

An Examination of the Robustness of Reference-Free Image Captioning Evaluation Metrics

Saba Ahmadi[△] Aishwarya Agrawal^{△,◇}

[△]Mila, Université de Montréal [◇]Canada CIFAR AI Chair


saba.ahmadi@mila.quebec

Abstract

Recently, reference-free metrics such as CLIPScore (Hessel et al., 2021) and UMIC (Lee et al., 2021) have been proposed for automatic evaluation of image captions, demonstrating a high correlation with human judgment. In this work, our focus lies in evaluating the robustness of these metrics in scenarios that require distinguishing between two captions with high lexical overlap but very different meanings. Our findings reveal that despite their high correlation with human judgment, both CLIPScore and UMIC struggle to identify fine-grained errors in captions. However, when comparing different types of fine-grained errors, both metrics exhibit limited sensitivity to implausibility of captions and strong sensitivity to lack of sufficient visual grounding. Probing further into the visual grounding aspect, we found that both CLIPScore and UMIC are impacted by the size of image-relevant objects mentioned in the caption, and that CLIPScore is also sensitive to the number of mentions of image-relevant objects in the caption. In terms of linguistic aspects of a caption, we found that both metrics lack the ability to comprehend negation, UMIC is sensitive to caption lengths, and CLIPScore is insensitive to the structure of the sentence. We hope our findings will serve as a valuable guide towards improving reference-free evaluation in image captioning.

1 Introduction

Traditionally, image caption quality has been automatically evaluated through a reference-based approach, which compares generated captions to a set of reference captions provided by human annotators. The majority of automatic evaluation metrics for captioning, such as BLEU (Papineni et al., 2002), ROUGE (Lin, 2004), CIDEr (Vedantam et al., 2014), and METEOR (Banerjee and Lavie, 2005), primarily assess the level of agreement between the generated caption and the reference caption by measuring lexical overlap. How-



Candidate Captions	CLIPScore	UMIC
The title of the book is topology.	0.472	0.347
The title of the book is muffin.	0.546	0.446

Figure 1: Recently proposed reference-free image captioning evaluation metrics such as CLIPScore and UMIC are far from perfect. This figure shows how these metrics cannot tell apart an incorrect caption (shown in red) from a correct caption when there is high lexical overlap between them.

ever, this approach can be limiting, as it does not necessarily capture the full range of acceptable captions that humans may generate for a given image. Moreover, it suffers with the issue of high scores being awarded to captions that employ similar vocabularies but possess vastly different semantic meanings. To address these limitations, recent studies like UMIC (Lee et al., 2021) and CLIPScore (Hessel et al., 2021) have proposed reference-free approaches for evaluating caption quality, which more closely align with how humans judge captions. These approaches leverage large pretrained image-text matching models to generate a score that measures the similarity between the provided image and the candidate caption. However, the benchmarks used to evaluate these metrics do not necessarily involve differentiating between captions with significant lexical overlap but vastly different meanings (refer to Figure 1). Consequently, such metrics could achieve success by focussing solely on a few salient words that are different between correct and incorrect captions, without fully grasping the meaning of each caption.

In this work, we evaluate the robustness of these metrics in scenarios where the correct and incorrect captions have high lexical overlap. To our surprise, we found that **both metrics fail**

to distinguish between correct and incorrect captions $\sim 46\%$ of the time. In a pursuit to identify what aspects of an image caption (e.g., plausibility, visual grounding, number and size of objects mentioned in the caption, negation, caption length, and sentence structure) these metrics are most sensitive to, we conduct several controlled experiments examining the sensitivity to one aspect at a time. We found that:

- Both metrics display limited sensitivity to the implausibility of captions, yet demonstrate a heightened sensitivity to the visual grounding aspect of the caption.
- Both metrics frequently fail to distinguish between ground truth captions and their negated counterparts.
- UMIC exhibits sensitivity to caption length, while CLIPScore demonstrates this behavior less frequently.
- CLIPScore shows high sensitivity to the number of image-relevant objects mentioned in the caption while UMIC is not notably sensitive to it.
- Both CLIPScore and UMIC are sensitive to the size of image-relevant objects mentioned in the caption; however, to our surprise CLIPScore increases with size while UMIC score decreases.
- UMIC is sensitive to sentence structure, whereas CLIPScore is not.

2 Related Work

Recently, a number of vision-language benchmarks have been proposed to evaluate fine-grained understanding of relations, attributes, actions, and visio-linguistic compositionality in vision-language models, such as, CAB (Yamada et al., 2022), Winoground (Thrush et al., 2022) and ARO (Yuksekgonul et al., 2023), VL-checklist (Zhao et al., 2022), CREPE (Ma et al., 2023) and VALSE (Parcalabescu et al., 2022). Although, these evaluations also highlight the limitations of current models towards fine-grained understanding, our focus is specifically on evaluating the robustness of recently proposed reference-free image-captioning **metrics**. Our goal is to identify the scenarios where these metrics fail to distinguish between correct and incorrect captions for an image, so that caution can be exercised when deploying these metrics in such scenarios.

3 Experimental Setup

Reference-free metrics under examination: We study the robustness of CLIPScore (Hessel et al., 2021) and UMIC (Lee et al., 2021), which are two recently proposed reference-free metrics used for image captioning evaluation. CLIPScore measures similarity between the image and the candidate caption using a scaled cosine similarity of the image and text representations from the CLIP (Radford et al., 2021) model. On the other hand, UMIC utilizes the UNITER (Chen et al., 2020) model, which is pretrained to align image and text pairs, and finetunes it via contrastive learning to distinguish reference captions from its hard negatives. These hard negatives are automatically curated by either sampling reference captions of images which are similar to the given image, or by altering the reference captions in different ways, such as, substituting nouns, verbs and adjectives with random ones, dropping or repeating some words randomly, and randomly permuting the word order. SMURF (Feinglass and Yang, 2021) is another recently proposed metric for image caption evaluation which has a reference-free evaluation of the fluency of the caption, however the evaluation of the semantic correctness of the caption is still reference-based, hence we do not include this in our study.

Datasets used to conduct the examination: To conduct our examination of the robustness of the metrics, we generate image captions in one of the following ways, depending on the question we are trying to answer:

- By converting QA pairs to captions: For this purpose, we generate captions by converting the question and answer pairs from visual question answering datasets (VQAv2 (Goyal et al., 2016) and TDIUC (Kafle and Kanan, 2017)) into caption-like sentences. We use GPT-J prompting to achieve this conversion (see Appendix A.2 for a detailed explanation). In addition to the popular VQAv2 dataset, we selected TDIUC dataset since in this dataset, each question is annotated for the skill needed to solve that question. This allows us to identify captions belonging to which skills are particularly challenging for CLIPScore and UMIC to evaluate.
- By using templates: We generate caption in a controlled setting in the format of "There is a/an [object name]" for objects present in the image. We utilized the ground truth COCO detection dataset (Lin et al., 2014) to extract the names

of objects in each image. The COCO detection dataset provides object tags for each object presented in an image, which provides object names spanning across 90 different object categories and other detailed attributes of the object such as its area. The process of constructing these sentences is further explained in each specific baseline.

We will make the dataset containing all the generated captions publicly available for the purpose of reproducibility and future use by the community.

4 Experiments and Results

Preliminary Experiment: First we describe our preliminary experiment that served as a motivation for the rest of the study. We were interested in examining how different the scores assigned by reference-free image captioning metrics are for correct and incorrect captions created by converting questions and answers from visual question answering datasets to caption-like sentences. Captions generated in this way are unique in that even for incorrect captions, a significant portion of it (that corresponds to the information in the question) is still valid given the image. Thus, such a dataset of captions serves as a stress-test for examining the robustness of reference-free image captioning metrics.

To obtain correct and incorrect answers, we evaluated the ALBEF (Li et al., 2021) visual question answering model on the validation splits of the VQAv2 (Goyal et al., 2016) and TDIUC (Kafle and Kanan, 2017) datasets. We fine-tuned ALBEF on each dataset separately and conducted IID evaluations. We then converted each questions and its corresponding ALBEF answer into a caption-like sentence following the process described in Section 3. For VQA, we only use answers that match with either 3 or more human answers (and we classify them as correct answer) or that do not match with any human answers (and we classify them as incorrect answers), resulting in total of 179,297 answers (43389 incorrect and 135908 correct). For TDIUC, we classify answers that matches to the ground truth answer in the annotation as correct and otherwise incorrect resulting in total 538,868 answers (54687 incorrect and 484181 correct).

In figures 2 and 9, we report the distribution of scores obtained from each of CLIPScore and UMIC for both correct captions and incorrect captions. The substantial overlap between correct and

Answer Type	CLIPScore	UMIC
VQAv2- Correct	0.480 ± 0.122	0.394 ± 0.195
VQAv2- Incorrect	0.481 ± 0.119	0.403 ± 0.202
TDIUC- Correct	0.479 ± 0.123	0.203 ± 0.198
TDIUC- Incorrect	0.492 ± 0.117	0.331 ± 0.201

Table 1: CLIPScore and UMIC comparison for caption-like sentences for incorrect and correct answers generated by ALBEF model for VQAv2 and TDIUC datasets.

incorrect caption scores underscores the limitations of these metrics in accurately evaluating caption quality.




Figure 2: Histograms of CLIPScore and UMIC for VQAv2.

Score Normalization: The UMIC final score, which is an output of a sigmoid function, has a value range between 0 and 1. On the other hand, the CLIPScore is the cosine similarity score scaled by a factor of 2.5. Although theoretically, CLIPScore can vary between -2.5 and 2.5, we have not observed negative scores, and it rarely exceeds 1.0. The distribution of both metrics is illustrated in Figure 2. While we do not directly compare the values of these two metrics in this paper, we aim to contrast their sensitivity to different factors. To achieve this, we apply the min-max normalization separately to each metric for every experiments. This method allows us to evaluate the respective sensitivities of the two metrics effectively. Please note that all reported scores from here onwards are normalized, but the histograms are plotted using the original scores to accurately represent the original distribution.

Score Normalized Results: As shown in Table 1, both metrics assign higher average scores to incorrect captions compared to correct captions. We conducted further analysis by examining the average scores assigned by these metrics for different answer types (refer to Table 7 for detailed scores). Specifically, we observed that for both ‘yes/no’ and ‘number’ answer types, on average, the metrics assigned higher scores to incorrect captions. However, for ‘others’ answer type, correct captions received higher scores in average. For further investigation we look at results for specific

question types for VQAv2 (see Table 8). For CLIP-Score we observe that incorrect captions received higher scores in average for three question types: ‘how many’, ‘what time’ and ‘others’ (please refer to Table 8 for checking question types). Also, UMIC assign higher scores in average to incorrect captions for four question types: ‘how many’, ‘what time’, ‘which’, ‘others’, suggesting both metrics are not performing well for counting question and time questions which are considered to be hard questions. For TDIUC (see Table 9), CLIPScore assigns higher scores to incorrect captions for four question types: ‘attribute’, ‘absurd’, ‘object presence’, and ‘sentiment understanding’. Also, UMIC assigns higher scores to incorrect captions in three question types: ‘utility affordance’, ‘absurd’ and ‘scene recognition’ question types. (See Figure 10 and Figure 11.)

Controlled investigation to identify sensitivity to various factors: Having established that these metrics struggle to distinguish the set of incorrect captions from the set of correct captions, we delve deeper into understanding the underlying reasons for their failure. Our investigation focuses on the evaluating the metrics’ sensitivity to several controlled factors such as, fine-grained errors, plausibility and visual grounding of captions, negation, caption length, the number and size of objects mentioned in the caption, and sentence structure. By examining these factors, we aim to gain insights into the specific challenges that contribute to the metrics’ limitations in evaluating caption quality accurately.

4.1 Sensitivity to fine-grained errors

The primary objective of this section is to determine the sensitivity of these metrics to fine-grained errors. By "fine-grained errors", we refer to errors between a pair of correct and incorrect captions that have high lexical overlap. To obtain such pairs, we first generate incorrect captions corresponding to the questions for which ALBEF produced incorrect responses. And then, we generate correct captions using ground-truth answers instead of ALBEF responses for the same set of questions. We convert the questions and answers into captions using the method described in Section 3. We excluded questions with yes/no answers from this study as we discuss them in Section 4.3.

Despite the average higher scores assigned to correct captions, as shown in Table 2, the ranking

Answer Type	CLIPScore	UMIC
Ground Truth	0.479 ± 0.123	0.422 ± 0.210
Incorrect from ALBEF	0.468 ± 0.116	0.404 ± 0.204

Table 2: CLIPScore and UMIC comparison for caption-like sentences for incorrect answers generated by ALBEF model for VQAv2 and captions generated with its ground truth counterpart.

results reveal that these metrics often fail to prioritize correct captions over incorrect ones. CLIPScore fails to rank correct captions above incorrect captions in 46.34% of cases, while UMIC fails to do so in 45.99% of cases. Thus, **both metrics, CLIPScore and UMIC, show insensitivity to detecting fine-grained errors.**

4.2 Are metrics differently sensitive to different kinds of fine-grained errors?

The primary objective of this experiment is to determine if the metrics exhibit different sensitivity to various types of fine-grained errors. For this purpose, we first obtain correct captions by transforming questions along with their ground truth answers to caption-like sentences as described in Section 3. For each correct caption, we then create three different types of incorrect captions by substituting the ground truth answer with different types of incorrect answers. First, we substitute the ground truth answer with a plausible but incorrect answer, such as, substituting a color answer (e.g., “brown”) with another color (e.g., “white”) (see Appendix A.3 for more details). Such captions are plausible but not sufficiently visually grounded (e.g., “The color of the grass is white.”). Second, we substitute the ground truth answer with an object found in the image. We use the COCO Detection annotations to identify the objects in the image. Such captions are visually grounded but not plausible (e.g., “The color of the grass is giraffe.”). Finally, we create a caption using a random answer from the list of all answers in VQAv2, while excluding candidates from the previous groups (e.g., “The color of the grass is grill.”). For this experiment, we limited our investigation to the following question types: ‘what number is’, ‘what time’, ‘what color’, and ‘what brand’, as their answers are non-object entities and, therefore, are not present in the COCO Detection dataset. Thus, when constructing a sentence using an object in the image, we can be sure that it would result in an incorrect caption for the image. We analyzed 23841 sets of 4 captions each for this

Answer Type	CLIPScore	UMIC
Ground Truth	0.501 ± 0.127	0.487 ± 0.193
Plausible	0.474 ± 0.124	0.242 ± 0.181
Object from Image	0.526 ± 0.119	0.354 ± 0.154
Random	0.458 ± 0.124	0.275 ± 0.160

Table 3: CLIPScore and UMIC comparison for caption-like sentences from VQAv2 ground truth, plausible, object from image and random answers.

experiment (see Figure 6).

As illustrated in Table 3, we observe that the score difference between Ground Truth and Object from Image (captions with plausibility errors but correct visual grounding) is smaller than the difference between Ground Truth and Plausible (captions with visual grounding errors but plausible content). This indicates that the metrics exhibit **lower sensitivity to caption implausibility errors and higher sensitivity to visual grounding errors**. Surprisingly, CLIPScore assigns higher scores to incorrect captions with Object from Image than to correct captions with Ground Truth.

4.3 Sensitivity to negation

The primary objective of this experiment is to evaluate the sensitivity of the metrics to negation in captions. To assess the ability of CLIPScore and UMIC to distinguish between accurate captions and their negated versions, we created captions-like sentences by using the validation split of VQAv2, where the ground truth answer was either ‘yes’ or ‘no’. Additionally, we generated negated captions by negating the ground truth answer. For CLIPScore, correct captions received 0.457 ± 0.128 and their negated version got 0.450 ± 0.127 on average. For UMIC, correct captions received 0.359 ± 0.184 and their negated version got 0.335 ± 0.193 on average. Moreover, UMIC ranked the negated caption above the correct caption incorrectly in 44.24% of cases, while CLIPScore failed in 41.36% of cases. We believe that both metrics have performed inadequately since the scores are very similar for both the correct and negated counterparts. In summary, **both metrics exhibited a weak understanding of negation**.

4.4 Sensitivity to the length of caption

In this section, our objective is to evaluate the sensitivity of CLIPScore and UMIC to sentence length rather than correctness. To accomplish this, we first filtered out the incorrect answers generated

by ALBEF on the TDIUC validation set and we generated caption-like sentences for them. Additionally, we generated a caption-like sentence based on the question only by utilizing GPT-J in a few-shot manner (see Figure 8). As a result, these question-based sentences are shorter than the sentences generated using both questions and answers. In terms of performance evaluation, for CLIPScore, longer caption-like sentences with incorrect answers received an average score of 0.521 ± 0.129 , while question-based captions received an average score of 0.512 ± 0.116 . On the other hand, UMIC assigned a higher score of 0.351 ± 0.196 to longer caption-like sentences with incorrect answers, while shorter question-based captions received an average score of 0.264 ± 0.149 . In total, for CLIPScore, 53.16% of the time, the score of question-based captions was lower than that of captions with incorrect answers, and for UMIC, 62.08% of the time. In conclusion, **UMIC exhibits significant sensitivity to caption length while CLIPScore exhibits limited sensitivity**.

4.5 Sensitivity to the number of objects mentioned in the caption

In this section, our objective is to assess the sensitivity of the metrics to the number of objects mentioned in the caption. We aim to determine whether the scores exhibit an increase with the inclusion of additional information about the objects depicted in the image. To conduct this evaluation, we filter images from COCO Detection dataset (Lin et al., 2014) having a minimum of three object tags (19412 images) and randomly select three object tags for each image and utilize their corresponding object names to form sentences, depicting one, two and three objects presented in the image (see Figure 4). As presented in three first rows of Table 4 illustrates, our findings indicate that CLIPScore is sensitive to the number of objects referenced in the caption, with scores increasing as more objects are mentioned. In contrast, UMIC shows little variation in scores with increasing numbers of objects, suggesting that it is not highly sensitive to this factor (see Figure 4). In conclusion, **CLIPScore displays a heightened sensitivity to the number of image-relevant objects mentioned in the caption, while UMIC does not exhibit significant sensitivity towards this factor**.

Number of Objects	CLIPScore	UMIC
One Object	0.449 ± 0.112	0.205 ± 0.111
Two Objects	0.512 ± 0.129	0.212 ± 0.175
Three Objects	0.561 ± 0.129	0.195 ± 0.175
Shuffled One Object	0.445 ± 0.114	0.139 ± 0.098
Shuffled Two Objects	0.499 ± 0.126	0.148 ± 0.123
Shuffled Three Objects	0.540 ± 0.125	0.169 ± 0.154

Table 4: CLIPScore and UMIC comparison for sentences with various number of objects name, and their shuffled counterparts.

Object Size	CLIPScore	UMIC
Small Object	0.396 ± 0.131	0.317 ± 0.162
Big Object	0.434 ± 0.134	0.232 ± 0.138
Shuffled Small Object	0.390 ± 0.131	0.205 ± 0.148
Shuffled Big Object	0.436 ± 0.135	0.170 ± 0.127

Table 5: CLIPScore and UMIC comparison for captions referring to small and a big objects in the image, and their shuffled counterparts.

4.6 Sensitivity to size of objects mentioned in the caption

In this experiment, our primary goal is to examine the effect of object size mentioned in captions on the CLIPScore (Hessel et al., 2021) and UMIC (Lee et al., 2021) metrics. To achieve this, we utilize the COCO Detection dataset (Lin et al., 2014) to select one small and one large object from the same image with a noticeable difference in area (see Figure 5 for an example and for detailed explanation see Appendix A.1.). Based on the first two rows of results presented in Table 5, it can be observed that CLIPScore tends to increase as the object size increases, whereas UMIC shows a small decrease in score with an increase in object size. **Both CLIPScore and UMIC demonstrate sensitivity to the size of image-relevant objects mentioned in the caption.** However, contrary to our expectations, **CLIPScore increases as the size of the objects mentioned grows, while UMIC score decreases.**

4.7 Sensitivity to the sentence structure

The primary objective of this section is to investigate the sensitivity of the metrics, CLIPScore and UMIC, to sentence structure. To evaluate their ability to comprehend sentence structure, we generated captions for VQA2 ground truth answers and then shuffled them. As shown in the Table 6, both CLIPScore and UMIC assign higher average scores to correct captions. However, for CLIPScore, the scores for correct and shuffled captions are very

Answer Type	CLIPScore	UMIC
Correct answer	0.469 ± 0.119	0.400 ± 0.199
Shuffled version	0.450 ± 0.116	0.211 ± 0.160

Table 6: CLIPScore and UMIC comparison for captions generated with ground truth answers of VQA2 and their shuffled counterparts.

close. The ranking results reveal that CLIPScore fails to assign a higher score to the correct caption than the shuffled one in 34.32% of cases, whereas this occurs in only 9.18% of cases for UMIC. This indicates that **UMIC is more responsive to the structure of the sentence compared to CLIPScore.**

In order to compare sensitivity of CLIPScore and UMIC to sentence structure and object size, we conducted a sentence shuffling experiment using captions that contained objects of varying sizes, as described in Section 4.6. We shuffle both big and small object captions in the same order (see Figure 5). As shown in Table 5, our results demonstrate that CLIPScore assigns higher scores to captions referring to larger area of the image, regardless of whether the sentence structure is shuffled or not. In contrast, UMIC exhibits the opposite trend, with higher scores assigned to correct sentences compared to shuffled ones, regardless of the size of the objects mentioned in the caption. This highlights that **UMIC is more sensitive to sentence structure than size of the objects mentioned in the caption, whereas for CLIPScore the behaviour is just the opposite.**

To compare the sensitivity of CLIPScore and UMIC to sentence structure and the number of object mentions, we conducted a sentence shuffling experiment using captions that varied in the number of object mentions. As shown in the Table 4, UMIC consistently assigns lower scores to shuffled captions compared to captions with one, two, or three object mentions and correct sentence structure. **This indicates that UMIC prioritizes sentence structure over the number of object mentions.** In contrast, CLIPScore assigns a higher score to a shuffled captions with three object mentions than to a caption with two objects and correct structure, revealing that **CLIPScore places greater importance on the number of object mentions rather than sentence structure.**

5 Conclusion

In conclusion, we found that recently proposed reference-free image captioning evaluation metrics such as CLIPScore and UMIC are far from perfect; they cannot tell apart an incorrect caption from a correct caption when the difference between them is fine-grained. Both metrics demonstrate varying sensitivity to different types of errors. They exhibit lower sensitivity towards plausibility errors but are more responsive towards visual grounding errors. Both metrics fail to understand negation sufficiently. While UMIC is sensitive to caption length, CLIPScore shows less sensitivity to this factor. We also found that CLIPScore is impacted by the number and size of image-relevant objects mentioned in the caption and it is indifferent to the structure of the sentence. As a result, caution must be exercised when employing them as metrics for captioning.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge the material support of NVIDIA in the form of computational resources. We also thank the Mila Innovation, Development and Technologies (IDT) team for maintaining the Mila compute cluster and providing technical support. During this project, Aishwarya Agrawal was supported by the Canada CIFAR AI Chair award.

References

- Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. 2005. [METEOR: An automatic metric for MT evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments](#). In *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization*, pages 65–72, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yen-Chun Chen, Linjie Li, Licheng Yu, Ahmed El Kholy, Faisal Ahmed, Zhe Gan, Yu Cheng, and Jingjing Liu. 2020. Uniter: Universal image-text representation learning. In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2020*, pages 104–120, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- Joshua Feinglass and Yezhou Yang. 2021. [Smurf: Semantic and linguistic understanding fusion for caption evaluation via typicality analysis](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. 2016. Making the v in vqa matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in visual question answering. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 127:398–414.
- Jack Hessel, Ari Holtzman, Maxwell Forbes, Ronan Le Bras, and Yejin Choi. 2021. [CLIPScore: A reference-free evaluation metric for image captioning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7514–7528, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kushal Kafle and Christopher Kanan. 2017. An analysis of visual question answering algorithms. In *ICCV*.
- Hwanhee Lee, Seunghyun Yoon, Franck Dernoncourt, Trung Bui, and Kyomin Jung. 2021. [UMIC: An unreferenced metric for image captioning via contrastive learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 220–226, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Junnan Li, Ramprasaath R. Selvaraju, Akhilesh Deepak Gotmare, Shafiq Joty, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. 2021. [Align before fuse: Vision and language representation learning with momentum distillation](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Chin-Yew Lin. 2004. [ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries](#). In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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*, pages 740–755, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- Zixian Ma, Jerry Hong, Mustafa Omer Gul, Mona Gandhi, Irena Gao, and Ranjay Krishna. 2023. [Crepe: Can vision-language foundation models reason compositionally?](#)
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. [Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Letitia Parcalabescu, Michele Cafagna, Lilitta Muradjan, Anette Frank, Iacer Calixto, and Albert Gatt. 2022. [VALSE: A task-independent benchmark for vision and language models centered on linguistic phenomena](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8253–8280, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. 2021. [Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision](#).

Anna Rohrbach, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Kaylee Burns, Trevor Darrell, and Kate Saenko. 2018. [Object hallucination in image captioning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4035–4045, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Ravi Shekhar, Sandro Pezzelle, Yauhen Klimovich, Aurélie Herbelot, Moin Nabi, Enver Sangineto, and Raffaella Bernardi. 2017. [FOIL it! find one mismatch between image and language caption](#). In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 255–265, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Tristan Thrush, Ryan Jiang, Max Bartolo, Amanpreet Singh, Adina Williams, Douwe Kiela, and Candace Ross. 2022. [Winoground: Probing vision and language models for visio-linguistic compositionality](#). In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 5238–5248.

Ramakrishna Vedantam, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. 2014. [Cider: Consensus-based image description evaluation](#). *2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 4566–4575.

Ben Wang and Aran Komatsuzaki. 2021. [GPT-J-6B: A 6 Billion Parameter Autoregressive Language Model](#). <https://github.com/kingoflolz/mesh-transformer-jax>.

Yutaro Yamada, Yingtian Tang, and Ilker Yildirim. 2022. [When are lemons purple? the concept association bias of clip](#).

Mert Yuksekgonul, Federico Bianchi, Pratyusha Kalluri, Dan Jurafsky, and James Zou. 2023. [When and why vision-language models behave like bags-of-words, and what to do about it?](#) In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.


Tiancheng Zhao, Tianqi Zhang, Mingwei Zhu, Haozhan Shen, Kyusong Lee, Xiaopeng Lu, and Jianwei Yin. 2022. [An explainable toolbox for evaluating pre-trained vision-language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 30–37, Abu Dhabi, UAE. Association for Computational Linguistics.

A Appendix

A.1 Picking a large and small object from the image

In this experiment, our primary objective is to investigate how the object size mentioned in captions affects the scores assigned by CLIPScore and UMIC. To select small and large objects that are distinctly different in size, we could sort the objects by their associated area in the COCO Detection dataset. However, this approach may not always yield accurate results because multiple objects with the same name may appear in an image. For instance, if there are two cars in an image, one smaller but further away and the other larger but closer, sorting by area would lead to incorrect identification of the smallest and largest objects. This would result in identical captions for both objects, such as “There is a car.” which is not ideal for comparison.

To overcome this issue, we added up the area of all object categories with the same name and sorted the total areas of each object category in the image. We then calculated the difference between the areas associated with the largest and smallest categories. If the difference exceeded our threshold, we selected those objects for analysis. As a result, we selected 24610 images for further analysis (See Figure 5).




Candidate Captions	CLIPScore	UMIC
Image Object: There is a car.	0.383	0.320
Hallucinated Sibling Object: There is a motorcycle.	0.309	0.143

Figure 3: Captions referring to an object from the image and its hallucinated sibling.


A.2 Generating Caption-like sentences

To generate caption-like sentences from each question and answer pair of VQA datasets, we utilize pretrained GPT-J (Wang and Komatsuzaki, 2021) in a few-shot manner. To accomplish this, we first constructed a support example dataset using the VQAv2 (Goyal et al., 2016) training split. For each of the sixty-four predefined question types in the VQAv2 dataset, we randomly selected four examples from the VQAv2 training split. Then, we trans-




Candidate Captions	CLIPScore	UMIC
One Object: There is a person.	0.374	0.142
Two Objects: There is a person and a sports ball.	0.530	0.156
Three Objects: There is a person, a sports ball and a baseball bat.	0.692	0.149

Figure 4: Captions referring to different number of objects from the image.



Candidate Captions	CLIPScore	UMIC
Ground Truth: The color of the grass is brown.	0.405	0.475
Plausible Answer: The color of the grass is green, white.	0.440	0.197
Image Object: The color of the grass is giraffe.	0.736	0.384
Random Answer: The color of the grass is grill.	0.367	0.147

Figure 6: Captions from ground truth, plausible answer, an object from the image and a random answer of VQAv2.



Candidate Captions	CLIPScore	UMIC
Small Object: There is a knife.	0.460	0.507
Big Object: There is a pizza.	0.632	0.469
Shuffled Small Object: A there knife is.	0.480	0.268
Shuffled Big Object: A there pizza is.	0.664	0.250

Figure 5: Captions referring to small and large area of the image and their shuffled counterparts.

formed both the questions and answers into single sentences, which we wrote ourselves. When generating captions for VQAv2 and TDIUC (Kafle and Kanan, 2017) validation split, we first match the question type to one of the predefined sixty-four question types. Then, we select four support examples associated with that question type and prompt GPT-J to generate a transformed sentence. If the question type does not match any of our predefined question types, we randomly select eight support examples from the entire pool of support examples. See an example in Figure 7, please note that we visualized 2-shot prompt for simplification.

Answer Type	CLIPScore	UMIC
Correct yes/no	0.457 ± 0.115	0.355 ± 0.183
Incorrect yes/no	0.470 ± 0.113	0.392 ± 0.183
Correct numbers	0.468 ± 0.119	0.354 ± 0.197
Incorrect numbers	0.477 ± 0.116	0.387 ± 0.194
Correct others	0.512 ± 0.123	0.452 ± 0.195
Incorrect others	0.485 ± 0.120	0.411 ± 0.207

Table 7: CLIPScore and UMIC comparison for correct and incorrect caption-like sentences generated with different answer types.

A.3 Plausible Answers

To generate plausible captions for each question type, we first compiled a list of plausible answers derived from the ground truth multiple choice answer of the same question type in the validation split of VQAv2. Subsequently, an answer was randomly selected from this list of plausible answers. This chosen answer was used to replace the ground truth answer in the original caption, thus generating a plausible alternate caption.

A.4 Sensitivity to hallucinated objects

The main aim of this section is to assess the sensitivity of CLIPScore and UMIC to hallucinated captions (Rohrbach et al., 2018). To achieve this, inspired by FOIL (Shekhar et al., 2017), we utilized the COCO Detection dataset and generated a caption for each unique object name in the image. Additionally, we created a hallucinated caption pair for each object by randomly selecting an object in the same super-category (e.g., ‘bicycle’ and ‘motorcycle’ belong to ‘vehicle’ super-category), but not present in the image (see Figure 3 for an example and see Section A.4.1 for a detailed description). Our experiment results demonstrate that both CLIPScore and UMIC assign lower scores to hallucinated captions compared to correct captions. Specifically, for CLIPScore, the mean score for hallucinated captions was 0.391 ± 0.096 , while the mean score for correct captions was 0.523 ± 0.127 . For UMIC, the mean score for hallucinated captions was 0.132 ± 0.015 , and the mean score for correct captions was 0.313 ± 0.149 . Overall, our study concludes that CLIPScore and UMIC are effective in distinguishing between real and hallucinated objects in image captions. This indicates the robustness of these metrics in evaluating hal-




Figure 7: Generating caption-like sentences from questions and answers of VQA datasets.




Figure 8: Generating caption-like sentences from questions of VQA datasets.





Figure 9: Histograms of CLIPScore and UMIC for TDIUC.



(a) Histograms of CLIPScore and UMIC for Attribute Question Type of TDIUC Dataset.

(b) Histograms of CLIPScore and UMIC for Absurd Question Type of TDIUC Dataset.

Figure 10: Histograms of CLIPScore and UMIC for Attribute and Absurd Question Type of TDIUC Dataset.

<i>Question Type</i>	<i>CLIPScore-Incorrect</i>	<i>CLIPScore-Correct</i>	<i>UMIC-Incorrect</i>	<i>UMIC-Correct</i>
how many	0.475 ± 0.120	0.468 ± 0.119	0.372 ± 0.197	0.354 ± 0.197
what color	0.454 ± 0.125	0.466 ± 0.124	0.420 ± 0.205	0.517 ± 0.183
what sport	0.480 ± 0.130	0.584 ± 0.072	0.299 ± 0.224	0.342 ± 0.182
what animal	0.436 ± 0.136	0.544 ± 0.108	0.257 ± 0.198	0.322 ± 0.169
what time	0.469 ± 0.098	0.405 ± 0.089	0.333 ± 0.119	0.282 ± 0.137
what brand	0.440 ± 0.124	0.458 ± 0.121	0.481 ± 0.191	0.511 ± 0.163
what type/kind	0.485 ± 0.116	0.537 ± 0.110	0.382 ± 0.195	0.417 ± 0.179
where	0.501 ± 0.117	0.551 ± 0.107	0.380 ± 0.190	0.435 ± 0.174
which	0.495 ± 0.118	0.529 ± 0.111	0.419 ± 0.197	0.414 ± 0.179
what is/are the	0.497 ± 0.118	0.543 ± 0.123	0.436 ± 0.207	0.468 ± 0.187
others	0.480 ± 0.119	0.471 ± 0.119	0.412 ± 0.205	0.370 ± 0.190

Table 8: CLIPScore and UMIC for correct and incorrect caption-like sentences generated for different question types of VQAv2.

<i>Question Type</i>	<i>CLIPScore-Incorrect</i>	<i>CLIPScore-Correct</i>	<i>UMIC-Incorrect</i>	<i>UMIC-Correct</i>
absurd	0.422 ± 0.092	0.388 ± 0.074	0.096 ± 0.132	0.011 ± 0.045
attribute	0.550 ± 0.107	0.546 ± 0.106	0.428 ± 0.163	0.458 ± 0.148
color	0.542 ± 0.111	0.551 ± 0.114	0.439 ± 0.186	0.498 ± 0.172
object presence	0.500 ± 0.074	0.492 ± 0.095	0.179 ± 0.126	0.188 ± 0.137
sport recognition	0.597 ± 0.114	0.667 ± 0.074	0.253 ± 0.195	0.326 ± 0.158
activity recognition	0.645 ± 0.108	0.664 ± 0.094	0.353 ± 0.159	0.390 ± 0.153
sentiment understanding	0.582 ± 0.089	0.564 ± 0.080	0.409 ± 0.188	0.421 ± 0.159
scene recognition	0.497 ± 0.074	0.513 ± 0.078	0.264 ± 0.149	0.182 ± 0.114
utility affordance	0.562 ± 0.103	0.591 ± 0.101	0.353 ± 0.194	0.353 ± 0.181
positional reasoning	0.613 ± 0.106	0.638 ± 0.106	0.425 ± 0.200	0.504 ± 0.198
counting	0.563 ± 0.105	0.572 ± 0.103	0.300 ± 0.179	0.339 ± 0.170
object recognition	0.554 ± 0.119	0.595 ± 0.106	0.251 ± 0.188	0.284 ± 0.161





Table 9: CLIPScore and UMIC score for correct and incorrect caption-like sentences generated for different question types of TDIUC.

lucinated captions in our **limited setting**. But we would like to note that our experimental results do not provide any information about whether these models are prone to other kinds of hallucination such as, hallucinating concepts that co-occur with a given concept (e.g., camels co-occur with sand, bananas are usually yellow etc.).

A.4.1 Forming hallucinated captions

The main objective of this section is to explain how we form hallucinated captions. The COCO detection dataset provides object tags for each object in an image, spanning 90 different object categories such as ‘bicycle’, ‘giraffe’, and ‘sandwich’, etc.. These categories are further grouped into 12 super categories including ‘person’, ‘vehicle’, ‘outdoor’, ‘animal’, ‘accessory’, ‘sports’, ‘kitchen’, ‘food’, ‘furniture’, ‘electronic’, ‘appliance’, and ‘indoor’. To systematically generate hallucinated captions, we define sibling categories, two categories are sib-

lings if they lie in the same super-category. For instance ‘bicycle’, ‘car’, ‘motorcycle’, ‘airplane’, ‘bus’, ‘train’, ‘truck’, ‘boat’ are all siblings by definition since they all lie in the ‘vehicle’ super category. Since there can be multiple objects with the same object name in an image, we created a set of unique objects presented in each image before generating hallucinated captions. We generate hallucinated captions by randomly selecting an object from one sibling object that was not present in the object set of the image. We only included objects with at least one sibling in the analysis, resulting in 94782 correct captions and hallucinated pairs. For instance if an image has a ‘bottle’ in it, we generate a correct caption for it: ‘There is a bottle.’, and for generating a hallucinated pair we randomly select an object from ‘bottle’ siblings that belongs to ‘kitchen’ super category and we generate a hallucinated caption ‘There is a knife.’.



(a) Histograms of CLIPScore and UMIC for Object Recognition Question Type of TDIUC Dataset.

(b) Histograms of CLIPScore and UMIC for Counting Question Type of TDIUC Dataset.

Figure 11: Histograms of CLIPScore and UMIC for Object Recognition and Counting Question Types of TDIUC Dataset.