

The Devil is in the Distributions: Explicit Modeling of Scene Content is Key in Zero-Shot Video Captioning

Mingkai Tian¹ Guorong Li¹ Yuankai Qi² Amin Beheshti²
 Javen Qinfeng Shi³ Anton van den Hengel³ Qingming Huang¹

¹School of Computer Science and Technology, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences

²Macquarie University ³Australian Institute for Machine Learning, The University of Adelaide

liguorong@ucas.ac.cn

Abstract

Zero-shot video captioning requires that a model generate high-quality captions without human-annotated video-text pairs for training. State-of-the-art approaches to the problem leverage CLIP to extract visual-relevant textual prompts to guide language models in generating captions. These methods tend to focus on one key aspect of the scene and build a caption that ignores the rest of the visual input. To address this issue, and generate more accurate and complete captions, we propose a novel progressive multi-granularity textual prompting strategy for zero-shot video captioning. Our approach constructs three distinct memory banks, encompassing noun phrases, scene graphs of noun phrases, and entire sentences. Moreover, we introduce a category-aware retrieval mechanism that models the distribution of natural language surrounding the specific topics in question. Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our method with 5.7%, 16.2%, and 3.4% improvements in terms of the main metric CIDEr on MSR-VTT, MSVD, and VATEX benchmarks compared to existing state-of-the-art.

1. Introduction

The fact that video captioning remains a challenge, despite significant effort, reflects the inherent complexity of understanding video. Part of the specific problem with captioning is the vast difference between video and natural language as data forms. Video represents a voluminous stream of continuous pixel measurements, whereas natural language is a sequence of discrete symbols with a peculiar structure. Methods that directly model associations between modalities are vulnerable to missing the structure in either. This is visible in the fact that they are susceptible to generating captions that focus on a single scene element. We propose an approach that models the structure of scenes, and the spe-

cific language that describes them, at multiple scales in the hope that the resulting model might not be easily distracted.

Traditional supervised video captioning methods [19, 32, 35, 44] utilize an encoder-decoder architecture trained on large-scale, manually annotated video-text pairs. The encoder leverages pre-trained convolutional neural networks (e.g., ResNet [9], I3D [2], C3D [8]), while the decoder uses LSTMs [11] or Transformers [4, 15]. Despite achieving remarkable performance, their reliance on human-labeled data constrains real-world scalability.

To address these limitations, zero-shot video captioning has emerged as a promising direction, aiming to generate high-quality descriptions without relying on video-text pairs for training. Existing methods can be broadly categorized into two types: training-free approaches and those trained solely on text corpora. Training-free methods leverage pre-trained vision-language models (e.g., CLIP [26]) to guide pre-trained language models (e.g., GPT-2 [25], BERT [5]) in generating text during inference. For instance, Tewel *et al.* [31] employ randomly initialized pseudo-tokens and prefix prompts (e.g., “Video of”) to assist GPT-2 in generating new tokens. After generating a complete sentence, the model updates the pseudo-tokens based on the gradient derived from the CLIP cross-modal similarity. However, introducing visual supervision after token generation can lead to the language model’s priors dominating the captioning process, resulting in hallucinations unrelated to the video content.

The other line of work involves training a text decoder on pure text corpora. Textual units (e.g., nouns, noun phrases, complete sentences) are extracted from the training corpus to form various memory banks. During training, embeddings of these textual units serve as prefix prompts for the text decoder to reconstruct the original caption. At inference time, visual features are used to retrieve relevant textual semantic units from the memory bank via CLIP similarity, which are then fed into the text decoder. For exam-




Figure 1. Current zero-shot captioning methods are easily distracted. NP, SG, and EC denote noun phrase, scene graph (triplets are displayed as concatenated strings), and entire caption prompt, respectively. “Res” indicates the generated captions, with **correct** and **incorrect** words highlighted. In the top example, MultiCapCLIP [40] fails to capture the rider-motorcycle interaction as the prior does not model the distribution of subject-object interactions effectively. In the bottom example, MultiCapCLIP’s top- K retrieval strategy produces repetitive similar noun phrases and lacks person and environment information, because it fails to model either the structure of the scene or of natural language. DeCap [16] struggles to fully understand the video details due to its coarse-grained prompt of global caption embedding. By contrast, our method generates more accurate and comprehensive descriptions.

ple, MultiCapCLIP [40] constructs a memory bank of noun phrases and retrieves top- K elements as prefix prompts. DeCap [16], on the other hand, builds a memory bank of entire captions and uses a single token of global embedding as the prefix prompt. Other text-only trained zero-shot image captioning methods, such as MeaCap [42], create a memory bank of complete captions as well, retrieve the top- K relevant descriptions, and parse key entities to input into a pre-trained language model.

Despite the progress, the above-mentioned methods still face limitations in their prefix prompt construction and retrieval strategies. They often rely on single-granularity textual units, such as nouns, noun phrases, or complete sentences, as prompts, failing to fully exploit multi-granularity textual units to provide rich information for the language model. While noun phrases offer more attribute information than simple nouns, they lack interaction information between entities. In addition, the adopted global embeddings of complete sentences of existing methods may dilute fine-grained details. As illustrated in the top video example of Fig. 1, MultiCapCLIP fails to accurately capture the rider’s stunt action providing only noun phrase prompts,

while DeCap fails to identify the “motorcycle”. Furthermore, top- K retrieval strategies, which simply select the K most similar elements, tend to retrieve semantically repetitive textual units, reducing the diversity of the prompts and the accuracy of the generated captions. We provide such an example in Fig. 1 bottom, where MultiCapCLIP repetitively prompts with musical instrument phrases but neglects information about the person and the environment.

To address these challenges, we propose a novel progressive multi-granularity textual prompting strategy. We construct three distinct memory banks comprising noun phrases, scene graphs that incorporate noun phrases, and entire sentences, ensuring the text decoder receives comprehensive semantic cues. Existing parsers [17] typically extract scene graphs with noun-only nodes, while we propose a text-similarity-based approach to enhance initial scene graphs by incorporating noun phrases with additional attributes wherever possible. We further develop a category-aware retrieval mechanism with top- p filtering for noun phrases and scene graphs, ensuring both diversity and visual relevance. Fig. 1 shows the captions generated by our method.

The main contributions of our work are summarized as follows:

- We propose a progressive multi-granularity textual prompting strategy, providing the language model with comprehensive semantic information across varying levels of abstraction.
- We introduce a category-aware retrieval method with top- p post-processing for semantic units, enhancing the diversity and relevance of the prompts during inference.
- Extensive experiments on the MSR-VTT, MSVD, and VATEX benchmarks demonstrate the effectiveness of our method with 5.7%, 16.2%, and 3.4% CIDEr improvements over state-of-the-art methods.

2. Related Work

Zero-shot visual captioning research splits into two main categories. The first uses training-free methods, leveraging pre-trained language models to generate captions during inference. These methods either optimize internal contexts [30, 31] or design sampling strategies to align tokens with visual inputs [29, 41]. The second trains models on text-only corpora, reconstructing captions from semantic units like nouns or noun phrases [6, 16, 22, 39, 40, 42], mapping visual features to textual prompts for inference.

2.1. Frozen vs. Trainable Language Models

Training-free and text-only training approaches both rely on pre-trained language models (e.g., BERT [5], GPT-2 [25]) and vision-language models (e.g., CLIP [26]). Training-free methods keep these models frozen. ZeroCap [30] and its variant for zero-shot video captioning [31] employ GPT-2

to iteratively predict new textual tokens, with cross-modal similarity calculation using CLIP after each token is generated. Subsequently, the two methods use gradient descent to respectively optimize the *key-value* cache and the prefix pseudo-tokens. ConZIC [41] utilizes a pre-trained BERT-Base with bidirectional attention for Gibbs sampling. It further incorporates cross-modal matching scores from CLIP to determine each token finally. In contrast, text-only training approaches fine-tune the weights of a pre-trained language model like GPT-2 (e.g., CapDec [22], ViECap [6], EntroCap [39]) or CBART [10] (e.g., MeaCap [42]), or train transformers from scratch (e.g., DeCap [16], MultiCapCLIP [40]). Our approach trains a lightweight randomly initialized Transformer, demonstrating strong adaptability and favorable performance.

2.2. Textual Memory Bank

Text-only training methods for zero-shot visual captioning often employ a textual memory bank for efficient storage and rich semantics. ViECap [6] and EntroCap [39] utilize a memory bank of object class names from Visual Genome [14]. They concatenate embeddings of parsed nouns with global caption embeddings during training, and retrieve relevant nouns using CLIP during inference. DeCap [16] and MeaCap [42] build memory banks with all training captions, employing sentence-level and core noun embeddings as prefix prompts, respectively. MultiCapCLIP’s [40] memory bank is composed of the 1000 most frequent noun phrases parsed from training captions, allowing the decoder to generate sentences from concept prompts. However, existing methods have not fully explored the potential of textual semantic units as prompts, as nouns and noun phrases often lack action-related information, while global sentence embeddings tend to dilute finer details, leading to incomplete information for the language decoder. To address this, we construct three separate memory banks composed of noun phrases, scene graphs incorporating noun phrases, and entire sentences, applying a progressive multi-granularity prompting strategy to ensure comprehensive information for the language model, leading to excellent experimental performance.

3. Method

As shown in Fig. 2, our approach includes three key processes: (1) Memory Bank Construction (top-left): constructing memory banks at three progressive granularities from training captions (Sec. 3.1); (2) Training Process (top-right): retrieving prompts from memory banks using perturbed text embeddings (Sec. 3.2); (3) Inference Process (bottom): generating diverse, visually-relevant prompts via category-based retrieval with top- p refinement during inference (Sec. 3.3).

3.1. Multi-Granularity Memory Bank Construction

Our method constructs three distinct memory banks to capture progressive multi-granularity textual semantics, which are used to obtain prompts during the caption generation process: noun phrases, scene graphs incorporating noun phrases, and entire sentences.

Noun Phrase Memory Bank (\mathcal{M}_{NP}) Let \mathcal{S} represent the set of all captions in the training split. For each caption $S \in \mathcal{S}$, we identify all the noun phrases from S using SpaCy¹, forming a set $\mathcal{P}(S)$. We then aggregate all noun phrases from all captions into a single set. The complete set of noun phrases extracted from the training corpus is denoted as

$$\mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{P}(S). \quad (1)$$

We then rank the noun phrases in \mathcal{P} based on their frequency of occurrence and retain the top- N_p most frequent noun phrases to construct the noun phrase memory bank:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{NP}} = \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{N_p}\}, \quad (2)$$

where p_i denotes the i -th most frequent noun phrase. These noun phrases provide fundamental object-level semantics, serving as the basic building blocks of textual prompts.

Scene Graph Memory Bank (\mathcal{M}_{SG}) Scene graphs are crucial for capturing the relationships between entities within a video. To build the memory bank, we first utilize an off-the-shelf textual parser [17] to extract basic scene graphs from each caption. Initially, the results include triples of the $\langle \text{subject}, \text{predicate}, \text{object} \rangle$ form, such as $\langle \text{boy}, \text{play}, \text{basketball} \rangle$ for the sentence “A young boy is playing basketball”. We enhance the scene graph by transforming it from being based solely on nouns to incorporating noun phrases wherever possible. For the objects at the beginning and end of the initial scene graph, if attribute information exists in the caption, we include it in. In the example above, we identify “young boy” as a noun phrase and transform the initial scene graph into $\langle \text{young boy}, \text{play}, \text{basketball} \rangle$.

For the i -th basic scene graph $g_i = \langle \text{sub}_i, \text{pred}_i, \text{obj}_i \rangle$ extracted from the caption S , we first identify all noun phrases in $\mathcal{P}(S)$ that contain sub_i , and combine them with sub_i itself to form the set \mathcal{A}_i . Similarly, we form the set \mathcal{B}_i for obj_i . These sets are then used to create the enhanced scene graph set \mathcal{X}_i , where each enhanced graph is a triple of the form $\langle a, \text{pred}_i, b \rangle$, with $a \in \mathcal{A}_i$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}_i$. Next, with the embeddings of S and all of the enhanced scene graphs in \mathcal{X}_i , denoted as \mathbf{E}_S and $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{X}_i}$ respectively, all produced by BGE [37] (we encode a scene graph by encoding the string formed by concatenating the subject, predicate, and object with a single space), we calculate the cosine similarity between them. The enhanced scene graph x_{best} with the highest cosine similarity to S is selected as the final improved

¹<https://spacy.io>




Figure 2. We construct noun phrase memory bank \mathcal{M}_{NP} and scene graph memory bank \mathcal{M}_{SG} by parsing training captions, selecting high-frequency elements, and enhancing scene graphs with noun phrases to include more attribute information. The entire caption memory bank \mathcal{M}_{EC} contains all training captions. During training, following MultiCapCLIP [40], we retrieve top- K elements from memory banks using perturbed embedding \tilde{e} and train a text decoder to reconstruct the original text. During inference, we first classify \mathcal{M}_{NP} with GPT-4 [23] and \mathcal{M}_{SG} based on noun phrase categories, compute statistical priors, retrieve a diverse set of relevant noun phrase and scene graph elements using CLIP embeddings with top- p filtering and generate a weighted embedding from \mathcal{M}_{EC} using softmax similarity scores between video and caption features. Three types of prompt are transformed by respective FFNs and concatenated to generate the final caption.

representation of the original scene graph g_i . Finally, we collect the enhanced scene graphs from all captions and select the top- N_g most frequent to form the scene graph memory bank \mathcal{M}_{SG} . This is used to provide richer and more semantically informative prompts for caption generation.

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{SG}} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{N_g}\}, \quad (3)$$

where x_i denotes the i -th most frequent enhanced scene graph. We also provide a pseudocode description of the enhanced scene graph memory bank construction in the appendix.

Entire Caption Memory Bank (\mathcal{M}_{EC}) This memory bank provides holistic textual descriptions that help maintain linguistic coherence in the generated captions. It is simply composed of all captions in the training set.

These three memory banks—noun phrases, enhanced scene graphs, and entire sentences—serve as progressively richer textual representations of the visual content and are significant for guiding the caption generation process.

3.2. Training Procedure

Our training objective is to learn a text decoder that generates captions conditioned on multi-granularity prompts, while maintaining robustness to noise during cross-modal retrieval. The text decoder is constructed as a stack of Transformer-BASE [33] decoder blocks, each comprising

masked self-attention, cross-attention, and feed-forward network (FFN) components. The training process consists of the following four steps.

Step 1: Embedding Augmentation For each caption S_o , we first retrieve the most similar M captions from the training set, based on their cosine similarity to the CLIP sentence embedding $e(S_o)$. Among these M captions, we randomly select one, denoted as S_r . We use $e(S_r)$ and add Gaussian noise $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \lambda^2)$ to obtain a perturbed embedding \tilde{e} :

$$\tilde{e} = e(S_r) + \epsilon. \quad (4)$$

Step 2: Memory Bank Retrieval The perturbed embedding \tilde{e} is used to retrieve the top- K_p noun phrases and top- K_g scene graphs from \mathcal{M}_{NP} and \mathcal{M}_{SG} , respectively, based on the cosine similarity of CLIP embeddings. The representations of these retrieved elements are denoted as e_{NP} and e_{SG} .

Step 3: Prompt Construction e_{NP} , e_{SG} , and \tilde{e} are passed through individual FFNs and then concatenated as the prefix prompt for the text decoder. Specifically, the final prompt is given by:

$$\mathbf{P} = \text{Concat}(e'_{\text{NP}}, e'_{\text{SG}}, e_{\text{EC}}), \quad (5)$$

where e'_{NP} , e'_{SG} , and e_{EC} represent the transformed embeddings of the noun phrases, scene graphs, and the entire sentence, respectively.

Step 4: Teacher-Forced Decoding The model is trained using teacher forcing, and the goal is to minimize the cross-entropy loss:

$$\mathcal{L} = - \sum_{t=1}^T \log p(y_t | y_{<t}, \mathbf{P}; \theta), \quad (6)$$

where y_t is the target word of sentence S_o at time step t , and θ represents the model parameters.

3.3. Inference with Category-Aware Retrieval

During inference, we utilize a specialized strategy for prompt generation, combining category-aware retrieval with top- p post-processing, to ensure diverse and relevant textual prompts for accurate and expressive video captions.

3.3.1. Noun Phrase Prompt Generation

The inference begins with generating prompts from \mathcal{M}_{NP} , involving noun phrase classification, relevant candidates retrieval based on statistical priors, and refinement with a top- p mechanism. Specifically, the retrieval step employs statistical priors tailored to the in-domain and cross-domain settings, respectively, and is discussed separately below.

Classification with GPT-4 For the noun phrase memory bank \mathcal{M}_{NP} , we apply GPT-4 [23] to automatically classify the noun phrases into different categories. The classification is completely unsupervised, allowing GPT-4 to determine the optimal categories for the noun phrases. Once the classification is completed, all noun phrases are assigned to one of the predefined categories, such as singular people, object, place, etc. Distribution details are provided in the appendix.

In-Domain Retrieval with Statistical Priors To adaptively determine hyperparameters (e.g., the number of most relevant elements to select per-category) and obviate manual configuration during the categorized retrieval process, we initially compute in-domain statistical priors. For a video from the training video set \mathcal{V} , unique noun phrases from its corresponding captions form a set \mathcal{P}_V . For each category κ with noun phrases $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{\text{NP}}$, we compute two statistics: a probability of occurrence, $p_\kappa = \frac{N_\kappa}{|\mathcal{V}|}$, where N_κ is the number of videos containing at least one noun phrase in \mathcal{P}_κ , and $|\mathcal{V}|$ is the total number of training set videos; and an average frequency, $\mu_\kappa = \frac{N_\kappa^{\mathcal{P}}}{N_\kappa}$, where $N_\kappa^{\mathcal{P}}$ is the total count of noun phrases parsed from the training corpus that overlap with \mathcal{P}_κ . This process is formalized in Algorithm 1.

Next, for a test video $V = \{f_t\}_{t=1}^T$, we compute frame-level cosine similarity between its CLIP visual features $\phi(f_t)$ and text embeddings $\mathbf{e}(n)$ of noun phrase $n \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa$. The video-phrase similarity s_n is derived by averaging frame-level scores. We retrieve the top- $\text{round}(\mu_\kappa)$ noun phrases from \mathcal{P}_κ based on s_n , and retain all of them with probability p_κ . The retained noun phrases across all categories are aggregated into a set Y .

Algorithm 1: Category-based Statistics Computation

Input: \mathcal{V} : Training videos; \mathcal{P}_κ : Noun phrases of category κ

Output: μ_κ, p_κ : Average number of noun phrases per video and category probability

- 1 $N_\kappa \leftarrow 0, N_\kappa^{\mathcal{P}} \leftarrow 0;$
- 2 **for** $V \in \mathcal{V}$ **do**
- 3 Parse captions of V to extract noun phrases \mathcal{P}_V ;
- 4 $\mathcal{P}_V \leftarrow$ Remove duplicates from \mathcal{P}_V ;
- 5 **if** $\mathcal{P}_V \cap \mathcal{P}_\kappa \neq \emptyset$ **then**
- 6 $N_\kappa \leftarrow N_\kappa + 1;$
- 7 $N_\kappa^{\mathcal{P}} \leftarrow N_\kappa^{\mathcal{P}} + |\mathcal{P}_V \cap \mathcal{P}_\kappa|;$
- 8 **end**
- 9 **end**
- 10 $p_\kappa \leftarrow \frac{N_\kappa}{|\mathcal{V}|}, \mu_\kappa \leftarrow \frac{N_\kappa^{\mathcal{P}}}{N_\kappa};$
- 11 **return** p_κ, μ_κ

Cross-Domain Retrieval with Statistical Priors In the cross-domain scenario, visual features of the target domain are leveraged to retrieve textual units from memory banks constructed from the source domain. These retrieved prompts are subsequently fed into the text decoder pre-trained on the source domain to generate captions. We compute category statistics using only the source domain training captions \mathcal{S} . For each category κ , we compute the total count of noun phrases parsed from the training corpus that belong to the category’s noun phrase set \mathcal{P}_κ , denoted as N_κ . We designate the category with the minimum count N_κ as the base category, with its corresponding count denoted as b . Then, for each category κ , we retrieve $r_\kappa = \text{round}(N_\kappa/b \cdot B)$ noun phrases, where B is a pre-defined base retrieval number. We adopt the same cross-modal similarity computation method as in the in-domain setting and aggregate the top- r_κ most relevant elements from each category into a set Y .

Top- p Refinement To balance relevance and diversity, we refine Y using a top- p strategy [12]: we normalize the similarities between the video and all noun phrases in Y into a probability distribution $\{\hat{s}_n | n \in Y\}$, sort Y in descending order of \hat{s}_n , and select the smallest subset $Y' \subseteq Y$ whose cumulative probability $\sum_{n \in Y'} \hat{s}_n$ reaches a predefined threshold τ . We encode Y' using CLIP text encoder to obtain the noun phrase prompt $\mathbf{e}(Y')$ of test video V .

3.3.2. Scene Graph Prompt Generation

For the scene graph prompt generation, we follow a pipeline similar to the previous section: Scene graphs in \mathcal{M}_{SG} are classified by pairing the categories of their subject and object noun phrases (e.g., “People_{pred}.Object” in Fig. 2). Noun phrases not in \mathcal{M}_{NP} are assigned to the category of their nearest neighbor in \mathcal{M}_{NP} based on BGE embedding similarity. Then, we computed the statistical priors analo-

gously to the noun phrase case and aggregate the retrieved items into a set Z . Finally, top- p filtering is applied to Z , and the filtered result is encoded with CLIP’s text encoder to produce the scene graph prompt $e(Z')$.

3.3.3. Entire Caption Prompt Generation

For the entire caption prompt, we compute the similarity between each video and each global caption embedding in \mathcal{M}_{EC} as in DeCap [16], then apply softmax to obtain weights, and finally generate a single prompt token e_c by weighted summation.

3.3.4. Integrating Prompts and Generating Captions

$e(Y')$, $e(Z')$, and e_c are processed by their respective FFNs and concatenated into a sequence, which is fed into our text decoder to generate the final caption for V .

4. Experiments

We begin by introducing the datasets, evaluation metrics, and implementation details in Sec. 4.1. Sec. 4.2 presents comprehensive comparisons with existing methods on in-domain zero-shot video captioning, wherein the model undergoes both training and evaluation on the same dataset. Sec. 4.3 further evaluates our method on cross-domain scenario, using a source domain corpus for training and a target domain dataset for evaluation. Sec. 4.4 conducts ablation studies to validate the effectiveness of our core design and the scalability of our model. Finally, Sec. 4.5 provides qualitative visualizations that intuitively demonstrate the superior performance of our model.

4.1. Experimental Setups

Datasets We evaluate our method on three video-text datasets: MSR-VTT [38], MSVD [3], and VATEX [36]. MSR-VTT includes 10,000 web videos, split into 6,513 training, 497 validation, and 2,990 testing videos. MSVD contains 1,970 YouTube clips, divided into 1,200 training, 100 validation, and 670 testing videos. VATEX comprises over 30,000 videos, and we use 25,006 clips for training, and 2,893 and 5,792 video clips for validation and testing respectively following MultiCapCLIP [40]. Experiments on VATEX concentrate exclusively on the English corpus.

Evaluation Metrics Following the common practice, we evaluate the caption quality with four metrics, including BLEU@4 (B@4) [24], METEOR (M) [1], ROUGE-L (R) [18] and CIDEr (C) [34]. Among them, the **CIDEr** is specifically designed to evaluate captioning systems and better captures human judgment of consensus better than the others. We also report Self-BLEU [45], a measure of text diversity in our ablation study on retrieval strategies.

Implementation Details In Tab. 1, we present key hyperparameters in our method. For feature extraction, we employ the frozen pre-trained CLIP (ViT/B-16). The text decoder is

	N_p	N_g	N_c	K_p	K_g	M	λ^2
MSVD	1000	37711	48774	13	16	5	0.01
MSR-VTT	1000	100000	130260	14	19	5	0.01
VATEX	3000	400000	250060	10	13	5	0.01

Table 1. Hyperparameters used in our in-domain experiments. N_c represents the number of captions in each dataset’s training set. For MSVD, 37711 equals the total number of enhanced scene graphs derived from all training captions.

an 6-layer Transformer trained from scratch. More details are provided in appendix.

4.2. In-domain Captioning

As shown in Tabs. 2 and 3, our method establishes new state-of-the-art zero-shot performance across all benchmarks. Three key performance patterns emerge:

Vertical Dominance Our method significantly outperforms existing text-only training methods, achieving CIDEr scores of 39.3% and 92.9% on MSR-VTT and MSVD, respectively, exceeding MultiCapCLIP by 5.7% and 16.2%. Superior performance is also observed on VATEX across all metrics. These results, coupled with substantial gains over training-free methods, validate the efficacy of our approach.

Horizontal Consistency The disparity in CIDEr scores between MSVD (92.9%) and VATEX (41.4%) reflects the positive correlation between absolute performance and dataset complexity. VATEX, with its longer videos and denser temporal relations, presents a greater challenge than the shorter, simpler clips in MSVD.

Supervised Proximity On MSVD, our CIDEr score of 92.9% has already exceeded supervised methods like SAAT [44], STR [20], and POS-CG [35], and is approaching VPT’s [13] 94.7%. Although a performance gap remains on MSR-VTT and VATEX compared to top supervised methods, our results highlight the strong potential of our approach in narrowing the gap with traditional supervised techniques.

4.3. Cross-domain Captioning

To evaluate the generalization ability of our method, we conduct cross-domain experiments on MSR-VTT and MSVD datasets. The results are presented in Tab. 4. Our method consistently outperforms both DeCap and MultiCapCLIP. In MSR-VTT \Rightarrow MSVD task, we achieve a CIDEr score of 51.7% (+11.8% over MultiCapCLIP, +23.5% over DeCap) and a B@4 score of 28.9% (+4.1% over MultiCapCLIP, +5.8% over DeCap). In MSVD \Rightarrow MSR-VTT task, we obtain a CIDEr score of 28.1% and a B@4 score of 25.0%, again demonstrating significant enhancements. These improvements underscore the superior generalization performance of our approach, attributed to the utilization of multi-granularity textual semantic units

Settings	Method	Pre-trained Model	Training Data		MSR-VTT				MSVD			
			Video	Text	B@4	M	R	C	B@4	M	R	C
Supervised	SGN [27]	ResNet-101 + C3D	✓	✓	40.8	28.3	60.8	49.5	52.8	35.5	72.9	94.3
	POS-CG [35]	InceptionResNetV2	✓	✓	42.0	28.2	61.6	48.7	52.5	34.1	71.3	88.7
	SAAT [44]	InceptionResNetV2 + C3D	✓	✓	39.9	27.7	61.2	51.0	46.5	33.5	69.4	81.0
	HRNAT [7]	InceptionResNetV2 + I3D	✓	✓	42.1	28.0	61.6	48.2	55.7	36.8	74.1	98.1
	STR [20]	InceptionResNetV2 + I3D	✓	✓	-	25.8	54.8	47.6	-	34.2	68.6	86.5
	VPT [13]	CLIP (ViT/B-16)	✓	✓	41.2	27.9	61.5	50.3	54.6	36.0	73.1	94.7
	CoCap [28]	CLIP (ViT/B-16)	✓	✓	43.1	29.8	62.7	56.2	55.9	39.9	76.8	113.0
Zero-shot	ZeroCap [30]	CLIP (ViT/B-32) + GPT	×	×	2.3	12.9	30.4	5.8	2.9	16.3	35.4	9.6
	ZeroCap-Video [31]	CLIP (ViT/B-32) + GPT	×	×	3.0	14.6	27.7	11.3	3.0	17.8	31.4	17.4
	MAGIC [29]	CLIP (ViT/B-32) + GPT	×	✓	5.5	13.3	35.4	7.4	6.6	16.1	40.1	14.0
	DeCap‡ [16]	CLIP (ViT/B-16)	×	✓	26.6	23.5	53.2	29.7	35.2	29.0	65.2	41.3
	MultiCapCLIP† [40]	CLIP (ViT/B-16)	×	✓	22.0	24.4	50.2	33.6	40.2	34.2	68.6	76.7
	Ours	CLIP (ViT/B-16)	×	✓	31.4	26.5	55.1	39.3	45.7	35.9	71.5	92.9

Table 2. In-domain captioning results on the MSR-VTT and MSVD test sets. ‡ indicates the reproduced results on both datasets using CLIP (ViT/B-16) for fair comparison. † denotes that the results on MSVD are from our implementation.

Settings	Method	VATEX			
		B@4	M	R	C
Supervised	VATEX [36]	28.4	21.7	47.0	45.1
	HRNAT [7]	32.5	22.3	49.0	50.7
	CoCap [28]	31.4	23.2	49.4	52.7
Zero-shot	DeCap‡ [16]	19.2	19.3	42.8	27.5
	MultiCapCLIP† [40]	21.7	20.1	43.3	38.0
	Ours	23.8	21.0	44.5	41.4

Table 3. In-domain captioning results on the VATEX test set. ‡ indicates the reproduced results using CLIP (ViT/B-16). † marks the MultiCapCLIP implementation with English annotations.

Method	MSR-VTT ⇒ MSVD				MSVD ⇒ MSR-VTT			
	B@4	M	R	C	B@4	M	R	C
DeCap‡	23.1	25.4	56.9	28.2	16.4	18.6	50.3	8.8
MultiCapCLIP‡	24.8	28.9	57.7	39.9	20.4	22.2	50.9	22.4
Ours	28.9	30.4	60.6	51.7	25.0	23.2	54.7	28.1

Table 4. Performance on cross-domain captioning. ‡ denotes our reproduction with CLIP (ViT/B-16).

and category-aware retrieval with top- p filtering. This facilitates effective knowledge transfer from source to target domain without video-text pairs.

4.4. Ablation studies

Multi-granularity Textual Prompts To evaluate the contributions of our proposed progressive multi-granularity prompts, we conduct in-domain ablation studies on MSR-VTT and MSVD, with results in Tab. 5. Starting with Ours (w/o Prompt), adding noun phrase prompts (Ours (NP)) boosts performance across all metrics—e.g., BLEU@4 increases from 25.9% to 28.7% on MSR-VTT and CIDEr from 60.8% to 79.7% on

MSVD—highlighting their role in providing key entity information. Incorporating scene graphs enhanced with noun phrases (Ours (NP+SG)) yields further gains, notably a 9.5% CIDEr increase on MSVD, capturing relational and action details. The full model (Ours (NP+SG+EC)), integrating entire caption prompts, achieves peak performance—e.g., BLEU@4 of 31.4% on MSR-VTT and CIDEr of 92.9% on MSVD—demonstrating that the progressive inclusion of multi-granularity prompts continuously refines caption quality by capturing complementary semantic information at various abstraction levels.

Category-aware Retrieval with Top- p We evaluate the effectiveness of our retrieval strategy for cross-domain captioning using noun phrase prompts, with results in Tab. 6. Both Direct Top- K and Category-based methods retrieve the same total number of noun phrases: the former selects the most similar ones from the entire memory bank, while the latter retrieves specific number from each category based on statistical priors. The Category-based method improves diversity of retrieved noun phrases over Direct Top- K , as evidenced by a lower self-BLEU score, though it slightly reduces CIDEr due to potential noise from irrelevant categories. Adding top- p filtering further enhances diversity and significantly boosts caption quality across all metrics, with CIDEr improving from 31.0 to 41.4% on MSR-VTT ⇒ MSVD task. These results highlight the superiority of our category-aware retrieval combined with top- p filtering, which balances diversity and relevance to produce higher-quality captions.

Scaling Up Pre-trained Multimodal Models In Tab. 7, we explore how the scale of pre-trained multimodal models affects the performance of zero-shot video captioning on two relatively large datasets, MSR-VTT and VATEX. As model size increases, all metrics improve significantly on both datasets. For instance, on MSR-VTT, scaling from

Method	MSR-VTT				MSVD			
	B@4	M	R	C	B@4	M	R	C
Ours (w/o prompt)	25.9	25.8	52.6	29.8	33.4	31.4	64.9	60.8
Ours (NP)	28.7	26.0	54.0	33.9	40.9	34.1	68.7	79.7
Ours (NP+SG)	29.7	26.2	54.8	37.3	45.0	35.6	71.1	89.2
Ours (NP + SG + EC)	31.4	26.5	55.1	39.3	45.7	35.9	71.5	92.9

Table 5. Ablation study on multi-granularity semantic prompts. NP: Noun Phrase, SG: Scene Graph, EC: Entire Caption.

Method	B@4	M	R	C	Self-BLEU (\downarrow)
MSVD \Rightarrow MSR-VTT					
Direct Top- K	19.7	21.7	50.7	20.9	0.565
Category-aware	19.9	22.1	51.3	19.1	0.432
Category-aware w/ Top- p	20.9	22.8	51.9	23.2	0.419
MSR-VTT \Rightarrow MSVD					
Direct Top- K	21.3	28.2	55.9	34.7	0.598
Category-aware	23.0	28.0	57.6	31.0	0.538
Category-aware w/ Top- p	25.2	29.1	58.7	41.4	0.475

Table 6. Ablation study on retrieval strategies, with metrics for caption quality and prompt diversity.

Pre-trained VL Model	Size	VATEX				MSR-VTT			
		B@4	M	R	C	B@4	M	R	C
CLIP (ViT/B-16)	0.15B	23.8	21.0	44.5	41.4	31.4	26.5	55.1	39.3
GME-Qwen2VL-2B	2.2B	26.3	23.2	46.3	50.9	31.8	26.6	56.1	41.5
GME-Qwen2VL-7B	8.2B	32.7	24.5	49.9	62.2	34.8	28.5	57.7	48.2

Table 7. Impact of different scales of pre-trained vision-language models on in-domain zero-shot video captioning performance.

CLIP (ViT/B-16) to GME-Qwen2VL-7B [43] increases the CIDEr score from 39.3% to 48.2%. The improvement is even more pronounced on VATEX, with CIDEr increasing from 41.4% to 62.2% (+20.8%). This indicates that our approach, when supported by larger multimodal models, can more more effectively retrieves relevant textual elements, achieving notable gains under a text-only training, visual-only inference paradigm. The advantage of stronger pre-trained vision-language models is particularly evident in the more complex VATEX dataset, highlighting our method’s potential with even more powerful multimodal models in the future. See the appendix for a qualitative comparison of retrieved text units and generated captions across model scales.

4.5. Qualitative Analysis

Fig. 3 provides a qualitative comparison of the generated captions from our method and other state-of-the-art approaches on three example videos. In the first video, our model precisely identifies the key entity “birthday cake” from the noun phrase memory bank, and, by leveraging both the scene graph and entire caption prompts, recognizes the action “blow out candles” which enables the model to generate a caption that covers all the essential information. For the remaining two videos, our three types of prompts



Figure 3. Comparison of generated captions of our method and other state-of-the-art methods. We emphasize ground-truth **important** words and **accurate** words in our generated descriptions.

continue to work synergistically. Through our designed retrieval method, noun phrases and scene graphs provide fundamental entities and action details, respectively, while entire captions capture the global context. As a result, our method produces more comprehensive captions.

5. Conclusion

We propose a novel zero-shot video captioning framework featuring two core innovations. First, our progressive multi-granularity prompting strategy hierarchically combines noun phrases (capturing fine-grained entities), attribute-enriched scene graphs (modeling structured object interactions), and entire captions (preserving contextual coherence) to comprehensively represent visual semantics. Second, we introduce category-aware retrieval with top- p filtering, which leverages statistical priors from the training data for adaptive selection to ensure prompt diversity, and employs top- p filtering to maintain semantic relevance. Experiments on MSR-VTT, MSVD, and VATEX achieve new SoTA results. Ablation studies confirm our design’s effectiveness and highlight potential for further improvement with future larger pre-trained vision-language models.

References

- [1] Satantjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. METEOR: an automatic metric for MT evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *IEEevaluation@ACL*, pages 65–72, 2005. 6
- [2] João Carreira and Andrew Zisserman. Quo vadis, action recognition? A new model and the kinetics dataset. In *CVPR*, pages 4724–4733, 2017. 1
- [3] David L. Chen and William B. Dolan. Collecting highly parallel data for paraphrase evaluation. In *ACL*, pages 190–200, 2011. 6, 1
- [4] Marcella Cornia, Matteo Stefanini, Lorenzo Baraldi, and Rita Cucchiara. Meshed-memory transformer for image captioning. In *CVPR*, pages 10575–10584, 2020. 1
- [5] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *NAACL-HLT*, pages 4171–4186, 2019. 1, 2
- [6] Junjie Fei, Teng Wang, Jinrui Zhang, Zhenyu He, Chengjie Wang, and Feng Zheng. Transferable decoding with visual entities for zero-shot image captioning. In *ICCV*, pages 3113–3123, 2023. 2, 3
- [7] Lianli Gao, Yu Lei, Pengpeng Zeng, Jingkuan Song, Meng Wang, and Heng Tao Shen. Hierarchical representation network with auxiliary tasks for video captioning and video question answering. *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, 31:202–215, 2022. 7
- [8] Kensho Hara, Hirokatsu Kataoka, and Yutaka Satoh. Can spatiotemporal 3d cnns retrace the history of 2d cnns and imagenet? In *CVPR*, pages 6546–6555, 2018. 1
- [9] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR*, pages 770–778, 2016. 1
- [10] Xingwei He. Parallel refinements for lexically constrained text generation with BART. In *EMNLP*, pages 8653–8666, 2021. 3
- [11] Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural Comput.*, 9(8):1735–1780, 1997. 1
- [12] Ari Holtzman, Jan Buys, Li Du, Maxwell Forbes, and Yejin Choi. The curious case of neural text degeneration. In *ICLR*, 2020. 5
- [13] Menglin Jia, Luming Tang, Bor-Chun Chen, Claire Cardie, Serge J. Belongie, Bharath Hariharan, and Ser-Nam Lim. Visual prompt tuning. In *ECCV*, pages 709–727, 2022. 6, 7
- [14] Ranjay Krishna, Yuke Zhu, Oliver Groth, Justin Johnson, Kenji Hata, Joshua Kravitz, Stephanie Chen, Yannis Kalantidis, Li-Jia Li, David A. Shamma, Michael S. Bernstein, and Li Fei-Fei. Visual genome: Connecting language and vision using crowdsourced dense image annotations. *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, 123(1):32–73, 2017. 3
- [15] Jiakuan Li, Duc Minh Vo, Akihiro Sugimoto, and Hideki Nakayama. Evcap: Retrieval-augmented image captioning with external visual-name memory for open-world comprehension. In *CVPR*, pages 13733–13742, 2024. 1
- [16] Wei Li, Linchao Zhu, Longyin Wen, and Yi Yang. Decap: Decoding CLIP latents for zero-shot captioning via text-only training. In *ICLR*, 2023. 2, 3, 6, 7, 1
- [17] Zhuang Li, Yuyang Chai, Terry Yue Zhuo, Lizhen Qu, Gholamreza Haffari, Fei Li, Donghong Ji, and Quan Hung Tran. FACTUAL: A benchmark for faithful and consistent textual scene graph parsing. In *ACL (Findings)*, pages 6377–6390, 2023. 2, 3
- [18] Chin-Yew Lin and Franz Josef Och. Automatic evaluation of machine translation quality using longest common subsequence and skip-bigram statistics. In *ACL*, pages 605–612, 2004. 6
- [19] Kevin Lin, Linjie Li, Chung-Ching Lin, Faisal Ahmed, Zhe Gan, Zicheng Liu, Yumao Lu, and Lijuan Wang. Swinbert: End-to-end transformers with sparse attention for video captioning. In *CVPR*, pages 17928–17937, 2022. 1
- [20] Zhu Liu, Teng Wang, Jinrui Zhang, Feng Zheng, Wenhao Jiang, and Ke Lu. Show, tell and rephrase: Diverse video captioning via two-stage progressive training. *IEEE Trans. Multim.*, 25:7894–7905, 2023. 6, 7
- [21] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *ICLR*, 2019. 1
- [22] David Nukrai, Ron Mokady, and Amir Globerson. Text-only training for image captioning using noise-injected CLIP. In *EMNLP (Findings)*, pages 4055–4063, 2022. 2, 3
- [23] OpenAI. GPT-4 technical report. *CoRR*, abs/2303.08774, 2023. 4, 5, 1
- [24] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *ACL*, pages 311–318, 2002. 6
- [25] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019. 1, 2
- [26] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *ICML*, pages 8748–8763, 2021. 1, 2
- [27] Hobin Ryu, Sunghun Kang, Haeyong Kang, and Chang D. Yoo. Semantic grouping network for video captioning. In *AAAI*, pages 2514–2522, 2021. 7
- [28] Yaojie Shen, Xin Gu, Kai Xu, Heng Fan, Longyin Wen, and Libo Zhang. Accurate and fast compressed video captioning. In *ICCV*, pages 15558–15567, 2023. 7
- [29] Yixuan Su, Tian Lan, Yahui Liu, Fangyu Liu, Dani Yogatama, Yan Wang, Lingpeng Kong, and Nigel Collier. Language models can see: Plugging visual controls in text generation. *CoRR*, abs/2205.02655, 2022. 2, 7
- [30] Yoad Tewel, Yoav Shalev, Idan Schwartz, and Lior Wolf. Zerocap: Zero-shot image-to-text generation for visual-semantic arithmetic. In *CVPR*, pages 17897–17907. IEEE, 2022. 2, 7
- [31] Yoad Tewel, Yoav Shalev, Roy Nadler, Idan Schwartz, and Lior Wolf. Zero-shot video captioning by evolving pseudo-tokens. In *BMVC*, pages 429–432, 2023. 1, 2, 7
- [32] Mingkai Tian, Guorong Li, Yuankai Qi, Shuhui Wang, Quan Z. Sheng, and Qingming Huang. Rethink video retrieval representation for video captioning. *Pattern Recognit.*, 156:110744, 2024. 1

- [33] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *NIPS*, pages 5998–6008, 2017. [4](#), [1](#)
- [34] Ramakrishna Vedantam, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. Cider: Consensus-based image description evaluation. In *CVPR*, pages 4566–4575, 2015. [6](#), [1](#)
- [35] Bairui Wang, Lin Ma, Wei Zhang, Wenhao Jiang, Jingwen Wang, and Wei Liu. Controllable video captioning with POS sequence guidance based on gated fusion network. In *ICCV*, pages 2641–2650, 2019. [1](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [36] Xin Wang, Jiawei Wu, Junkun Chen, Lei Li, Yuan-Fang Wang, and William Yang Wang. Vatex: A large-scale, high-quality multilingual dataset for video-and-language research. In *ICCV*, pages 4580–4590, 2019. [6](#), [7](#), [1](#)
- [37] Shitao Xiao, Zheng Liu, Peitian Zhang, Niklas Muennighoff, Defu Lian, and Jian-Yun Nie. C-pack: Packed resources for general chinese embeddings. In *SIGIR*, pages 641–649, 2024. [3](#)
- [38] Jun Xu, Tao Mei, Ting Yao, and Yong Rui. MSR-VTT: A large video description dataset for bridging video and language. In *CVPR*, pages 5288–5296, 2016. [6](#), [1](#)
- [39] Jie Yan, Yuxiang Xie, Shiwei Zou, Yingmei Wei, and Xidao Luan. Entrocap: Zero-shot image captioning with entropy-based retrieval. *Neurocomputing*, 611:128666, 2025. [2](#), [3](#)
- [40] Bang Yang, Fenglin Liu, Xian Wu, Yaowei Wang, Xu Sun, and Yuexian Zou. Multicapclip: Auto-encoding prompts for zero-shot multilingual visual captioning. In *ACL*, pages 11908–11922, 2023. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [7](#), [1](#)
- [41] Zequn Zeng, Hao Zhang, Ruiying Lu, Dongsheng Wang, Bo Chen, and Zhengjue Wang. Conzic: Controllable zero-shot image captioning by sampling-based polishing. In *CVPR*, pages 23465–23476, 2023. [2](#), [3](#)
- [42] Zequn Zeng, Yan Xie, Hao Zhang, Chiyu Chen, Bo Chen, and Zhengjue Wang. Meacap: Memory-augmented zero-shot image captioning. In *CVPR*, pages 14100–14110, 2024. [2](#), [3](#)
- [43] Xin Zhang, Yanzhao Zhang, Wen Xie, Mingxin Li, Ziqi Dai, Dingkun Long, Pengjun Xie, Meishan Zhang, Wenjie Li, and Min Zhang. GME: improving universal multimodal retrieval by multimodal llms. *CoRR*, abs/2412.16855, 2024. [8](#), [3](#)
- [44] Qi Zheng, Chaoyue Wang, and Dacheng Tao. Syntax-aware action targeting for video captioning. In *CVPR*, pages 13093–13102, 2020. [1](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [45] Yaoming Zhu, Sidi Lu, Lei Zheng, Jiaxian Guo, Weinan Zhang, Jun Wang, and Yong Yu. Taxygen: A benchmarking platform for text generation models. In *SIGIR*, pages 1097–1100, 2018. [6](#)

The Devil is in the Distributions: Explicit Modeling of Scene Content is Key in Zero-Shot Video Captioning

Appendix

6. Implementation Details

This section provides additional details on our implementation. We adopt the same model architecture as Multi-CapCLIP [40], where the text decoder consists of a 6-layer Transformer [33] with 8 attention heads and a hidden size of 512. The CLIP (ViT/B-16) [26] model encodes textual units, which are subsequently processed by a feed-forward network (FFN) with both input and output dimensions set to 512 before being fed into the text decoder. During training, we apply label smoothing with a value of 0.1, while for inference, we employ beam search with a beam size of 3 to generate text tokens. All experiments are conducted over 10 epochs using the AdamW [21] optimizer, incorporating a linear warm-up phase over the first 10% of the training steps.

The threshold τ for top- p post-processing remains consistent across noun phrases and scene graphs. For in-domain tasks, the MSR-VTT [38] and MSVD [3] datasets utilize a peak learning rate of 1×10^{-4} , which remains fixed after the warm-up phase. In contrast, the VATEX [36] dataset employs a peak learning rate of 5×10^{-4} , followed by a linear decay to 0 after the warm-up period. The value of τ is set to 0.6 for both MSVD and VATEX, and to 0.8 for MSR-VTT.

In the cross-domain setting, for the MSR-VTT \Rightarrow MSVD task, the parameters K_p and K_g are configured to 12 and 34, respectively. For the MSVD \Rightarrow MSR-VTT task, these parameters are set to 14 and 25, respectively. The learning rate and scheduler configurations mirror those of the in-domain tasks, with τ fixed at 0.5 for both cross-domain tasks.

7. Scene Graph Memory Bank Construction

Algorithm 2 details the process of constructing the enhanced scene graph memory bank. It takes the training captions as input and generates a memory bank consisting of scene graphs enriched with noun phrases.

8. Classification of Noun Phrase Memory Bank

We first performed unsupervised classification using GPT-4 [23] on the noun phrase memory bank \mathcal{M}_{NP} of MSR-VTT. Subsequently, the same categories are applied to the classification process for the MSVD and VATEX datasets. Tab. 8 presents the eight categories identified by GPT-4, together with their interpretations. Examples of noun phrases belonging to each category are provided in the last col-

Algorithm 2: Enhanced Scene Graph Memory Bank Construction

Input: \mathcal{S} : Training captions;
 $\{\mathcal{P}(S)\}_{S \in \mathcal{S}}$: Noun phrase sets;
 N_g : Frequency threshold
Output: \mathcal{M}_{SG} : Enhanced scene graph memory bank

```
1  $\mathcal{X}_{all} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;  
2 for caption  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  do  
3    $\mathcal{G}_S \leftarrow \text{TextualParser}(S)$ ;  
4   for  $g_i = \langle sub_i, pred_i, obj_i \rangle \in \mathcal{G}_S$  do  
5      $\mathcal{A}_i \leftarrow \{p \mid p \in$   
        $\mathcal{P}(S) \wedge sub_i \text{ is substring of } p\} \cup \{sub_i\}$ ;  
6      $\mathcal{B}_i \leftarrow \{p \mid p \in$   
        $\mathcal{P}(S) \wedge obj_i \text{ is substring of } p\} \cup \{obj_i\}$ ;  
7      $\mathcal{X}_i \leftarrow \{\langle a, pred_i, b \rangle \mid a \in \mathcal{A}_i, b \in \mathcal{B}_i\}$ ;  
8      $\mathbf{E}_S \leftarrow \text{BGE}(S)$ ;  
9      $\mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{X}_i} \leftarrow \text{BGE}(\mathcal{X}_i)$ ;  
10     $x_{best} \leftarrow \arg \max_{x_i^j \in \mathcal{X}_i} \cos(\mathbf{E}_S, \mathbf{E}_{\mathcal{X}_i}[x_i^j])$ ;  
11     $\mathcal{X}_{all} \leftarrow \mathcal{X}_{all} \cup \{x_{best}\}$ ;  
12  end  
13 end  
14  $\mathcal{F} \leftarrow \{(x, \text{count}(x \in \mathcal{X}_{all})) \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_{all}\}$ ;  
15  $\mathcal{M}_{SG} \leftarrow \text{Sort}(\mathcal{F}, \text{by count descending})[0 : N_g - 1]$ ;  
16 return  $\mathcal{M}_{SG}$ 
```

umn. Fig. 4 illustrates the distribution of noun phrases across these categories in the MSR-VTT, MSVD, and VATEX datasets. As can be observed, object noun phrases consistently dominate across all datasets, followed by singular people. For the complex VATEX dataset, which contains more diverse and intricate scenes, place noun phrases also exhibit a significant presence.

9. Other Ablation Studies

9.1. Impact of Memory Bank Size

As illustrated in Tab. 9, we evaluate the performance of in-domain zero-shot video captioning with varying sizes of memory bank of noun phrase and scene graph containing noun phrases. Following DeCap [16], where the prompt at the entire caption granularity occupies only one token, computations during retrieval are considerably simplified. Therefore, we fix the size of the entire caption memory bank to the number of captions in the training set. Upon increasing the sizes of both the noun phrase and scene graph memory bank, we observe improvements across all metrics, with the enhancement in CIDEr [34] being the most notable. A

Category ID	Category Name	Category Description	Example Noun Phrases
1	Video Overall Description	Video types and content descriptions	“a talk show”, “sports highlights”, “a music video”
2	Abstract Noun Phrases	Noun phrases representing abstract concepts	“different types”, “the features”, “beauty”
3	Plural People	Nouns representing plural people	“some kids”, “two men”, “a band”
4	Personal Pronouns	Pronouns referring to people	“he”, “us”, “they”
5	Object Noun Phrases	Noun phrases representing physical objects	“black t-shirt”, “a frying pan”, “a race car”
6	Place Noun Phrases	Noun phrases representing different environments	“a busy street”, “a basketball court”, “a restaurant”
7	Singular People	Noun phrases representing single people	“the man”, “a police officer”, “Captain America”
8	Quantifiers & Others	Quantifiers and other general terms	“one”, “which”, “another”

Table 8. GPT-4-generated Categories for Noun Phrases Memory Bank \mathcal{M}_{NP} with Example Phrases.




Figure 4. Distribution of Noun Phrases across Different Categories in the MSR-VTT, MSVD, and VATEX Datasets.

Size of Memory Bank		VATEX			
NP	SG	B@4	M	R	C
1000	200,000	23.1	20.6	44.1	37.4
1000	400,000	23.3	21.0	44.2	39.1
3000	400,000	23.8	21.0	44.5	41.4

Table 9. Impact of memory bank size on in-domain captioning, evaluated on VATEX test set. NP: Noun Phrase, SG: Scene Graph.

larger memory bank suggests a more comprehensive and enriched knowledge base from the training set, thereby enhancing the generalization capability from training to inference phases.

9.2. Impact of top-K Selection from Memory

During training, we retrieve fixed numbers of elements from both the noun phrase (NP) and scene graph (SG) memory banks for each caption, which are then fed into the language decoder as prefix prompts for reconstruction. As visualized in Fig. 5, our ablation study on MSR-VTT and MSVD datasets systematically investigates how varying selection quantities of NP and SG elements affect the CIDEr metric. Notably, the model demonstrates well robustness across




Figure 5. Impact of number of selected elements from noun phrase and scene graph memory banks on in-domain CIDEr scores. NP: Noun Phrase, SG: Scene Graph.

different parameter combinations, maintaining consistently high performance levels. Through grid search optimization, we ultimately identify top-14 NP with top-19 SG as the optimal configuration for MSR-VTT, while top-13 NP paired with top-16 SG achieves peak performance on MSVD.

9.3. Qualitative Gains from Scaling Multimodal Models

Building on the quantitative analysis of scaling up pre-trained multimodal models of the main paper, we present a qualitative analysis in Fig. 6, visually illustrating the ben-

GT	<i>A man throws a hatchet at a pile of wood in the yard.</i>
NP	["a chair", "the image", "an image"]
CLIP (ViT/B-16)	SG ["another man pull out the chair", "a person play in background", "an object in front of camera"]
EC	["A boy is riding on a riding mower in a yard with a shed in the background.", "A man is filming himself do tricks with his wheel barrel in the back yard.", "A man is talking and flipping backward in a yard."]
Res	<i>A man is outside and is using a chair to blow leaves out of a yard.</i>
NP	["a backyard", "another man", "his chair"]
SG	["a person in a grassy backyard", "lawn chairs in a backyard", "person throw stick outside"]
GME-Qwen2VL-2B	EC ["In a back yard setting, a man throws objects into a stump from a far distance, then looks at his success.", "A group of people in a backyard watch a man throw a knife at a target.", "A guy is standing in a grassy backyard taking a knife out of a wooden fence and throwing it at the fence!"]
Res	<i>A man is outside in a backyard and he throws a frisbee and it lands in a.</i>
NP	["a backyard", "a shirtless man", "a swing"]
SG	["a man stand in a yard throwing axes", "a man in a yard throwing axes", "a shirtless man swing at wood"]
GME-Qwen2VL-7B	EC ["A man in the back yard throwing a knife into a tree.", "A man throws and acts across the yard at tree.", "A man is shot putting an object in his back yard."]]
Res	<i>A man is standing in a yard and he is throwing something at a tree.</i>
GT	<i>A woman is painting in the studio as another woman is watching her and giving instructions.</i>
NP	["a women", "a painting", "a studio"]
CLIP (ViT/B-16)	SG ["an artist paint a portrait", "a woman draw pictures", "an artist work on painting"]
EC	["Women are painting onto canvases together in a time lapse video.", "Women are painting on canvases using paint brushes in an art room.", "Four women sit at easels and uses paint brushes to apply paint to separate canvases."]]
Res	<i>A timelapse of a woman painting a picture of a woman in a studio.</i>
NP	["a seated woman", "a canvas", "a painting"]
SG	["two women work on an art project", "a person paint an art piece", "a person paint a canvas"]
GME-Qwen2VL-2B	EC ["A group of people together for a painting event where a woman uses a brush on a small girls arm to paint it.", "One person is teaching children to art and people are watching.", "Two women sit at a table working on an arts and crafts project together."]]
Res	<i>A group of people are working on an art project while a woman is talking in the background.</i>
NP	["a seated woman", "a canvas", "a painting"]
SG	["women paint on canvases", "two women work on an arts and crafts project", "a young woman paint with her friend"]
GME-Qwen2VL-7B	EC ["Women are painting on canvases using paint brushes in an art room.", "Two women are doing a few arts and crafts type projects.", "Two women are demonstrating how to do a certain paint technique."]]
Res	<i>A woman is painting a picture on a canvas while another woman watches.</i>

Figure 6. Comparison of the three granularities of text prompts retrieved using different pre-trained multimodal models and the generated captions, denoted as “Res”. We emphasize ground-truth *important* words and *accurate* words in our generated descriptions.

efits. Compared to CLIP (ViT/B-16), larger models like GME-Qwen2VL-2B [43] and GME-Qwen2VL-7B [43] retrieve more video-relevant textual units from the same memory bank, leading to more semantically accurate and detail-rich captions.