
A Study of Test-time Contrastive Concepts for Open-world, Open-vocabulary Semantic Segmentation

Monika Wysoczańska^{1*}Antonin Vobecky^{2,3,4}Amaia Cardiel^{2,8}Tomasz Trzciniński^{1,5,6}Renaud Marlet^{2,7}Andrei Bursuc²Oriane Siméoni²¹Warsaw University of Technology ²valeo.ai ³CIIRC CTU Prague ⁴FEE CTU Prague⁵Tooploox ⁶IDEAS NCBR ⁷LIGM, Ecole des Ponts, Univ Gustave Eiffel⁸Université Grenoble Alpes

Abstract

Recent VLMs, pre-trained on large amounts of image-text pairs to align both modalities, have opened the way to open-vocabulary semantic segmentation. Given an arbitrary set of textual queries, image regions are assigned the closest query in feature space. However, the usual setup expects the user to list all possible visual concepts that may occur in the image, typically all classes of benchmark datasets, that act as negatives to each other. We consider here the more challenging scenario of segmenting a single concept, given a textual prompt and nothing else. To achieve good results, besides contrasting with the generic “background” text, we study different ways to generate query-specific test-time contrastive textual concepts, which leverage either the distribution of text in the VLM’s training set or crafted LLM prompts. We show the relevance of our approach using a new, specific metric.

1 Introduction

Vision-language models (VLMs) [3] are trained to create and align text and image representations, i.e., the representation of an image is made close to the representation of text expressing the image contents. VLMs such as CLIP [4] and its successors deliver impressive zero-shot performance on various open-vocabulary image-level tasks, such as image classification [5–7], image retrieval [8] and image captioning [9, 10]. However, transferring such ability at the pixel level is not straightforward.

A particularly challenging pixel-level task is the open-vocabulary semantic segmentation (OVSS) of *visual concepts* in images, i.e. visual entities such as objects, stuff (e.g. grass), or visual phenomena (e.g. sky). Various methods have been proposed to that end, exploiting a frozen CLIP model with well-designed additional operations [11, 2, 12, 13], or fine-tuning the model with particular losses [14, 15, 1, 16, 17]. Better results can be obtained using annotations, such as classes or class-agnostic masks [18–20]. Yet, we focus here on strategies which do not rely on any type of manual supervision, therefore avoiding any specialization to annotated domains.

Despite the remaining gap in segmentation quality compared to fully supervised training on specific datasets, the reported performance of these open-vocabulary segmenters is appealing. However, the current benchmarking strategy to evaluate them [1] does not exactly measure pure, out-of-context, open-vocabulary performance. The fact is that evaluation is mainly based on existing, classical semantic segmentation datasets organized around a limited set of classes [21–24]. More importantly, to enable dense segmentation, the evaluated algorithms have access to a complete list of all visual

*Corresponding author: monika.wysoczanska.dokt@pw.edu.pl




Figure 1: **Illustration of the benefit of our contrastive concepts CC .** We investigate open-world, open-vocabulary segmentation, where only one or a few visual concepts to segment are known, as opposed to all classes that can possibly occur in the image. Contrasting the query with “background” helps [1, 2] (3rd column). However, this may not suffice to catch all pixels *not* corresponding to the query if they are related or co-occur frequently in the VLM training set. Our automatically-generated *contrastive concepts* CC help to separate and disentangle pixels of the query (right column).

concepts in the dataset. While this may seem natural for a fully dense task, it is actually key to part of the reported segmentation performances. The reason is that visual concepts that co-occur in a VLM’s training set can be mistaken for each other at test time as they tend to have close representations. For instance, “boat” can be hard to separate from “water”, leading to coarse segment boundaries when prompted alone. Now if all visual concepts possibly present in an image are known from the dataset, it is easy to contrast them and assign pixels to the closest concept in feature space.

In this work, we study the impact of contrasting textual prompts at test time. To that end, we consider the harder and maybe more realistic task of segmenting one or several visual concepts given as text (positives), without any given knowledge of all other classes that may occur in the image (negatives).

Various methods tried to address this problem. One of the most straightforward ways to separate background from foreground, i.e., from the queried visual concept(s), is to introduce a similarity threshold [11, 1]. This can be however hard to set and is, at least, dataset-dependent if not image-dependent. Using an *objectness* map helps separate the queried visual concept from the background [12], but fails when the queried object is in the background. Leveraging rich image features from DINO [25] improves object delineation and filters out likely background [2], but lacks priors to further disentangle foreground from background. This ambiguity can be partly tackled by generating visual prototypes for given textual categories, but at the cost of expensive test-time diffusions [26].

Another common strategy, in this case, is to consider an extra class labelled “background”, intended to catch all pixels not corresponding to the queried visual concepts. It provides an easy generic and default negative, in particular for object-centric evaluation datasets, such as Pascal VOC [21]. The notion of background is however not well defined as it is context-dependent. It may also not be present with the expected distribution in the training set. Besides, a failure case is when a queried visual concept (e.g., “tree”) falls in the learned background (which commonly encompasses trees).

In this work, rather than assuming access to a dataset-specific set of classes, we propose instead to automatically produce visual concepts that are useful to better localize a queried concept. We also propose a new metric to evaluate such an ability, namely *IoU-single*, which considers one query prompt at a time and thus does not rely on the knowledge of potential domain classes. We show that leveraging test-time contrastive concepts allows us to reach better results on our metric and achieve on-par results when using the classic *mIoU* metric. To summarize, our contributions are as follows:

- We investigate a new evaluation setup for open-world, open-vocabulary semantic segmentation, which does not rely on any domain knowledge.
- We introduce the notion of test-time contrastive concepts and discuss the interest of generated contrastive concepts to improve open-vocabulary image segmentation.
- We discuss the usage of “background” as a contrastive concept, which has been so far accepted but not discussed.
- We propose a new metric to evaluate the grounding of visual concepts and use it to benchmark multiple state-of-the-art methods across several commonly used datasets.

2 Related work

Open-vocabulary semantic segmentation. VLMs trained on web-collected data to produce aligned image-text representations [4, 27, 5] had a major impact on open-vocabulary perception and opened up new avenues for research and practical applications. While CLIP can be used *off-the-shelf* for image classification in different settings, a major shortcoming is its inability to produce dense pixel-level features and predictions due to its final global attentive-pooling [13, 28]. To mitigate this and produce dense image-text features, several approaches finetune CLIP with dense supervision or devise new CLIP-like models trained from scratch with segmentation-compatible pooling on large datasets annotated with coarse captions [29, 15, 30, 14, 31, 32, 17, 1], object masks [33, 29, 34] or pixel labels [35, 30]. However, such models either face feature degradation [28] when finetuning or need long training cycles on huge amounts of images when trained from scratch.

CLIP densification methods arise as a low-cost alternative for producing pixel-level image-text features while keeping CLIP frozen [13, 12, 28, 36, 2, 37]. The seminal MaskCLIP [13] mimics the global pooling layer of CLIP with a 1×1 conv layer. The aggregation of features from multiple views and crops [36, 38, 12, 28] also leads to dense features, yet with the additional cost of multiple forward passes. Some methods [39, 40, 26] rely on codebooks of visual prototypes per concept, including per-dataset negative prototypes [26], or leverage self-self attention to create groups of similar tokens [37]. The recent CLIP-DINOiser [2] improves MaskCLIP features with limited computational overhead thanks to a guided pooling strategy which leverages correlation information from DINO features [25].

Prompt augmentation. Prompt engineering is a common practice for adapting Large Language Models (LLMs) to different language tasks [41] without updating parameters. This strategy of carefully selecting task-specific prompts also improves the performance of VLMs. For instance, in the original CLIP work [4], dataset-specific prompt templates, e.g., “a photo of the nice {}“ were devised towards improving zero-shot prediction performance. Although effective, manual prompting can be a laborious task as templates must be adapted per dataset and must be sufficiently general to apply to all classes, limiting fine-grained accuracy. Different automated strategies have been subsequently explored, e.g., scoring and ensembling predictions from multiple prompts [42]. Prompts can also be augmented by exploiting semantic relations between concepts defined in WordNet [43] to generate new coarse/fine-grained [44] or synonym [45] prompts. LLMs can be used as a knowledge base to produce rich visual descriptions adapted for each class starting from simple class names [46, 47]. Prompt features can be learned by taking into account visual co-occurrences [48], a connection between training and test distributions [49], mining important features for the VLM [50] or by test-time tuning on a sample [51]. Most of these strategies have been designed and evaluated for the image classification task and their generalization and scalability for semantic segmentation is not always trivial. Here we aim to obtain better prompts for semantic segmentation to separate queried object pixels from their background. We do this automatically without changing the parameters of either the text encoder or the image encoder, by leveraging statistics from VLM training data or LLM-based knowledge.

Dealing with contrastive concepts in OVSS. Our contrastive concept discovery is tightly related to *background handling* in the context of open-vocabulary semantic segmentation since the standard benchmark datasets for this task, originally designed for supervised learning, use *background* to describe unlabeled pixels, e.g., covering concepts outside of the dataset vocabulary. There are three main types of approaches to address this issue. The first one is to threshold the uncertain predictions [1, 11, 14] with a given probability value [14, 11] or clip similarities [1]. The second group of methods leverages the object-centric nature of certain datasets by defining background through visual saliency,

leveraging an external foreground/background segmentation model to discard the background [12, 2]. Finally, a significant body of work addresses the same issue by defining dataset-level concepts either by adding handcrafted names of concepts to the background definition [52, 18, 15, 19] or by extracting visual *negative prototypes* with a large diffusion model [26]. In contrast, in this work, we aim for automatic discovery of contrastive concepts without any prior access to the vocabulary used for the annotation of the dataset.

Visual grounding. is the task of localizing within images specific objects from text descriptions. The major instances of visual grounding tasks are *referring segmentation* that produce pixel-level predictions for one [53–55] or multiple target objects [56] given a text description, and *referring expression comprehension* [57–60] that detects objects. Similarly to referring segmentation, we aim to segment precisely specific objects defined by the user. In contrast, we do not use supervision to align textual descriptions with object masks, do not focus on text-described relations between objects and mine contrastive concepts to disentangle target objects from the background.

3 Improving segmentation with test-time contrastive concepts

We consider here the following segmentation task: given an image and a set of textual queries characterizing different visual concepts, the goal is to label all pixels in the image corresponding to each concept, leaving out unrelated pixels, if any. *Our work is to study how existing segmentation methods may support this task.* In particular, we are interested in the ability to generalize well to unseen datasets [61]. That is, we not only want to be open-vocabulary regarding the choice of words for querying, we also want to be open-world, i.e., not specialized to a given set of categories, implicitly or explicitly (e.g., when evaluating on a specific dataset).

3.1 Closed-world vs open-world open-vocabulary semantic segmentation

Even if open-vocabulary, traditional semantic segmentation is *close-world* in the following sense. Given an RGB image $\mathbf{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 3}$ and a set of textual queries $q \in Q$, semantic segmentation yields a map $\mathbf{S}_{\text{closew}} : H \times W \mapsto Q$, where each image pixel has to be assigned one of the queries as label.

In contrast, *open-world* segmentation considers an extra label ‘ \perp ’ to represent any visual concept that is different from the queries. The segmentation map in this case is then $\mathbf{S}_{\text{openw}} : H \times W \mapsto Q \cup \{\perp\}$. For instance, to label a boat, it is enough to ask for the “boat” segment; other pixels (sky, sea, sand, rocks, trees, swimmers, etc.) are to be labelled ‘ \perp ’.

Our proposals for open-world segmentation are described below. Meanwhile, in our comparative study, we use the following close-world open-vocabulary segmentation framework. A CLIP-like textual encoder noted $\phi_T(\cdot)$ is used to extract textual features $\phi_T(q) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for each query q , where d is the feature dimension. Different segmentation methods then have their own ways of generating patch-level features $\phi_V(\mathbf{I}) \in \mathbb{R}^{w \times h \times d}$, where $\phi_V(\cdot)$ denotes a CLIP-like visual encoder, $w = W/P$, $h = H/P$, and P is the patch size. We then compute the cosine similarities between each of the query features and the patch feature (thus after L2-normalization), which we use as logits when upsampling to finally obtain pixel-level predictions.

3.2 Test-time Contrastive Concepts (CC)

We mentioned in the introduction the ambiguity of representation between different visual concepts due to co-occurrences at training time. One of the keys to separating such concepts in a segmentation scenario is to *contrast* them at test time.

If ambiguous visual concepts are part of the queries Q , they are “naturally” separated at segmentation time thanks to the closest-feature principle. However, a problem arises if a visual concept in a query $q \in Q$ can be mistaken with another visual concept present in the image but not being queried (e.g., querying “boat” but not “sea”). In this case, we propose to use one or more additional textual queries of visual concepts that are likely to contrast well with q . We name such concepts *contrastive concepts* and note them \mathcal{CC}_q . Although this formulation generalizes to several queries Q , with contrastive concepts \mathcal{CC}_Q , we focus on $|Q| = 1$ in the following. In this context, to segment a query q , given contrastive concepts \mathcal{CC}_q , we simply segment $\{q\} \cup \mathcal{CC}_q$ in the close-world segmentation framework, and then remap to label ‘ \perp ’ the pixels assigned to \mathcal{CC}_q to ignore them.

In recent works [1, 2, 12], the word “background” has been used as a generic contrastive concept to help separate foreground objects from their background. We note this setup $\mathcal{C}^{BG} = \{\text{“background”}\}$ and discuss in the next section why such a simple word contrasts well with benchmarked classes.

3.3 Why does $\mathcal{C}^{BG} = \{\text{“background”}\}$ work?




Figure 2: **Statistics about “background” in metadata of web-crawled datasets.** (a) Frequency of some of the concepts from VOC dataset in Laion400M caption samples. Examples of images in web-crawled data with a caption including the words “background” (b) or “in the background” (c).

In this section we study why using the single word “background” as contrastive concept, i.e., $\mathcal{C}^{BG} = \{\text{“background”}\}$, achieves good results [1, 2]. Notably, if the word feels natural to us, it is not obvious why it should work in CLIP space. In fact, this formulation is not contextual in that the contrastive concept is not specific to the query, which might be suboptimal. Offering a single concept to contrast with could also be suboptimal. Worse, the “background” samples that CLIP learned from could accidentally include the visual concept of the query, which could make the query representation close to the background representation and defeat the contrast mechanism.

We investigate the occurrence of “background” in VLM training data. First, we use the metadata provided by the authors of [62], which describe the representation of four thousand common concepts in LAION-400M [63] (a subset of the web-crawled LAION-2B dataset [64] used to train CLIP). We plot in Fig. 2a the frequency of occurrence of “background”, compared to the occurrence of class names of VOC. We observe that the word is significantly more frequent than all others, hinting that the word is widely available not only in CLIP training data but also in web-crawled data in general.

We also show in Fig. 2b images sampled from the LAION training set that have a caption containing “background”. We observe that they display high diversity in colours and textures. Images captioned with “in the background” (Fig. 2c) appear to be more photo-oriented and are also highly diverse. We believe that the combination of a high frequency of the “background” word in the dataset and the diversity of associated images make it a good contrastive concept. However state-of-the-art results have been obtained by leveraging well-designed tricks [12, 2, 1, 11] to handle the background, showing the need to something more than just “background” as a contrastive concept.

3.4 Mining co-occurrence-based contrastive concepts \mathcal{C}^D

We have just discussed using the word “background” as a contrastive concept, which appears frequently, but not systematically, in VLM training data. However, we argue here that it is possible to *mine* better and more precise contrastive concepts from the VLM training data, which are specific to a query q . To that end, we propose to use *co-occurrence* information to find contrastive concepts \mathcal{C}_q^D , which are typically described in captions alongside the query concept q . This approach relies on the offline construction of a *co-occurrence dictionary*, which is built for a large list of concepts \mathcal{T} extracted from the training data.

Co-occurrence extraction. We consider a set of textual concepts \mathcal{T} extracted from the captions of the VLM training dataset and construct the co-occurrence matrix $X \in \mathbb{N}^{|\mathcal{T}| \times |\mathcal{T}|}$. Concretely, two

concepts $\{i, j\} \subset \mathcal{T}$ co-occur if they appear simultaneously in the caption of an image. $X_{i,j}$ counts the number of times concepts $\{i, j\}$ co-occur in some images. Last, we normalize the symmetric matrix X row-wise by the number of occurrences of concept i in the dataset, producing the frequency matrix \hat{X} . We then consider only concepts with frequent co-occurrences: for each $i \in \mathcal{T}$, we select concepts $\mathcal{T}_i = \{j \in \mathcal{T} \mid \hat{X}_{i,j} > \gamma\}$, for some frequency threshold γ ($= 0.01$ in all our experiments).

Concept filtering. To improve the quality of selected contrastive concept \mathcal{T}_i , we design a simple filtering pipeline. For each target concept $i \in \mathcal{T}$ (which may be thought of as a future query), we remove from \mathcal{T}_i any concept that might interfere with i and induce false negatives. First, we discard uninformative words that appear in captions: {"image", "photo", "picture", "view"}. Then, we remove *abstract* concepts, such as "liberty". To do so, we ask an LLM whether a given word can be visible or not in an image (more details in Appendix Sec. 6.3.2). We also filter out concepts that are too semantically similar to target concept i , e.g., such that their cosine similarity with $\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(i)$ is more than a threshold δ ($= 0.8$ in all experiments).

Generalization to arbitrary concepts. We discussed so far how to select contrastive concepts \mathcal{CC}_i^D for a target concept $i \in \mathcal{T}$. Now when we are given an arbitrary textual query q , to make the generation of contrastive concepts truly open-vocabulary, we first find in CLIP space the nearest neighbour i of q in \mathcal{T} and then use for q the contrastive concepts of i : $\mathcal{CC}_q^D = \mathcal{CC}_i^D$.

3.5 Prompting an LLM to generate contrastive concepts \mathcal{CC}^L

Instead of extracting contrastive concepts from the VLM training set, we investigate here another strategy, which is generating them using an LLM. For a given text query q , we ask an LLM to directly generate contrastive concepts \mathcal{CC}_q^L , without the need for subsequent filtering. To that end, we design a prompt that tries to avoid producing words that are synonyms, meronyms (e.g., "wing" for "plane") or possible contents (e.g., "wine" for "bottle"). This prompt is partially reproduced below (more details in the Appendix Sec. 6.3.2).

Given an input object O, I want you to generate a list of words related to objects that can be surrounding input object O in an image to help me perform semantic segmentation.

[... In-context examples ...]

You should not generate synonyms of input object O, **nor parts** of input object O.

Generate a list of objects surrounding the input object \mathcal{T} **without any synonym nor parts, nor content** of it. Answer with a list of words.

Using an LLM has the benefit of allowing us to produce specific contrastive concepts \mathcal{CC}_q for any target query q . However, the cost to run an LLM, even a small one (in our case a Mixtral-8x7B Instruct), is high and unlikely to fit on small devices.

3.6 Generalizing to several concept queries

The above discussion is formulated for a single concept query $Q = \{q\}$. To generalize to any number of simultaneous queries Q , with $|Q| > 1$, we consider the union of contrastive concepts \mathcal{CC}_q for each query q , however removing contrastive concepts that are too similar to queries, i.e., with a cosine similarity above β : $\mathcal{CC}_Q = \bigcup_{q \in Q} \{q' \in \mathcal{CC}_q \mid \phi_{\mathcal{T}}(q') \cdot \phi_{\mathcal{T}}(q) \leq \beta\}$. Open-world multi-query segmentation is then just segmenting $Q \cup \mathcal{CC}_Q$ and ignoring pixels not assigned to queries, as in the single query case.

4 Experiments

In this section, we present our experimental setup (Sec. 4.1) and the background handling strategies of baselines (Sec. 4.2). Then, in Sec. 4.3, we discuss our finding, ablate our method in Sec. 4.4, and produce visualizations in Sec. 4.5.

4.1 Experimental setup

Baselines. In our study, we consider several state-of-the-art methods for OVSS. We study two training-free methods, which directly exploit CLIP-backbone, namely GEM [11] and MaskCLIP [13]. We investigate the generalization of our contrastive concepts generation when considering the application of MaskCLIP to different OpenCLIP [65] backbones pre-trained either on LAION [64], MetaCLIP [6], or WIT400M [4] dataset. All compared methods use a *frozen* CLIP ViT-B/16. We further discuss the background handling strategies in the Appendix Sec. 6.1.1.

\mathcal{CC} generation. For \mathcal{CC}^D generation, we use the metadata extracted by [62]. In particular, we use the gathered statistics for four thousand common concepts in the LAION-400M dataset, which is a subset of LAION-2B [64] and used to train CLIP [4]. We filter contrastive concepts using a low co-occurrence threshold $\gamma = 0.01$ and a high CLIP similarity threshold $\delta = 0.8$. In multiple queries scenario, we use a threshold $\beta = 0.9$ to account for possible similarities between one query and contrastive concepts corresponding to other queries from a set. We discuss the values selection in Appendix Sec. 6.2.1. When generating \mathcal{CC}^L , we use the recent Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct model [66]. More details about the setup can be found in Appendix Sec. 6.3.1 alongside our designed prompts in Appendix Sec. 6.3.2. In our experiments, if not stated otherwise we use $\mathcal{CC}_t^D \leftarrow \{\text{“background”}\} \cup \mathcal{CC}_t^D$ and $\mathcal{CC}_t^L \leftarrow \{\text{“background”}\} \cup \mathcal{CC}_t^L$.

Evaluation datasets. We conduct our experiments on six datasets widely used for the task of zero-shot semantic segmentation [1], namely VOC [21], Context [22], COCO-Stuff [67], COCO-Object [67], Cityscapes [23], and ADE20K [24]. The object-centric datasets VOC and COCO Object have typically been evaluated considering or not the “background” class. Additionally to our new metric described below, we evaluate results with the standard mIoU metric. We also follow the protocol of [1] detailed in Appendix Sec. 6.1.

Our IoU-single metric. To better evaluate the capabilities of methods to localize a visual concept *when provided with no other information*, we propose IoU-single metric. It consists in using the classic mIoU, but this time considering one concept at a time. Indeed, we iterate over the depicted classes for each dataset image and provide each existing class one at a time, therefore always with $|\mathcal{Q}| = 1$. We give a more intuitive illustration of our metric in Appendix Fig. 5. If a dataset contains a *background* class, we do not consider it in the mIoU calculation.

4.2 Lack of generalization of the baselines

Before presenting the benefit of using co-occurrent concepts, we first discuss the lack of generalizability of the current background handling strategies used in recent works [2, 1, 11].

Limitations of the objectness. The authors of CLIP-DINOiser [2] propose a foreground/background saliency generation to handle the segmentation of the “background”. However, such saliency segmentation strategy is derived from FOUND [68], which aims at discovering the *foreground objects* and therefore discards any pixel that “falls in the background” in their definition, but which might depict the queried concepts. The image in the inset presents such a failure case: the mountain (in green) is discarded because falling in the background.



Sensitive thresholds. On the other hand, we have observed that the thresholding approach of TCL, which simply consists of keeping pixels with a similarity to the query concept above a certain threshold, can hurt performances when the number of queried concepts increases. In GEM, the thresholding is applied on the softmax probabilities therefore not applicable in the case of a single queried concept.

4.3 Contrastive concepts generation results

We present in Tab. 1 results obtained with our metric IoU-single on three different datasets, namely ADE20k, Cityscapes, and VOC. We compare results when using various types \mathcal{CC} proposed in this work.

Method	CLIP training data	VOC			Cityscapes				ADE20k			
		'BG'	CC^L	CC^D	oracle	'BG'	CC^L	CC^D	oracle	'BG'	CC^L	CC^D
MaskCLIP [13]	WIT400M	44.2	52.2	53.4	30.6	15.0	22.5	22.1	29.8	20.2	23.5	25.2
DINOiser [2]	Laion2B	59.4	63.2	64.8	36.0	23.0	30.7	27.4	35.3	27.1	29.5	31.5
TCL [1]	[1]	52.9*	52.6*	54.5*	29.7	9.8	26.2	22.0	32.6	14.9*	25.9	26.5
GEM [11]	MetaCLIP	48.7*	59.9	60.6	20.6	21.2*	21.4	14.4	33.0	23.4*	26.1	28.9

Table 1: **Results with IoU-single.** We present results on VOC, Cityscapes and ADE20k with our metric IoU-single (Sec. 4.1). We note with '*' when the original background handling is applied (provided it gives the best results). We note "BG" when using CC^D . We report results with an 'oracle' corresponding to using the in-domain classes of the specific datasets (except VOC, which are too sparse and give bad performances).

Method	M.CLIP				Method	Cityscapes		ADE20k		CLIP tr. dataset	CLIP tr. dataset		
	TCL	DINOi	GEM			CC^L	\cup 'BG'	CC^L	\cup 'BG'		'BG'	CC^L	CC^D
no filtering	20.0	22.4	23.9	22.7	MaskCLIP	22.3	22.5	22.5	23.5	Laion2B	47.9	51.8	53.8
+ <i>abstract</i>	20.9	23.2	25.5	23.6	DINOiser	30.3	30.7	27.5	29.5	WIT400M	44.2	52.2	53.4
+ <i>sem. similar</i>	25.2	26.0	31.5	28.9	TCL	26.0	26.2	25.4	25.9	MetaCLIP	46.8	50.6	50.0
					GEM	21.3	21.4	25.7	26.1				

(a) **Impact of the filtering** in CC^D .

(b) **Adding "background"** to CC^L .

(c) **Different backbones.**

Table 2: **Ablation studies** under IoU-single. (a) We study the cumulative impact of filtering steps when considering different methods on the ADE20k dataset. 'M.CLIP' stands for MaskCLIP and 'DINOi' for DINOiser. (b) We investigate the impact of combining the LLM contrastive concepts to the "background", noted ' \cup BG'. (c) We ablate MaskCLIP [13] performance with different CLIP pre-training datasets on VOC.

Moreover, we consider an *oracle*, which uses the in-domain dataset classes as contrastive concepts and gives us a possible upper bound. We do not report it on VOC as its classes do not cover the 'stuff' pixels. We additionally report results on three more datasets in Appendix Tab. 7.

In all cases, we observe significant improvement when using generated contrastive concepts w.r.t. the "background" baseline. For both VOC and ADE20k datasets, the co-occurrence-based CC^D outperforms LLM-based CC^L , with a margin varying from 0.6 pt on ADE20k with TCL to 2.8 pts with GEM. Interestingly, CC^L gives the best results on Cityscapes for all methods. This may suggest that LLM can yield better results for more domain-specific tasks.

Finally, the *oracle* results show that there is still room for improvement for most of the methods. Yet, the *oracle* results also point out that, in the ideal scenario of having access to all the classes present on an image, there exists a clear limitation in the CLIP space that can only be pushed forward by improving text prompting rather than segmentation techniques themselves.

Additionally, we present results with the standard mIoU in Tab. 3 for MaskCLIP ('M.CLIP') and CLIP-DINOiser ('DINOi') both with Laion2B backbone. We study different contrastive concepts (CC) and background handling strategies (Bkg.). We observe that in all cases the results produced using CC^D and CC^L are on par with results obtained with the saliency (noted 'sal.[2]'). We show more results in Appendix (Tab. 6).

Method	Bkg.	CC	Object VOC	
M.CLIP	CC	CC^{BG}	17.8	35.1
	CC	CC^L	25.9	46.2
	CC	CC^D	25.0	46.5
DINOi	sal.[2]		34.8	62.1
	CC	CC^{BG}	29.5	54.0
	CC	CC^L	35.0	60.7
	CC	CC^D	34.0	61.5

Table 3: **Results w/ mIoU.**

4.4 Ablation studies

In this section, we discuss different ablation studies presented in Tab. 2.

CC^D filtering. In Tab. 2a, we analyze the impact of the different filtering steps discussed in 3.4 on the ADE20k dataset under IoU-single. We observe that each step helps improve results by removing *noisy concepts*. The largest boost is observed when filtering the *abstract concepts* (“abstract”) and highly *semantic similarity* (“sem similar”). We also note that the improvement is consistent for all the methods.

Adding “background”. In Tab. 2b, we study the influence of adding “background”, noted “U‘BG”, to the set of contrastive concepts CC^L generated with the LLM. We observe that the overall impact of the “background” is not significant, yet still yields better performance up to 2 IoU-single pts on ADE20k.

Generalizability to other pre-training datasets. Tab. 2c shows the results of MaskCLIP with different pre-training datasets used to train CLIP. We observe that using CC^D always gives a boost over using “background” alone across all pre-training datasets, including highly-curated MetaCLIP. However, we notice that for MetaCLIP, CC^L gives better results suggesting that leveraging LLMs can yield better results for backbones with carefully curated pre-training datasets.

4.5 Qualitative results

We present in Fig. 3 some qualitative examples when using different contrastive concepts proposed in this work. We compare CC^L and CC^D with the ground truth (GT) and baseline CC^{BG} . For both CC^L and CC^D , we present the output segmentation mask for the single queried concept (noted *pred*) as well as the overall semantic map produced with all contrastive concepts (denoted *all*). We observe that the output masks produced by our methods are more accurate and indeed remove the noise from related concepts, e.g. “tree” for the bird or “sofa” for the “bed”.




Figure 3: **Qualitative results.** We show the examples from ADE20K (top row) and Context (bottom row) and the segmentation masks produced by CLIP-DINOiser. For CC^D and CC^L , we additionally show the segmentation of contrastive classes (all).

Generalization to arbitrary concepts. We present in Fig. 4 results when prompting queries which are not included in the subset of concepts \mathcal{T} (extracted from the VLM training dataset), such as “muffin” or “cavalier” (dog breed). We show the closest neighbour for the query q below each example and visualize masks for MaskCLIP as well as CLIP-DINOiser. We observe that the CC^D generation method leveraging statistics from pre-training datasets is also robust to examples outside of vocabulary by accurately mapping q to its closest concept in \mathcal{T} , e.g., “cavalier” mapped to “dog”.




Figure 4: **In the wild examples.** We visualize results for MaskCLIP and CLIP-DINOiser for query concepts beyond \mathcal{T} . The closest neighbour to a query is presented below each example (grey row).

5 Conclusions and limitations

Conclusions. In this work, we identify limitations of the current evaluation setup for open-vocabulary semantic segmentation tasks which are inherited from close-world evaluation benchmarks. To bridge the gap between close- and open-world setups, we propose the single-class segmentation scenario. We study the limitations of current state-of-the-art models when we assume no prior access to in-domain classes and propose to automatically discover contrastive concepts \mathcal{C} that are useful to better localize any queried concept. To do so, we employ two different strategies and leverage either the distribution of co-occurrences in the VLM’s training set or use an LLM to generate such \mathcal{C} . Our results show the generalizability of our proposed method across several setups. Our analysis reveals some of the other shortcomings of the currently accepted evaluation protocol for OVSS, i.e., limitations of using class names as they are for concept queries, which we leave for future work.

Limitations. In this work, we leverage statistics extracted from the training set of CLIP. Despite its known data-collection problems, CLIP trained with LAION [63] is still widely adopted. Therefore, we also base our analysis on LAION dataset by leveraging the thorough work of [62] and their metadata.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Centre of Science (Poland) Grant No. 2022/45/B/ST6/02817 and by the grant from NVIDIA providing one RTX A5000 24GB used for this project. We would also like to thank the authors of [62] for sharing their metadata.

References

- [1] Junbum Cha, Jonghwan Mun, and Byungseok Roh. Learning to generate text-grounded mask for open-world semantic segmentation from only image-text pairs. In *CVPR*, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 15, 16, 17
- [2] Monika Wysoczańska, Oriane Siméoni, Michaël Ramamonjisoa, Andrei Bursuc, Tomasz Trzciniński, and Patrick Pérez. CLIP-DINOiser: Teaching CLIP a few DINO tricks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.12359*, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 15, 16, 17
- [3] Jingyi Zhang, Jiaying Huang, Sheng Jin, and Shijian Lu. Vision-language models for vision tasks: A survey. *TPAMI*, 2024. 1

- [4] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *ICML*, 2021. 1, 3, 7
- [5] Xiaohua Zhai, Basil Mustafa, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. Sigmoid loss for language image pre-training. In *ICCV*, 2023. 1, 3
- [6] Hu Xu, Saining Xie, Po-Yao Huang, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Russell Howes, Shang-Wen Li, Vasu Sharma, Gargi Ghosh, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. Demystifying clip data. In *ICLR*, 2024. 7
- [7] Alex Fang, Albin Madappally Jose, Amit Jain, Ludwig Schmidt, Alexander Toshev, and Vaishaal Shankar. Data filtering networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17425*, 2023. 1
- [8] Alberto Baldrati, Marco Bertini, Tiberio Uricchio, and Alberto Del Bimbo. Effective conditioned and composed image retrieval combining CLIP-based features. In *CVPR*, 2022. 1
- [9] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. BLIP: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *ICML*, 2022. 1
- [10] Yiren Jian, Chongyang Gao, and Soroush Vosoughi. Bootstrapping vision-language learning with decoupled language pre-training. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023. 1
- [11] Walid Bousselham, Felix Petersen, Vittorio Ferrari, and Hilde Kuehne. Grounding everything: Emerging localization properties in vision-language transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00878*, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 15, 16
- [12] Monika Wysoczanska, Michael Ramamonjisoa, Tomasz Trzcinski, and Oriane Simeoni. Clip-diy: Clip dense inference yields open-vocabulary semantic segmentation for-free. In *WACV*, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 16
- [13] Chong Zhou, Chen Change Loy, and Bo Dai. Extract free dense labels from clip. In *ECCV*, 2022. 1, 3, 7, 8, 15, 16, 17
- [14] Jiarui Xu, Shalini De Mello, Sifei Liu, Wonmin Byeon, Thomas Breuel, Jan Kautz, and Xiaolong Wang. Groupvit: Semantic segmentation emerges from text supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.11094*, 2022. 1, 3, 15, 16
- [15] Kanchana Ranasinghe, Brandon McKinzie, Sachin Ravi, Yinfei Yang, Alexander Toshev, and Jonathon Shlens. Perceptual grouping in contrastive vision-language models. In *ICCV*, 2023. 1, 3, 4
- [16] Huaishao Luo, Junwei Bao, Youzheng Wu, Xiaodong He, and Tianrui Li. SegCLIP: Patch aggregation with learnable centers for open-vocabulary semantic segmentation. In *ICML*, 2023. 1
- [17] Jishnu Mukhoti, Tsung-Yu Lin, Omid Poursaeed, Rui Wang, Ashish Shah, Philip HS Torr, and Ser-Nam Lim. Open vocabulary semantic segmentation with patch aligned contrastive learning. In *CVPR*, 2023. 1, 3
- [18] Qihang Yu, Ju He, Xueqing Deng, Xiaohui Shen, and Liang-Chieh Chen. Convolutions die hard: Open-vocabulary segmentation with single frozen convolutional CLIP. In *NeurIPS*, 2023. 1, 4
- [19] Seokju Cho, Heeseong Shin, Sunghwan Hong, Anurag Arnab, Paul Hongsuck Seo, and Seungryong Kim. CAT-Seg: Cost aggregation for open-vocabulary semantic segmentation. In *CVPR*, 2024. 4
- [20] Jiarui Xu, Sifei Liu, Arash Vahdat, Wonmin Byeon, Xiaolong Wang, and Shalini De Mello. ODISE: Open-Vocabulary Panoptic Segmentation with Text-to-Image Diffusion Models. *CVPR*, 2023. 1
- [21] M. Everingham, L. Van Gool, C. K. I. Williams, J. Winn, and A. Zisserman. The PASCAL Visual Object Classes Challenge 2012 (VOC2012) Results. 1, 2, 7

- [22] Roozbeh Mottaghi, Xianjie Chen, Xiaobai Liu, Nam-Gyu Cho, Seong-Whan Lee, Sanja Fidler, Raquel Urtasun, and Alan Yuille. The role of context for object detection and semantic segmentation in the wild. In *CVPR*, 2014. 7
- [23] Marius Cordts, Mohamed Omran, Sebastian Ramos, Timo Rehfeld, Markus Enzweiler, Rodrigo Benenson, Uwe Franke, Stefan Roth, and Bernt Schiele. The cityscapes dataset for semantic urban scene understanding. In *CVPR*, 2016. 7
- [24] Bolei Zhou, Hang Zhao, Xavier Puig, Tete Xiao, Sanja Fidler, Adela Barriuso, and Antonio Torralba. Semantic understanding of scenes through the ade20k dataset. *IJCV*, 2019. 1, 7
- [25] Mathilde Caron, Hugo Touvron, Ishan Misra, Hervé Jégou, Julien Mairal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Emerging properties in self-supervised vision transformers. In *ICCV*, 2021. 2, 3
- [26] Laurynas Karazija, Iro Laina, Andrea Vedaldi, and Christian Rupprecht. Diffusion models for zero-shot open-vocabulary segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09316*, 2023. 2, 3, 4
- [27] Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *ICML*, 2021. 3
- [28] Krishna Murthy Jatavallabhula, Alihusein Kuwajerwala, Qiao Gu, Mohd Omama, Tao Chen, Shuang Li, Ganesh Iyer, Soroush Saryazdi, Nikhil Keetha, Ayush Tewari, et al. Conceptfusion: Open-set multimodal 3d mapping. In *RSS*, 2023. 3
- [29] Golnaz Ghiasi, Xiuye Gu, Yin Cui, and Tsung-Yi Lin. Scaling open-vocabulary image segmentation with image-level labels. In *ECCV*, 2022. 3
- [30] Feng Liang, Bichen Wu, Xiaoliang Dai, Kunpeng Li, Yanan Zhao, Hang Zhang, Peizhao Zhang, Peter Vajda, and Diana Marculescu. Open-vocabulary semantic segmentation with mask-adapted clip. In *CVPR*, 2023. 3
- [31] Quande Liu, Youpeng Wen, Jianhua Han, Chunjing Xu, Hang Xu, and Xiaodan Liang. Open-world semantic segmentation via contrasting and clustering vision-language embedding. In *ECCV*, 2022. 3
- [32] Jilan Xu, Junlin Hou, Yuejie Zhang, Rui Feng, Yi Wang, Yu Qiao, and Weidi Xie. Learning open-vocabulary semantic segmentation models from natural language supervision. In *CVPR*, 2023. 3
- [33] Yongming Rao, Wenliang Zhao, Guangyi Chen, Yansong Tang, Zheng Zhu, Guan Huang, Jie Zhou, and Jiwen Lu. Denseclip: Language-guided dense prediction with context-aware prompting. In *CVPR*, 2022. 3
- [34] Jian Ding, Nan Xue, Gui-Song Xia, and Dengxin Dai. Decoupling zero-shot semantic segmentation. In *CVPR*, 2022. 3
- [35] Boyi Li, Kilian Q Weinberger, Serge Belongie, Vladlen Koltun, and Rene Ranftl. Language-driven semantic segmentation. In *ICLR*, 2022. 3
- [36] Ahmed Abdelreheem, Ivan Skorokhodov, Maks Ovsjanikov, and Peter Wonka. Satr: Zero-shot semantic segmentation of 3d shapes. In *ICCV*, 2023. 3
- [37] Walid Bousselham, Felix Petersen, Vittorio Ferrari, and Hilde Kuehne. Grounding everything: Emerging localization properties in vision-language transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00878*, 2023. 3
- [38] Justin Kerr, Chung Min Kim, Ken Goldberg, Angjoo Kanazawa, and Matthew Tancik. Lerf: Language embedded radiance fields. In *ICCV*, 2023. 3
- [39] Gyungin Shin, Weidi Xie, and Samuel Albanie. Reco: Retrieve and co-segment for zero-shot transfer. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 3

- [40] Gyungin Shin, Weidi Xie, and Samuel Albanie. Namedmask: Distilling segmenters from complementary foundation models. In *CVPRW*, 2023. 3
- [41] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 3
- [42] James Urquhart Allingham, Jie Ren, Michael W Dusenberry, Xiuye Gu, Yin Cui, Dustin Tran, Jeremiah Zhe Liu, and Balaji Lakshminarayanan. A simple zero-shot prompt weighting technique to improve prompt ensembling in text-image models. In *ICML*, 2023. 3
- [43] Christiane Fellbaum. *WordNet: An electronic lexical database*. MIT press, 1998. 3
- [44] Yunhao Ge, Jie Ren, Andrew Gallagher, Yuxiao Wang, Ming-Hsuan Yang, Hartwig Adam, Laurent Itti, Balaji Lakshminarayanan, and Jiaping Zhao. Improving zero-shot generalization and robustness of multi-modal models. In *CVPR*, 2023. 3
- [45] Yuqi Lin, Minghao Chen, Wenxiao Wang, Boxi Wu, Ke Li, Binbin Lin, Haifeng Liu, and Xiaofei He. Clip is also an efficient segmenter: A text-driven approach for weakly supervised semantic segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15305–15314, 2023. 3
- [46] Sarah Pratt, Rosanne Liu, and Ali Farhadi. What does a platypus look like. In *ICCV*, 2023. 3
- [47] Sachit Menon and Carl Vondrick. Visual classification via description from large language models. In *ICLR*, 2023. 3
- [48] Tanmay Gupta, Alexander Schwing, and Derek Hoiem. Vico: Word embeddings from visual co-occurrences. In *ICCV*, 2019. 3
- [49] Zehao Xiao, Jiayi Shen, Mohammad Mahdi Derakhshani, Shengcai Liao, and Cees GM Snoek. Any-shift prompting for generalization over distributions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10099*, 2024. 3
- [50] Reza Esfandiarpour, Cristina Menghini, and Stephen H Bach. If clip could talk: Understanding vision-language model representations through their preferred concept descriptions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16442*, 2024. 3
- [51] Manli Shu, Weili Nie, De-An Huang, Zhiding Yu, Tom Goldstein, Anima Anandkumar, and Chaowei Xiao. Test-time prompt tuning for zero-shot generalization in vision-language models. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 3
- [52] Yuqi Lin, Minghao Chen, Kaipeng Zhang, Hengjia Li, Mingming Li, Zheng Yang, Dongqin Lv, Binbin Lin, Haifeng Liu, and Deng Cai. Tagclip: A local-to-global framework to enhance open-vocabulary multi-label classification of clip without training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.12828*, 2023. 4
- [53] Ronghang Hu, Marcus Rohrbach, and Trevor Darrell. Segmentation from natural language expressions. In *ECCV*, 2016. 4
- [54] Henghui Ding, Chang Liu, Suchen Wang, and Xudong Jiang. Vlt: Vision-language transformer and query generation for referring segmentation. *TPAMI*, 2023.
- [55] Zhaoqing Wang, Yu Lu, Qiang Li, Xunqiang Tao, Yandong Guo, Mingming Gong, and Tongliang Liu. Cris: Clip-driven referring image segmentation. In *CVPR*, 2022. 4
- [56] Chang Liu, Henghui Ding, and Xudong Jiang. Gres: Generalized referring expression segmentation. In *CVPR*, 2023. 4
- [57] Xinpeng Chen, Lin Ma, Jingyuan Chen, Zequn Jie, Wei Liu, and Jiebo Luo. Real-time referring expression comprehension by single-stage grounding network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.03426*, 2018. 4
- [58] Jiajun Deng, Zhengyuan Yang, Tianlang Chen, Wengang Zhou, and Houqiang Li. Transvg: End-to-end visual grounding with transformers. In *ICCV*, 2021.

- [59] Yue Liao, Si Liu, Guanbin Li, Fei Wang, Yanjie Chen, Chen Qian, and Bo Li. A real-time cross-modality correlation filtering method for referring expression comprehension. In *CVPR*, 2020.
- [60] Shilong Liu, Zhaoyang Zeng, Tianhe Ren, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Jie Yang, Chunyuan Li, Jianwei Yang, Hang Su, Jun Zhu, et al. Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for open-set object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05499*, 2023. 4
- [61] Jianzong Wu, Xiangtai Li, Shilin Xu, Haobo Yuan, Henghui Ding, Yibo Yang, Xia Li, Jiangning Zhang, Yunhai Tong, Xudong Jiang, et al. Towards open vocabulary learning: A survey. *T-PAMI*, 2024. 4
- [62] Vishaal Udandarao, Ameya Prabhu, Adhiraj Ghosh, Yash Sharma, Philip H. S. Torr, Adel Bibi, Samuel Albanie, and Matthias Bethge. No "zero-shot" without exponential data: Pretraining concept frequency determines multimodal model performance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04125*, 2024. 5, 7, 10
- [63] Christoph Schuhmann, Richard Vencu, Romain Beaumont, Robert Kaczmarczyk, Clayton Mullis, Aarush Katta, Theo Coombes, Jenia Jitsev, and Aran Komatsuzaki. LAION-400M: Open dataset of CLIP-filtered 400 million image-text pairs. In *NeurIPS*, 2021. 5, 10
- [64] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade W Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, Patrick Schramowski, Srivatsa R Kundurthy, Katherine Crowson, Ludwig Schmidt, Robert Kaczmarczyk, and Jenia Jitsev. LAION-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. In *NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2022. 5, 7
- [65] Gabriel Ilharco, Mitchell Wortsman, Ross Wightman, Cade Gordon, Nicholas Carlini, Rohan Taori, Achal Dave, Vaishal Shankar, Hongseok Namkoong, John Miller, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Ali Farhadi, and Ludwig Schmidt. Openclip, July 2021. 7, 15
- [66] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de Las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Bour, Guillaume Lample, L lio Renard Lavaud, Lucile Saulnier, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Sandeep Subramanian, Sophia Yang, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Th ophile Gervet, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth e Lacroix, and William El Sayed. Mixtral of experts. *CoRR*, abs/2401.04088, 2024. 7, 18
- [67] Holger Caesar, Jasper Uijlings, and Vittorio Ferrari. Coco-stuff: Thing and stuff classes in context. In *CVPR*, 2018. 7
- [68] Oriane Sim oni, Chlo e Sekkat, Gilles Puy, Anton n Vobeck y,  loi Zablocki, and Patrick P rez. Unsupervised object localization: Observing the background to discover objects. In *CVPR*, 2023. 7, 15
- [69] MMSegmentation Contributors. MMSegmentation: Openmmlab semantic segmentation toolbox and benchmark, 2020. 15
- [70] Soravit Changpinyo, Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, and Radu Soricut. Conceptual 12m: Pushing web-scale image-text pre-training to recognize long-tail visual concepts. In *CVPR*, 2021. 16
- [71] Karan Desai, Gaurav Kaul, Zubin Aysola, and Justin Johnson. RedCaps: Web-curated image-text data created by the people, for the people. In *NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks*, 2021. 16
- [72] Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, Sebastian Goodman, and Radu Soricut. Conceptual captions: A cleaned, hypernymed, image alt-text dataset for automatic image captioning. In *ACL*, 2018. 16
- [73] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *CVPR*, 2009. 16

6 Appendix

6.1 Evaluation protocol

In all experiments, we follow the evaluation protocol of [1]. We use MMSegmentation [69] implementation with a sliding window strategy and resizing input images to have a shorter side of 448. We also do not perform text expansions of the class names and use only the standard ImageNet prompts following [65, 14, 13].

6.1.1 Background handling of baselines

We detail here the different strategies employed in [11, 1, 2] to handle the background. TCL [1] applies thresholding and considers pixels with maximal logits ≤ 0.5 to be in the background. GEM [11] applies a background handling strategy, by thresholding the normalized logits, only for the VOC dataset and does not consider background otherwise. Therefore, we explore GEM performance both with and without background handling and report each time the better score. MaskCLIP [13] does not use any dedicated mechanism for background therefore we do not report the original setup for it. CLIP-DINOiser [2] leverages a foreground/background saliency strategy which focuses on foreground pixels. In that case, the foreground/background is defined following FOUND [68] which focuses on objectness and mainly discards pixels corresponding to ‘stuff’ that we might want.

6.1.2 About the metric




Figure 5: Illustration of our metric.

We present in Fig. 5 an illustration of our proposed metric `IoU-single`. We illustrate the difference between the standard `mIoU` metric (dataset-driven `mIoU`), where all the concepts present on an image are considered at once. On the contrary, our `IoU-single` considered each of the present concepts separately to measure the single-class segmentation abilities of current open vocabulary semantic segmentation methods.

6.2 More quantitative results

6.2.1 Hyperparameter selection

In this section, we discuss the hyperparameter selection for our `CC` generation. For γ and δ , we randomly select 100 images from the training set of the ADE20K dataset and report `IoU-single` on this subset — which we observe was enough to select the values. We report in Tab. 4 a parameter study of both hyperparameters and mark in grey selected values, i.e., $\gamma = 0.01$ and $\delta = 0.8$. For γ , we observe that values $\gamma < 0.005$ are too low, most likely introducing too much noise in selected contrastive concepts.

We also present a parameter study for β in Tab. 5. Here, we randomly select 100 images of VOC training set and report classic `mIoU` for different β values. We select $\beta = 0.9$ as it gives the best result for most methods. We also note that controlling the similarity between query concepts and

Method	CLIP tr. data	values of γ					values of δ				
		0.001	0.005	0.01	0.015	0.02	0.95	0.9	0.85	0.8	0.75
MaskCLIP [13]	WIT400M	24.4	26.0	24.8	24.4	23.2	19.9	21.0	23.0	24.4	22.8
	Laion2B	25.8	27.8	27.4	26.0	25.4	23.0	24.1	26.4	27.4	24.6
	MetaCLIP	22.0	24.1	24.4	23.8	23.4	22.7	23.7	25.9	27.2	23.7
DINOiser [2]	Laion2B	24.4	27.2	27.9	27.9	27.7	23.5	24.6	26.4	27.9	26.9

Table 4: **Parameter study of γ and δ .** Selection (marked in grey) of the hyperparameters γ and δ with IoU-single on 100 images randomly selected in ADE20k training dataset.

contrastive concepts in the multiple-query scenario is necessary. Not including this step (see results for $\beta = 1.0$) highly degrades performance.

Method	CLIP tr. data	1.0	0.95	0.9	0.85	0.8
MaskCLIP [13]	WIT400M	26.0	40.4	41.1	39.1	32.1
	Laion2B	35.3	43.7	44.0	44.6	42.2
	MetaCLIP	24.4	39.1	40.3	34.3	30.6
DINOiser [2]	Laion2B	51.3	57.8	58.6	58.8	55.2
TCL	[1]	37.2	47.6	47.7	47.1	47.7

Table 5: **Selection of β with classic mIoU** on 100 images randomly selected in VOC training dataset. We report results when using \mathcal{CC}^L .

6.2.2 State-of-the-art results under classic mIoU

Methods	Background handling	Type of \mathcal{CC}	CLIP backbone	Training dataset	Dataset		
					Context	Object	VOC
GroupViT [14]	threshold	\emptyset	scratch	CC12M [70]+RedCaps [71]	18.7	27.5	50.4
CLIP-DIY [12]*	saliency-[12]	\emptyset	Laion2B	-	19.7	31.0	59.9
TCL [1]	threshold	\emptyset	WIT400M	CC12M [70]+CC3M [72]	24.3	30.4	51.2
MaskCLIP [13] [1]	\emptyset	\emptyset	WIT400M	-	21.1	15.5	29.3
MaskCLIP*	\emptyset	\emptyset	Laion2B	-	22.9	16.4	32.9
MaskCLIP* †	\emptyset	\emptyset	Laion2B	-	24.0	21.6	41.3
CLIP-DINOiser [2]	\emptyset	\emptyset	Laion2B	ImageNet [73] (1k im.)	32.4	29.9	53.7
GEM [11]	\emptyset	\emptyset	MetaCLIP	-	-	-	46.8
CLIP-DINOiser [2]	saliency[2]	\emptyset	Laion2B	ImageNet [73] (1k im.)	-	34.8	62.1
	\mathcal{CC}	\mathcal{CC}^{BG}	Laion2B	ImageNet [73] (1k im.)	32.4	29.5	54.0
	\mathcal{CC}	\mathcal{CC}^L	Laion2B	ImageNet [73] (1k im.)	31.3	35.0	60.7
	\mathcal{CC}	\mathcal{CC}^D	Laion2B	ImageNet [73] (1k im.)	31.8	39.9	61.5
MaskCLIP	\mathcal{CC}	\mathcal{CC}^{BG}	Laion2B	-	23.6	17.8	35.1
	\mathcal{CC}	\mathcal{CC}^L	Laion2B	-	22.5	25.9	46.2
	\mathcal{CC}	\mathcal{CC}^D	Laion2B	-	23.2	25.0	46.5
GEM	threshold	\emptyset	MetaCLIP	-	33.4	27.4*	46.6*
GEM	\mathcal{CC}	\mathcal{CC}^L	MetaCLIP	-	31.8	34.9	58.0
GEM	\mathcal{CC}	\mathcal{CC}^D	MetaCLIP	-	32.4	34.9	60.6

Table 6: **Results with standard mIoU metric** when employing different contrastive concept generation strategies.

We report in Tab. 6 the results under the classic mIoU metric for selected state-of-the-art methods on open-vocabulary semantic segmentation. For each of the methods we detail the specific background handling techniques (if applied), CLIP backbone used as well as additional datasets used for the training. We notice that extending the dataset vocabulary with our generated contrastive concepts does not hurt the overall performance under a normal setup when all dataset labels are considered as

prompts. For GEM and MaskCLIP we observe significant improvements over their original setups for VOC dataset. This holds for both contrastive concept generation methods $\mathcal{C}C^D$ and $\mathcal{C}C^L$. Looking at the results of CLIP-DINOiser we observe that saliency is still more effective in the object-centric scenario.

Method	CLIP dataset	Original	'oracle'	w/ 'BG'	w/ $\mathcal{C}C^L$	w/ $\mathcal{C}C^D$
VOC21						
MaskCLIP [13]	Laion2B	–	49.9	47.9	51.8	53.8
	WIT400M	–	47.1	44.2	52.2	53.4
	MetaCLIP	–	47.9	46.8	50.6	50.0
DINOiser [2]	Laion2B	63.8*	61.2	59.4	63.2	64.8
TCL [1]	[1]	52.9*	53.0*	52.9*	52.6*	54.5*
GEM	MetaCLIP	–	–	48.7*	59.9	60.0
Cityscapes						
MaskCLIP [13]	Laion2B	–	32.2	16.2	27.2	24.0
	WIT400M	–	30.6	15.0	22.5	22.1
	MetaCLIP	–	30.0	13.6	24.9	23.2
DINOiser [2]	Laion2B	20.8*	36.0	23.0	30.7	27.4
TCL [1]	[1]	18.6*	29.7	9.8	26.2	22.0
GEM	MetaCLIP	–	20.6	21.2*	21.4	14.4
COCO-Stuff						
MaskCLIP [13]	Laion2B	–	34.1	26.4	28.8	29.5
	WIT400M	–	33.6	24.1	28.5	28.8
	MetaCLIP	–	34.0	25.8	27.9	27.9
DINOiser [2]	Laion2B	28.0*	35.3	32.2	33.4	34.1
TCL [1]	[1]	25.0*	34.7	17.4	29.5	30.6
GEM	MetaCLIP	–	38.3	22.9*	32.2	33.6
ADE20k						
MaskCLIP [13]	Laion2B	–	33.2	22.7	26.8	27.8
	WIT400M	–	29.8	20.2	23.5	25.2
	MetaCLIP	–	32.1	21.5	24.7	26.0
DINOiser [2]	Laion2B	28.8*	35.3	27.1	29.5	31.5
TCL [1]	[1]	14.8*	32.6	14.9*	25.9	26.5
GEM	MetaCLIP	–	33.0	23.4*	26.1	28.9
COCO Object						
MaskCLIP [13]	Laion2B	–	32.1	27.8	33.7	32.9
	WIT400M	–	31.3	24.3	34.4	33.3
	MetaCLIP	–	30.9	27.3	32.0	31.0
DINOiser [2]	Laion2B	38.8*	38.9	35.2	40.8	39.6
TCL [1]	[1]	37.2*	37.9	37.1*	38.1*	37.2*
GEM	MetaCLIP	–	–	31.6	39.0	40.1
Pascal Context						
MaskCLIP [13]	Laion2B	–	40.5	34.4	35.2	37.4
	WIT400M	–	41.1	32.9	33.7	36.8
	MetaCLIP	–	41.1	32.6	34.1	35.7
DINOiser [2]	Laion2B	33.9*	45.8	41.3	41.3	44.0
TCL [1]	[1]	29.7*	41.7	29.7*	36.8	38.2
GEM	MetaCLIP	–	–	27.0	40.1	42.0

Table 7: Results on VOC with our metric IoU-single defined in Sec. 4.1. ‘*’ denotes the result when the original background handling gives the best results. "w/ BG" denotes using only “background” as the contrastive concept.

6.2.3 More results

Tab. 7 presents results obtained with the metric IoU-single on all datasets studied.

6.3 Prompting the LLM

We provide in this section more details about the LLM and the prompts used.

6.3.1 The LLM model

We use the recent Mixtral-8x7B-Instruct model [66] a sparse mixture of experts model (SMoE), finetuned for instruction following, released by Mistral AI. In particular, we rely on the v0.1 version of its open weights available via Hugging Face transformers library. We run the LLM in 4-bit precision with flash attention to speedup inference.

6.3.2 The prompts

We provide below the prompts used to generate the contrastive concepts \mathcal{C}^L as well as those used to predict whether a concept can be seen in an image or not in order to filter \mathcal{C}^D .

In the following prompts, we indicate the inserted input text as $\{q\}$. We follow Mixtral-8x7B Instruct’s prompt template. In particular, we use $\langle s \rangle$ as the beginning of the string (BOS) special token, as well as $[INST]$ and $[/INST]$ as string markers to be set around the instructions.

For the generation of \mathcal{C}^L , we also integrate a light post-processing step, ensuring that all generated lists have a unified format with coma separation. We do not apply a filtering or cleaning step to the LLM-generated results.

Contrastive concepts generation.

$\langle s \rangle$ [INST] You are a helpful AI assistant with visual abilities.
Given an input object O, I want you to generate a list of words related to objects that can be surrounding input object O in an image to help me perform semantic segmentation.
For example:
* If the input object is 'fork', you can generate a list of words such as '['"bottle", "knife", "table", "napkin", "bread"]'.
* If the input object is 'child', you can generate a list of words such as '['"toy", "drawing", "bed", "room", "playground"]'.
You should not generate synonyms of input object O, nor parts of input object O.
Generate a list of objects surrounding the input object $\{q\}$ without any synonym nor parts, nor content of it. Answer with a list of words.
No explanation.
Answer: [/INST]

Visible or not prediction.

$\langle s \rangle$ [INST] Please specify whether $\{q\}$ is something that one can see.
Reply with 'yes' or 'no' only. No explanation.
Answer: [/INST]

6.4 Parts removal via LLM-prompting

We also explore the possibility of removing suggested contrastive concepts that can be *parts* of query concepts. Note that in \mathcal{C}^L , we explicitly do it in the prompt itself. Fig. 6 presents one of such examples when removing “wheel” from the \mathcal{C}^D of query “bicycle” gives a slight improvement for MaskCLIP segmentation. However, we do not notice a particular improvement in the case of other segmentation methods, since typically they refine the masks or feature maps to include localization priors. For example, in Fig. 6, the second row presents the same example for CLIP-DINOiser (DINOiser), where the improvement is marginal. Finally, we observe little or no quantitative improvement when applying part removal filtering on entire datasets. Therefore, we do not include it in our final method.




Figure 6: **Parts removal.** We show an example of $q = \text{bicycle}$ from Pascal Context and the segmentation masks produced by MaskCLIP and CLIP-DINOiser for CC^D as well as for CC^D when parts of objects are removed ($CC^D - \text{parts}$).

For part prediction, we use the following prompt:

<s> [INST] You are a helpful AI assistant with visual abilities.
 Given an input object O, I want you to generate a list of words that are parts of an object O.
 For example:
 * If the input object is 'rabbit', you can generate a list of words such as '['paw', 'tail', 'fur', 'ears', 'muzzle']'.
 * If the input object is 'building', you can generate a list of words such as '['door', 'window', 'wall', 'hall', 'floor']'.
 Generate a list of parts of the input object $\{q\}$. Answer with a list of words. Do not give any word that is not a part of the input object. No explanation.
 Answer: [/INST]

6.5 Example of generated CC^L

We provide in Tab. 8 an exemplary result of CC^L for Cityscapes dataset.

Query t	CC^L
road	building, tree, car, pedestrian, sky, streetlight, sidewalk, bicycle, parked car, traffic sign
sidewalk	building, street, car, tree, people, bike, road, park, sky, lane
building	sky, tree, road, car, park, people, lane, fence, house, field
wall	door, window, floor, ceiling, painting, light, chair, table, carpet, curtain
fence	grass, tree, house, car, path, post, gate, field, flowers, animals
pole	building, wire, tree, street, sky, fence, cable, road, banner, light
traffic light	road, car, building, pedestrian, sky, streetlight, traffic sign, parking meter
traffic sign	road, street, pole, vehicle, building, sky, pedestrian, curb, lane, light
vegetation	soil, tree, grass, water, animal, fence, field, sky, rock, sun
terrain	tree, sky, building, road, mountain, river, field, fence, vehicle, person
sky	tree, building, cloud, sun, bird, airplane, mountain, sea, sunset, cityscape
person	bike, road, car, tree, building, park, cityscape, nature, animal, sports equipment
rider	bicycle, road, nature, park
car	road, tree, building, person, parking
truck	road, car, building, tree, parking
bus	road, tree, building, sky, person, car, traffic light, bicycle, parking meter, street sign
train	track, grass, sky, building, platform, tree, sign, person, car, road
motorcycle	road, person, bike, car, traffic, building, nature, parking, city, scenery
bicycle	road, tree, person, park, building, grass, basket, helmet, traffic, path

Table 8: Example of LLM-generated CC^L for Cityscapes.