

Abduction of Domain Relationships from Data for VQA

Al Mehdi Saadat Chowdhury, Paulo Shakarian

School of Computing and Augmented Intelligence
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona, USA
{achowd43, pshak02}@asu.edu

Gerardo I. Simari

DCIC Univ. Nac. del Sur (UNS)
ICIC (UNS-CONICET)
Bahia Blanca, Argentina
gis@cs.uns.edu.ar

In this paper, we study the problem of visual question answering (VQA) where the image and query are represented by ASP programs that lack domain data. We provide an approach that is orthogonal and complementary to existing knowledge augmentation techniques where we abduce domain relationships of image constructs from past examples. After framing the abduction problem, we provide a baseline approach, and an implementation that significantly improves the accuracy of query answering yet requires few examples.

1 Introduction

Visual Question Answering (VQA) is an AI task designed to reason about images. Commonly, the image is transformed into a “scene graph” that enables the deployment of more formal reasoning tools. For example, in recent work, both the scene graph and associated query were represented as an ASP Program [2, 1]; however, notably the scene graph itself only contains information about the scene, but lacks commonsense knowledge – in particular, knowledge about the domains of attributes identified by the scene. Existing work to address this shortcoming relies on leveraging large commonsense knowledge graphs for obtaining domain knowledge [5, 6, 7]. However, such approaches require the ability to accurately align the language of the knowledge graph with the language of the scene graph. Further, for some applications, this does not guarantee that the aligned knowledge graph will necessarily improve VQA performance (e.g., if domain knowledge relevant to the queries is not possessed in the knowledge graph). In this paper, we provide an orthogonal and complementary approach that leverages logical representations of the scene graph and query to abduce domain relationships that can improve query answering performance. We frame the abduction problem and provide a simple algorithm that provides a valid solution. We also provide an implementation and show on a standard dataset that we can improve question answering accuracy from 59.98% to 81.01%, and provide comparable results with few historical examples.

Motivating Example. Consider the simple scene graph depicted in Figure 1 and the query “*What is the color of the fruit to the right of the juice?*”. Without the shaded nodes (which indicate domain information external to the image) there is no attribute of any constant associated with *banana* that is associated with the domain *color* or the domain *fruit*. Hence, the only answer would be to assume that there is no fruit or the color information is not given, or randomly guess *large* (while not a color, it is an attribute) or *yellow*. In this paper, we will look to abduce these domain relationships from a limited number of examples.

2 Technical Preliminaries

We extend the framework of [2], which represents both images and queries as ASP programs (and the programs can be directly represented as an equivalent scene graph as shown in Figure 1). Their approach




Figure 1: An image (left) and a section of its corresponding scene graph (right). In the scene graph, square nodes represent objects, oval nodes represent attributes, and solid edges connect objects to attributes. Shaded nodes represent domain knowledge, connected to attributes by dashed edges.

to VQA leverages a neurosymbolic framework and was tested on synthetic datasets (e.g., CLEVR [4]) that involve limited objects and attributes. We seek to extend their results to real-world datasets such as GQA [3], which are more complex. We follow the logic programming construct as [2] in that we have logical facts representing the scene graphs (Π^I), the query to be answered (Π^Q), as well as standard “VQA helper” rules (Π^R).

We assume the existence of a first order logical language (constants \mathcal{C} , variables \mathcal{V} , predicates \mathcal{P}). Set \mathcal{C} has several subsets: objects (\mathcal{C}_{obj}), attributes (\mathcal{C}_{attr}), domains (\mathcal{C}_{dom}), and single choice questions ($\mathcal{C}_{sinChoice}$). Additionally, we will have a special binary predicate *assign* where the first argument is an attribute and the second is a domain. Every attribute can thus be associated with one or more domains via atom *assign*(a, d), meaning that attribute a has domain d . We will also define Answer Set Programming (ASP) rules in the usual manner; a rule with no body is a fact and a set of rules is a program. Given a program Π , the subset of facts in Π where the head is formed with *assign* is called the “domain relationships”, and denoted Π^D . Likewise, we assume programs representing an image and a query, Π^I and Π^Q , respectively, that do not contain domain relationships, and a common set of rules Π^R that answers the query using Π^I and Π^Q . Also, we shall use the standard ASP semantics based on interpretations [2], and use the notation $I \models \Pi$ to denote that interpretation I satisfies program Π . Further, we say that program $\Pi_1 \models \Pi_2$ (read “ Π_1 entails Π_2 ”) meaning that all interpretations that satisfy Π_1 also satisfy Π_2 .

In this work, we are primarily concerned with the case where there is a common Π^D for a collection of image-query program pairs (“examples”) denoted $\langle \Pi_1^I, \Pi_1^Q \rangle, \dots, \langle \Pi_n^I, \Pi_n^Q \rangle$. We may also know that a given $\langle \Pi_i^I, \Pi_i^Q \rangle$ is associated with some set of *ground truth* Π_i^{GT} . Due to the lack of domain knowledge, $\Pi_i^I \cup \Pi_i^Q \cup \Pi^R$ may not entail Π_i^{GT} . However if an oracle provides a correct Π^D , we have that $\Pi_i^I \cup \Pi_i^Q \cup \Pi^R \cup \Pi^D \models \Pi_i^{GT}$. We show an example of this case below taken from the scene graph dataset of [3] (depicted in Figure 1), which we also use in our experiments.

Example 2.1. Consider a program $\Pi_i = \Pi_i^I \cup \Pi_i^Q \cup \Pi^R$ that consists of the following scene representa-

tion Π_i^I , question representation Π_i^Q for the question “What is the color of the fruit to the right of the juice?”, and the set of rules Π^R common to all image-query program pairs:

$$\Pi_i^I = \begin{cases} ob(2317538, 51). & name(51, cup). & attr(51, glass). & attr(51, white). \\ ob(2317538, 54). & name(54, apple). & attr(54, round). & attr(54, red). \\ ob(2317538, 55). & name(55, banana). & attr(55, yellow). & attr(55, large). & rel(55, 57, right). \\ ob(2317538, 57). & name(57, juice). & attr(57, yellow). & rel(57, 55, left). \end{cases}$$

$$\Pi_i^Q = \begin{cases} scene(0, 2317538). & select(1, juice, 0). & relate(2, fruit, right, 1). \\ query(4, color, 3). & exit(5). \end{cases}$$

As in [2], our question representation Π_i^Q is structured so that each query part is organized sequentially, with the first argument of each predicate indicating order and the last argument showing dependency on prior results. This step-by-step approach along with Π^R aids in answering questions effectively:

$$\Pi^R = \begin{cases} r(T, OID) & :- & scene(T, S), ob(S, OID). \\ r(T, OID) & :- & select(T, ON, D), r(D, OID), name(OID, ON). \\ r(T, TID) & :- & relate(T, GC, R, D), r(D, OID), rel(TID, OID, R), name(TID, ON), \\ & & assign(ON, GC). \\ r(T, A) & :- & query(T, color, D), r(D, OID), attr(OID, A), assign(A, color). \\ result(RSLT) & :- & exit(T), r(T - 1, RSLT). \\ empty(AT) & :- & exit(T), not r(AT, _), AT = 0..T - 1. \end{cases}$$

For this question, the ground truth is the program:

$$\Pi_i^{GT} = \{ result(yellow). \}$$

However, due to the lack of atoms $assign(banana, fruit)$ and $assign(yellow, color)$, we see that, $\Pi_i \not\models \Pi_i^{GT}$. Now we assume that an oracle provides us with Π^D , as follows:

$$\Pi^D = \begin{cases} assign(glass, material). & assign(white, color). & assign(apple, fruit). \\ assign(round, shape). & assign(red, color). & assign(banana, fruit). \\ assign(yellow, color). & assign(large, size). & assign(juice, drink). \end{cases}$$

With the existence of this domain Π^D , now we have $\Pi_i \cup \Pi^D \models \Pi_i^{GT}$.

Fallback Rules. In this framework, where we may have an absent or partial Π^D , it is useful to have “fallback rules” of the form: $assign(att, default) \leftarrow \bigwedge_{att \in \mathcal{C}_{att} \setminus \{default\}} \neg assign(att, DOM)$. This assumes a special attribute constant “default” to which an object without an attribute falls back. The next example augments Example 2.1 with fallback rules:

Example 2.2. We assume additional fallback rules, added to Π^R , of the form:

$$r(T, A) \quad :- \quad query(T, color, D), r(D, OID), attr(OID, A), \\ \neg assign(A, color), assign(A, default).$$

Returning to our running example, assuming there is no $\{assign(yellow, color).\} \in \Pi^D$, adding fallback rules, we get the following Π^D :

$$\Pi^D = \begin{cases} assign(glass, material). & assign(white, color). & assign(apple, fruit). \\ assign(round, shape). & assign(red, color). & assign(banana, fruit). \\ assign(yellow, default). & assign(large, size). & assign(juice, drink). \end{cases}$$

Algorithm 1: FAST-DAP

Input : A set of programs $\mathbf{EX} = \{\langle \Pi_1^I, \Pi_1^Q \rangle, \dots, \langle \Pi_n^I, \Pi_n^Q \rangle\}$ where Π_i^I , and Π_i^Q correspond to scene and question representation; Common Rule Set Π^R with Fallback rules; Set of ground truths $\mathbf{GT} = \{\Pi_1^{GT}, \dots, \Pi_n^{GT}\}$.

Output: A hypothesis Π^D

- 1 $\Pi^D \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 2 **foreach** $\langle \Pi_i^I, \Pi_i^Q \rangle \in \mathbf{EX}$ **do**
- 3 **if** $\text{choose}(w, x, y) \in \Pi_i^Q$ **then** // w is the query type, x, y are possible answers
- 4 **if** $w \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{sinChoice}}$ **then**
- 5 **if** $\text{result}(x) \in \Pi_i^{GT}$ **then** $\Pi^D \leftarrow \Pi^D \cup \{\text{assign}(x, w).\}$
- 6 **else** $\Pi^D \leftarrow \Pi^D \cup \{\text{assign}(y, w).\}$
- 7 **else**
- 8 $\Pi^D \leftarrow \Pi^D \cup \{\text{assign}(x, w). \text{assign}(y, w).\}$
- 9 **if** $\Pi_i^I \cup \Pi_i^Q \cup \Pi^R \not\models \Pi_i^{GT}$ **then**
- 10 Pick the fact $\text{select}(i, c, j) \in \Pi_i^Q$ such that $\Pi_i^I \cup \Pi_i^Q \cup \Pi^R \models \text{empty}(i)$ and i is minimal
- 11 **if** *there does not exist* $\text{name}(_, c) \in \Pi_i^I$ **then** // c is then a general concept
- 12 Pick $c' \neq c$ such that $\text{name}(_, c') \in \Pi_i^I$ and $\Pi_i^I \cup \Pi_i^Q \cup \Pi^R \cup \{\text{assign}(c', c).\} \models \Pi_i^{GT}$
- 13 $\Pi^D \leftarrow \Pi^D \cup \{\text{assign}(c', c).\}$
- 14 $\text{support}_{c', c} += 1$
- 15 **return** $\{\text{assign}(c', c).\} \in \Pi^D$ with $\text{support}_{c', c} > \text{threshold}$

Abducting Domain Relationships. We now formalize our problem. Given examples $\mathbf{EX} = \{\langle \Pi_1^I, \Pi_1^Q \rangle, \dots, \langle \Pi_n^I, \Pi_n^Q \rangle\}$ with a common rule set Π^R (which may or may not include fallback rules) and corresponding ground truth $\mathbf{GT} = \{\Pi_1^{GT}, \dots, \Pi_n^{GT}\}$, then $\langle \mathbf{EX}, \mathbf{GT}, \Pi^R \rangle$ is a *domain abduction problem* (DAP).

Any Π^D containing only facts formed with *assign* in the head is a *hypothesis* for a DAP. A hypothesis Π^D is an *explanation* for DAP $\langle \mathbf{EX}, \mathbf{GT}, \Pi^R \rangle$ if and only if for all i we have $\Pi_i^I \cup \Pi_i^Q \cup \Pi^R \cup \Pi^D \models \Pi_i^{GT}$. However, when \mathbf{EX}, \mathbf{GT} are noisy (e.g., produced from a machine learning system) there may be no explanation; in such cases, we may be able to find a hypothesis Π^D that maximizes some accuracy or recall metric. For example, finding Π^D that maximizes $\frac{1}{|\mathbf{GT}|} |\{\Pi_i^{GT} \in \mathbf{GT} \text{ s.t. } \Pi_i^I \cup \Pi_i^Q \cup \Pi^R \cup \Pi^D \models \Pi_i^{GT}\}|$ (where $|\cdot|$ is set cardinality) would lead to maximized accuracy.

3 A Practical Heuristic Algorithm

In this section, we present a practical, heuristic algorithm for finding a DAP, that while is not guaranteed to maximize the accuracy of question answering, we show to perform very well in practice. There are several reasons as to why we adopt this more practical approach. First, in the general case, a brute-force approach is intractable. Second, even if it is possible to exactly optimize an accuracy metric as described in the previous section, it may still perform poorly when confronted with unseen data due to overfitting. Third, in some cases, the query itself can reveal portions of the ground truth. To address all of these issues, we introduce our practical heuristic algorithm FAST DAP (Algorithm 1). Regarding the first point, the algorithm is highly performant, requiring only one pass over all examples in \mathbf{EX} – this also allows for trivial parallelization. Second, we only add facts to Π^D that support a certain number of examples, which acts as a form of regularization; we then tune this threshold to maximize accuracy. To address the third

point, in lines 3–8 we utilize examples that provide domain information in the query itself (with two answers as in $choose(color, red, blue, 0)$ and with single answer as in $choose(healthy, apple, cake, 0)$), while we leverage the step-by-step nature of the ASP formulation of queries (following [2], see Example 2.1) to identify domain assignments that can satisfy the ground truth (lines 9-14).

4 Evaluation


We now report on the results of our experimental evaluation. We use the GQA dataset [3], allowing us to build on the results of [2], which uses the CLEVR [4] synthetic data. Note that we use ground truth ASP representations of the images and queries. We examine our practical heuristic in four different ways. First, we examine the accuracy improvements when employing FAST-DAP. Second, we examine its data efficiency (e.g., how many examples in **EX** are required to provide useful results). Third, we examine the sensitivity of the support threshold for elements of Π_D . Finally, we examine running time. We created our implementation in Python 3.11.7 and use the Clingo solver for the ASP engine. Experiments were run on an Apple M2 machine with a 10-core CPU, and 32GB of RAM. All computations were carried out using only the CPU (the system’s GPU was not used). We now present the results of each experiment.

Accuracy. We assess our approach’s accuracy against the baseline (no Π^D), evaluating improvements with and without fallback rules (FBR and No FBR), both utilizing FAST-DAP. For the baseline (no FAST-DAP), the ASP solver either provides an answer or returns “empty” if it cannot deduce one. On our test set (disjoint from the examples), the baseline accuracy across all question types was 59.98% without domain information. Incorporating domain information learned from the training set significantly boosted accuracy to 80.62% without fallback rules, and 81.01% with them. To gain deeper insights, we analyze specific question types, a subset of which is presented in Table 1. Some types, such as verification questions, show minimal dependence on domain categorization, while others rely more heavily on it. Additionally, certain questions require translating specific concepts into general terms (FAST-DAP, lines 9-14), like generalizing “banana” to “fruit” or “juice” to “drink.” In Table 1, all non-choice queries require such generalization.


Question Type	Baseline	FBR (Ours)	No FBR (Ours)
choose_activity	69.02	95.11	94.84
choose_color	89.80	93.48	93.21
choose_older	0	97.24	97.24
choose_rel	73.88	85.48	81.72
choose_vposition	96.27	94.98	94.93
and	94.25	91.93	91.83
verify_age	86.89	97.54	97.54
verify_color	95.71	96.58	96.44
verify_location	49.28	94.5	94.5
query	36.07	72.83	72.20

Table 1: Evaluation of answering questions. The “Baseline” column shows accuracy (in percentage) without learned domains, “FBR” shows accuracy with learned domains and fallback rules, and “No FBR” shows accuracy with domain atoms but without using fallback rules.

Data Efficiency. In this second experiment, we aimed to find the optimal sample size for learning do-



(a) Accuracy on the test set leveraging learned domains from different training subsets.



(b) Execution time of our algorithm for different sample sizes, run in parallel with identical settings.

Figure 2: Accuracy and running time on different training subsets.

Percentile	Threshold	Accuracy
10	12.3	79.44
20	20.6	79.79
30	30.9	79.89
40	46.4	80.10

Percentile	Threshold	Accuracy
50	59.5	80.54
60	90.8	80.02
70	121.2	79.75

Table 2: Accuracy results on the validation set after removing domains with support below a threshold.

main. We randomly divided the data as follows: 20% for training, 10% for validation, and the remaining 70% for testing. Instead of using the entire training set at once, we divided it into 11 progressively larger subsets as follows: the first subset served as a baseline model with no samples, the second subset contained 10% of the training data, the third subset included the first 10% plus an additional 10%, making up 20% of the training data, and this pattern continued until the 11th subset, which encompassed all the training data. Each training subset was used independently to learn the domains, and these learned domains were then used to predict the answers in the test set. Figure 2a illustrates the results, showing accuracy across the training data for two scenarios: the black line represents the learned domain without fallback rules, while the red line includes fallback rules. As depicted in Figure 2a, using just 10% of the training set (equivalent to 2% of the entire dataset) achieves a respectable accuracy of 78.93%. With 20% of the training data (4% of the entire dataset), accuracy exceeds 80%. This suggests that a small amount of data can effectively learn domains, with only slight accuracy gains from adding more data.

Threshold Sensitivity. FAST-DAP refines the learned domain set by removing domains whose support falls below a specified threshold. This approach helps regularize the outcome since the domains were derived from the application of possibly noisy data and rules. The threshold is a hyper-parameter determined from the validation set. We used the 10th to 70th percentile support values as potential thresholds. For each, we removed domains with lower support, assessed validation accuracy, and selected the threshold with the highest accuracy. Domains below this final threshold were then removed. Table 2 illustrates the accuracy achieved at different thresholds. Based on this data, we selected a threshold of 59.5, and domains with support below this value were excluded to form the final set of domains.

Running Time. The running time of our algorithm is primarily influenced by the performance of the ASP solver Clingo, and is directly proportional to the number of atoms it processes. Figure 2b illustrates

that the running time grows consistently from the base case with no training samples to the scenario where all training samples are used. Incorporating more training samples to learn domains substantially boosts the number of learned new domain atoms, thereby requiring Clingo to process more atoms during deduction. This necessity is the main factor driving the increase in running time. However, note that this increase is bounded by a constant factor related to the domain's size.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced a practical heuristic algorithm designed to infer domain relationships from a logical representation of data specifically for visual question answering. Our algorithm is highly efficient, requiring just a single pass over the data, and it significantly enhances accuracy compared to using a logical representation that does not leverage domain information. Despite its strong practical performance, an important limitation of our approach is that there are no theoretical guarantees for the solutions it obtains. A promising direction for future research focused on addressing this limitation is to refine our approach by incorporating meta-cognitive AI [8] techniques.

Acknowledgement

This research was funded by Army Research Office (ARO) grant W911NF-24-1-0007.

References

- [1] Kinjal Basu, Farhad Shakerin & Gopal Gupta (2020): *AQuA: ASP-Based Visual Question Answering*. In: *PADL*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 57–72, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-39197-3_4.
- [2] Thomas Eiter, Nelson Higuera, Johannes Oetsch & Michael Pritz (2022): *A neuro-symbolic ASP pipeline for visual question answering*. *TPLP* 22(5), pp. 739–754, doi:10.1017/S1471068422000229.
- [3] Drew A. Hudson & Christopher D. Manning (2019): *GQA: A New Dataset for Real-World Visual Reasoning and Compositional Question Answering*. In: *CVPR*, pp. 6693–6702, doi:10.1109/CVPR.2019.00686.
- [4] Justin Johnson, Bharath Hariharan, Laurens van der Maaten, Li Fei-Fei, C. Lawrence Zitnick & Ross Girshick (2017): *CLEVR: A Diagnostic Dataset for Compositional Language and Elementary Visual Reasoning*. In: *CVPR*, pp. 1988–1997, doi:10.1109/CVPR.2017.215.
- [5] Kenneth Marino, Mohammad Rastegari, Ali Farhadi & Roozbeh Mottaghi (2019): *OK-VQA: A Visual Question Answering Benchmark Requiring External Knowledge*. In: *CVPR*, pp. 3190–3199, doi:10.1109/CVPR.2019.00331.
- [6] Dustin Schwenk, Apoorv Khandelwal, Christopher Clark, Kenneth Marino & Roozbeh Mottaghi (2022): *A-OKVQA: A Benchmark for Visual Question Answering Using World Knowledge*. In: *ECCV*, Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, pp. 146–162, doi:10.1007/978-3-031-20074-8_9.
- [7] Peng Wang, Qi Wu, Chunhua Shen, Anthony Dick & Anton van den Hengel (2018): *FVQA: Fact-Based Visual Question Answering*. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 40(10), pp. 2413–2427, doi:10.1109/TPAMI.2017.2754246.
- [8] Hua Wei, Paulo Shakarian, Christian Lebiere, Bruce Draper, Nikhil Krishnaswamy & Sergei Nirenburg (2024): *Metacognitive AI: Framework and the Case for a Neurosymbolic Approach*, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2406.12147.