
MAC: A Benchmark for Multiple Attributes Compositional Zero-Shot Learning

Shuo Xu* Sai Wang* Xinyue Hu

Yutian Lin Bo Du Yu Wu†

School of Computer Science, Wuhan University

{shuoxu, saiwang23, wuyucs}@whu.edu.cn

Abstract

Compositional Zero-Shot Learning (CZSL) aims to learn semantic primitives (attributes and objects) from seen compositions and recognize unseen attribute-object compositions. Existing CZSL datasets focus on single attributes, neglecting the fact that objects naturally exhibit multiple interrelated attributes. Real-world objects often possess multiple interrelated attributes, and current datasets' narrow attribute scope and single attribute labeling introduce annotation biases, undermining model performance and evaluation. To address these limitations, we introduce the Multi-Attribute Composition (MAC) dataset, encompassing 18,217 images and 11,067 compositions with comprehensive, representative, and diverse attribute annotations. MAC includes an average of 30.2 attributes per object and 65.4 objects per attribute, facilitating better multi-attribute composition predictions. Our dataset supports deeper semantic understanding and higher-order attribute associations, providing a more realistic and challenging benchmark for the CZSL task. We also develop solutions for multi-attribute compositional learning and propose the MM-encoder to disentangling the attributes and objects.

1 Introduction

Compositional zero-shot learning (CZSL) [14, 13, 18, 2] aims to compose knowledge of learned primitive components (e.g., attributes and objects) to recognize unseen combinations during the testing phase, where each individual attribute and object has been encountered during training. It highlights the model's capacity to generalize knowledge and infer novel concepts from known components, mimicking human cognitive abilities. Additionally, it serves as the foundation for various downstream tasks such as open-vocabulary object detection [5, 20, 27] and human object interaction [30, 4, 28].

Existing CZSL datasets, such as MIT-States [9], UT-Zappos [31] and C-GQA [22], predominantly focus on predicting a single while incomplete attribute, as listed in Table 1. However, in the real world, objects usually exhibit multiple interrelated attributes. The single and incomplete attribute may introduce strong annotator bias and thus significantly restrict the model's understanding of the content of the image. In addition, it hampers the accurate assessment of model performance. Even if the predicted result differs from the sole ground truth, it may still be a potentially correct label. Predicting a single attribute cannot comprehensively evaluate a model, as correct predictions of other relevant attributes for the same object should also be considered valid. Moreover, the

*Equal contribution.

†Co-corresponding author.




Figure 1: (a) Compared to previous datasets, our MAC contains **multiple and representative attributes**. (b) Example of compositional zero-shot learning with multiple attributes.

Table 1: **Comparison of existing CSZL datasets.** “Avg.attr” represents the average number of attributes per object, while “Avg.obj” denotes the average number of objects covered by each attribute.

Dataset	Attribute	Object	Combination	Avg. attr	Avg. obj	Multit-attribute
UT-Zappos [31]	16	12	149	24.75	24.75	✗
MIT-States [9]	115	245	1962	8.01	17.06	✗
C-GQA [22]	413	674	7767	18.81	11.52	✗
MAC (Ours)	98	212	11067	30.20	65.40	✓

existing dataset only considers the relationship between attributes and the objects, without accounting for the co-occurrence relationships between different attributes. For instance, the attributes “cool” and “refreshing” frequently co-occur when depicting an image of ice-cola, and understanding these associations can enhance the model’s primitive learning capabilities. Additionally, the attribute sets defined in existing datasets are often inadequate. They tend to focus on superficial attributes like color and material rather than delving into more representative attributes. A target can be described from shallow, appearance-based dimensions like color and shape, as well as from deeper, semantic dimensions such as state and properties. For example, it can be described as “yellow orange” based on appearance, or as “fresh and juicy orange” based on its semantic, as shown in Figure 1. Therefore, it urgently needs a new dataset that encompasses a wide range of attributes across different dimensions of objects to promote the development of CZSL tasks.

However, creating a multi-attribute dataset can be challenging and presents three main challenges: (1) **Comprehensive Annotation.** Unlike existing datasets where attention is focused solely on a single attribute, multi-attribute datasets necessitate comprehensive coverage of a target’s primary attributes. Thus, the labeling complexity significantly increases, raising the critical question of how to annotate attributes comprehensively and without omission. (2) **Attribute Selection.** While aiming for comprehensive attribute coverage, emphasis should be placed on selecting representative attributes. Numerous simple and trivial attributes, such as [22], contribute minimally to knowledge gain and distract from the focus of model learning. Therefore, the key lies in determining how to select the essential attributes of the target. (3) **Image diversity.** Existing compositions largely revolve around common attributes and objects, overlooking those sparse relationships. For instance, the occurrence of “blue strawberries” in real life is rare, which becomes more pronounced in multi-attribute scenarios. Additionally, existing datasets often feature highly similar images within the same class, hindering the essence of CZSL task, which seeks to enhance transferability to unseen combinations. Hence, the critical challenge lies in gathering diverse image data depicting different attributes and combinations for objects of the same class.

To advance the field of CZSL under multi-attribute conditions, we introduce the Multi-Attribute Composition (MAC) dataset in this paper, which aims to offer comprehensive, representative, and diverse attribute annotations to address the aforementioned challenges. Our dataset comprises 18,217 images and 11,067 compositions, where each composition refers to an object with its corresponding multiple attributes in the image. Compared to previous datasets, our dataset contains more diverse

and representative attributes, enabling a comprehensive description of targets from both appearance and semantic dimensions. It is worth noting that each object is associated with an average of 30.2 attributes, and each attribute covers 65.4 objects. This indicates that MAC is highly suitable for multi-attribute composition prediction. We also construct solutions for multi-attribute compositional learning based on existing methods and evaluate their capability with our proposed dataset. Moreover, we design the MM-encoder, which leverages two branches of prompt tuning [15, 10, 11] to disentangle primitives and achieve the state-of-the-art performance.

2 Related Work

2.1 Compositional Zero-Shot Learning

Compositional Zero-Shot Learning (CZSL) [25, 8, 26] aims to recognize unseen attribute-object pairs at test time while each semantic primitive exists in the training sample. The latest methods for CZSL can be roughly divided into two main directions. One group of methods involves training two separate classifiers to forecast attribute and object primitives, respectively [14, 33]. Nevertheless, the intrinsic relationship between them may be overlooked. Another group of methods learns the joint state-object semantic representation of seen and unseen components using transformation functions in a shared feature space [1, 21, 22]. However, learning semantic primitives from scratch is difficult because of the complexity of the compositions. The recent work is starting to research how to transfer pre-trained vision-language models (VLMs) [32, 3] to composition prediction tasks. CSP [23] first adapts the CLIP [24] by replacing the classes in text vocabulary with trainable tokens that represent states and objects respectively. PromptCompVL [17] creates a fully learnable soft prompt including the prefix, state, and object. The latest DFSP [16] proposes a cross-modal decomposed fusion module to learn more expressive image features. Troika [6] adopts a Multi-Path framework to dynamically adjust prompts based on visual features, similar to the idea of the CoCoOP [34]. The PLO [12] solves composition predicting in a simple to complex manner by utilizing the knowledge of large language models. In this work, we explore several strategies to adapt the VLMs to compositions predicting and find it is important to disentangle primitives in different branches and model the relations between them, including both connections within attributes and connections between attributes and objects.

2.2 Existing CZSL Benchmarks

Datasets like MITStates [9], UT-Zappos [31], and CGQA [22] are commonly utilized for studying CZSL. UT-Zappos is a relatively simple dataset focusing on the composition of shoes, materials and brands. MIT-States is designed for characterizing state variation that occurs within image classes, its attribute set consists of diverse adjectives and their antonyms. CGQA includes numerous attributes and objects, derived from images cropped from the GQA [7] based on the bounding boxes. However, these three datasets have some shared shortcomings. They all include non-visual attributes that are difficult to distinguish and their primitive set consists of synonyms and near-synonyms. Also, their composition labels have just one attribute that doesn't match reality. This misleads the model's understanding of attributes and results in misjudgment during evaluation. To tackle these problems, we construct a new dataset with comprehensive attribute annotations and design a multilabel composition predicting task on it.

3 MAC benchmark

3.1 Dataset Overview

Our Multi-Attribute Composition (MAC) dataset includes 18,217 images and 11,067 compositions, featuring a total of 98 attributes and 212 classes of objects. The MAC dataset is divided into training, validation, and testing sets with 11101, 1973, and 5143 images respectively. Our images encompass a variety of representative attributes and objects, with each object associated with multiple attributes. Figure 2 summarizes important statistics about our MAC.




Figure 2: Statistical distributions in MAC. Our dataset covers images in comprehensive and diverse attributes with rich associations. Best viewed in color with zoom-in. (a) shows the distribution of the number of attributes for each image; (b) shows the binding relations between attributes and objects, where the outer circle represents the proportion of attributes linked to a specified number of objects and the inner circle showing the reverse; (c) is co-occurrence matrix of different attributes, with color intensity indicating the frequency of their co-occurrences; (d) displays the distribution of the number of images for different primitives.

3.2 Dataset Construction

In the MAC dataset, each image contains a single object label and multiple attribute labels. To create a high-quality dataset with object-centric images and diverse compositions, we follow a three-step process as illustrated in Figure 3 (a). First, we carefully define the semantic primitives (*i.e.*, attributes and objects) using GPT-4o and manual verification (**Primitive Set Definition**). Next, we ask GPT-4o to generate diverse compositions for each object by selecting appropriate attributes and objects. These compositions are used as keywords to retrieve images from search engines, forming the initial dataset (**Collect Images of Diverse Compositions**). To expand the set of possible attributes, we use CLIP [24] and GPT-4o to predict attributes for each image. Annotators then select, refine, and add correct attributes for each image based on these predictions and the initial search keywords (**Multiple Attributes Labeling**). This process results in a high-quality multi-attribute composition dataset with comprehensive attribute labels.

Primitive Set Definition. The primitive set defines the image object classes and provides initial possible attributes, which is crucial as it directly determines the dataset’s scope and significantly influences its quality. Existing datasets, such as MIT-States [9] and C-GQA [22], often include a large number of synonyms and non-visual words, which hinders the model’s ability to learn proper semantic primitives and negatively impacts evaluation. We carefully define the primitive set by leveraging GPT-4o. Take the attribute set as an example, we consider the attribute set of MIT-States as a predefined set and refine it through the following steps. First, we ask GPT-4o to eliminate attributes that are not visible or do not directly describe the appearance of the object. Then, we categorize the remaining attributes into mutually exclusive groups and merge synonyms. Finally, we ask GPT-4o to enrich each group with new attributes. To ensure that each attribute has a unique meaning, we merge synonyms using WordNet [19] and perform manual checks to create the primitive set. The object set is constructed in the same manner. The resulting primitive set comprises 98 attributes and 212 objects. We use a refined set to collect diverse images and annotate them in detail.

Collect Images of Diverse Compositions. For a high-quality composition dataset, the diversity of attributes associated with each object is crucial. It is not sufficient to simply collect a large number of images for each object. These images must show the object with different attributes. This diversity is beneficial for learning how attributes and objects interact. To achieve this, we create a diverse set of feasible attribute-object compositions. Specifically, using the objects and attributes from the primitive set, we task GPT-4o to generate plausible compositions that include three attributes each. Compared to single attribute compositions, this strategy generates more diverse compositions with attributes from different descriptive perspectives. We also leverage GPT-4o to perform self-evaluation, rating each combination’s logical rationality and feasibility on a scale from 1 to 5. Compositions scoring in the top 50% and above 3 are selected as the final composition set. We utilize these compositions as




Figure 3: (a) Step-by-step diagram of dataset construction. (b) Samples comparison. The images from top left to bottom right are UT-Zappos, MIT-States, C-GQA, and MAC.

keywords to crawl images from Google. Leveraging the search engine’s robust retrieval capabilities, we are able to collect diverse images with various attributes.

Multiple Attributes Labeling. Labels with multiple attributes will provide more useful information for the model. Insufficient attribute annotations will mislead the model into overlooking the correct attributes that actually exist. For example, if an image of “peeled round fresh apple” is annotated as “round apple”, the model will incorrectly reduce the likelihood that the image belongs to the other two attributes. To label the attributes of each image as thoroughly as possible, we provide annotators with three sets of reference attributes: the keyword set, GPT-4o set, and CLIP set. The keyword set consists of the search keywords used to collect images. It contains three attributes plus one object per image, reflecting the data stored in search engines like image tags, file names, text around the images, and other metadata. These terms are relevant and offer a starting point for annotation but may not always accurately represent the image content. For example, the term “frozen” might bring up images of the movie “Frozen” instead of images depicting objects that are literally frozen. The GPT-4o set is produced by GPT-4o, which can select basically correct attributes from the attribute set based on the image content. However, the attributes suggested by GPT-4o may be too broad or not specific enough, such as “smooth” or “shiny”, despite attempts to minimize these types of responses. This set may not encompass all the attributes of the object in question. The CLIP set is generated by CLIP, which retrieves attributes for an object o_i , using prompts $P = \{“a photo of < a_j o_i >” \mid a_j \in A\}$, where A represents the set of attributes. The top five attributes with the highest similarity are selected. As shown in Figure 4, the CLIP set and the GPT-4o set exhibit a distinct complementary relationship. However, CLIP sometimes provides attributes that do not relate to the object, indicating that it struggles to model the relationship between objects and their attributes. Furthermore, annotators are instructed to discard images that do not match the objects described by the search keywords. The dataset is annotated by two authors in a total of 80 man-hours.

3.3 Task Formulation

Given the attribute set $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{|A|}\}$ and object set $O = \{o_1, o_2, \dots, o_{|O|}\}$ as the semantic primitives, where $|\cdot|$ denotes the number of elements in the set, the multi-attribute compositional label space is defined as $C = \{\langle S, o \rangle \mid S \subseteq A, o \in O\}$, with almost all combinations containing fewer than 5 attributes. We define the set of seen compositions and unseen compositions as $C^s \subseteq C$ and $C^u \subseteq C$, respectively, where $C^s \cap C^u = \emptyset$. At the training time, only the data of seen compositions is provided. Implementing Image-to-Text retrieval for multi-attribute compositions is impractical due to the massive search space. Therefore, we design a multi-label single attribute composition classification task for our dataset. Notably, multiple labels apply only to the attribute part. This task aims to predict compositions in the test space C^t on closed-world setting and open-world setting.




Figure 4: The complementarity of prediction results between CLIP and GPT-4o.

In closed-world setting, the test space is defined as $C^t = \{\langle a, o \rangle \mid \exists \langle S, o \rangle \in C^s \cup C^u, a \in S\}$. Additionally, we focus more on the open-world setting because it is more consistent with real-world scenarios. In this setting, the test space is defined as the Cartesian product of the attribute set and the object set, *i.e.*, $C^t = |A| \times |O|$.

3.4 Evaluation Metric

Following the evaluation protocol of [29], we use **Exact Match**, Top-1 precision (**Top1-P**), Top-5 Recall (**Top5-R**) and **Coverage** to evaluate the accuracy and comprehensiveness of model respectively. The Top1-P reflects the model’s ability to correctly predict each instance. It measures the proportion of instances in which top-1 prediction matches a true label. The Exact Match evaluates how often all true labels are ranked higher than any false labels. We consider the top K predictions for an instance where K represents the number of its ground truths. The Top5-R evaluates the ability of a model to correctly identify relevant labels within its top 5 predictions. Specifically, it calculates the proportion of true labels that appear in the top 5 predicted labels out of all true labels. The Coverage reflects the model’s ability to cover all the true labels. It calculates the smallest integer K such that the set of the top K predicted labels covers all the true labels of an instance. However, in composition classification, the solution space is notably vast, making this metric susceptible to excessively large values. So we propose a normalized form of the coverage metric. Additionally, the Top-1 precision of attributes (**Top1-P-attr**) and objects (**Top1-P-obj**) is introduced to measure the model’s performance in predicting individual primitives.

4 Proposed Method

The multi-attribute composition prediction is a complex task due to the complex intricate interrelationships in it. Compared to single attribute composition, it involves two types of primitive relations: relations between different attributes and relations between attribute and object. To achieve accurate composition predictions, a model needs to first disentangle the semantic primitives, enabling it to learn the attributes and objects independently from composition data. Additionally, the model must effectively relate various primitives, including both attribute-attribute and attribute-object relations, facilitating the prediction for novel compositions. However, existing pre-trained models struggle to make composition predictions since they fail to disentangle and relate the primitives. Since CLIP [24] is commonly used for various tasks and is a relatively lightweight vision-language foundation model, we explore how to adapt it to composition predicting.

Prompt Tuning. A simple method to adapt Vision-Language Models like CLIP to specific tasks is prompt-tuning [35]. For an attribute-object composition ($a o$), prompt-tuning converts the natural language text prompt “a photo of $a o$ ” into learnable embedding $P_{ao} = [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m, v_a, v_o]$, where $\{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m\}$ are the prefix trainable embedding initialized by the token embedding of “a photo of” and v_a, v_o are the frozen word vocabulary embeddings of a, o , respectively. To prove the importance of semantic disentanglement, we introduce a two-branch method which uses independent learnable prompts for attributes and objects: $P_a = [p_1^a, p_2^a, \dots, p_m^a, v_a]$ and $P_o = [p_1^o, p_2^o, \dots, p_m^o, v_o]$. This strategy does not relate the primitives in any form explicitly. To verify the importance of semantic




Figure 5: Overview of the proposed MM-Encoder.

disentanglement, following Troika [6], we also introduce a three-branch prompting strategy by using P_a , P_o , and P_c together.

Multimodal Adapting. None of the above methods consider disentangling primitives and modeling the two types of relations between primitives simultaneously. Based on the two-branch prompt tuning strategy, we design a simple and effective method named **MM-Encoder**, as shown in Figure 5. The MM-Encoder adds a multi-modal transformer encoder after CLIP to relate different primitives and image features. Specifically, let I denote the concatenated image patch representations and the class token representation extracted by the CLIP’s visual encoder. T represents the concatenated text representation extracted by CLIP’s text encoder for all primitives (attributes and objects). The combined tokens $M = [I; T]$ is fed into a lightweight transformer encoder to model both the relationship between different semantic primitives (attributes and objects) and the relationship between the image and the text. Finally, the cosine similarity between refined image class token embedding and the original text token embedding T is computed to produce the predicted logits. It’s worth noting that the methods without a composition branch do not require training on all possible compositions. It significantly reduces the computational resources for training and inference on the combined dataset: the input number to the text encoder drops from $|A| \times |O|$ to $|A| + |O|$.

5 Experiments

5.1 Implementation Details

We evaluate methods on the multi-label composition task described in Sec. 3.3 with metrics in Sec. 3.4. All methods are implemented with a pre-trained CLIP ViT-L/14 model using PyTorch. We train and evaluate all methods on 1 NVIDIA RTX 4090 GPU. The details of hyperparameters are provided in the supplementary. All the methods are trained and evaluated in the same way. In the training stage, we use cross-entropy loss for the object branch and BCELoss for the multilabel branch, including attribute prediction and composition prediction. During inference, we simply add all the predictions to get the final composition prediction:

$$\tilde{P}((a, o)|x_i) = P(a|x_i) + P(o|x_i) + P((a, o)|x_i). \quad (1)$$

For methods without three branches, we simply disregard the outcomes of the missing branches in both training and inference.

5.2 Comparison of Baselines

We experiment with four CZSL models covering the most classic to the state-of-the-art methods for multi-attribute composition predicting, including CLIP [24], CoOP [35], CSP [23] and Troika [6]. Among these methods, CLIP stands out as a well-known methods using the ViT-L/14 backbone, providing a reliable baseline. CoOP, CSP, and Troika build upon the success of CLIP, utilizing the prompt tuning and multi-branch mechanism to jointly model the attribute, object and composition. Table 2 and Table 3 show the performance of various models on the closed-world setting and open-world setting of the MAC dataset, respectively. On the closed-world setting, MM-Encoder significantly outperforms other methods across most metrics and achieves 45.36% top1-P and 44.08% top5-R. In the open-world setting, our method also achieves the best results on most metrics.

Table 2: **Main results on the closed-world setting.** All methods use a CLIP ViT-L/14 backbone.

	branch	Top1-P	Top5-R	Exact Match	Coverage	Top1-P-attr	Top1-P-obj
CLIP[24]	c	38.89	38.26	4.49	0.1031	46.28	81.49
CoOP[35]	c	39.00	35.70	4.32	0.0941	46.92	80.01
CSP [23]	c	24.86	24.22	2.15	0.0497	36.71	66.00
Troika [6]	a;o;c	41.75	38.49	4.96	0.1186	48.75	84.89
MM-Encoder	a;o	46.80	46.11	7.27	0.1687	55.51	82.77

Table 3: **Main results on the open-world setting.** All methods use a CLIP ViT-L/14 backbone.

	branch	Top1-P	Top5-R	Exact Match	Coverage	Top1-P-attr	Top1-P-obj
CLIP [24]	c	27.92	28.21	2.16	0.0478	34.94	79.82
CoOP [35]	c	28.49	24.76	2.37	0.0443	35.91	79.80
CSP [23]	c	13.86	14.39	0.84	0.0145	23.55	63.11
Troika [6]	a;o;c	29.67	25.76	2.64	0.0514	35.91	83.49
MM-Encoder	a;o	45.36	44.08	6.82	0.1505	54.54	82.15

5.3 Analysis

Disentangling primitives is crucial. The paradigm of existing methods that primarily focus on learning knowledge solely from the composition, *i.e.*, only contains a composition (c) branch, lacking explicit exploration of the intrinsic features of attributes and objects, which is more prominent in the multi-attributes scenario as more attributes are involved in the composition. To this end, we investigate an improved setting, that is, decoupling the composition into attributes and objects. Specifically, we added two additional branches to the existing architecture to learn attribute and object knowledge separately. Table 4 shows the relative results of adding extra branches under both closed-world setting and open-world setting. When using both the attribute and object branches (a;o branch), CoOP performs better in the closed-world setting compared to the combined branch (c branch). Both CLIP and CoOP perform better in the open-world setting compared to their respective composition branches. This indicates that it is challenging for the model to transfer the knowledge from composition to individual attributes, as reflected in the significant improvement of the Top1-P-attr. Furthermore, using the attribute, object, and composition branches simultaneously (a;o;c branch) leads to further improvement in performance. This demonstrates that decoupling attributes and objects while introducing the composition branch explicitly models the matching relationship between attributes and objects.

Zero-shot learning ability across different setting. Compared with the closed-world setting, the open-world setting lacks composition priors, making it more suitable for evaluating zero-shot learning abilities and aligning better with real-world applications. Existing methods show a significant drop in performance from closed-world to open-world settings, with at least a 10.51% decrease in top-1 accuracy. Specifically, the performance in terms of the Top1-P-attr drops by at least 11.01%, while the drop in terms of the Top1-P-obj is just 0.21%. This indicates that existing methods are heavily influenced by combination priors and have a weaker understanding of the essential characteristics of attributes, resulting in poor zero-shot capabilities. In contrast, our MM-Encoder shows a difference of only 1.44% in top1-P and 0.97% in the Top1-P-attr between different settings, with overall results remaining nearly unchanged. This demonstrates that decoupling the learning of attribute and object knowledge and modeling the correlations between multiple attributes are crucial for significantly improving the model’s zero-shot abilities.

Solution space across different methods. All existing methods that use the composition branch face a significant increase in the solution space with the number of attributes $|A|$ and categories $|O|$, reaching $|A| \times |O|$ in open-world setting, which leads to substantial GPU memory pressure and cannot be used in practice, as discussed in section 3.3. In contrast, our MM-Encoder includes only the attribute and object branches, avoiding constraints from the total number of compositions. This makes it more flexible, with a solution space of only $|A| + |O|$.

Table 4: **Main results of Multiple Branches.** All methods use a CLIP ViT-L/14 backbone. The original result of CLIP and CoOP can be seen in Tab. 2 and Tab. 3.

	branch	Top1-P	Top5-R	Exact Match	Coverage	Top1-P-attr	Top1-P-obj
<i>Closed-World Results</i>							
CLIP	a;o	-2.02	-2.61	-0.56	-0.0073	-1.09	-3.15
	a;o;c	+4.57	+2.31	+0.76	+0.0203	+4.94	+0.19
CoOP	a;o	+4.32	+4.75	+0.64	+0.0260	+4.76	+2.82
	a;o;c	+7.47	+6.43	+1.44	+0.0400	+7.48	+3.68
<i>Open-World Results</i>							
CLIP	a;o	+1.46	-0.79	+0.10	+0.0035	+2.63	-1.93
	a;o;c	+7.10	+3.19	+0.81	+0.0002	+7.93	+0.52
CoOP	a;o	+10.53	+8.95	+1.29	+0.0003	+11.67	+2.64
	a;o;c	+12.01	+9.98	+1.89	+0.0382	+4.66	+3.07



Figure 6: Qualitative results compared to the previous dataset MIT-States [9]. We transfer our MM-Encoder model trained on our MAC dataset to directly test on the MIT-States data. We show top-3 attribute predictions of our model, and found they are more comprehensive compared to the original MIT-States annotations.

5.4 Qualitative Results

In Figure 6, we use the MM-Encoder trained on the MAC dataset to predict sampled images from the MIT-States dataset. For simplicity, we only present the top three predictions. As can be seen, the MM-Encoder generates diverse and representative new attributes while accurately predicting the objects. Compared to the original single and incomplete attribute annotations of MIT-States, these new attributes significantly enrich the dataset’s diversity.

6 Discussion and Conclusion

In this paper, we address the limitations of compositional zero-shot learning (CZSL) and introduce the Multi-Attribute Composition (MAC) dataset, which focuses on multi-attribute composition prediction. Unlike existing datasets with single and incomplete attributes for each image, the MAC dataset offers comprehensive, representative, and diverse attribute annotations. It contains a large number of compositions with multiple attributes, allowing for robust evaluation of compositional learning methods. By leveraging existing methods, we constructed solutions and evaluated their performance using the MAC dataset. The results demonstrate the importance of disentangling attributes and objects. Our work contributes to the advancement of object recognition by highlighting the significance of multi-attribute compositions in real-world scenarios. The MAC dataset provides a valuable resource for further research and development in compositional learning-related tasks. Future work could explore the fine-grained correspondence between images and multiple attributes, as well as the prediction of the importance of inter-attribute associations. **Ethics.** We have followed the official Ethics Guidelines and manually reviewed the collected data, ensuring that it contains no sensitive content or personally information.

References

- [1] Muhammad Umer Anwaar, Zhihui Pan, and Martin Kleinsteuber. “On leveraging variational graph embeddings for open world compositional zero-shot learning”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*. 2022, pp. 4645–4654.
- [2] Yuval Atzmon et al. “A causal view of compositional zero-shot recognition”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), pp. 1462–1473.
- [3] Peng Gao et al. “Clip-adapter: Better vision-language models with feature adapters”. In: *International Journal of Computer Vision* 132.2 (2024), pp. 581–595.
- [4] Georgia Gkioxari et al. “Detecting and recognizing human-object interactions”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2018, pp. 8359–8367.
- [5] Xiuye Gu et al. “Open-vocabulary object detection via vision and language knowledge distillation”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.13921* (2021).
- [6] Siteng Huang et al. “Troika: Multi-path cross-modal traction for compositional zero-shot learning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15230* (2023).
- [7] Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning. “Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2019, pp. 6700–6709.
- [8] Dat Huynh and Ehsan Elhamifar. “Compositional zero-shot learning via fine-grained dense feature composition”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), pp. 19849–19860.
- [9] Phillip Isola, Joseph J Lim, and Edward H Adelson. “Discovering states and transformations in image collections”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2015, pp. 1383–1391.
- [10] Muhammad Uzair Khattak et al. “Maple: Multi-modal prompt learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2023, pp. 19113–19122.
- [11] Brian Lester, Rami Al-Rfou, and Noah Constant. “The power of scale for parameter-efficient prompt tuning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08691* (2021).
- [12] Lin Li et al. “Compositional Zero-shot Learning via Progressive Language-based Observations”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.14749* (2023).
- [13] Xiangyu Li et al. “Siamese contrastive embedding network for compositional zero-shot learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2022, pp. 9326–9335.
- [14] Yong-Lu Li et al. “Symmetry and group in attribute-object compositions”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2020, pp. 11316–11325.
- [15] Xiao Liu et al. “P-tuning v2: Prompt tuning can be comparable to fine-tuning universally across scales and tasks”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07602* (2021).
- [16] Xiaocheng Lu et al. “Decomposed soft prompt guided fusion enhancing for compositional zero-shot learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2023, pp. 23560–23569.
- [17] Yuning Lu et al. “Prompt distribution learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2022, pp. 5206–5215.
- [18] Massimiliano Mancini et al. “Open world compositional zero-shot learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2021, pp. 5222–5230.
- [19] George A Miller et al. “Introduction to WordNet: An on-line lexical database”. In: *International journal of lexicography* 3.4 (1990), pp. 235–244.
- [20] Matthias Minderer, Alexey Gritsenko, and Neil Houlsby. “Scaling open-vocabulary object detection”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [21] Ishan Misra, Abhinav Gupta, and Martial Hebert. “From red wine to red tomato: Composition with context”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2017, pp. 1792–1801.
- [22] Muhammad Ferjad Naeem et al. “Learning graph embeddings for compositional zero-shot learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2021, pp. 953–962.

- [23] Nihal V Nayak, Peilin Yu, and Stephen H Bach. “Learning to compose soft prompts for compositional zero-shot learning”. In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.03574* (2022).
- [24] Alec Radford et al. “Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision”. In: *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR. 2021, pp. 8748–8763.
- [25] Bernardino Romera-Paredes and Philip Torr. “An embarrassingly simple approach to zero-shot learning”. In: *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR. 2015, pp. 2152–2161.
- [26] Frank Ruis, Gertjan Burghouts, and Doina Bucur. “Independent prototype propagation for zero-shot compositionality”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34* (2021), pp. 10641–10653.
- [27] Tao Wang. “Learning to detect and segment for open vocabulary object detection”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2023, pp. 7051–7060.
- [28] Tiancai Wang et al. “Learning human-object interaction detection using interaction points”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2020, pp. 4116–4125.
- [29] Xi-Zhu Wu and Zhi-Hua Zhou. “A unified view of multi-label performance measures”. In: *international conference on machine learning*. PMLR. 2017, pp. 3780–3788.
- [30] Xianghui Xie, Bharat Lal Bhatnagar, and Gerard Pons-Moll. “Visibility aware human-object interaction tracking from single rgb camera”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 2023, pp. 4757–4768.
- [31] Aron Yu and Kristen Grauman. “Fine-grained visual comparisons with local learning”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2014, pp. 192–199.
- [32] Jingyi Zhang et al. “Vision-language models for vision tasks: A survey”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* (2024).
- [33] Tian Zhang et al. “Learning invariant visual representations for compositional zero-shot learning”. In: *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer. 2022, pp. 339–355.
- [34] Kaiyang Zhou et al. “Conditional prompt learning for vision-language models”. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2022, pp. 16816–16825.
- [35] Kaiyang Zhou et al. “Learning to prompt for vision-language models”. In: *International Journal of Computer Vision* 130.9 (2022), pp. 2337–2348.