12dB	15dB	18dB
BLEU (1-gram)	0.0190	0.0222	0.0221	0.0240	0.0223	0.0212	0.0215
Sentence Similarity	0.0198	0.0230	0.0235	0.0268	0.0244	0.0231	0.0218

Figure 3 and Figure 4 compare our method with others under AWGN channel conditions, showing consistent outperformance across SNR levels. Specifically, for location-related questions, methods like MJCMSC, LLM-SC, Huffman, and 5bit score zero, as they lack a mechanism for location description. In contrast, our method calculates object center points and maps them to image regions, embedding structured data into high-dimensional vectors for semantic retrieval and enhancement. Traditional methods like Huffman and 5bit struggle at low SNRs and underperform at high SNRs due to their reliance on pure text, which lacks semantic depth. The JPEG+LDPC method, focused only on image data, fails to enable effective VQALLM-based question answering.

For the Rayleigh channel Figure 7 and Figure 8), our method outperforms others across most SNR levels. While JPEG+LDPC performs well for Category and Quantity questions at low SNR (0-3 dB), and LLM-SC leads around 9 dB, our approach consistently excels for Location and Relationship questions.

5.3.2 Performance of Different Modulation Methods. Figure 5 and Figure 6 show the performance comparison of

our method in terms of Recall and F1-score under different modulation schemes (BPSK, 4QAM, 16QAM). It can be seen that our performance is quite similar across the three modulation methods, indicating that changing the modulation scheme does not affect the robustness of our system. This indicates that different modulation schemes and encoding lengths can be selected based on varying channel conditions, and the encoding length can be adjusted according to different modulation methods. Furthermore, we have also conducted experiments with the three different modulation methods within the MJCMSC framework, and in all four types of questions, our approach has an advantage.

5.4 Ablation Experiments

To validate the effectiveness of the proposed Scene Understanding Enabled Semantic Encoder module, the Open Channel Coding module, and the large language model (LLM) used at the receiver end for the VQA task, we designed three ablation experiments. These experiments focus on evaluating the individual contributions of each module to the overall performance.

5.4.1 The Ablation Study of Semantic Encoder and Open Channel Coder. The ablation study underscores the critical importance of both the Structured Semantic Encoder (SSC) and Open Channel Coder (OCC) in achieving high VQA performance. Removing OCC and using the Deep-SC approach significantly degraded the system’s ability to recover semantic information, as reflected in the sharp drop in recall rates for “Category,” “Quantity,” and “Relationship” questions (Table 2). Furthermore, when both SSC and OCC are ablated

Table 2: Performance comparison across different Large Language Models for each attribute.

VQA LLM	SSC	OCC	Performance Metrics (Recall)			
			Category	Quantity	Location	Relationship
✓	×	✓	0.4408	0.1452	-	0.1378
✓	×	×	0.1158	0.0644	0.0308	0.0015
✓	✓	×	-	-	-	-
✓	✓	✓	0.6401	0.3255	0.3227	0.1398

and the JCMSC method was used for image transmission and recovery, performance worsened even further. Without structured semantic encoding, the VQALLM (Visual Question Answering-Large Language Model) model struggles to extract meaningful semantic details from raw image data. In contrast, when both SSC and OCC are retained, recall rates improved significantly across all question types, demonstrating that combining structured semantic encoding with open channel coding is essential for preserving semantic information and enhancing VQA performance.




Figure 3: Recall performance evaluation under different SNR levels in an AWGN channel using a 16QAM modulation scheme. The MJCMSVC system represents our constructed JCMSVC multimodal system, where 5-bit + RS Huffman + RS JPEG + LDPC all use 16QAM. The performance is evaluated for four types of questions: Category, Quantity, Location, and Relationship.




Figure 4: F1-score evaluation for four types of questions (Category, Quantity, Location, Relationship) under different SNR levels in an AWGN channel using a 16QAM modulation scheme.




Figure 5: Recall performance evaluation for four types of questions (Category, Quantity, Location, Relationship) under different SNR levels in an AWGN channel, using BPSK, 4QAM, and 16QAM modulation schemes.




Figure 6: F1-score evaluation for four types of questions (Category, Quantity, Location, Relationship) under different SNR levels in an AWGN channel, using BPSK, 4QAM, and 16QAM modulation schemes.




Figure 7: Recall performance for four types of questions (Category, Quantity, Location, Relationship) under different SNR levels in a Rayleigh channel using a 16QAM modulation scheme.




Figure 8: F1 score for four types of questions (Category, Quantity, Location, Relationship) under different SNR levels in a Rayleigh channel using a 16QAM modulation scheme.

5.4.2 *Performance Comparison of Different Large Language Models for VQA at the Receiver End.* In the ablation study, we evaluate the performance of four different large VQALLM models—Llama-3.1, Claude-3.5, GPT-4o, and Qwen-plus—at the receiver end for VQA tasks, with the SNR fixed at 18 dB. The results shown in Table 4 reveal that the choice of VQALLM model causes only minor fluctuations in performance, with no significant impact on overall recall or F1-scores across the attributes of Category, Quantity, Location, and Relationship.

5.5 Average Number Of Transmitted Symbols

To assess the efficiency of different image transmission and semantic encoding methods, we compare the average number of transmitted symbols for each approach. A lower symbol count indicates more efficient data transmission, which is vital in bandwidth-limited or efficiency-focused scenarios. This comparison highlights how our method reduces data overhead while maintaining semantic integrity.

Table 3 presents a comparison of the average number of transmitted symbols across various methods. All methods utilize 16QAM modulation to ensure fairness, and the JPEG+LPDC method employs an LPDC coding rate of 1/2. The results show that methods involving Scene Graph Generation (SGG) information, such as Huffman+RS, LLM-SC,

Table 3: Average Number of Transmitted Symbols for Different Methods

Methods	Average Number of Transmitted Symbols	Ratio (%)
Ours / JPEG-LDPC	4,160 / 16,242,744	2.6×10^{-4}
Ours / Huffman+RS	4,160 / 1,549	2.6856×10^2
Ours / 5bit+RS	4,160 / 4,288	9.7015×10^1
Ours / MJCMSC	4,160 / 6,472	6.4277×10^1
Ours / LLMSC	4,160 / 4,220	9.8578×10^1

and our method, transmit significantly fewer symbols than traditional methods like MJCMSC and JPEG+LPDC. Notably, our method requires only 4160 symbols, which is approximately $2.6 \times 10^{-4}\%$ of the symbol count needed by JPEG-LDPC, due to its highly compact semantic encoding and the efficient OpenSC method. This demonstrates the superior efficiency of our approach in reducing transmission costs without compromising the quality of the transmitted semantic information.

5.6 Complexity Analysis

The complexity analysis is crucial to assess the computational efficiency of the proposed OpenSC method in comparison to other existing approaches. While our previous




Figure 9: Visualization comparing the differences between our method and other methods.

experiments highlighted its performance, understanding the computational cost is essential for practical applications.

Table 4: Performance Comparison Across Different Large Language Models for Each Attribute.

VQA LLM	SSC	OCC	Category		Quantity	
			Recall	F1 Score	Recall	F1 Score
llama-3.1 [45]	✓	✓	0.6239	0.7056	0.3089	0.3141
Claude-3.5 [46]	✓	✓	0.6380	0.6943	0.3162	0.3036
GPT-4o [47]	✓	✓	0.6332	0.7011	0.3367	0.3348
Qwen-plus [48]	✓	✓	0.6401	0.7042	0.3255	0.3281
VQA LLM	SSC	OCC	Location		Relationship	
			Recall	F1 Score	Recall	F1 Score
llama-3.1 [45]	✓	✓	0.3018	0.2947	0.1244	0.1266
Claude-3.5 [46]	✓	✓	0.3241	0.3373	0.1187	0.1210
GPT-4o [47]	✓	✓	0.3184	0.3044	0.1371	0.1204
*Qwen-plus [48]	✓	✓	0.3227	0.3219	0.1398	0.1281

*Our proposed OpenSC utilizes Qwen-Plus for VQALLM. The main experiments in this paper use Qwen-Plus for VQALLM.

Table 5: Average Processing Time (ms/Item) for Different Methods

Method	DeepSC	MJMISC	LLMSC	OpenSC (Ours)
Time (ms/Item)	35.99	1,210.23	143.97	158.43

Table 5 compares the average processing time per item for OpenSC and other methods. OpenSC requires 158.43 ms, slightly more than LLMSC (143.97 ms) but much faster than MJMISC (1,210.23 ms). DeepSC is the fastest at 35.99 ms. The higher runtime of OpenSC is mainly due to the

large number of parameters in the LLM, though it benefits from eliminating the need for local knowledge base setup. With advancements in computing power, the processing time for OpenSC is expected to further decrease, improving its efficiency.

5.7 Visualization

The visualization is conducted to highlight the superiority of our method in both VQA tasks and detailed image description generation. As shown in Figure 9, our method produces a comprehensive image description with only three minor errors, while other methods exhibit more significant errors and semantic loss. This demonstrates the effectiveness of our approach in preserving the full semantic context of the image. Additionally, the integration of RAG [49] enhances the precision and detail of our responses, allowing for more accurate and diverse interpretations compared to traditional VQA methods.

6 Conclusion

In conclusion, our propose semantic communication system enhances 6G networks by integrating Large Language Models (LLMs) with structured semantic encoding through scene graphs. This approach improves interpretability, reduces redundancy, and adapts to channel variations in real-time, optimizing transmission efficiency. By focusing on critical objects and relationships, it boosts performance in tasks like Visual Question Answering (VQA). Experimental results

validate significant improvements in both semantic understanding and transmission efficiency, advancing multimodal semantic communication and providing a foundation for future adaptive communication systems.

References

- [1] Claude Elwood Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell system technical journal*, 27(3):379–423, 1948.
- [2] Wanting Yang, Hongyang Du, Zi Qin Liew, Wei Yang Bryan Lim, Zehui Xiong, Dusit Niyato, Xuefen Chi, Xuemin Shen, and Chunyan Miao. Semantic communications for future internet: Fundamentals, applications, and challenges. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 25(1):213–250, 2022.
- [3] Ping Zhang, Wenjun Xu, Hui Gao, Kai Niu, Xiaodong Xu, Xiaoqi Qin, Caixia Yuan, Zhijin Qin, Haitao Zhao, Jibo Wei, et al. Toward wisdom-evolutionary and primitive-concise 6g: A new paradigm of semantic communication networks. *Engineering*, 8:60–73, 2022.
- [4] Guangming Shi, Yong Xiao, Yingyu Li, and Xuemei Xie. From semantic communication to semantic-aware networking: Model, architecture, and open problems. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 59(8):44–50, 2021.
- [5] Huiqiang Xie, Zhijin Qin, Geoffrey Ye Li, and Bing-Hwang Juang. Deep learning enabled semantic communication systems. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 69:2663–2675, 2021.
- [6] Zhenzi Weng, Zhijin Qin, and Geoffrey Ye Li. Semantic communications for speech signals. In *ICC 2021 - IEEE International Conference on Communications*, pages 1–6, 2021.
- [7] Danlan Huang, Xiaoming Tao, Feifei Gao, and Jianhua Lu. Deep learning-based image semantic coding for semantic communications. In *2021 IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM)*, pages 1–6, 2021.
- [8] Sixian Wang, Jincheng Dai, Zijian Liang, Kai Niu, Zhongwei Si, Chao Dong, Xiaoqi Qin, and Ping Zhang. Wireless deep video semantic transmission. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 41(1):214–229, 2023.
- [9] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In Jill Burstein, Christy Doran, and Tamar Solorio, editors, *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)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [10] Alec Radford and Karthik Narasimhan. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 2018.
- [11] Kaihua Tang, Yulei Niu, Jianqiang Huang, Jiaxin Shi, and Hanwang Zhang. Unbiased scene graph generation from biased training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3716–3725, 2020.
- [12] Hongfei Ge, Yuanchun Jiang, Jianshan Sun, Kun Yuan, and Yezheng Liu. Llm-enhanced composed image retrieval: An intent uncertainty-aware linguistic-visual dual channel matching model. *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.*, October 2024. Just Accepted.
- [13] Mohan Raparathi, Venkata Siva Prakash Nimmagadda, Mohit Kumar Sahu, Swaroop Reddy Gayam, Sandeep Pushyamitra Pattayam, Krishna Kanth Kondapaka, Bhavani Prasad Kasaraneni, Praveen Thuniki, Siva Sarana Kuna, and Sudharshan Putha. Real-time ai decision making in iot with quantum computing: Investigating & exploring the development and implementation of quantum-supported ai inference systems for iot applications. *Internet of Things and Edge Computing Journal*, 1(1):18–27, 2021.
- [14] Yu Zhang, Peter Tiño, Aleš Leonardis, and Ke Tang. A survey on neural network interpretability. *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computational Intelligence*, 5(5):726–742, 2021.
- [15] Xuewen Luo, Hsiao-Hwa Chen, and Qing Guo. Semantic communications: Overview, open issues, and future research directions. *IEEE Wireless Communications*, 29(1):210–219, 2022.
- [16] Danlan Huang, Feifei Gao, Xiaoming Tao, Qiyuan Du, and Jianhua Lu. Toward semantic communications: Deep learning-based image semantic coding. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 41(1):55–71, 2023.
- [17] Chen Dong, Haotai Liang, Xiaodong Xu, Shujun Han, Bizhu Wang, and Ping Zhang. Semantic communication system based on semantic slice models propagation. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 41(1):202–213, 2022.
- [18] Huiqiang Xie, Zhijin Qin, and Geoffrey Ye Li. Task-oriented multi-user semantic communications for vqa. *IEEE Wireless Communications Letters*, 11(3):553–557, 2022.
- [19] Huiqiang Xie, Zhijin Qin, Xiaoming Tao, and Khaled B Letaief. Task-oriented multi-user semantic communications. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, 40(9):2584–2597, 2022.
- [20] Ang Li, Xin Wei, Dan Wu, and Liang Zhou. Cross-modal semantic communications. *IEEE Wireless Communications*, 29(6):144–151, 2022.
- [21] H. Nyquist. Certain factors affecting telegraph speed. *The Bell System Technical Journal*, 3(2):324–346, 1924.
- [22] Tianwen Qian, Jingjing Chen, Shaoxiang Chen, Bo Wu, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Scene graph refinement network for visual question answering. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 25:3950–3961, 2022.
- [23] Fengjuan Wang and Gaoyun An. Visual question answering based on multimodal triplet knowledge accumulation. In *2022 16th IEEE International Conference on Signal Processing (ICSP)*, volume 1, pages 81–84, 2022.
- [24] Dipali Koshti, Ashutosh Gupta, and Mukesh Kalla. Knowledge blended open domain visual question answering using transformer. In *2023 Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Smart Energy (ICAIS)*, pages 823–828, 2023.
- [25] Longkun Peng, Gaoyun An, and Qiuqi Ruan. Transformer-based sparse encoder and answer decoder for visual question answering. In *2022 16th IEEE International Conference on Signal Processing (ICSP)*, volume 1, pages 120–123, 2022.
- [26] Wen Tong and Geoffrey Ye Li. Nine challenges in artificial intelligence and wireless communications for 6g. *IEEE Wireless Communications*, 29(4):140–145, 2022.
- [27] Jie Bao, Prithwish Basu, Mike Dean, Craig Partridge, Ananthram Swami, Will Leland, and James A Hendler. Towards a theory of semantic communication. In *2011 IEEE Network Science Workshop*, pages 110–117. IEEE, 2011.
- [28] Emilio Calvanese Strinati and Sergio Barbarossa. 6g networks: Beyond shannon towards semantic and goal-oriented communications. *Computer Networks*, 190:107930, 2021.
- [29] Yufei Bo, Yiheng Duan, Shuo Shao, and Meixia Tao. Joint coding-modulation for digital semantic communications via variational auto-encoder. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 2024.
- [30] Yuandi Li, Zhe Xiang, Fei Yu, Zhangshuang Guan, Hui Ji, Zhiguo Wan, and Cheng Feng. Multimodal trustworthy semantic communication for audio-visual event localization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.01991*, 2024.
- [31] Xuewen Luo, Ruobin Gao, Hsiao-Hwa Chen, Shuyi Chen, Qing Guo, and Ponnuthurai Nagaratnam Suganthan. Multimodal and multiuser semantic communications for channel-level information fusion. *IEEE Wireless Communications*, 31(2):117–125, 2024.
- [32] Feibo Jiang, Li Dong, Yubo Peng, Kezhi Wang, Kun Yang, Cunhua Pan, and Xiaohu You. Large ai model empowered multimodal semantic

- communications. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, pages 1–7, 2024.
- [33] Feibo Jiang, Yubo Peng, Li Dong, Kezhi Wang, Kun Yang, Cunhua Pan, and Xiaohu You. Large ai model-based semantic communications. *IEEE Wireless Communications*, 31(3):68–75, 2024.
- [34] Yifei Shen, Jiawei Shao, Xinjie Zhang, Zehong Lin, Hao Pan, Dongsheng Li, Jun Zhang, and Khaled B Letaief. Large language models empowered autonomous edge ai for connected intelligence. *IEEE Communications Magazine*, 2024.
- [35] Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jiasen Lu, Margaret Mitchell, Dhruv Batra, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. Vqa: Visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2425–2433, 2015.
- [36] Zichao Yang, Xiaodong He, Jianfeng Gao, Li Deng, and Alex Smola. Stacked attention networks for image question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 21–29, 2016.
- [37] Chaofan Zheng, Xinyu Lyu, Lianli Gao, Bo Dai, and Jingkuan Song. Prototype-based embedding network for scene graph generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 22783–22792, 2023.
- [38] Yansheng Li, Kun Li, Yongjun Zhang, Linlin Wang, and Dingwen Zhang. Aug: A new dataset and an efficient model for aerial image urban scene graph generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2404.07788, 2024.
- [39] Kaiming He, Georgia Gkioxari, Piotr Dollár, and Ross Girshick. Mask r-cnn. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2961–2969, 2017.
- [40] Tsung-Yi Lin, Piotr Dollár, Ross Girshick, Kaiming He, Bharath Hariharan, and Serge Belongie. Feature pyramid networks for object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2117–2125, 2017.
- [41] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [42] Shaoqing Ren, Kaiming He, Ross Girshick, and Jian Sun. Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 39(6):1137–1149, 2016.
- [43] Shunpu Tang, Qianqian Yang, Lisheng Fan, Xianfu Lei, Arumugam Nallanathan, and George K. Karagiannidis. Contrastive learning-based semantic communications. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 72(10):6328–6343, 2024.
- [44] Zhenyi Wang, Li Zou, Shengyun Wei, Feifan Liao, Jia Zhuo, Haibo Mi, and Rongxuan Lai. Large language model enabled semantic communication systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.14112*, 2024.
- [45] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- [46] The claude 3 model family: Opus, sonnet, haiku.
- [47] OpenAI Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, and et al. Gpt-4 technical report. 2023.
- [48] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, and et al. Qwen technical report. *ArXiv*, abs/2309.16609, 2023.
- [49] Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yi Dai, Jiawei Sun, Meng Wang, and Haofen Wang. Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10997*, 2023.