
CMFeed: A Benchmark Dataset for Controllable Multimodal Feedback Synthesis

Puneet Kumar*¹ Sarthak Malik*² Balasubramanian Raman² Xiaobai Li†³

¹University of Oulu, Finland ²Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, India ³Zhejiang University, China
puneet.kumar@oulu.fi, {sarthak_m@mt, bala@cs}.iitr.ac.in, xiaobai.li@zju.edu.cn

Abstract

The Controllable Multimodal Feedback Synthesis (CMFeed) **dataset** enables the generation of sentiment-controlled feedback from multimodal inputs. It contains images, text, human comments, comments’ metadata and sentiment labels. Existing datasets for related tasks such as multimodal summarization, visual question answering, visual dialogue, and sentiment-aware text generation do not incorporate training models using human-generated outputs and their metadata, a gap that CMFeed addresses. This capability is critical for developing feedback systems that understand and replicate human-like spontaneous responses. Based on the CMFeed dataset, we define a novel **task** of controllable feedback synthesis to generate context-aware feedback aligned with the desired sentiment. We propose a **benchmark** feedback synthesis system comprising encoder, decoder, and controllability modules. It employs transformer and Faster R-CNN networks to extract features and generate sentiment-specific feedback, achieving a sentiment classification accuracy of 77.23%, which is 18.82% higher than models not leveraging the dataset’s unique controllability features. Additionally, we incorporate a similarity module for relevance assessment through rank-based metrics.

1 Introduction

The process of multimodal feedback synthesis involves generating responses to multimodal inputs in a way that mimics human spontaneous reaction [1]. Controlling sentiments in feedback, a capability inherent to humans remains a challenge for machines [2]. The ability to control sentiments in feedback synthesis facilitates more empathetic healthcare, accurate marketing insights, and engaging educational content while enabling systems to predict patients’ mental states, assess product responses, analyze social behaviours, and gauge user engagement in advertisements [3, 4]. Crucially, the controllability aspect of these systems enables them to adopt various roles, from supporting those under stress to acting as a motivator or providing light-hearted engagement. This adaptability enhances the personalization of interactions across different contexts [5].

The need for the Controllable Multimodal Feedback Synthesis (CMFeed) dataset arises from the requirement of a dataset containing human-generated feedback in addition to multimodal inputs. The CMFeed dataset has been created by crawling Facebook news articles and it includes input images, texts, human comments, comments’ metadata (such as likes, shares, reactions, and relevance scores), and sentiment labels. Unlike traditional sentiment-controlled text generation systems that do not utilize human comments, systems developed using the CMFeed dataset can be distinctively trained on human-generated comments to learn human-like spontaneity and contextual diversity. This enables

*Equal Contribution

†Corresponding Author. X. Li is with the State Key Laboratory of Blockchain and Data Security, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China and Center for Machine Vision and Signal Analysis, University of Oulu, Finland.

the generation of ‘opinions’ rather than just ‘knowledge’ or ‘facts,’ which the proposed task focuses on. Our approach uniquely allows for the generation of controlled opinions, which can vary just as human opinions do.

Based on the CMFeed dataset, a novel task of controllable feedback synthesis for input images and text has been defined and a feedback synthesis system has been proposed to generate sentiment-controlled feedback. It employs two networks for textual and visual modalities, each comprising an encoder, a decoder, and a control layer. The encoders use a text transformer [6] and a Faster R-CNN model [7] to extract features, which the decoder combines for feedback generation. The control layer, placed after the decoder, selectively activates or deactivates neurons corresponding to the positive or negative sentiments as per the requirements. The system also includes a similarity module, which ensures that generated feedback closely aligns with the input’s context, enhancing the relevance and accuracy of the response.

To establish benchmarks for this new task, we compared our system against several baselines using different fusion methods and encoding strategies. The proposed system, which combines a Transformer for text and Faster RCNN for visual data using late fusion, achieved a sentiment classification accuracy of 77.23%, significantly higher than the baselines. This success highlights the system’s ability to effectively control sentiments and integrate multimodal inputs. We have released these benchmark results to encourage further exploration and development in the field. The major contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- The CMFeed dataset has been constructed for multimodal feedback synthesis, encompassing text, images, corresponding comments, number of likes, shares, and sentiment class.
- A new task has been defined to generate sentiment-controlled feedback towards multimodal input containing images and text similar to how humans do.
- A benchmark feedback synthesis system capable of generating sentiment-controlled feedback has been developed using the CMFeed dataset. It extracts the textual and visual features using transformer and Faster R-CNN models and combines them to generate feedback.
- A novel controllability module has been introduced, enabling sentiment regulation in the generated feedback. It selectively activates or deactivates neurons to ensure alignment of the feedback with the desired sentiment.

2 Related Works

The related works to the proposed task of controllable feedback synthesis include multimodal summarization, visual question answering (VQA), dialogue generation, and sentiment-aware text generation. Unlike multimodal summarization [8], which condenses information from various modalities, our proposed system is designed to create contextually appropriate and sentiment-aligned feedback [9–11]. Multimodal summarization often suffers from modality bias and fails to generate sentiment-influenced feedback [12–16]. Similarly, VQA merges visual perception with interactive question-answering to analyze sentiments but does not produce sentiment-influenced feedback [17–22]. Advancements in dialogue generation have introduced attention mechanisms and learning strategies [23, 24], while sentiment-aware text generation has evolved from generating texts with varied sentiment tones [25–28] to integrating emotions in conversational agents [29–31]. However, these works do not train the models on human-generated comments and generally lack the capability for controlled sentiment output [32–38], a gap that the proposed system addresses.

The datasets used for the aforementioned methods are summarized in Table 1. While a few include human-generated summaries or answers, none offer the metadata (such as relevance, reactions, and sentiment labels) necessary for training feedback synthesis systems. The absence of human comments and metadata in existing datasets hinders the development of sentiment-controlled feedback synthesis systems [1, 51]. In contrast, CMFeed addresses this gap by supporting the development of models that can generate opinions mimicking human conversational dynamics, a feature not covered by existing tasks. This capability enables CMFeed to create more personalized and contextually aware multimodal interactions, allowing sentiment to reflect the natural ebb and flow of human emotions. In contrast to the latest large language models (LLMs) such as Generative Pre-Trained Transformer (GPT) [52], which primarily excel in summarization and question answering through knowledge retrieval, the CMFeed dataset is designed to interpret multimodal inputs and produce novel, sentiment-controlled feedback that mimics human interaction, thereby marking a distinct contribution from conventional LLMs that rely on existing knowledge.

Table 1: Related datasets. ‘HC’: Human Comments, ‘CM’: Comments’ Metadata, ‘V’: Visual, ‘A’: Audio, ‘T’: Textual, ‘MMSum’: Multimodal Summarization, ‘VQA’: Vis Qu Ans, ‘VisDial’: Vis Dialogue, ‘SATextGen’: Sentiment-Aware Text Generation, ‘N/A’: Not Applicable, ‘-’: Unavailable.

Area	Dataset	Year	Dataset Size	No. of Subjects	Modalities	HC	CM
MMSum	VMSMO [11]	2020	184920 documents	70 participants	V, T	✓	✗
	MSMO [10]	2018	314581 documents	10 students	V, T	✓	✗
	MVSA-Single [39]	2016	4869 tweets	N/A	V, T	✗	✗
	MVSA-Multiple [39]	2016	4869 tweets	N/A	V, T	✗	✗
VQA	DocVQA [40]	2020	50K QA pairs	-	T	✗	✗
	OK VQA [41]	2019	150K QA pairs	5 MTurk workers	V, T	✗	✗
	VQA [42]	2017	1.1M QA pairs	215 MTurk workers	V, T	✓	✗
	VideoQA [43]	2017	243K QA pairs	-	V, T	✗	✗
VisDial	InfoVisDial [44]	2023	79535 dialogues	35 annotators	V, T	✗	✗
	CLEVR-Dialog [45]	2019	4.25M dialogues	-	V, T	✗	✗
	VisDial [46]	2017	1.23M QA pairs	200 annotators	V, T	✓	✗
	Visual Madlibs [47]	2015	397675 dialogues	1 quality checker	V, T	✗	✗
SATextGen	SEPRG [31]	2021	64356 conversations	500 samplers	T	✓	✗
	EMOTyDA [48]	2020	19365 videos	10 participants	V, T	✓	✗
	ESTC [49]	2018	4308211 conversations	-	T	✓	✗
	STC [50]	2015	4.4M conversations	-	T	✓	✗

3 CMFeed

3.1 Dataset Construction

The CMFeed dataset contains 61734 comments from 3646 posts compiled by crawling news articles from Sky News, NYDaily, FoxNews, and BBC News through Facebook posts. Its details are described in Table 2 while sample data instances have been depicted in Table 3. Multiple images and comments correspond to each news post, enabling the feedback synthesis model to learn the comments’ contextual diversity and relevance with the input. The dataset collection process utilized the NLTK [53] & newspaper3k [54] libraries and it was conducted in compliance with Facebook’s terms and conditions [55], ensuring adherence to all legal and ethical standards. The CMFeed dataset and corresponding code can be accessed at zenodo.org/records/11409612 and github.com/MIntelligence-Group/CMFeed/ respectively. Appendix A describes more details about the dataset such as its documentation, metadata, collection process, intended usage, licensing, and handling.




Preprocessing: The CMFeed dataset consists of multiple images per sample, corresponding news text, post likes and shares, human comments along with reactions and shares. The comments for each post have been sorted based on Facebook’s ‘most-relevant’ criterion, which prioritizes the comments with the highest likes and shares. The comments have been preprocessed in the following manner – the emoticons have been converted to words using the Demoji library [56]; blank comments have been removed; contractions have been expanded; special and accented characters have been eliminated; punctuations and numbers have been purged to reduce noise; the stop-words have been removed, and the comments have been converted to lowercase. The preprocessing steps are designed to balance noise reduction with the retention of crucial sentiment cues in textual content. Converting emoticons to words preserves their sentiment value in a more consistent format for analysis. This focus enhances dataset consistency and analyzability. Although punctuations and numbers may convey sentiment, their removal reduces noise and sharpens the focus of the text. This approach is based on the understanding that core sentiments are primarily conveyed through words, not punctuation or numbers.

Annotation Strategy: To determine the ground-truth sentiment labels for the comments, we obtained sentiment scores using four pre-trained models: FLAIR Library [57], SentimentR [58], DistilBERT [59], and RoBERTa [60]. Each of these models has unique capabilities: FLAIR specializes in capturing contextual variations in text using a neural network approach. SentimentR is designed to

Table 2: CMFeed dataset’s details

Parameter	Value
No. of news posts	3646
No. of total data samples	61734
No. of samples after filtering	57222
Avg. no. of likes per post	65.1
Avg. no. of likes per comment	10.5
Avg. length of news text	655 words
Avg. no. of images per post	3.7

Table 3: Representative samples from the CMFeed dataset. Here, ‘PLikes’ (Post Likes) and ‘CLikes’ (Comment Likes) show the number of likes for the post and comment, respectively; ‘Shares’ denotes number of shares for the post and ‘C’ represents comment’s sentiment class (1: positive, 0: negative).

Title	Text	Images	PLikes	Shares	Comment	CLikes	C
There are costs of managing beavers, but the benefits outweigh those costs.	Beaver dams in east Devon create area of wetland amid drought. The dams have created a wetland despite the dry weather. A network of dams built by beavers in Devon has helped to maintain an area of wetland despite a drought in the South West. There are a number of beavers ...		2887	165	Benefits outweigh the costs because beavers are ecosystem engineers!	47	1
A national emergency has been declared.	Pakistan floods: Monsoons bring misery to millions in Pakistan By Pumza Fihlani in Sukkur, Pakistan and Frances Mao in Singapore. Millions of people have been affected by floods in Pakistan, hundreds have been killed, and the government has declared a national emergency ...		2005	126	Circumstances are really miserable after monster floodings.	26	0
Celebrating his birthday, John Tinniswood said moderation in everything.	Moderation is the key to life, GB’s oldest man says on 110th birthday, Mr Tinniswood was joined by family and friends to celebrate his big day. Britain’s oldest man has celebrated his 110th birthday by declaring "moderation in everything and all things" as the secret ...		12000	407	Congratulations on a well lived life and 110.	31	1
If it leaks then it’s easy to clean.	Bin strikes: The people using baths and hiring skips to store rubbish, Helen Sikora has been keeping rubbish bags in her bath so she can easily clean up any leaks. Edinburgh residents have told how they have hired skips and even used bathtubs to store rubbish, as waste piles up ...		464	29	Dump it on streets if they do not bother to collect it.	29	0

analyze textual sentiments by evaluating linguistic cues within the text. DistilBERT and RoBERTa are both transformer-based models optimized for understanding the nuances of language through self-attention mechanisms. DistilBERT offers a lighter, faster variant of BERT that retains most of its predictive power, whereas RoBERTa is trained on an even larger corpus with more robust fine-tuning, enhancing its ability to discern complex sentiment patterns.

We adopted a majority voting strategy for annotation, similar to that used in the construction of the IEMOCAP dataset [61], retaining data samples that received the same sentiment class from at least three of the four models. The remaining samples were excluded and marked with the sentiment class ‘XX.’ The models generated sentiment values of -1 or 1 along with a confidence score. We calculated a score by multiplying the sentiment value by its confidence, then normalized this score to a range between 0 (negative sentiment) and 1 (positive sentiment). Averages of these normalized scores across the models provided the final sentiment labels. To further ensure robustness, we also employed a safety margin from 0.49 and 0.51 and marked the labels with the score in this range as ‘XX.’ Of the total 61734 samples analyzed, 57222 met the criteria for inclusion in further experiments based on the above filtering strategies, ensuring high confidence in the ground-truth labels.

The sentiment prediction was conducted on comments to capture and analyze direct human emotional reactions, independent of the original text or imagery. This approach aims to understand user reactions, which are direct, spontaneous, and personal, thus providing insights into user sentiments. The objective is to enable the feedback synthesis system to emulate this human-like directness and spontaneity. To ensure the accuracy of the constructed ground-truth sentiment labels, a **human evaluation** was conducted. 50 evaluators (25 males and 25 females, average age 30 ± 2.73 years) assessed the sentiment of 50 randomly selected pairs of input image and text. The results showed that 90.88% of evaluators (standard deviation 7.59%) agreed on the consistency between the expressed sentiment and the assigned sentiment label.

3.2 Task Formulation

Given an environment $E = \{T, I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n\}$, where T denotes input text and I_1, I_2, \dots, I_n denote n input images. Each image is comprised of m objects o_1, o_2, \dots, o_m , while the text T is made up of a dictionary of k words w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k . The task is to generate a feedback towards environment E under a sentiment-controlled manner where ‘sentiment-controlled’ implies the feedback aligns with a specified sentiment S , with S being either 0 for a negative sentiment or 1 for a positive sentiment.

3.3 Proposed Feedback Synthesis System

The proposed system, as illustrated in Fig. 1, comprises two networks for processing textual and visual data, each with an encoder, a decoder, and a control layer. Textual and visual features are extracted using a text transformer [6] and a Faster R-CNN model [7], respectively. These features are then utilized by the decoders to generate feedback. The system also features a similarity module to evaluate the feedback’s contextual alignment with human comments, and an interpretability module to analyze feature influence on feedback generation. For enhanced performance, it employs visual and textual attention mechanisms, integrating a pre-trained VGG network and Faster R-CNN for optimal feature extraction.

3.3.1 Textual Encoder

The textual encoder utilizes a transformer model [6], featuring global encoding and textual attention mechanisms. Global encoding is enhanced by a convolution-gated unit to improve textual representation, reduce repetition, and maintain semantic relevance. The textual attention component includes multi-headed self-attention, comprising a self-attention layer and a feed-forward layer. Positional embedding captures token positioning, and normalization finalizes the process to produce the textual context vector z_i^* . The feed-forward network (FFN) includes input and output layers with a dimension of 512 and a hidden layer of 2048. The FFN’s output for a specific input x is defined in Eq.1.

$$FFN(x) = \max(0, xW_1 + b_1)W_2 + b_2 \quad (1)$$

where, b_1, b_2, W_1 , and W_2 represent the bias terms and weight matrices, respectively. In the self-attention mechanism, the query, key, and value weight matrices are initially randomized in the encoder and updated during training.

3.3.2 Visual Encoder

The top three images from each sample are inputted into a visual encoder, using blank images when fewer are available. Features extracted from these images are concatenated to form visual context vector z_i^* . This process employs a pre-trained Faster R-CNN model [7]. According to Eq. 2, CNN layers produce feature maps that the Region Proposal Network (RPN) uses to create anchor boxes with binary scores based on Intersection Over Union (IoU) values [62]. These anchors are then classified and regressed to yield classified boxes. A total of 1601 classes are assigned to these boxes, and their features are combined into a global feature vector. Faster R-CNN is selected for its efficiency and precision in detecting small and varied objects, suitable for non-real-time settings. The choice to use the top three images strikes a balance between retaining essential visual content and minimizing blank images in posts with fewer images, considering most posts have at least three images.

$$Objectiveness\ Score = \begin{cases} Positive; & IoU > 0.7 \\ Negative; & IoU < 0.3 \\ No\ score; & 0.3 < IoU < 0.7 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

3.3.3 Attention

The attention mechanism in both the encoder and decoder operates on three vectors: Q (query), K (key), and V (value). The output of the self-attention layer, denoted as z_i , is computed by multiplying the i^{th} input vector of the encoder with the respective weight matrices $W(Q)$, $W(K)$, and $W(V)$. This computation yields the attention head matrix z , as detailed in Eq. 3, whose dimensionality is equivalent to the length of the input sequence.

$$z = Attention(Q, K, V) = softmax\left(\frac{Q \cdot K^T}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right)V \quad (3)$$




Figure 1: Proposed feedback synthesis system’s architecture with encoder, decoder, and controllability blocks for textual and visual data. The decoder, convolution-gated unit, control layer, and similarity modules are shown as distinct subblocks while off & on neurons are shown as black & white circles.

where Q , K , and V represent matrices that contain all queries, keys, and values, respectively, with d_k as the scaling factor and K^T denoting the transpose of K . To achieve a comprehensive subspace representation, the mechanism computes multiple attention heads using distinct sets of Query, Key, and Value matrices. The queries, keys, and values undergo projection $head$ times, resulting in multiple attention heads $h_1, h_2, \dots, h_{head}$, where $head$ signifies the total number of heads. These heads are then concatenated and multiplied by the weight matrix W , producing the intermediate output vector z' , as delineated in Eq. 4.

$$\begin{aligned} h_i &= Attention(QW^Q i, KW^K i, VW^V i) \\ z' &= Concat(h_1, h_2, \dots, h_{head})W^O \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $W^Q i$, $W^K i$, $W^V i$, and $W^O i$ are the respective projections of queries, keys, values, and output of corresponding heads. The final context vector z^* is then derived by passing this intermediate output through the feed-forward layer.

3.3.4 Decoder

The textual and visual decoders have an identical architecture comprising two main blocks: a self-attention block and an encoder-decoder attention block. These blocks are enhanced with positional encoding and normalization to improve efficiency and accuracy. They work separately. The textual decoder is fed with the textual context vector z_t , while the visual decoder receives the visual context vector z_i . Additionally, both decoders are provided with the ground-truth comment as input. The functioning of the attention layers is as follows: *Self-attention layer*: This layer utilizes future position masking to concentrate exclusively on prior positions in the output sequence. This layer’s query, key, and value weight matrices are initially set to random values in the decoder and are progressively refined throughout the training process. *Encoder-decoder attention layer*: In this layer, queries are produced within the decoder. For the textual and visual context vectors, the context vectors z_t or z_i are used as keys and values in the matrices, respectively. Late fusion has been applied using concatenation, preserving the distinct information of image features. A gated convolution unit (GCU) has been introduced for textual feature encoding to minimize the repetition in the generated feedback.

3.3.5 Control Layer

The control layer, positioned after the decoder and before feedback generation, introduces perturbations to ensure feedback aligns with desired sentiments. It utilizes two masks, one each for positive and negative sentiments, altering the input vector via element-wise multiplication as per Eq. 5. This layer functions like a modified dropout layer, selectively activating or deactivating neurons to tune sentiment in the feedback, ensuring it matches the targeted tone.

$$O = \begin{cases} mask_1 * I; & Sentiment = 0 \\ mask_2 * I; & Sentiment = 1 \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where O and I denote the output and input vectors, respectively. In this setup, each mask blocks $x\%$ of neurons, targeting different neuron sets. Consequently, $(100 - 2x)\%$ of neurons are trained on both sentiments, while $x\%$ are specialized for a specific sentiment, with $x\%$ set at 10%. This configuration helps direct the feedback towards the desired sentiment tone. During inference, to generate sentiment-specific feedback, neurons trained for the contrasting sentiment are deactivated. For instance, to produce positive feedback, neurons associated with negative sentiment are turned off, and vice versa. This method is crucial for controlling the output sentiment independently of the input text’s sentiment, focusing on steering the generated sentence’s sentiment.

3.3.6 Similarity Module

The similarity module quantitatively assesses the semantic similarity between the feedbacks generated by the proposed system and human comments, using a pre-trained Sentence-BERT (SBERT) model [63]. It transforms individual comments and feedbacks into vectors in an n -dimensional embedding space, where n is the size of the embeddings produced by the model. Each dimension represents a distinct linguistic feature or attribute, effectively capturing the sentence’s semantic characteristics. After generating these embeddings, the cosine similarity between the vector representations of the generated feedback and the human-provided comment is computed. This cosine similarity score, a robust metric for this purpose, captures the orientation of the sentence vectors, reflecting their semantic similarity and providing a measure of relevance between the feedbacks and comments.

We also propose an **interpretability** technique based on the K-Average Additive exPlanation (KAAP) method [64] to analyze the contribution of textual and visual features towards feedback generation. The proposed interpretability technique has been described in Appendix B and the corresponding results have been discussed in Section C.3.

3.4 Experiments and Results

The proposed feedback synthesis models described in the following sections were trained for 60 epochs on an Nvidia V100 GPU, employing 5-fold cross-validation and an 80%-20% training-testing split. Since feedback synthesis is a one-to-many task, we do not compute accuracy for generated feedbacks but assess them against ground-truth comments using semantic relevance and ranking metrics. For semantic relevance evaluation, we use BLEU [65], CIDEr [66], ROUGE [67], SPICE [68], and METEOR [69] metrics, where higher values signify greater semantic similarity. For ranking-based evaluation, we employ ‘Recall@k’ [70] and ‘Mean Reciprocal Rank’ [71], suitable for assessing top ‘k’ results. Further details of various modules’ parameters and the aforementioned metrics’ definitions have been provided in Appendix C.1 and Appendix C.2, respectively.

3.4.1 Models

The following models have been constructed. Their architectures have been determined as per the ablation studies discussed in Appendix C.4. These models have the Controllability module outlined in Section 3.3.5 common and remaining architecture as follows.

- **Baseline 1:** This baseline utilizes Gated Recurrent Units (GRU) as textual and VGG network as visual encoders. An early fusion method is applied to integrate visual and textual modalities.
- **Baseline 2:** Maintaining GRU for textual encoding and VGG for visual encoding, this baseline utilizes a late fusion approach for combining the visual and textual data.
- **Baseline 3:** This baseline implements a combination of a Transformer and a Gated Convolutional Unit (GCU) for textual encoding. It uses Faster RCNN with an additional visual attention mechanism for visual encoding. A late fusion strategy with averaging is used here.
- **Baseline 4:** The third baseline replaces the textual encoder with GPT-2 [72] and continues to Faster RCNN for visual data encoding with visual attention. It also combines the modalities using a late fusion with averaging. It has been empirically observed that GPT-2 based model generated good feedbacks only for textual input; however, it did not generate good feedbacks for multimodal input.
- **Proposed System:** The proposed system incorporates Transformer as the textual encoder and Faster RCNN as the decoder and it uses concatenation along with late fusion.

3.4.2 Results

The results of the proposed benchmark feedback synthesis system are presented as follows.

Semantic Relevance Evaluation: The generated feedbacks’ semantic relevance with human comments has been evaluated. The feedbacks are generated to reflect the same sentiment class as reflected by the corresponding comments and then the feedbacks are evaluated using the BLEU, CIDEr, ROUGE, SPICE, and METEOR metrics. As depicted in Table 4, the proposed model has obtained the best values for these metrics in most cases.

Table 4: Semantic Relevance Evaluation.

Rank-based Evaluation: The generated feedbacks are evaluated using the MRR and Recall@k. As observed in Table 5, 76.58% feedbacks are relevant to one of the top 10 comments and the MRR of 0.3789 denotes that the generated feedbacks are contextually similar to one of the top 3 comments.

Model	BLEU	CIDEr	ROUGE	SPICE	METEOR
Baseline 1	0.1942	0.1342	0.2527	0.1028	0.0929
Baseline 2	0.2122	0.1635	0.2748	0.1654	0.1394
Baseline 3	0.2093	0.1835	0.2377	0.1555	0.1407
Baseline 4	0.1953	0.1798	0.2471	0.1478	0.1407
Proposed	0.3020	0.1817	0.3378	0.1554	0.1412

The variations in sentiment classification accuracy and MRR varied differently for different models. For example, baseline 4 has lower MRR but high sentiment classification accuracy, whereas it is reverse for baseline 3. The proposed model provides the right trade-off with high values for both.

Table 5: Rank-based Evaluation. Here, ‘MMR’ and ‘R@k’ denote ‘Mean Reciprocal Rank’ and ‘Recall@k’ where $k \in \{1,3,5,10\}$.

Sentiment-Control: Table 6 reports the Control Accuracies, which represent the difference in accuracies between controlled and uncontrolled feedbacks, for both the baselines and the proposed models. These models take the desired sentiment for the feedback to portray as one of the input parameters: 0 for negative and 1 for positive. In uncontrolled settings, this parameter is not used as the control layer is disabled. In contrast, controlled settings involve passing the ground-truth comment’s sentiment as the parameter.

Model	MRR	R@1	R@3	R@5	R@10
Baseline 1	0.3435	17.30	39.67	60.67	67.75
Baseline 2	0.3305	17.69	36.99	61.47	74.29
Baseline 3	0.3214	16.08	37.53	59.32	69.29
Baseline 4	0.3182	16.98	37.26	56.11	71.29
Proposed	0.3789	18.76	40.92	60.13	76.58

The sentiment class of the generated feedback is computed using the FLAIR Library [57], SentimentR [58], DistilBERT [59], and RoBERTa [60], as described in Section 3.1. The proposed model achieves a sentiment classification accuracy of 77.23% and a control accuracy of 18.82%. To calculate the sentiment accuracy, one negative and one positive feedback is generated by passing the respective parameter i.e. we passed parameter 0 for negative and 1 for positive feedback. Then the sentiment of generated feedback is calculated and compared to the ground truth sentiment labels.

Table 6: Synthesized feedbacks’ sentiment analysis. Here, ‘USentiAcc’ and ‘CSentiAcc’ denote the sentiment classification accuracies for uncontrolled and controlled feedbacks respectively.

Model	USentiAcc	CSentiAcc	Control Acc
Baseline 1	52.34	63.10	10.76
Baseline 2	54.72	67.06	12.34
Baseline 3	48.25	57.32	9.07
Baseline 4	52.48	71.57	19.09
Proposed	58.41	77.23	18.82

Sample Results: Fig. 2 shows sample results with uncontrolled, positively controlled and negatively controlled synthesized feedbacks.

Human Evaluation: The sentiments of the generated feedbacks have been evaluated by 50 evaluators, comprising 25 males and 25 females, with an average age of 30 ± 2.73 years. They assessed the controlled and uncontrolled feedbacks for their valence and relevance with the inputs. A total of 50 randomly picked samples have been evaluated, and the averages of the evaluators’ scores have been reported. These scores for the relevance ratings for three types of feedback—uncontrolled, positive, and negative—against images and texts have been described in Table 7. On average, 72.68% and

Table 7: Human evaluation of generated feedbacks where F_{UnCtrl} , $F_{PosCtrl}$ and $F_{NegCtrl}$ show uncontrolled, positively and negatively controlled feedbacks. Rel_{img} , Rel_{text} , $Rel_{Comment}$ and $Rel_{F_{UnCtrl}}$ are ‘relevant with’ input images, text, comments and uncontrolled feedback, respectively.

	Rel _{img}	Rel _{text}	Comment	Rel _{F_{UnCtrl}}
Comment	70.85%	72.93%	100.00%	78.27%
F_{UnCtrl}	67.27%	69.58%	78.27%	100.00%
F_{PosCtrl}	69.47%	71.07%	79.93%	81.96%
F_{NegCtrl}	71.23%	72.13%	80.17%	83.24%

Title: Moderation is the key, GB's oldest man says on 110th birthday	Title: Foo Fighters - Girl drums at Taylor Hawkins Memorial Gig	Title: Armed man shot dead after trying to breach Ohio FBI office	Title: What we know about the memphis heirress who found dead.
News Text: Britain's oldest man has celebrated his 110th birthday by declaring moderation in everything ...	News Text: A 12-year-old drummer said she had mixed emotions performing at Wembley Stadium as part ...	News Text: The suspect fled the scene in Cincinnati and was shot by police after an hours-long standoff rural ...	News Text: Eliza Fletcher, 34, was out on her usual morning run near the University when she disappeared ...
			
Feedback (Uncontrolled): Old people having good time.	Feedback (Uncontrolled): This is one performance.	Feedback (Uncontrolled): How are the people responding to FBI.	Feedback (Uncontrolled): This is about the people.
Feedback (Positively Controlled): People having wonderful birthday.	Feedback (Positively Controlled): This is one great artist.	Feedback (Positively Controlled): How well the people responding to FBI.	Feedback (Positively Controlled): This is about the justice.
Feedback (Negatively Controlled): People having old with time.	Feedback (Negatively Controlled): This is crowded performance.	Feedback (Negatively Controlled): How not the people responding to FBI.	Feedback (Negatively Controlled): This is about the loss.
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)

Figure 2: Sample Results depicting the feedbacks generated by the proposed system using input text and images (one out of multiple images shown) under the sentiment-controllability constraint.

78.14% evaluators reported that the sentiments of positively and negatively controlled feedbacks are more positive and more negative respectively than uncontrolled feedbacks'. The higher relevance scores for controlled feedbacks ($F_{PosCtrl}$ and $F_{NegCtrl}$) compared to uncontrolled ones (F_{UnCtrl}) confirm the control layer's influences in feedback's desired sentiment alignment.

Additional experimental results are included in the Appendix section where Appendix C.3 presents an interpretability analysis of the contributions of various textual and visual features towards generating uncontrolled and controlled feedbacks, while Appendix C.4 discusses the ablation studies.

4 Discussion and Conclusion

The proposed system, trained on human comments and image-text inputs under sentiment constraints, generates human-like feedback with appropriate sentiments, evidenced by metrics in Tables 4 and 5. The control layer facilitates the generation of feedback with desired sentiments, utilizing different non-keywords and varying keywords, especially at higher control parameter values. We addressed the challenge of comment relevance in the CMFeed dataset by adopting Facebook's relevance criteria.

The proposed controllable feedback synthesis system builds on our pioneering work on uncontrolled feedback synthesis [1], which utilized a basic dataset collected from Twitter lacking detailed comment metadata. The current system enhances both the control and interpretability of feedback. Despite slightly lower 'R@k' values due to more comments per sample (10.5 compared to 8.5), the improved MRR value (0.3789 versus 0.3042) highlights the effectiveness of the implemented similarity module. Validated by robust evaluation metrics and with future plans to integrate discrete emotion classes and additional modalities like audio or physiological signals, this groundwork could enhance sentiment-controlled applications across various applications. It offers a valuable benchmark for future studies on controllable multimodal feedback synthesis.

Limitations: The effectiveness of the CMFeed dataset depends on data diversity and quality. Collection biases from specific platforms or demographics may impact generalizability. Technological constraints also limit the deployment of our system; substantial computational resources are required, which may not be readily available in all scenarios. Furthermore, adding modalities such as audio and physiological data may introduce privacy and ethical challenges. There is a risk of technology misuse in manipulating user sentiments and potential biases in sentiment analysis, which could result in over-reliance on automation, reduced human empathy, and unethical applications of feedback synthesis. These limitations highlight the need for cautious and responsible use of AI technologies, ensuring that ethical standards are rigorously maintained and biases are systematically addressed.

Acknowledgments and Disclosure of Funding

This work was supported by the University of Oulu and the Research Council of Finland Profi 5 HiDyn fund (grant 24630111132). The authors acknowledge the CSC-IT Center for Science, Finland, for providing computational resources.

References

- [1] Puneet Kumar, Gaurav Bhatt, Omkar Ingle, Daksh Goyal, and Balasubramanian Raman. Affective Feedback Synthesis Towards Multimodal Text and Image Data. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications and Applications*, 19(6):1–23, 2023.
- [2] Mariana Rodrigues Makiuchi, Kuniaki Uto, et al. Multimodal Emotion Recognition with High-level Speech and Text Features. In *IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*, 2021.
- [3] Fabio R Gallo, Gerardo I Simari, et al. Predicting User Reactions to Twitter Feed Content based on Personality Type and Social Cues. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 110:918–930, 2020.
- [4] Paulo Blikstein and Marcelo Worsley. Multimodal Learning analytics and Education Data Mining: Using Computational Technologies to Measure Complex Learning Tasks. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, 3(2): 220–238, 2016.
- [5] Michal Muszynski et al. Recognizing Induced Emotions of Movie Audiences from Multimodal Information. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, 12(1):36–52, 2019.
- [6] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, et al. Attention Is All You Need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pages 5998–6008, 2017.
- [7] Shaoqing Ren, Kaiming He, et al. Faster R-CNN: Towards Real-Time Object Detection with Region Proposal Networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 28:91–99, 2015.
- [8] Shen Gao, Xiuying Chen, et al. From Standard Summarization to New Tasks and Beyond: Summarization With Manifold Information. In *The 29th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, 2020.
- [9] Jingqiang Chen and Hai Zhuge. Abstractive Text-Image Summarization Using Multimodal Attention Hierarchical RNN. In *The Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 4046–4056, 2018.
- [10] Junnan Zhu, Haoran Li, et al. MSMO: Multimodal Summarization With Multimodal Output. In *The Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 4154–4164, 2018.
- [11] Rowan Zellers et al. VMSMO: Learning to Generate Multimodal Summary for Video-based News Articles. In *The Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 9360–9369, 2020.
- [12] Xindi Shang, Zehuan Yuan, et al. Multimodal Video Summarization Via Time-Aware Transformers. In *29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia (MM)*, pages 1756–1765, 2021.
- [13] Bin Zhao, Maoguo Gong, and Xuelong Li. Audio-Visual Video Summarization. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2021.
- [14] Jiehang Xie, Xuanbai Chen, et al. Multimodal-Based And Aesthetic-Guided Narrative Video Summarization. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2022.
- [15] Mathieu Page Fortin and Brahim Chaib-draa. Multimodal Multitask Emotion Recognition Using Images, texts and tags. In *The ACM International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval (ICLR)*, pages 3–10, 2019.
- [16] Junnan Zhu, Yu Zhou, et al. Multimodal Summarization With Guidance of Multimodal Reference. In *The 34th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, volume 34, pages 9749–9756, 2020.
- [17] Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, et al. VQA: Visual Question Answering. In *The 19th IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 2425–2433, 2015.
- [18] Feng Chen, Jiayuan Xie, et al. Graph Convolutional Net For Difficulty-Controllable Visual Ques. Generation. *World Wide web (www)*, pages 1–23, 2023.

- [19] Peng Wang, Qi Wu, et al. FVQA: Fact-Based Visual Question Answering. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 40(10):2413–2427, 2017.
- [20] Paola Cascante-Bonilla, Hui Wu, et al. SimVQA: Exploring Simulated Environments for Visual Question Answering. In *IEEE/CVF Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 5056–5066, 2022.
- [21] Zhicheng Guo, Jiaxuan Zhao, et al. A Universal Quaternion Hypergraph For Multimodal VQA. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2021.
- [22] Jinmeng Wu, Tingting Mu, et al. Memory-Aware Attentive Control For Community Question Answering With Knowledge-Based Dual Refinement. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, 2023.
- [23] Chenyang Huang, Osmar R Zaiane, et al. Automatic Dialogue Generation With Expressed Emotions. In *The Conference of North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL)*, pages 49–54, 2018.
- [24] Peixiang Zhong et al. An Affect-Rich Neural Conversational Model With Biased Attention And Weighted Cross-Entropy Loss. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, volume 33, pages 7492–7500, 2019.
- [25] Abhishek Das, Satwik Kottur, et al. Learning Cooperative Visual Dialog Agents With Deep Reinforcement Learning. In *The 21th IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 2951–2960, 2017.
- [26] Weiyan Shi and Zhou Yu. Sentiment Adaptive End-to-End Dialog Systems. In *56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 1509–1519, 2018.
- [27] Jiaxiong Hu, Yun Huang, et al. The Acoustically Emotion-Aware Conversational Agent With Speech Emotion And Empathetic Responses. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, 14(1):17–30, 2022.
- [28] Ke Wang and Xiaojun Wan. SentiGAN: Generating Sentimental Texts Via Mixture Adversarial Networks. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, pages 4446–4452, 2018.
- [29] Xiang Kong, Bohan Li, et al. An Adversarial Approach To Sentiment-Controlled Neural Dialogue Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.07129*, 2019. Accessed 31 May 2024.
- [30] Mauajama Firdaus, Hardik Chauhan, et al. EmoSen: Generating Sentiment And Emotion Controlled Responses In A Multimodal Dialogue System. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing*, 13(3):1555–1566, 2020.
- [31] Mauajama Firdaus, Umang Jain, et al. SEPRG: Sentiment Aware Emotion Controlled Personalized Response Generation. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Natural Language Generation (INLG)*, pages 353–363, 2021.
- [32] Gi-Cheon Kang, Jaeseo Lim, et al. Dual Attention Networks for Visual Reference Resolution in Visual Dialog. In *The Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 2024–2033, 2019.
- [33] Xiaoze Jiang et al. DualVD: An Adaptive Dual Encoding Model for Deep Visual Understanding in Visual Dialogue. In *The 34th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, volume 34, pages 11125–11132, 2020.
- [34] Feilong Chen, Xiuyi Chen, et al. Improving Cross-Modal Understanding In Visual Dialog Via Contrastive Learning. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 7937–7941, 2022.
- [35] Zihao Wang, Junli Wang, et al. Unified Multimodal Model With Unlikelihood Training For Visual Dialog. In *The 30th ACM International Conference on Multimedia (MM)*, pages 4625–4634, 2022.
- [36] Gi-Cheon Kang, Sungdong Kim, et al. The Dialog Must Go On: Improving Visual Dialog via Generative Self-Training. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 6746–6756, 2023.
- [37] An-An Liu, Guokai Zhang, et al. Closed-Loop Reasoning With Graph-Aware Dense Interaction For Visual Dialog. *Multimedia Systems*, 28(5):1823–1832, 2022.

- [38] An-An Liu, Chenxi Huang, et al. Counterfactual Visual Dialog: Robust Commonsense Knowledge Learning From Unbiased Training. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 2023.
- [39] Teng Niu, Shiai Zhu, Lei Pang, and Abdulmotaleb El Saddik. Sentiment analysis on multi-view social data. In *22nd International Conference on MultiMedia Modeling (MMM)*, pages 15–27. Springer, 2016.
- [40] Minesh Mathew, Ruben Tito, Dimosthenis Karatzas, R Manmatha, and CV Jawahar. Document visual question answering challenge 2020. In *The IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) Workshop*, 2020.
- [41] Kenneth Marino, Mohammad Rastegari, Ali Farhadi, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. OK-VQA: A Visual Question Answering Benchmark Requiring External Knowledge. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 3195–3204, 2019.
- [42] Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Making the V in VQA Matter: Elevating the Role of Image Understanding in Visual Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 6904–6913, 2017.
- [43] Dejing Xu, Zhou Zhao, Jun Xiao, Fei Wu, Hanwang Zhang, Xiangnan He, and Yueting Zhuang. Video Question Answering via Gradually Refined Attention over Appearance and Motion. In *ACM Multimedia (MM)*, 2017.
- [44] Bingbing Wen, Zhengyuan Yang, Jianfeng Wang, Zhe Gan, Bill Howe, and Lijuan Wang. InfoVisDial: An Informative Visual Dialogue Dataset by Bridging Large Multimodal and Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.13503*, 2023.
- [45] Satwik Kottur, José MF Moura, Devi Parikh, Dhruv Batra, and Marcus Rohrbach. CLEVR-Dialog: A Diagnostic Dataset for Multi-Round Reasoning in Visual Dialog. In *Proceedings of Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL-HLT)*, pages 582–595, 2019.
- [46] Abhishek Das, Satwik Kottur, Khushi Gupta, Avi Singh, Deshraj Yadav, José M.F. Moura, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. Visual Dialog. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2017.
- [47] Licheng Yu, Eunbyung Park, Alexander C Berg, and Tamara L Berg. Visual Madlibs: Fill in the Blank Description Generation and Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (CVPR)*, pages 2461–2469, 2015.
- [48] Tulika Saha, Aditya Patra, Sriparna Saha, and Pushpak Bhattacharyya. Towards Emotion-Aided Multi-Modal Dialogue Act Classification. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 4361–4372, 2020.
- [49] Hao Zhou, Minlie Huang, Tianyang Zhang, Xiaoyan Zhu, and Bing Liu. Emotional Chatting Machine: Emotional Conversation Generation with Internal and External Memory. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, volume 32, 2018.
- [50] Lifeng Shang, Zhengdong Lu, and Hang Li. Neural responding machine for short-text conversation. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (ACL-IJCNN)*, pages 1577–1586, 2015.
- [51] Yu Wu, Furu Wei, et al. Response Generation by Context Aware Prototype Editing. In *The 33rd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, volume 33, pages 7281–7288, 2019.
- [52] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, et al. Improving Language Understanding by Generative Pre-training. *OpenAI*, 2018.
- [53] Steven Bird, Ewan Klein, and Edward Loper. NLTK Documentation. <https://nltk.org/>. Accessed 31 May 2024.
- [54] Lucas Ou-Yang. Newspaper3k Documentation. <https://newspaper.readthedocs.io/>. Accessed 31 May 2024.
- [55] Meta. Facebook Terms and Conditions. <https://developers.facebook.com/terms/>. Accessed 31 May 2024.
- [56] Brad Solomon. Demoji Documentation. <https://pypi.org/project/demoji/>. Accessed 31 May 2024.
- [57] Alan Akbik, Tanja Bergmann, et al. FLAIR: An Easy-to-Use Framework For State-Of-The-Art NLP. In *2019 Conf. of North American Chapter of Association for Comp. linguistics (NAACL)*, pages 54–59, 2019.

- [58] Tyler Rinker. Sentimentr Package for R Language. <https://github.com/trinker/sentimentr>, 2017. Accessed 31 May 2024.
- [59] Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, et al. DistilBERT, A Distilled Version of BERT: Smaller, Faster, Cheaper and Lighter. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108*, 2019. Accessed 31 May 2024.
- [60] Yinhan Liu, Myle Ott, et al. RoBERTa: A Robustly Optimized BERT Pretraining Approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019. Accessed 31 May 2024.
- [61] Carlos Busso et al. IEMOCAP: Interactive Emotional Dyadic Motion Capture Database. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 42:335–359, 2008.
- [62] Adrian Rosebrock. Intersection Over Union (IoU) for Object Detection. *PyImageSearch.com*, 2016. Accessed 31 May 2024.
- [63] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. Sentence-BERT: Sentence Embeddings using Siamese BERT-Networks. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3982–3992, 2019.
- [64] Puneet Kumar, Sarthak Malik, Balasubramanian Raman, and Xiaobai Li. VISTANet: Visual Spoken Textual Additive Net for Interpretable Multimodal Emotion Recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.11450*, 2022. Accessed 31 May 2024.
- [65] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, et al. BLEU: A Method for Automatic Evaluation of Machine Translation. In *The 40th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 311–318, 2002.
- [66] Ramakrishna Vedantam, C Lawrence Zitnick, et al. CIDEr: Consensus-based Image Description Evaluation. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 4566–4575, 2015.
- [67] Chin-Yew Lin. ROUGE: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of Summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out, Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, pages 74–81, 2004.
- [68] Peter Anderson, Basura Fernando, et al. SPICE: Semantic Propositional Image Caption Evaluation. In *The European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 382–398, 2016.
- [69] Alon Lavie and Michael J Denkowski. The METEOR Metric for Automatic Evaluation of Machine Translation. *Springer Machine Translation Journal*, 23(2-3):105–115, 2009.
- [70] Per Runeson, Magnus Alexandersson, and Oskar Nyholm. Detection of Duplicate Defect Reports using Natural Language Processing. In *International Conference on Software Engineering*, pages 499–510, 2007.
- [71] Nick Craswell. Mean Reciprocal Rank. *Encyclopedia of Database Systems*, 1703, 2009.
- [72] OpenAI. GPT2. https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/model_doc/gpt2, 2019. Accessed 31 May 2024.
- [73] LS Shapley. A Value for n-Person Games, Contributions to the Theory of Games II, 1953.
- [74] Ruoxi Deng, Chunhua Shen, et al. Learning To Predict Crisp Boundaries. In *The European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 562–578, 2018.

Appendix

A Dataset: More Details

A.1 Dataset & Code Access, Documentation and Metadata

The CMFeed dataset is available for access at zenodo.org/records/11409612 along with detailed documentation and metadata description. Its DOI is [10.5281/zenodo.11409611](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11409611). The CMFeed is structured utilizing widely used formats such as ‘.csv’ for text part and ‘.jpg’ for images. Detailed explanation of how the dataset can be read and used is provided on the aforementioned Zenodo repository’s link.

The code for the controllable feedback synthesis models (four baseline models and the proposed system) can be found at github.com/MIntelligence-Group/CMFeed/ and used to reproduce the results.

A.2 Licensing, Hosting, and Maintenance Plan

The CMFeed dataset has been hosted at the Zenodo repository which is maintained by CERN’s Data Centres. It ensures the long-term access and availability of the dataset.

Under the ‘Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International’ licence, the CMFeed dataset is released for academic research only and is free to researchers from educational or research institutes for non-commercial purposes.

A.3 Collection Process and Compliance with Ethical Standards

Data for our study was systematically gathered using the Facebook API from publicly available posts on the pages of leading news channels such as Sky News, NYDaily, FoxNews, and BBC News. The data extraction process adhered to Facebook’s terms and conditions outlined at developers.facebook.com/terms/, ensuring compliance with all applicable legal and ethical standards. Our data collection strategy supports responsible research, ensuring personal privacy and data security. Detail of the data collection flow is further elaborated in the aforementioned GitHub repository

A.4 Intended Usage, Data Handling and Privacy

The use of such data is intended solely for academic and research purposes, aiming to enhance the capabilities of feedback synthesis and sentiment analysis systems in a controlled environment.

The public nature of the collected data eliminates typical privacy concerns associated with personal user data. Throughout the data collection and handling stages, we rigorously filtered out any sensitive information, focusing on content that is inherently non-personal and intended for broad dissemination.

A.5 Author statement

We, the authors, bear all responsibility in the event of any rights violations or issues arising from the use of the data. We confirm adherence to the terms of the data license associated with our research.

B Additional Implementation: Interpretability

This section proposes an interpretability technique using the K-Average Additive exPlanation (KAAP) method [64] to analyze the contribution of textual and visual features towards feedback generation. It is based on Shapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP) that is an approximation of Shapley values [73]. As depicted in Fig. 3, it has been incorporated to assess the influence of each visual and textual feature on the sentiment portrayed by the generated feedback. We hypothesize that varying sentiments produced from identical inputs (text + images) should reflect in differential feature importance. It is expected that key features will differ for negative versus positive sentiments. When identical inputs are processed to portray varied sentiments, the model should adjust its focus across different image and text segments, thereby validating our controllability hypothesis.




Figure 3: Representation of the proposed interpretability technique. Here k_i and k_t denote the number of partitions for image and text, w_i is the image's width, and L_t is the text feature vector's length.

SHAP Values Computation: The SHAP values for the features denote their contribution to the model's prediction. For a model f , the SHAP value for feature i is defined as per Eq. 6.

$$\mathcal{S}_i(f) = \sum_{S \subseteq F \setminus \{i\}} \frac{|S|!(|F| - |S| - 1)!}{|F|!} [f(S \cup \{i\}) - f(S)] \quad (6)$$

where F denotes the complete feature set, S a subset excluding i , and $f(S)$ the model's prediction using features in S .

The computation of SHAP values requires exponential time theoretically which is approximated by dividing the input into k parts as illustrated in Eq. 7. For each modality, the input is repeatedly divided into k segments, determining each segment's impact on model predictions. A feature vector X with n features is segmented into k parts.

$$X = [X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k], \text{ where } X_i \subseteq X \text{ and } \bigcup_{i=1}^k X_i = X \quad (7)$$

For simplicity with $k = 2$, the fundamental computation of SHAP values is denoted in Eq. 8. It is extended for other values of k . The optimal values of k_{img} and k_{txt} , representing the number of segments to divide the image and text into, have been determined experimentally.

$$\mathcal{S}_{\{f_1\}} + \mathcal{S}_{\{f_2\}} = \mathcal{S}_{\{f_1, f_2\}} - \mathcal{S}_{\{\text{null}\}} \quad (8)$$

K-Average Additive exPlanation (KAAP): The KAAP value for feature i is calculated by averaging the SHAP values across the k divisions of the feature vector using Eq. 9.

$$\text{KAAP}_i = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \mathcal{S}_i(X_j) \quad (9)$$

The KAAP values directly indicate the significant image features for predictions. For input image X^{img} of dimensions 128×128 , the KAAP values for a given k are computed by segmenting the input along both axes. For text data X^{txt} , we derive the feature vector and divide it into k segments. Text division considers each word as a feature, acknowledging that sentiments are conveyed by words, not individual letters.

C Experiments & Results: Additional Details

C.1 Parameters

- *General parameters* – Batch size: 16, learning rate: 0.001, network optimizer: Adam, loss function: cross-entropy loss, activation function: ReLU.
- *Parameters for the transformer model* – Encoder embedding dimensions: 100, decoder embedding dimensions: 100, encoder hidden units dimensions: 128, decoder hidden units dimensions: 128, encoder dropout: 0.1, decoder dropout: 0.1, encoder no. of layers and attention heads: 3 and 8, decoder no. of layers & attention heads: 3 and 8, metric: accuracy.
- *Parameters for the Faster R-CNN model* – No. of epochs: 18, no. of proposals: 18, no. of anchor-box classes: 1601, network optimizer: adaDelta, metric: mAP (mean Average Precision).

Compute Time Requirement: The total amount of compute time required for one epoch of model training on V100 GPU – Baseline 1: 168 minutes, Baseline 2: 233 minutes, Baseline 3: 144 minutes, Baseline 4: 103 minutes, Proposed System: 112 minutes.

C.2 Evaluation Metrics

As discussed in Section 3.4, we evaluate the generated feedbacks against ground-truth comments using semantic relevance and ranking metrics. The metrics used for semantic relevance are as follows.

- **BLEU Score** [65]: BLEU (bilingual evaluation understudy) uses precision and compares the candidate translation against reference translations to judge the quality of the candidate translation.
- **ROUGE** [67]: ROUGE (Recall-Oriented Understudy for Gisting Evaluation) uses recall measure to analyze machine translation and summarization against human-produced reference set.
- **Meteor** [69]: METEOR (Metric for Evaluation of Translation with Explicit ORdering) uses the harmonic mean of unigrams’ precision and recall to evaluate machine-translated output at the sentence level.
- **CIDEr** [66]: CIDEr (Consensus-based Image Description Evaluation) automatically evaluates machine translation and image caption outputs by considering the agreement of various reference descriptions.
- **SPICE** [68]: SPICE (Semantic Propositional Image Caption Evaluation) is an automated caption and sentence evaluation metric that considers the sensitivity of the n-grams during the evaluation.

For ranking-based evaluation, we use ‘Mean Reciprocal Rank’ [71] and ‘Recall@k’ [70] defined as follows.

- **Mean Reciprocal Rank:** For calculating the Mean Reciprocal Rank (MRR), first, the similarity of the generated feedback is compared with all the ground-truth comments. If the most similar comment is ranked k , then the rank of the j^{th} feedback is given by Eq. 10.

$$rank_j = k \tag{10}$$

where k denotes the k^{th} comment when sorted by the relevance whereas $rank_j$ is the Rank of the j^{th} feedback. Finally, MRR is calculated as the average of the reciprocal ranks of all the generated feedback samples as per Eq. 11.

$$MRR = \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{1}{rank_j} \tag{11}$$

where n is the number of generated feedback samples, while $rank_j$ denotes the j^{th} feedback’s rank.

- **Recall@k:** Recall@k counts the number of data samples matching any top- k relevant data samples. Adapting Recall@k for evaluating the generated feedback, the number of feedbacks similar to any of the top- k comments sorted according to relevance is calculated. To find if the generated feedback is similar to any comment, the rank of that feedback as calculated in Eq. 11 is used. Finally, the Recall@k can be formulated according to Eq. 12. According to this, if the rank of the feedback is in top- k , then a score of 1 is assigned to the feedback, else 0. The summation of all scores is done to calculate the Recall@k as shown in Eq. 12.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Recall}@k_i &= 1 \text{ if } \text{rank}_i \in [1, \dots, k] \\
 \text{Recall}@k &= \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Recall}@k_i
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{12}$$

where $\text{Recall}@k_i$ and rank_i is the Recall@k and rank of i^{th} feedback respectively whereas $\text{Recall}@k$ denotes final score.

Furthermore, the sentiments of the generated feedbacks have been computed and sentiment classification accuracy has been analysed along with the ‘Control Accuracy’ which is the difference between the accuracies of controlled and uncontrolled feedbacks.

C.3 Visualization and Interpretability

Fig. 4 shows sample results, highlighting the features being focused on during the generation of uncontrolled and controlled feedbacks. In image plots, red and blue represent the most and least contributing pixels, respectively whereas for text plots, yellow and blue indicate the most and least important textual features. In Fig. 4a, positive sentiments are indicated by smiling faces and a family setting, while negative sentiments are associated with the depiction of ageing, particularly in the older face. The expression of the girl on the left, a blend of smiling and discomfort, captures attention in both positive and negative contexts. The middle girl’s face, predominantly smiling, is highlighted in red for positive and blue for negative sentiments.

Fig. 4b shows that dark areas contribute to negative sentiment, whereas faces are linked to positive sentiment. In negatively controlled settings, the crowd is focused; in positively controlled settings, the focus shifts to individual people. In Fig. 4c, positive sentiments downplay the importance of the gun, concentrating more on the number plate. In the uncontrolled setting, the focus is primarily on the words. For Fig. 4d, the facial features are highlighted red for positively controlled and blue for negatively controlled settings for the first image. The second image associates positive sentiment with light and text and negative sentiment with darkness.


The model-level and case-level interpretability analyses have been incorporated. Model-level interpretability is achieved by introducing perturbations to the feedback synthesis model via the control layer. The impact of these perturbations on the output feedback is detailed in Table 6 in terms of sentiment classification accuracies for uncontrolled and controlled (perturbed) scenarios. Additionally, Fig. 4 exemplifies case-level interpretability, illustrating how the model’s output varies in different situations.

C.4 Ablation Studies


Following ablation studies have been conducted to evaluate the impact of various parameters on the proposed system’s performance.

C.4.1 Effect of Number of Control Layers and Value of Control-Parameter

The control layer has been used after the decoder and before the text generation phase to apply ‘control’ or constraints on the text generation. Here, it is crucial to decide a) the number of control layers and b) the suitable value for the control parameter. Regarding the number of control layers, we experimented with 1, 2, 3, and 4 control layers. The best performance has been observed using the 1 control layer, which decreased slightly for 2 control layers, decreased further for 3 layers, and decreased significantly for 4 layers. Further, regarding the control parameter, we experimented with its values of 5%, 10%, 15%, and 20%. The results show that more control can be achieved with



(a) Sample Result 1




(b) Sample Result 2, to be continued.


the increasing value of the control parameter; however, fewer neurons will get trained for the entire training data, causing a degradation in the result's quality. As depicted in Table 8, a control value of 10% results in better performance than the other values. Hence, 1 control layer with the control value of 10% has been used in the final implementation.

C.4.2 Effect of Beam-size

The beam-size is a search parameter that refers to the number of options the model keeps at each step of the prediction, controlling the breadth of the search for the best output sequence. It keeps only the top k predictions, where k is the beam size. A larger beam size allows the model to explore more possibilities, potentially improving output quality; however, it increases computational requirements and may also degrade the output because of repetitive text generation. We experimented with beam-size values of 2, 5, 10, 15, and 20. The corresponding sentiment classification accuracies and MRR



(c) Sample Result 3



(d) Sample Result 4

Figure 4: Sample results along with interpretability plots. They depict the feedback generated by the proposed system using the news headline, text, and images (two out of multiple images shown) under the given sentiment-controllability constraint.

values have been summarized in Table 8. As the beam-size value of 5 provides the best performance and computational complexity trade-off, it has been used in the final implementation.

Table 8: Ablation studies on control parameter (x) and beam-size. The entries show sentiment classification accuracy / MRR.

x / Beam-size	2	5	10	15	20
5	66.92% / 0.3505	76.89% / 0.3605	52.83% / 0.3641	54.51% / 0.3214	50.40% / 0.3491
10	71.42% / 0.3483	77.23% / 0.3789	64.81% / 0.3390	50.48% / 0.3393	47.36% / 0.3503
15	52.82% / 0.3429	69.71% / 0.3548	54.99% / 0.3312	60.40% / 0.3523	45.24% / 0.3449
20	64.57% / 0.3354	75.12% / 0.3389	57.76% / 0.3355	49.63% / 0.3409	41.46% / 0.3295

C.4.3 Effect of Division Factor for KAAP technique

The suitable values of the division factors k_{img} and k_{txt} used in Section B have been decided experimentally using the dice coefficient [74]. It measures the similarity of two data samples; the value of 1 denotes that the two compared data samples are completely similar, whereas a value of 0 denotes their complete dis-similarity. For each modality, we computed the KAAP values at $k \in \{2, 3, \dots, 30\}$ and analyzed the dice coefficients for two adjacent k values. For image & text, the dice coefficient values converge to 1 at k values of 5 and 20 respectively. Hence, the same have been used by the proposed system.

Checklist

1. For all authors...
 - (a) Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper’s contributions and scope? [Yes] The main claims about the proposal of the CMFeed dataset, a novel task of controllable feedback synthesis and benchmark feedback synthesis system & corresponding results mentioned in the abstract and introduction reflected in Sections 3.1, 3.3 and 3.4.2.
 - (b) Did you describe the limitations of your work? [Yes] In Section 4.
 - (c) Did you discuss any potential negative societal impacts of your work? [Yes] In Section 4.
 - (d) Have you read the ethics review guidelines and ensured that your paper conforms to them? [Yes]
2. If you are including theoretical results...
 - (a) Did you state the full set of assumptions of all theoretical results? [N/A]
 - (b) Did you include complete proofs of all theoretical results? [N/A]
3. If you ran experiments (e.g. for benchmarks)...
 - (a) Did you include the code, data, and instructions to reproduce the main experimental results (either in the supplemental material or as a URL)? [Yes] In Appendix A
 - (b) Did you specify all the training details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen)? [Yes] In Section 3.4 and Appendix C.1.
 - (c) Did you report error bars (e.g., with respect to the random seed after running experiments multiple times)? [N/A]
 - (d) Did you include the total amount of compute and the type of resources used (e.g., type of GPUs, internal cluster, or cloud provider)? [Yes] In Section 3.4 and Appendix C.1.
4. If you are using existing assets (e.g., code, data, models) or curating/releasing new assets...
 - (a) If your work uses existing assets, did you cite the creators? [Yes] The presented work builds on top of our previous work on multimodal (but not controllable) feedback synthesis, which has been duly cited in Section 4. The data & code have been developed using open-source tools (such as PyTorch, Facebook API, NLTK, Newspaper3k, and Demoji) which have been cited in Section 3.1.
 - (b) Did you mention the license of the assets? [Yes] In Appendix A.2.
 - (c) Did you include any new assets either in the supplemental material or as a URL? [Yes] The data URL, zenodo.org/records/11409612 includes dataset’s metadata and organization. The code URL, github.com/MIntelligence-Group/CMFeed/ includes implementation code.
 - (d) Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you’re using/curating? [N/A]
 - (e) Did you discuss whether the data you are using/curating contains personally identifiable information or offensive content? [Yes] In Section A.4.
5. If you used crowdsourcing or conducted research with human subjects...

We carried out the evaluation of our results by human evaluations on a voluntary basis using Google Forms. Details of the same are included in Section 3.1 and Table 7. However, no research was performed on the human subjects.

- (a) Did you include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable? [N/A]
- (b) Did you describe any potential participant risks, with links to Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals, if applicable? [N/A]
- (c) Did you include the estimated hourly wage paid to participants and the total amount spent on participant compensation? [N/A]

Dataset Papers Checklist

Include extra information in the appendix. This section will often be part of the supplemental material. Please see the call on the NeurIPS website for links to additional guides on dataset publication.

1. Submission introducing new datasets must include the following in the supplementary materials (Appendix):
 - (a) Dataset documentation and intended uses. Recommended documentation frameworks include datasheets for datasets, dataset nutrition labels, data statements for NLP, and accountability frameworks. [Yes] In Appendix A.1 and A.4.
 - (b) URL to website/platform where the dataset/benchmark can be viewed and downloaded by the reviewers. [Yes] In Appendix A.1.
 - (c) URL to Croissant metadata record documenting the dataset/benchmark available for viewing and downloading by the reviewers. You can create your Croissant metadata using e.g. the Python library available here: <https://github.com/mlcommons/croissant>. [No] We have instead mentioned the metadata record on Zenodo repository mentioned in Appendix A.1.
 - (d) Author statement that they bear all responsibility in case of violation of rights, etc., and confirmation of the data license. [Yes] In Appendix A.5.
 - (e) Hosting, licensing, and maintenance plan. The choice of hosting platform is yours, as long as you ensure access to the data (possibly through a curated interface) and will provide the necessary maintenance. [Yes] In Appendix A.2.
2. To ensure accessibility, the supplementary materials (Appendix) for datasets must include the following:
 - (a) Links to access the dataset and its metadata. This can be hidden upon submission if the dataset is not yet publicly available but must be added in the camera-ready version. In select cases, e.g. when the data can only be released at a later date, this can be added afterwards. Simulation environments should link to (open source) code repositories. [Yes] In Appendix A.1.
 - (b) The dataset itself should ideally use an open and widely used data format. Provide a detailed explanation on how the dataset can be read. For simulation environments, use existing frameworks or explain how they can be used. [Yes] In Appendix A.1.
 - (c) Long-term preservation: It must be clear that the dataset will be available for a long time, either by uploading to a data repository or by explaining how the authors themselves will ensure this. [Yes] In Appendix A.2.
 - (d) Explicit license: Authors must choose a license, ideally a CC license for datasets, or an open-source license for code (e.g. RL environments). [Yes] In Appendix A.2.
 - (e) Add structured metadata to dataset’s metadata page using Web standards (schema.org and DCAT): This allows it to be discovered and organized by anyone. If you use an existing data repository, it is often done automatically. [Yes] In Appendix A.1.
 - (f) Highly recommended: a persistent differentiable identifier (e.g. a DOI minted by a data repository or a prefix on identifiers.org) for datasets, or a code repository (e.g. GitHub, GitLab,...). If this is not possible or useful, please explain why. [Yes] In Appendix A.1.
3. For benchmarks, the supplementary materials (Appendix) must ensure that all results are easily reproducible. Where possible, use a reproducibility framework such as the ML reproducibility checklist, or otherwise guarantee that all results can be easily reproduced, i.e. all necessary datasets, code, and evaluation procedures must be accessible and documented. [Yes] In Appendix A.1.
4. For papers introducing best practices in creating or curating datasets and benchmarks, the above supplementary materials are not required. [N/A]