

ImageInWords: Unlocking Hyper-Detailed Image Descriptions


Roopal Garg¹, Andrea Burns¹, Burcu Karagol Ayan¹, Yonatan Bitton¹, Ceslee Montgomery¹, Yasumasa Onoe¹, Andrew Bunner¹, Ranjay Krishna^{1,3}, Jason Baldridge², and Radu Soricut¹

¹Google Research, ²Google DeepMind, ³University of Washington
<https://github.com/google/imageinwords>

Abstract. Despite the longstanding adage “*an image is worth a thousand words*,” creating accurate and hyper-detailed image descriptions for training Vision-Language models remains challenging. Current datasets typically have web-scraped descriptions that are short, low-granularity, and often contain details unrelated to the visual content. As a result, models trained on such data generate descriptions replete with missing information, visual inconsistencies, and hallucinations. To address these issues, we introduce *ImageInWords* (IIW), a carefully designed human-in-the-loop annotation framework for curating hyper-detailed image descriptions and a new dataset resulting from this process. We validate the framework through evaluations focused on the quality of the dataset and its utility for fine-tuning with considerations for readability, comprehensiveness, specificity, hallucinations, and human-likeness. Our dataset significantly improves across these dimensions compared to recently released datasets (+66%) and GPT-4V outputs (+48%). Furthermore, models fine-tuned with IIW data excel by +31% against prior work along the same human evaluation dimensions. Given our fine-tuned models, we also evaluate text-to-image generation and vision-language reasoning. Our model’s descriptions can generate images closest to the original, as judged by both automated and human metrics. We also find our model produces more compositionally rich descriptions, outperforming the best baseline by up to 6% on ARO, SVO-Probes, and Winoground datasets.

1 Introduction

Today’s state-of-the-art Vision-Language Models (VLMs) are trained using large, noisy web datasets. Datasets such as WebImageText [41], ALIGN [18], Conceptual Captions [47] and LAION [46] are crawled from the internet and rely on alt-text associated with each image as an imperfect proxy description for its visual contents. Some alt-text captions only mention the geographical location of where the photo was taken (*e.g.* “Europe”), or the camera model used to capture the photo (*e.g.* “Canon EOS R6 Mark II”), or it is SEO-specific (*e.g.* “keep calm and carry on”). While data filtering and post-processing can remove noisy text, alt-text is inherently ambiguous between conveying the *content* or the *intent*



An eye-level, vertically-oriented, three-quarter outdoor shot features the multi-tiered, classical Roman fountain at Hundertwasser House in Vienna, Austria, with a backdrop of three people sitting on its rim, a cobbled walk area, concrete supports under an arching roof area with inlaid mosaics, arched glass doors, and a bit of sunlight greenery beyond the roof. Four sections make up the fountain, starting with a large, circular concrete basin as the base. The walls of the basin rise to a sitting height, and the face is covered in cobblestone of gray and dark blue shades that are similar in square and rectangle shapes and sizes, but not uniform. This makes for uneven and wavering mortar joints. The basin takes up much of the bottom third of the scene, and the rim alternates between flat sections capped with flat red-blue stone that slightly overhangs the wall, and flowing sections of cobble that angle up from ground-level and flow over the top of the basin wall. One of these flowing cobblestone sections takes up the bottom right corner of the scene and extends left of the horizontal midpoint before transitioning to a flat section. Light gray-blue water fills the basin to a bit below the bottom of the wall caps. From the center of the basin, a wide, jointed stem of what appears to be black, tan and brown ceramic, rises to support the next level of the fountain, which is a ceramic basin of brown, tan, and black segments. Water completely fills this section, and many small streams spill over the sides and fall to the basin below. A shorter, tan hourglass-shaped stem comes up from the center of the second basin to support the third basin of a bronze ceramic casting. This basin is smaller than the second, and the lip alternates between short flat sections and higher, double scalloped sections. Thin streams of water fall from the flat sections to the basin below. An ornate, vertically ribbed stem rises from the center to a final, smaller pink ceramic basin. A tan-gold concrete-casting of a cherub-style angel sits on top of this basin. A flat section on the back left side of the bottom basin has two people, who appear to be women, sitting on it and facing away and left. The woman on the left has straight, shoulder-length dark hair and wears a long-sleeved top with navy and white vertical stripes, navy pants, and a large blue bag on her back with the strap slung over her right shoulder and left stomach and chest. To her right is a woman with straight dark hair, a dark top, and light denim jeans with a bit of her bare back between the pants and top. The back of someone in a navy shirt is visible as they sit on a flat section of the basin on the right edge of the scene, facing left. Behind the fountain is a cobbled area, with a large gray rectangular column angled back and right behind the second woman. Several narrow strips of colorful mosaic tiles run gently, curving in a horizontal fashion across the two visible faces of the pillar. Behind the pillar is a gray wall with arched doors on the right and dark brown frames and panels. The arched gray ceiling above has many patches of inlaid mosaic tiles of white, black, gray, and bronze. A bit of sunlight comes in from the right through a large opening, and some green vegetation is visible behind a short wall with an iron vertical railing on top.

Fig. 1: ImageInWords *Seeded* Annotation Framework. Humans enrich and refine outputs *sequentially*, building upon previous human and/or machine provided inputs. The human annotation flow starts with fine-grained object captions in Task 1. They are used as building blocks to help compose image-level hyper-detailed descriptions in Task 2. The VLMs (in orange) are updated in an active learning loop to produce better object-level captions and image-level descriptions as more annotated data becomes available. Screenshots of the end-to-end annotation process and UI are in the Supplemental.

of the image [56]. Therefore, scraping image descriptions from the web as the primary source of effective vision-language (VL) pairing is fundamentally flawed and limits model capabilities [17, 29, 42, 48, 51].

With the goal of curating higher quality image-text data, recent works have released dense human-written caption datasets (*e.g.*, DCI [52], DOCCI [32]) or model-generated datasets (*e.g.*, DAC [13], PixLore [5]). Both types have their limitations, as using annotators without comprehensive guidelines results in vague, subjective outputs that vary by human attention span, bias, and effort [6, 31, 36, 63]. In contrast, model-generated captions are cheaper to generate but result in outputs that are incomplete and rife with hallucinations [11, 44].

In this work, we describe ImageInWords (IIW), a human-in-the-loop framework for curating hyper-detailed and hallucination-free image descriptions, and its resulting annotations. ImageInWords combines the irreplaceable quality of human annotators with seeded metadata from machine generations. The process begins with object detectors first identifying individual object instances in the image. Next, a VLM generates granular captions for each detected object which seed our human annotation process. These seed captions may contain hallucinations or lack object-level comprehensiveness and specificity. Our crowd workers augment and fix the object-level captions to make them richer and hallucination free to seed the next step. Next, we operate at image-level, where an image caption is generated by the VLM to seed our final image *description*. Crowd workers now consume the image-level seed captions along with the object-level human

annotations to fill in contextual gaps missing from the existing image captions. We design guidelines for crowd workers to attend to concepts beyond objects, such as visual perspective, spatial arrangement, and human-object interactions. This process is iterative to ensure a final high quality dataset (Fig. 1).

Following this process, we construct the IIW dataset containing 9018 images, each with its hyper-detailed description. In comparison to other dense description datasets (Tab. 1), our dataset contains more information along multiple dimensions: our descriptions have an average of 9.8 sentences, and 52.5 nouns, 28 adjectives, 5 adverbs, and 19.1 verbs per description. To evaluate description quality, we perform a side-by-side (SxS) human evaluation against those from human-generated datasets (DCI, DOCCI) and from those generated by GPT-4V. Evaluators rated our descriptions as more comprehensive, specific, and human-like, containing fewer hallucinations and better leading sentences (Tab. 3) at an average of +66% (DCI and DOCCI) and +48% (GPT-4V).

To comprehensively evaluate the utility of our framework’s generated descriptions, we use it as a fine-tuning dataset. We fine-tune a PaLI-3 5B model [8] to successfully generate hyper-detailed descriptions. We conduct four evaluations to compare the same model fine-tuned on our dataset versus other fine-tuning sets. First, a battery of well-established readability metrics finds IIW to be superior to DCI and DOCCI, when measuring either the annotations directly or fine-tuned model-generated descriptions. Second, using these fine-tuned models, we generate descriptions on the Localized Narratives (LocNar) [39] dataset to create a common pool of image-description pairs and run human SxS evaluations. We find that IIW model-generated outputs are preferred more by +31% compared to models fine-tuned on prior work. Third, we show that images generated using our model’s descriptions were considered to be a closer reconstruction of the original image than descriptions from other models. The generations were evaluated both by human evaluators as well as CLIP. Fourth, we test the generated descriptions’ compositionality by swapping the images in compositionality reasoning benchmarks with the generated description (ARO [66], SVO-Probes [15] and Winoground [51]). Our trained model results in higher reasoning accuracy compared to LLaVA-v1.5 and InstructBLIP.

Overall, our framework produces higher quality image description data that serve as an effective fine-tuning dataset, and our evaluations along a dozen dimensions validate its utility. We posit that the level of detail attained in our annotations facilitates a strong new capability that can help advance VL research and its applications; this level of descriptive detail is important for multiple downstream applications, including generating descriptions for Text-to-Image (T2I) models [4, 45, 65] and in applications for people with visual impairments.

2 Related Work

Image *captioning* has been studied for many years, starting with CNN and LSTM encoder-decoder frameworks for generating generic captions [2, 16, 43, 55], to the more recent Transformer-based VLMs which are evaluated on more challenging

Table 1: Dataset Statistics Comparing ImageInWords (IIW) to Prior Work. We include the number of samples (*i.e.*, number of captions/descriptions) and the average number of tokens, sentences, nouns (NN), adjectives (ADJ), adverbs (ADV), and verbs (VB). The statistics are noted as average counts.

Dataset	Sample Count	Tokens	Tokens	Sentences	NN	ADJ	ADV	VB
		/ Sentence	/ Description					
SVP [22]	19,561	11.9	68.5	5.7	17.1	6.7	1.1	5.0
LocNar [39]	873,107	15.7	41.0	2.6	10.7	1.6	0.4	3.5
DCI [52]	7,805	15.8	148.0	9.3	35.3	16.3	3.6	10.5
DOCCI [32]	14,647	19.2	135.7	7.1	34.0	16.6	2.7	9.6
IIW (ours)	9,018	22.1	217.2	9.8	52.5	28.0	5.0	19.1

captions [9, 25, 53] (*e.g.*, VizWiz [14], NoCaps [1], TextCaps [49]). These datasets, among many others, contain captions with an average of 15 words or fewer [1, 12, 14, 19, 23, 27, 30, 38, 38, 47, 49, 64] and may differ by caption grounding level (*e.g.* whole image or region-level captions) or image domain (*e.g.* images taken by people who are blind or images capturing text).

There are, however, few *dense image description* datasets. PixLore [5] proposed using multiple vision-language datasets to generate more verbose captions with BLIP-2 [25]. DAC [13] uses a machine-generated approach: pretrained language models expand the original image caption and pretrained VLMs are used to generate captions over smaller image regions. The resulting descriptions are then used to fine-tune a VLM model for better compositional reasoning. While model-only approaches are cost effective and avoid the challenges of designing instructions for crowd workers, they risk introducing hallucinations and systematic biases, which may not be easily mitigated. Using only crowd workers, DOCCI [32] collects image descriptions that we later show can be considerably improved. Closest to IIW is DCI [52], which uses human annotators to reach denser image descriptions. DCI uses the SAM [20] object detector to generate smaller regions to be described and then composes them into an overall image description. In contrast to DCI, we seed our annotation pipeline with VLM generated outputs and allow crowd workers to update or correct every component of the seeded information. The output is then sequentially refined over multiple annotation rounds to produce a single coherent hyper-detailed annotation output. In comparison to DCI’s “caption-extra” annotation, we collect significantly better descriptions. In Tab. 1, we provide quantitative comparisons to prior work designed for longer image captions.

3 ImageInWords Dataset Collection

The IIW dataset is composed of 9018 (IIW-Train: 8573, IIW-Test: 445) images that are sampled from a dataset built similar to WebLI [9], and human annotated. Details on the human annotator pool are provided in the Supplemental. In Sec. 3.1, we briefly review the foundational guidelines we define for use with crowd workers. We describe our annotation methodology which consists of seed-

ing and sequential description refinement in Sec. 3.2. Finally, details on the types of image-text annotations we collect (Fig. 3) are described in Sec. 3.3.

3.1 Annotation Guidelines

Our goal is to curate image descriptions rich enough to paint a vivid mental picture that is closely aligned with the actual image. To reach this level of detailed descriptions, composed in an articulate manner, we compile an extensive set of guidelines for human annotators and iterate over them with multiple pilot rounds. A high-level version of the guidelines is presented here; see the Supplementary for a detailed version.

Annotators are asked to operate as if they are instructing a painter to paint with their words and only include details that can be deduced from visual cues, erring on the side of higher precision. To compose flowing, coherent descriptions, unnecessary fragmentation of sentences should be avoided; annotators should avoid the use of filler phrases like *“in this image,”* *“we can see,”* *“there is a,”* and *“this is a picture of”* since they are verbose and add no visual detail.

While describing the overall image, we instruct annotators to start with a newspaper style TLDR (Too Long Didn’t Read; meant to serve as a succinct summary) sentence that paints a very clear, high-level idea. Objects should be described in the order of their saliency, while noting individual objects and relationships in a well organized manner. Descriptions should include the overall setting, background, and style, and the annotators should consider the camera angle, overall composition, and any rendered text in the image. We also ask them to pay special attention to attributes that relate to people, apparel, art pieces, and locale specific attributes. When noting object attributes in the image, the following are used as example features (but are not limited to): function, shape, size, color, design, pattern, texture, material, condition, opacity, orientation, location, relationship to other components/objects, and text written on objects. Attributes that make the objects unique should be explicitly included.

3.2 Annotation Methodology

This section describes the *seeded, sequential* process employed in annotating the IIW dataset.

Seeded Annotation Describing images in detail is a highly subjective and complicated task. To ease some of the effort required here, we use PaLI-3 5B outputs to seed the annotation process. This provides a starting point for crowd workers, expediting human annotations instead of them starting from scratch. While VLMs have quickly improved in their ability to capture details about images, attempts to generate a consistent rich output still fall prey to hallucinations and information recall issues. Starting from a seeded caption, our human annotation pipeline is designed to ensure that VLM hallucinations can be corrected and missing details filled in to obtain detailed descriptions.

An initial machine generated caption and optional high precision, domain specific metadata (*e.g.*, art style or title of a painting) provides a minimal quality




Fig. 2: Effects of Sequential Annotation: Over annotation rounds, (a) token count goes up as (b) time spent goes down with (c) higher agreement, measured by Jaccard Similarity [61]. A very low agreement across rounds (1,3) indicates considerable edits which annotators largely agreed upon in rounds (2,3). Round (1,2) provides the highest mean token count gain of ~ 30 . (d) Over time with a constant human annotator pool, each learns from the other via an *implicit feedback loop* and a high agreement rate in round (1,2) can now be observed as was previously only seen in round (2,3) in (c).

and coverage guarantee from the human outputs. As data is collected, the PaLI-3 5B model is fine-tuned to produce better quality descriptions in an active learning loop (as reflected with loops in Fig. 1).

Sequential Augmentation In addition to seeding the IIW annotation pipeline with VLM outputs to ease human annotation, we also improve the efficiency of our framework with sequential image description augmentations. For this, humans augment on top of a previous crowd worker’s or VLM’s outputs instead of starting from scratch each time in parallel. The seed information and annotations from previous rounds are available to the annotators for reference. During the annotation process, we observed (Fig. 2) that it is far more effective in terms of both *time* and *output* to read and augment image descriptions than to write from scratch. From Fig. 2 we see that if annotations were done in parallel, we would have 3 competing outputs per image, each with their own style, perspective, strength, and weakness, and each containing ~ 170 words and taking ~ 800 seconds. Whereas, in the sequential process, we get a single all-inclusive output per image that has been verified and augmented by three humans with $+20\%$ token count in -30% time. Higher Jaccard Similarity over rounds suggests a higher inter-annotator agreement on the output, which serves as a proxy for quality.

Finally, our framework has the benefit of injecting an implicit human-to-human learning loop, as each human annotator has the opportunity to read and learn from other perspectives across the annotation rounds, leading to improved individual quality. This is evident from a $\sim 2x$ improved inter-annotator agreement between rounds (1, 2); compare (c) and (d) in Fig. 2.




Fig. 3: IIW Annotation Tasks. Objects and their attributes are first individually annotated to note the salient objects and focus on coverage of their attributes in Task 1. These outputs, along with a seed VLM caption, are passed to humans to build the initial image-level description. The initial caption is then human augmented and refined in N sequential rounds to attain the final hyper-detailed description in Task 2.

3.3 Annotation Framework

Based on the above guidelines and methodologies, we present the IIW annotation framework to annotate images across two tasks. The tasks are annotated sequentially, seeded from VLMs or previous human annotations (Fig. 3). Each task can have multiple sequential rounds of annotations, each building on top of another. Annotation examples and UI screenshots are provided in the Supplementary.

Annotation Task 1: Fine Grained Objects and Attributes Similar to the Visual Genome [23] dataset, we design this annotation task to capture a (label, bounding box, object description) triplet per salient image object. An object’s label is open vocabulary with no verbosity restrictions, and its description is focused on the object but additionally takes the context of the image into account. The bounding box localizes where the object is in the image (Fig. 3 (left)). To seed the data, we first used an internal object detection (OD) model to obtain a list of (label, bounding box) pairs. Then, object captions are generated by cropping the image to the object bounding box and generating a caption via a periodically fine-tuned PaLI-3 5B. Our methodology is agnostic to which VLM, OD (or image-segmentation) model is used.

From the seeded list of (label, bounding box, object caption), the annotators are first asked to determine the salient objects and fix the list of (label, bounding box) by editing, removing, adding or merging the object annotations based on their accuracy, importance, and role in the overall image. They have the freedom to update the labels to make them more accurate and specific. The object captions are then updated to obtain a final list of (label, bounding box, object description). By limiting the scope to specific individual objects, human annotators can better focus and capture details more comprehensively. All of the

annotations are done using the guidelines in Sec. 3.1 as reference. More details on the annotation UI, seeded inputs and outputs are in the Supplemental.

Annotation Task-2: Overall Image Description Our second annotation task is to formulate the final holistic hyper-detailed description using the guidelines from Sec. 3.1. Seeded data from Task-1 (detailed above), optional domain specific metadata (*e.g.*, art style of a painting, otherwise requiring domain expertise from humans), and a VLM seed image caption are used to hint and help the annotators compose the overall image description.

The bulk of the annotation responsibility falls on the first annotator who composes the initial description; note that the crowd worker annotation order is randomly assigned per sample and the same annotator is not re-employed across rounds for the same sample. This output is then refined and augmented in sequential rounds to improve the quality of the output. Sequential annotation helps mitigate subjectivity and quality drops as data is human verified across the rounds. The annotators are encouraged to focus more on the augmentation efforts and only remove things if they are obvious errors from previous rounds. They are however free to re-frame existing information to augment new details. In our data collection experiments, we started with 3 sequential annotation rounds and monitored the n-gram Jaccard similarity between the outputs. With human-in-the-loop learning, once a high round-over-round output similarity was achieved (we used a 0.8 threshold), we reduced the numbers of rounds. Optionally, early stopping support could be added to the annotation framework itself to make this instance specific. We found our similarity threshold can be met between the first two rounds, *i.e.*, (1,2), (Fig. 2) suggesting a high individual-annotator quality.

4 Experiments

We perform qualitative and quantitative experiments to evaluate the quality of the IIW dataset and its utility for fine-tuning. We start the evaluation with text-based automatic readability metrics in Sec. 4.1 and extend to human SxS evaluations (defined in Sec. 4.2) to compare our human annotations to prior work (*e.g.* DCI, DOCCI, GPT-4V) in Sec. 4.3.

In Sec. 4.4, we fine-tune separate PaLI-3 5B models on DCI, DOCCI and IIW training splits, with their detailed human-authored text as target. Each model is trained with an identical setup (~ 40 epochs, learning-rate 0.0003, batch-size 32) and using the generic input instruction: “Generate a detailed image description.” Additional details on the fine-tuning setup are provided in the Supplemental. Existing text similarity metrics like BLEU [37], and ROUGE [26] have been shown to correlate poorly with human judgement as they are heavily dependent on n-gram overlaps, and thus ill-suited for long texts [24]. As such, to get reliable results, IIW fine-tuned model outputs are compared with models fine-tuned with prior work (DCI and DOCCI), and also GPT-4V outputs.

Finally, we quantify the richness of the IIW model outputs via two downstream evaluations. First, in Sec. 4.5, we use generated descriptions from DCI, DOCCI, and IIW fine-tuned models to prompt a Text-to-Image (T2I) model for

Table 2: Readability Metrics on Human and Model Annotated Data. We include ARI [57], Flesch Kincaid (FK) [58], Gunning Fog (GF) [59], and SMOG [60] metrics. They approximate grade level needed to comprehend the text and results indicate a more mature writing style in IIW human-authored and model generated outputs.

Dataset	Human Authored				Model Generated			
	ARI↑	FK↑	GF↑	SMOG↑	ARI↑	FK↑	GF↑	SMOG↑
DCI	5.8	5.7	8.1	8.1	2.9	3.7	6.2	6.9
DOCCI	7.5	7.1	9.5	8.7	6.4	6.6	8.7	8.2
IIW	10.4	9.5	11.8	11.5	9.3	9.0	11.3	11.7

image reconstruction and evaluate which descriptions result in higher fidelity generated images. Then, in Sec. 4.6, we quantitatively show how IIW models can generate descriptions to aid in vision-language compositional reasoning.

4.1 Automatic Readability Measurements

Before we compare descriptions with human SxS, we use a suite of *readability* metrics to quantify writing style differences between DCI, DOCCI, and IIW. We run heuristics based readability metrics over both human-authored and model-generated descriptions (see Sec. 4.4 for more on fine-tuned model evaluation) representing each style, and present the results in Tab. 2. Each metric roughly estimates the level of education needed to understand a piece of written text using different units, *e.g.* education years or grade-level. While they are proxy signals, a pattern across all can be seen as a clear indication of a more mature and articulate writing style for IIW in comparison with the other alternatives.

4.2 Side-by-Side (SxS) Evaluation Framework

We design our human SxS framework to evaluate on 5 metrics: Comprehensiveness, Specificity, Hallucinations, quality of the first few line(s) as a TLDR (Too Long Didn’t Read; meant to serve as a succinct summary), and Human-Like. The evaluation is done on a 5 point scale defined using “substantially better” (++) or “marginally better” (+) ratings on both sides of a “neutral” (-). Higher numbers indicate higher quality across each metric, and our tables report *percentages* for ease of comparison. This setup is used to run IIW human-authored (Sec. 4.3) and IIW fine-tuned model (Sec. 4.4) quality comparative evaluations. We emphasize that this is an *extremely challenging* human annotation task, where per image, two text pieces of 100+ words need to be evaluated across 5 metrics in a SxS setting. On average, we observe each comparison takes 15-20 minutes. Details on the annotation setup and UI are in the Supplemental.

4.3 Human Annotation Quality Evaluation

To run a SxS experiment on human-authored description quality, we first need a common pool of human annotated images. For this, we additionally annotate the

Table 3: Human SxS to Evaluate IIW Human-Authored Data. The eval reports percentages comparing data from prior work with data annotated by the IIW framework.

Metric	DCI Test					DOCCI Test				
	DCI		IIW			DOCCI		IIW		
	++	+	-	+	++	++	+	-	+	++
Comprehensiveness	3	7	19	30	41	4	6	38	33	19
Specificity	5	3	4	20	68	3	2	8	22	65
Hallucinations	2	3	48	32	15	0	12	41	34	13
TLDR	3	0	3	20	74	1	4	11	30	54
Human-Like	1	1	14	25	59	1	0	30	46	23

DCI test set (112) and a comparable number of samples (100) from the DOCCI test set with our IIW annotation framework. We thus have human-authored IIW annotations for direct comparison on images in the DCI and DOCCI datasets.

Table 3 reports preference percentages for each human-authored test set on our five metrics. Comparing IIW to DCI and DOCCI, Comprehensiveness is higher by +61% and +42%, Specificity by +80% and +82%, Hallucinations are lower by 42% and 35%, TLDR quality is higher by +91% and +79%, and Human-Likeness improves by +82% and +68%, respectively. This indicates that the IIW human-authored image descriptions on images from DCI and DOCCI are considerably better than those originally published with prior work.

To further quantify the quality of IIW human annotations, we compare with GPT-4V outputs [33–35] in Tab. 5 (right). We use GPT-4V to generate image descriptions on 100 IIW images. The descriptions are generated with the prompt “Generate a detailed image description” and no other specifications. The results from the Model-Human section of Tab. 5 show that we reach Comprehensiveness (+35%), Specificity (+53%), Hallucination (+59%), TLDR (+70%), and Human-Likeness (+21%) improvements over GPT-4V outputs. Although GPT-4V performs relatively better than the human-authored data from DCI and DOCCI when compared to IIW annotations, we assess that considerable future modeling efforts are needed for VLMs to reach IIW human-authored quality.

4.4 IIW Fine-tuned VLM Evaluation

After evaluating IIW human annotations, we turn to quantifying the impact of fine-tuning with IIW data versus fine-tuning with prior annotations. We begin by directly evaluating model-generated outputs with automated text similarity metrics, and then run additional human SxS for comparison. Using the standard automatic metrics, Tab. 4 illustrates how fine-tuned models largely perform better in replicating their own style. We also report CIDEr, BERTScore [67], and BLEURT [40] metrics in the Supplemental.

We report these results simply to emphasize the limitations of these metrics when measuring the quality of hyper-detailed image descriptions. Our main evaluation instead uses the same human SxS setup as in Sec. 4.2. We evaluate the three fine-tuned models on a random sample of LocNar Eval images, which can

Table 4: Cross Dataset Automatic Metric Evaluation of Fine-tuned Models

PaLI-ft	DCI Test (112)			DOCCI Test (5k)			IIW Test (445)		
	bleu-4	rouge-1	rouge-2	bleu-4	rouge-1	rouge-2	bleu-4	rouge-1	rouge-2
DCI	4.97	35.38	12.70	5.24	39.55	12.95	2.30	31.70	8.58
DOCCI	4.24	34.60	10.70	8.68	45.50	17.07	3.50	36.10	10.02
IIW	3.02	31.59	8.02	4.60	38.10	10.06	5.66	38.57	11.73

Table 5: Human SxS to Evaluate IIW Model Predictions. Model Generated compares IIW to prior work DCI and DOCCI using PaLI-5B fine-tuned models and GPT-4V outputs. Model-Human then compares GPT-4V model to IIW human-annotations.

Metric	Model Generated														Model-Human					
	LocNar Eval										IIW-400				IIW-400					
	DCI		IIW		DOCCI		IIW		GPT-4V		IIW		GPT-4V		IIW					
	++	+	-	+	++	++	+	-	+	++	++	+	-	+	++	++	+	-	+	++
Comprehensive	7	10	24	32	27	5	22	42	26	5	21	29	36	10	4	3	10	39	29	19
Specificity	6	10	14	24	46	6	14	23	33	24	46	32	12	8	2	6	10	15	35	34
Hallucinations	12	21	43	11	13	9	25	39	21	6	22	29	23	20	6	0	6	29	34	31
TLDR	9	11	9	30	41	6	7	17	42	28	7	15	27	31	20	5	6	8	47	34
Human-Like	11	5	13	32	39	6	12	41	27	14	8	22	60	7	3	6	13	41	27	13

be considered as out-of-distribution for each of these fine-tuning datasets. The results mirror Tab. 3’s human-authored statistics more closely. We see IIW gains over existing datasets (DCI, DOCCI) on Comprehensiveness (+42, +4)%, Specificity (+54, +37)%, TLDR (+51, +57)% and Human-Likeness (+55, +23)% with a relatively small hallucination trade-off (-9, -7)%, largely dominated by marginal rated losses. Overall, compared to DCI and DOCCI, IIW model-generated outputs show a higher average preference from human judgement by +31%.

From Tab. 5 (middle), we see that the IIW PaLI-5B fine-tuned model has clear room for improvement compared to GPT-4V, as expected given its 5B size. It is worth noting that it competes well on the Human-Likeness writing-style metric, and actually excels at learning the TLDR concept, which we built as a distinct feature of our dataset.

4.5 Reconstructing Images with IIW Descriptions

To complement our direct qualitative analysis, we consider how model-generated descriptions are useful for other downstream use-cases. We first consider how IIW generated descriptions can empower T2I models to produce more controlled and specific image reconstructions. For this study, we re-use the PaLI-5B (DCI, DOCCI and IIW) fine-tuned VLMs from Sec. 4.4 to generate descriptions on 240 images from the LocNar eval set. We then split the image description for each (original image, VLM) pair into sentences as units which are fed as cumulative inputs (*i.e.*, sentence 1, sentence 1 & 2, sentence 1 & 2 & 3...) to an Imagen model variant [45]. By breaking up a description into its sentences, we aim to study how IIW descriptions are higher quality at the same input unit length compared to prior work. We ultimately evaluate ~ 1000 generated images across

Table 6: T2I Reconstruction Rankings from Image Descriptions. The original image is compared to generated images from cumulative sentence inputs on both relative (Mean Rank Position) and absolute (CLIP similarity) metrics. For both, we limit the comparisons to a rough estimate of maximum token length in the T2I and CLIP Model.

PaLI-ft	Mean Rank Position ↓					CLIP Similarity ↑			
	1	1-2	1-3	1-4	1-5	1	1-2	1-3	1-4
DCI	2.05	2.06	1.95	2.00	1.88	0.844	0.852	0.855	0.850
DOCCI	1.74	1.79	1.83	1.84	1.86	0.853	0.862	0.865	0.855
IIW	1.63	1.69	1.62	1.66	1.66	0.861	0.867	0.870	0.868




Fig. 4: Example T2I Outputs and the Resulting Human Rankings. We show an example output when the first sentence of the image description from DCI, DOCCI and IIW PaLI-5B fine-tuned models are fed as input to the same T2I model. Richer information in the first sentence from IIW makes the T2I model reconstruct the original image more closely. Additional examples are provided in the Supplemental.

the varied input sentence unit lengths (over the 240 random LocNar eval images) as a 3-way human ranking evaluation (Fig. 4) and report results in Tab. 6. To assess image-reconstruction power, we also report the CLIP [41] similarity score between the reconstructed image and the original image. The results indicate that IIW’s detailed outputs consistently lead to better T2I reconstruction, with highest mean rank and CLIP similarity regardless of the length of input units. Additional rank plots and examples are shared in the Supplemental.

4.6 Compositional Reasoning with IIW Descriptions

We look to a second downstream evaluation to quantify the impact of our hyper-detailed image descriptions. Specifically, we use IIW generated descriptions to aid in vision-language compositional reasoning. Probing datasets ARO [62], SVO-Probes [15], and Winoground [51] modify image captions to no longer match

Table 7: VL Compositional Reasoning Accuracy with Image Descriptions. We evaluate if richer IIW descriptions can help to distinguish the true matching image caption in ARO, SVO-Probes, and Winoground Datasets. The COCO and Flickr30k Order Subsets of ARO are not reported due to a very high language bias baseline of 98%.

Image Description Model	ARO [66]		SVO-Probes [15]	Winoground [51]
	VG-A	VG-R		
None (Language Bias Baseline)	56.50	59.94	50.71	49.88
InstructBLIP-Vicuna-7B	83.99	62.73	89.35	65.25
LLaVA-V1.5-7B	84.80	63.71	87.89	63.38
IIW PaLI-3 5B	90.37	66.19	88.66	69.38

the paired image¹: changing visual attributes or relationships, swapping verbs, or shuffling image captions such that they contain the same words but reflect different semantics. This is done to evaluate different types of vision-language reasoning, *e.g.*, visual attribute understanding or verb understanding.

In this experiment we evaluate if IIW descriptions can be used to distinguish the real image caption from the incorrect negative caption in ARO, SVO-Probes, and Winoground datasets using an LLM-only setup. We prompt PaLM2-340B [3] to select which of the caption options is true given the image description (see the Supplemental for the exact input prompt). This essentially replaces the image in these datasets with a generated description; the amount the description is able to boost accuracy on these compositional reasoning tests should correlate to the description’s comprehensiveness and specificity. We compare IIW fine-tuned models to two larger (7B) open source models: InstructBLIP-Vicuna-7B [10] and LLaVA-V1.5-7B [28] in Tab. 7, with additional models in the Supplemental.

Our first baseline is the no-image condition, which simply asks an LLM which image caption is more likely. This serves an important language-bias baseline (the first row of Tab. 7), and quantifies whether the vision-language compositional reasoning task really requires vision at all. Our results show that SVO-Probes and Winoground have the lowest language bias (baseline performs nearly at random). On the other hand, ARO visual genome attribution and relation subsets are not quite at random baseline; we also note that we do not include the Flickr30k nor COCO order ARO subsets, as the LLM can distinguish the true caption at 98% accuracy without any image description.

When incorporating image descriptions, all models perform significantly better than the language-bias baseline. Our IIW fine-tuned model results in the best task performance for ARO Visual Genome Attribution and Relation (VG-A, VG-R) and Winoground, with accuracy gains of nearly 34%, 6%, and 20%, respectively. Moreover, we can further boost performance compared to the InstructBLIP and LLaVA image captions: we improve reasoning accuracy by about 6%, 2%, and 4% compared to the best image description model-based baseline. For SVO-Probes, we find smaller differences amongst the image description models, with IIW, InstructBLIP, and LLaVA within ~ 1 point of each other.

¹ SVO-Probes has a negative *image* for each positive image-caption pair. The negative images also have captions, so we use those in our experiments.

5 Data Release

We release a subset of human- and model-annotated IIW image & descriptions, as well as human SxS results on Human Authored and Model-Human sourced pairs of descriptions. The model generated descriptions may have hallucinations, information recall losses, or non-human like writing style artifacts. By releasing this subset along with human SxS judgements, we encourage the development of new metrics and evaluation systems to detect them in an automated, scalable manner. It also promotes fair comparison across methods in future work. The set is released under a [CC BY 4.0](#) license on [GitHub](#).

Human Annotated We provide human-authored annotations from the IIW framework. *IIW-400*, a new eval dataset of 400 random images sampled from DOCCI-AAR [32]. Full IIW Task-1 and Task-2 annotations (Sec. 3.3) along with 100 human SxS results each on GPT-4V and IIW PaLI-5B models (including model predictions). *DCI-Test*, 112 images re-annotated with the IIW framework along with human SxS results comparing them to DCI’s original human annotations. *DOCCI-Test*, 100 random images re-annotated with the IIW framework along with human SxS results comparing them to DOCCI’s human annotations.

Model Annotated We release 2.4k random images annotated by the IIW PaLI-5B model (Tab. 4) comprising of the *IIW-400* set (as used for the human SxS evaluation), 1k samples from the LocNar Eval set (from the *OpenImages* [21] subset), and 1k samples from the XM3600 images [50].

6 Conclusion

In this work, we described ImageInWords (IIW), a new framework for rich, hyper-detailed image descriptions. Our annotation guidelines and seeded sequential annotation process lead to human authored descriptions that are strongly preferred over both prior work’s human annotations (+66%) and fine-tuned models (+31%). Images constructed with IIW descriptions were ranked 1st more often regardless of how much of the image description was used, reflecting higher saliency earlier and better overall quality. Our compositional reasoning evaluation showed IIW descriptions to best contain fine-grained visual detail needed to decipher true from false visual attributes and semantics, with accuracy gains of up to 6% over our most performant baselines. Collectively, our results show the quality and utility of IIW image descriptions as state-of-the-art.

In future work, we will explore the potential of hyper-detailed image descriptions to improve tasks like image retrieval, visual question answering, synthetic data generation, T2I fine-tuning, and automatic evaluation metrics to measure these outputs. We are working on extending our careful and meticulous data vetting process to ensure geodiverse images and continuing to improve the efficiency of our data collection framework. Our current work focused on producing detailed descriptions in English, and future iterations will expand this to more languages with locale-specificity. Our goal is to make the annotation guidelines holistic, reduce human effort and dependency in the annotation process, and help shift the narrative from captions to descriptions.

References

1. Agrawal, H., Desai, K., Wang, Y., Chen, X., Jain, R., Johnson, M., Batra, D., Parikh, D., Lee, S., Anderson, P.: nocaps: novel object captioning at scale. In: Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision. pp. 8948–8957 (2019)
2. Anderson, P., He, X., Buehler, C., Teney, D., Johnson, M., Gould, S., Zhang, L.: Bottom-up and top-down attention for image captioning and visual question answering (2018)
3. Anil, R., Dai, A.M., Firat, O., Johnson, M., Lepikhin, D., Passos, A., Shakeri, S., Taropa, E., Bailey, P., Chen, Z., Chu, E., Clark, J.H., Shafey, L.E., Huang, Y., Meier-Hellstern, K., Mishra, G., Moreira, E., Omernick, M., Robinson, K., Ruder, S., Tay, Y., Xiao, K., Xu, Y., Zhang, Y., Abrego, G.H., Ahn, J., Austin, J., Barham, P., Botha, J., Bradbury, J., Brahma, S., Brooks, K., Catasta, M., Cheng, Y., Cherry, C., Choquette-Choo, C.A., Chowdhery, A., Crepy, C., Dave, S., Dehghani, M., Dev, S., Devlin, J., Díaz, M., Du, N., Dyer, E., Feinberg, V., Feng, F., Fienber, V., Freitag, M., Garcia, X., Gehrmann, S., Gonzalez, L., Gur-Ari, G., Hand, S., Hashemi, H., Hou, L., Howland, J., Hu, A., Hui, J., Hurwitz, J., Isard, M., Ittycheriah, A., Jagielski, M., Jia, W., Kenealy, K., Krikun, M., Kudugunta, S., Lan, C., Lee, K., Lee, B., Li, E., Li, M., Li, W., Li, Y., Li, J., Lim, H., Lin, H., Liu, Z., Liu, F., Maggioni, M., Mahendru, A., Maynez, J., Misra, V., Moussalem, M., Nado, Z., Nham, J., Ni, E., Nystrom, A., Parrish, A., Pellat, M., Polacek, M., Polozov, A., Pope, R., Qiao, S., Reif, E., Richter, B., Riley, P., Ros, A.C., Roy, A., Saeta, B., Samuel, R., Shelby, R., Slone, A., Smilkov, D., So, D.R., Sohn, D., Tokumine, S., Valter, D., Vasudevan, V., Vodrahalli, K., Wang, X., Wang, P., Wang, Z., Wang, T., Wieting, J., Wu, Y., Xu, K., Xu, Y., Xue, L., Yin, P., Yu, J., Zhang, Q., Zheng, S., Zheng, C., Zhou, W., Zhou, D., Petrov, S., Wu, Y.: Palm 2 technical report (2023)
4. Betker, J., Goh, G., Jing, L., Brooks, T., Wang, J., Li, L., Ouyang, L., Zhuang, J., Lee, J., Guo, Y., Manassra, W., Dhariwal, P., Chu, C., Jiao, Y., Ramesh, A.: Improving image generation with better captions (2023), <https://cdn.openai.com/papers/dall-e-3.pdf>
5. Bonilla, D.: Pixlore: A dataset-driven approach to rich image captioning (2023)
6. Burghardt, K., Hogg, T., Lerman, K.: Quantifying the impact of cognitive biases in question-answering systems (2019)
7. Chen, T., Saxena, S., Li, L., Fleet, D.J., Hinton, G.: Pix2seq: A language modeling framework for object detection (2022)
8. Chen, X., Wang, X., Beyer, L., Kolesnikov, A., Wu, J., Voigtlaender, P., Mustafa, B., Goodman, S., Alabdulmohsin, I., Padlewski, P., Salz, D., Xiong, X., Vlasic, D., Pavetic, F., Rong, K., Yu, T., Keysers, D., Zhai, X., Soricut, R.: Pali-3 vision language models: Smaller, faster, stronger (2023)
9. Chen, X., Wang, X., Changpinyo, S., Piergiovanni, A., Padlewski, P., Salz, D., Goodman, S., Grycner, A., Mustafa, B., Beyer, L., Kolesnikov, A., Puigcerver, J., Ding, N., Rong, K., Akbari, H., Mishra, G., Xue, L., Thapliyal, A., Bradbury, J., Kuo, W., Seyedhosseini, M., Jia, C., Ayan, B.K., Riquelme, C., Steiner, A., Angelova, A., Zhai, X., Hounsby, N., Soricut, R.: Pali: A jointly-scaled multilingual language-image model (2023)
10. Dai, W., Li, J., Li, D., Tiong, A.M.H., Zhao, J., Wang, W., Li, B., Fung, P., Hoi, S.: Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning (2023)

11. Dai, W., Liu, Z., Ji, Z., Su, D., Fung, P.: Plausible may not be faithful: Probing object hallucination in vision-language pre-training (2023)
12. Desai, K., Kaul, G., Aysola, Z., Johnson, J.: Redcaps: web-curated image-text data created by the people, for the people (2021)
13. Doveh, S., Arbel, A., Harary, S., Herzig, R., Kim, D., Cascante-bonilla, P., Alfassy, A., Panda, R., Giryes, R., Feris, R., Ullman, S., Karlinsky, L.: Dense and aligned captions (dac) promote compositional reasoning in vl models (2023)
14. Gurari, D., Zhao, Y., Zhang, M., Bhattacharya, N.: Captioning images taken by people who are blind (2020)
15. Hendricks, L.A., Nematzadeh, A.: Probing image-language transformers for verb understanding (2021)
16. Hochreiter, S., Schmidhuber, J.: Long short-term memory. *Neural computation* **9**, 1735–80 (12 1997). <https://doi.org/10.1162/neco.1997.9.8.1735>
17. Hsieh, C.Y., Zhang, J., Ma, Z., Kembhavi, A., Krishna, R.: Sugarcrepe: Fixing hackable benchmarks for vision-language compositionality. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **36** (2024)
18. Jia, C., Yang, Y., Xia, Y., Chen, Y.T., Parekh, Z., Pham, H., Le, Q.V., Sung, Y., Li, Z., Duerig, T.: Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision (2021)
19. Kazemzadeh, S., Ordonez, V., Matten, M., Berg, T.: Referitgame: Referring to objects in photographs of natural scenes. In: *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*. pp. 787–798 (2014)
20. Kirillov, A., Mintun, E., Ravi, N., Mao, H., Rolland, C., Gustafson, L., Xiao, T., Whitehead, S., Berg, A.C., Lo, W.Y., Dollár, P., Girshick, R.: Segment anything (2023)
21. Krasin, I., Duerig, T., Alldrin, N., Ferrari, V., Abu-El-Haija, S., Kuznetsova, A., Rom, H., Uijlings, J., Popov, S., Kamali, S., Mallocci, M., Pont-Tuset, J., Veit, A., Belongie, S., Gomes, V., Gupta, A., Sun, C., Chechik, G., Cai, D., Feng, Z., Narayanan, D., Murphy, K.: Openimages: A public dataset for large-scale multi-label and multi-class image classification. Dataset available from <https://storage.googleapis.com/openimages/web/index.html> (2017)
22. Krause, J., Johnson, J., Krishna, R., Fei-Fei, L.: A hierarchical approach for generating descriptive image paragraphs. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. pp. 317–325 (2017)
23. Krishna, R., Zhu, Y., Groth, O., Johnson, J., Hata, K., Kravitz, J., Chen, S., Kalantidis, Y., Li, L.J., Shamma, D.A., Bernstein, M.S., Li, F.F.: Visual genome: Connecting language and vision using crowdsourced dense image annotations (2016)
24. Kryściński, W., Keskar, N.S., McCann, B., Xiong, C., Socher, R.: Neural text summarization: A critical evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.08960* (2019)
25. Li, J., Li, D., Savarese, S., Hoi, S.: Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models (2023)
26. Lin, C.Y.: ROUGE: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In: *Text Summarization Branches Out*. pp. 74–81. Association for Computational Linguistics, Barcelona, Spain (Jul 2004), <https://aclanthology.org/W04-1013>
27. Lin, T.Y., Maire, M., Belongie, S., Bourdev, L., Girshick, R., Hays, J., Perona, P., Ramanan, D., Zitnick, C.L., Dollár, P.: Microsoft coco: Common objects in context (2015)
28. Liu, H., Li, C., Wu, Q., Lee, Y.J.: Visual instruction tuning (2023)
29. Ma, Z., Hong, J., Gul, M.O., Gandhi, M., Gao, I., Krishna, R.: Crepe: Can vision-language foundation models reason compositionally? In: *Proceedings of the*

- IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). pp. 10910–10921 (June 2023)
30. Mao, J., Huang, J., Toshev, A., Camburu, O., Yuille, A.L., Murphy, K.: Generation and comprehension of unambiguous object descriptions. In: Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition. pp. 11–20 (2016)
 31. Marshall, C., Shipman, F.: Experiences surveying the crowd: Reflections on methods, participation, and reliability. In: Proceedings of the 3rd Annual ACM Web Science Conference, WebSci 2013. pp. 234–243 (05 2013). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2464464.2464485>
 32. Z. Onoe, Y., Rane, S., Berger, Z., Bitton, Y., Cho, J., Garg, R., Ku, A., Parekh, N., Pont-Tuset, J., Tanzer, G., Wang, S., Baldrige, J.: DOCCI: Descriptions of connected and contrasting images (2024)
 33. OpenAI, :, Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F.L., Almeida, D., Altenschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S., Avila, R., Babuschkin, I., Balaji, S., Balcom, V., Baltescu, P., Bao, H., Bavarian, M., Belgum, J., Bello, I., Berdine, J., Bernadett-Shapiro, G., Berner, C., Bogdonoff, L., Boiko, O., Boyd, M., Brakman, A.L., Brockman, G., Brooks, T., Brundage, M., Button, K., Cai, T., Campbell, R., Cann, A., Carey, B., Carlson, C., Carmichael, R., Chan, B., Chang, C., Chantzis, F., Chen, D., Chen, S., Chen, R., Chen, J., Chen, M., Chess, B., Cho, C., Chu, C., Chung, H.W., Cummings, D., Currier, J., Dai, Y., Decareaux, C., Degry, T., Deutsch, N., Deville, D., Dhar, A., Dohan, D., Dowling, S., Dunning, S., Ecoffet, A., Eleti, A., Eloundou, T., Farhi, D., Fedus, L., Felix, N., Fishman, S.P., Forte, J., Fulford, I., Gao, L., Georges, E., Gibson, C., Goel, V., Gogineni, T., Goh, G., Gontijo-Lopes, R., Gordon, J., Grafstein, M., Gray, S., Greene, R., Gross, J., Gu, S.S., Guo, Y., Hallacy, C., Han, J., Harris, J., He, Y., Heaton, M., Heidecke, J., Hesse, C., Hickey, A., Hickey, W., Hoeschele, P., Houghton, B., Hsu, K., Hu, S., Hu, X., Huizinga, J., Jain, S., Jain, S., Jang, J., Jiang, A., Jiang, R., Jin, H., Jin, D., Jomoto, S., Jonn, B., Jun, H., Kaftan, T., Łukasz Kaiser, Kamali, A., Kanitscheider, I., Keskar, N.S., Khan, T., Kilpatrick, L., Kim, J.W., Kim, C., Kim, Y., Kirchner, H., Kiros, J., Knight, M., Kokotajlo, D., Łukasz Kondraciuk, Kondrich, A., Konstantinidis, A., Kosic, K., Krueger, G., Kuo, V., Lampe, M., Lan, I., Lee, T., Leike, J., Leung, J., Levy, D., Li, C.M., Lim, R., Lin, M., Lin, S., Litwin, M., Lopez, T., Lowe, R., Lue, P., Makanju, A., Malfacini, K., Manning, S., Markov, T., Markovski, Y., Martin, B., Mayer, K., Mayne, A., McGrew, B., McKinney, S.M., McLeavey, C., McMillan, P., McNeil, J., Medina, D., Mehta, A., Menick, J., Metz, L., Mishchenko, A., Mishkin, P., Monaco, V., Morikawa, E., Mossing, D., Mu, T., Murati, M., Murk, O., Mély, D., Nair, A., Nakano, R., Nayak, R., Neelakantan, A., Ngo, R., Noh, H., Ouyang, L., O’Keefe, C., Pachocki, J., Paino, A., Palermo, J., Pantuliano, A., Parascandolo, G., Parish, J., Parparita, E., Passos, A., Pavlov, M., Peng, A., Perelman, A., de Avila Belbute Peres, F., Petrov, M., de Oliveira Pinto, H.P., Michael, Pokorny, Pokrass, M., Pong, V., Powell, T., Power, A., Power, B., Proehl, E., Puri, R., Radford, A., Rae, J., Ramesh, A., Raymond, C., Real, F., Rimbach, K., Ross, C., Rotsted, B., Roussez, H., Ryder, N., Saltarelli, M., Sanders, T., Santurkar, S., Sastry, G., Schmidt, H., Schnurr, D., Schulman, J., Selsam, D., Sheppard, K., Sherbakov, T., Shieh, J., Shoker, S., Shyam, P., Sidor, S., Sigler, E., Simens, M., Sitkin, J., Slama, K., Sohl, I., Sokolowsky, B., Song, Y., Staudacher, N., Such, F.P., Summers, N., Sutskever, I., Tang, J., Tezak, N., Thompson, M., Tillet, P., Tootoonchian, A., Tseng, E., Tuggle, P., Turley, N., Tworek, J., Uribe, J.F.C., Vallone, A., Vijayvergiya, A., Voss, C., Wainwright, C., Wang, J.J., Wang, A., Wang, B., Ward, J., Wei, J., Weinmann, C., Welihinda, A., Welinder, P., Weng, J.,

- Weng, L., Wiethoff, M., Willner, D., Winter, C., Wolrich, S., Wong, H., Workman, L., Wu, S., Wu, J., Wu, M., Xiao, K., Xu, T., Yoo, S., Yu, K., Yuan, Q., Zaremba, W., Zellers, R., Zhang, C., Zhang, M., Zhao, S., Zheng, T., Zhuang, J., Zhuk, W., Zoph, B.: Gpt-4 technical report (2023)
34. OpenAI: Gpt-4. <https://openai.com/research/gpt-4,2023> (2023), [Online; accessed 19-February-2024]
 35. OpenAI: Gpt-4v(ision) technical work and authors. <https://cdn.openai.com/contributions/gpt-4v.pdf,2023> (2023), [Online; accessed 19-February-2024]
 36. Pandey, R., Purohit, H., Castillo, C., Shalin, V.L.: Modeling and mitigating human annotation errors to design efficient stream processing systems with human-in-the-loop machine learning. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* **160**, 102772 (2022). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2022.102772>, <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1071581922000015>
 37. Papineni, K., Roukos, S., Ward, T., Zhu, W.J.: Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In: Isabelle, P., Charniak, E., Lin, D. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. pp. 311–318. Association for Computational Linguistics, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA (Jul 2002). <https://doi.org/10.3115/1073083.1073135>, <https://aclanthology.org/P02-1040>
 38. Plummer, B.A., Wang, L., Cervantes, C.M., Caicedo, J.C., Hockenmaier, J., Lazebnik, S.: Flickr30k entities: Collecting region-to-phrase correspondences for richer image-to-sentence models. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. pp. 2641–2649 (2015)
 39. Pont-Tuset, J., Uijlings, J., Changpinyo, S., Soricut, R., Ferrari, V.: Connecting vision and language with localized narratives. In: *ECCV* (2020)
 40. Pu, A., Chung, H.W., Parikh, A.P., Gehrmann, S., Sellam, T.: Learning compact metrics for mt. In: *Proceedings of EMNLP* (2021)
 41. Radford, A., Kim, J.W., Hallacy, C., Ramesh, A., Goh, G., Agarwal, S., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Mishkin, P., Clark, J., et al.: Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In: *International conference on machine learning*. pp. 8748–8763. PMLR (2021)
 42. Ray, A., Radenovic, F., Dubey, A., Plummer, B.A., Krishna, R., Saenko, K.: Cola: A benchmark for compositional text-to-image retrieval (2023)
 43. Ren, S., He, K., Girshick, R., Sun, J.: Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks. In: Cortes, C., Lawrence, N., Lee, D., Sugiyama, M., Garnett, R. (eds.) *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. vol. 28. Curran Associates, Inc. (2015), https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2015/file/14bfa6bb14875e45bba028a21ed38046-Paper.pdf
 44. Rohrbach, A., Hendricks, L.A., Burns, K., Darrell, T., Saenko, K.: Object hallucination in image captioning (2019)
 45. Saharia, C., Chan, W., Saxena, S., Li, L., Whang, J., Denton, E., Ghasemipour, S.K.S., Ayan, B.K., Mahdavi, S.S., Lopes, R.G., Salimans, T., Ho, J., Fleet, D.J., Norouzi, M.: Photorealistic text-to-image diffusion models with deep language understanding (2022)
 46. Schuhmann, C., Beaumont, R., Vencu, R., Gordon, C., Wightman, R., Cherti, M., Coombes, T., Katta, A., Mullis, C., Wortsman, M., Schramowski, P., Kundurthy, S., Crowson, K., Schmidt, L., Kaczmarczyk, R., Jitsev, J.: Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models (2022)

47. Sharma, P., Ding, N., Goodman, S., Soricut, R.: Conceptual captions: A cleaned, hypernymed, image alt-text dataset for automatic image captioning. In: Gurevych, I., Miyao, Y. (eds.) *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. pp. 2556–2565. Association for Computational Linguistics, Melbourne, Australia (Jul 2018). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P18-1238>, <https://aclanthology.org/P18-1238>
48. Shekhar, R., Pezzelle, S., Klimovich, Y., Herbelot, A., Nabi, M., Sangineto, E., Bernardi, R.: Foil it! find one mismatch between image and language caption. In: *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Association for Computational Linguistics (2017). <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/p17-1024>, <http://dx.doi.org/10.18653/v1/P17-1024>
49. Sidorov, O., Hu, R., Rohrbach, M., Singh, A.: Textcaps: a dataset for image captioning with reading comprehension (2020)
50. Thapliyal, A.V., Pont-Tuset, J., Chen, X., Soricut, R.: Crossmodal-3600: A massively multilingual multimodal evaluation dataset (2022)
51. Thrush, T., Jiang, R., Bartolo, M., Singh, A., Williams, A., Kiela, D., Ross, C.: Winoground: Probing vision and language models for visio-linguistic compositionality (2022)
52. Urbanek, J., Bordes, F., Astolfi, P., Williamson, M., Sharma, V., Romero-Soriano, A.: A picture is worth more than 77 text tokens: Evaluating clip-style models on dense captions (2023)
53. Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A.N., Kaiser, L., Polosukhin, I.: Attention is all you need (2023)
54. Vedantam, R., Zitnick, C.L., Parikh, D.: Cider: Consensus-based image description evaluation (2015)
55. Vinyals, O., Toshev, A., Bengio, S., Erhan, D.: Show and tell: A neural image caption generator (2015)
56. Wikipedia contributors: Alt attribute — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Alt_attribute&oldid=1189330128 (2023), [Online; accessed 15-January-2024]
57. Wikipedia contributors: Automated readability index — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Automated_readability_index&oldid=1145735758 (2023), [Online; accessed 22-February-2024]
58. Wikipedia contributors: Flesch–kincaid readability tests — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Flesch–Kincaid_readability_tests&oldid=1192056958 (2023), [Online; accessed 22-February-2024]
59. Wikipedia contributors: Gunning fog index — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Gunning_fog_index&oldid=1181089308 (2023), [Online; accessed 22-February-2024]
60. Wikipedia contributors: Smog — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. <https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=SMOG&oldid=1192815974> (2023), [Online; accessed 22-February-2024]
61. Wikipedia contributors: Jaccard index — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia (2024), https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Jaccard_index&oldid=1196092673, [Online; accessed 24-January-2024]
62. Yarom, M., Bitton, Y., Changpinyo, S., Aharoni, R., Herzig, J., Lang, O., Ofek, E., Szpektor, I.: What you see is what you read? improving text-image alignment evaluation (2023)

63. Ye, A., Santy, S., Hwang, J.D., Zhang, A.X., Krishna, R.: Cultural and linguistic diversity improves visual representations. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14356 (2023)
64. Young, P., Lai, A., Hodosh, M., Hockenmaier, J.: From image descriptions to visual denotations: New similarity metrics for semantic inference over event descriptions. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* **2**, 67–78 (02 2014). https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00166, https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00166
65. Yu, J., Xu, Y., Koh, J.Y., Luong, T., Baid, G., Wang, Z., Vasudevan, V., Ku, A., Yang, Y., Ayan, B.K., Hutchinson, B., Han, W., Parekh, Z., Li, X., Zhang, H., Baldrige, J., Wu, Y.: Scaling autoregressive models for content-rich text-to-image generation (2022)
66. Yuksekgonul, M., Bianchi, F., Kalluri, P., Jurafsky, D., Zou, J.: When and why vision-language models behave like bags-of-words, and what to do about it? (2023)
67. Zhang, T., Kishore, V., Wu, F., Weinberger, K.Q., Artzi, Y.: Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with BERT. In: 8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26–30, 2020. OpenReview.net (2020), <https://openreview.net/forum?id=SkeHuCVFDr>

7 Supplementary Material

7.1 Annotation Guidelines

We now present the full detailed annotation guideline used for IIW annotations. Image descriptions should be composed such that they *paint a vivid mental picture* of an actual image in the mind of someone hearing the description and has their eyes closed. In order to reach this level of detail composed in an articulate manner, we compile an extensive set of annotation guidelines. We iterated over these guidelines with multiple pilot rounds.

The annotators are asked to *operate as if they are instructing a painter to paint with their words* and only include details that can be deduced from visual cues, erring on the side of higher precision. Unnecessary fragmentation of sentences should be avoided to compose in a flowy coherent style avoiding the use of *filler phrases* like: “*In this image,*” “*we can see,*” “*there is a,*” “*this is a picture of,*” since they add no visual detail and come at a cost of verbosity.

Objects form the lego-blocks of an image. Interactions and spatial arrangements among them help to form the context of the image. In complex multi-object images with dense settings, noting each and every object independently can become cumbersome and highly dependent on the effort the particular human annotator puts in. To define this better and expect a consistent behavior from the annotation outputs, we introduce the notion of *salient objects*. Key objects without which the image would lose its context and meaning are considered *salient*. This can include individual objects or combinations of them depending on the role they play in the image; consider the following 2 cases as examples:

- Three people in the blurry background of an image, with the scene set inside a coffee shop, who play no concrete role individually can be grouped as *people in the background* instead of 3 individual *people* object annotations.
- Two people in the foreground and in-focus, engaged in a conversation in the same scene. The two individuals are likely the focus of the image and hence worth noting individually in detail as separate objects. This is likely what the photographer was attempting to capture.

While annotating each of these *salient objects* in an image, the annotators should consider the following axes as reference (but not limit themselves to this list), paying special attention to features that makes them unique or salient:

- **Function** Purpose of the component or the role it plays in the image
- **Shape** Specific geometric shape, organic, or abstract
- **Size** Large, small, or relative size to other objects
- **Color** Specific color with nuances like solid or variegated
- **Design/Pattern** Solid, flowers, or geometric
- **Texture** Smooth, rough, bumpy, shiny, or dull
- **Material** Wooden, metallic, glass, or plastic
- **Condition** Good, bad, old, new, damaged, or worn out
- **Opacity** Transparent, translucent, or opaque

- **Orientation** Upright, horizontal, inverted, or tilted
- **Location** Foreground, middle ground, or background
- **Relationship to other components** Interactions or relative spatial arrangement
- **Text written on objects** Where and how its written, font and its attributes, single/multi-line, or multiple pieces of individual text

Humans typically associate a set of default features to objects. Consider the following examples:

- *Car* by default is assumed to have 4 of each: tires, door, windows and 1 of each: trunk, hood, steering wheel, roof. Mentioning them separately might not be that useful as it adds no specific visual detail that we did not already know as the norm. Now, if the car is a *coupe*, has a missing window, or contains a door painted with a different color than the overall color, *i.e.*, making it a unique feature, then that would be worth mentioning in the description since it holds specific added visual value.
- *The Golden Gate Bridge* by default is orange. That being said, it does not hurt to include extra detail depending on the use-case. If the annotators do not recognize the bridge as a famous well known entity, then it would make sense to include the color and additional attributes.

When composing the overall image description, start with a newspaper style *tldr* sentence that paints a very clear high level picture. Describe the *objects* in order of their *saliency* while noting the description of individual objects and relationships in a coherent manner. Include the overall setting, background, style, and consider:

- **Overall composition** Arrangement of the elements in the image, focal point, balanced, or asymmetrical
- **Lighting** Natural or artificial, light source
- **Color palette** Colors or how they interact with each other
- **Texture** Smooth or rough, shiny or dull
- **Depth of field** Entire image or only a portion of it is in focus, what effect this has on the overall composition
- **Subject matter** Main subject of the image, other elements that are present, how they relate to the subject matter
- **Mood or feeling** Overall mood or feeling of the image

Camera angle (*i.e.*, the position of the camera in relation to the subject) is crucial, as this sets a precedence for what level and kind of information to expect. The choice of camera angle can have a significant impact on the mood and meaning of a photograph. Different camera angles can be used to create different effects and convey different messages, *e.g.*, details about a close-up are different from those of a wide angle shot. Examples of camera angles (see Figure 5):




Fig. 5: Camera Angles to Consider when Annotating Images. These are important to set a precedence on the level and kind of information to expect in the image description.

- Eye level: The camera is positioned at the same level as the subject’s eyes. This is the most natural and neutral camera angle.
- High angle: The camera is positioned above the subject. This angle can make the subject appear smaller, weaker, or less important.
- Low angle: The camera is positioned below the subject, anywhere below the eye line, looking up. This angle can make the subject appear larger, stronger, or more important. Sometimes, it is even directly below the subject’s feet.
- Ground level: The camera is positioned at the ground level. This angle captures what is in the frame at ground level, that is, the feet, or maybe the character lying on the ground.
- Dutch tilt: The camera is tilted on its axis. This angle can be used to create a sense of unease or disorientation.
- Bird’s-eye view: The camera is positioned directly above the subject. This angle can be used to show the subject’s relationship to their surroundings.
- Worm’s-eye view: The camera is positioned directly below the subject. This angle can be used to create a sense of awe or wonder.
- Top-down view or Overhead shot: The camera is above the subject and you’re taking the photograph downwards from straight above, and not at any kind of angle. It is typically closer to the subject than a bird’s eye view (see Figure 5 for comparison).

Some other terms that are sometimes used to describe camera angles and depths:

- Close-up: A close-up is a photograph that is taken from a very close distance. Close-ups can be used to show details that would not be visible from a further distance.
- Medium shot: A medium shot is a photograph that shows the subject from the waist up or from the knees up. Medium shots are often used to show the subject’s body language and facial expressions.
- Long shot: A long shot is a photograph that shows the subject from a distance. Long shots can be used to show the subject’s relationship to their surroundings.
- Full shot: A full shot is a photograph that shows the subject’s entire body. Full shots are often used to show the subject’s height and stature.
- Over-the-shoulder shot: An over-the-shoulder shot is a photograph that is taken from behind one person’s shoulder, showing the other person in the foreground. Over-the-shoulder shots are often used to create a sense of intimacy or connection between the two people.
- Point-of-view shot: A point-of-view shot is a photograph that is taken from the perspective of the subject. Point-of-view shots can be used to create a sense of immersion in the scene.

When *text* is present, include detail such as whether the text is in a single line or spread along multiple lines, if text is in multiple lines whether there is mutual alignment, the features of the *font* such as size, style, color, and orientation (*e.g.*, vertical, horizontal, arched), *casing* (*e.g.*, lower, upper, mixed), and attributes like italics, underlined, bold, written in quotes, clearly visible or blurred. Describe the words in the case they are written.

If text is written in multiple lines, we should:

- Quote them as individual units that exist on the same line
- Mention its mutual alignment using references like vertically stacked, aligned to the left, *etc.*

For example, in Figure 6, the phrase (“Juice,” “ACROSS THE,” “Universe”) has words “Juice” and “Universe” as capitalized while the phrase “ACROSS THE” is all uppercase, and components are aligned along a diagonal. Information on the font color, type, and shadow effect should be included. As another example from the same image, the phrase (“FREE,” “ARCADE,” “GAMES”) are all upper-cased, vertically stacked and centrally aligned.

If you have a good idea of the font family and are confident, that would be valuable to note.

When *people* are present, special notes should be kept in mind. The tone should be *respectful* to the subject and not make assumptions or try to guess their gender, identity, ancestry, where they are from, sexuality, religion, *etc.* We emphasize that the descriptions should be noted in objective, neutral and fair language for related attributes and focus solely on the visual aspects. Consider the following axes with respect to attributes here:

- How much of their body is visible



Fig. 6: An Example where Quoting *Text* in a Detailed Manner can Enable Precise Reconstruction. The word-casing and alignment attributes of the multi-line phrase (“Juice,” “ACROSS THE,” “Universe”) has words “Juice” and “Universe” as capitalized while the phrase “ACROSS THE” is all upper-cased, all components are aligned along a diagonal. Information on the font color, type, shadow effect should be included. For the phrase (“FREE,” “ARCADE,” “GAMES”) all words are upper-cased, vertically stacked and centrally aligned.

- Whether the face is fully visible
- Whether they are facing the camera or looking somewhere else
- Where and what they are looking at
- What the person is doing (standing, posing, sitting, running, playing a sport)
- What they are wearing. For each piece, note the clothing item name (dress, pants, short, gloves, shoes), color, pattern (plain, striped), length (if applicable)
- What they are carrying, details about that object (bag, purse, camera)
- Whether they are using any assistance device (wheelchair, cane)
- Whether they have any unique features like marks, tattoos, scars on their body that are visible. If applicable, note the respective positions on their body where each is present
- For professions with known gender biases like “nurse,” “doctor,” or “construction worker,” explicitly include the gender (if clearly deducible) and do

not operate under the assumption that one gender is more common in that profession.

For any *apparel*, the descriptions should focus on overall style, unique details, silhouette of the garment, how it fits, fabric, color, shades, and tone of the garment. If the branding is visually visible, it should be included while attributes like size should be skipped unless visually verifiable.

Where applicable use *locale specific names* of objects like *clothing* (e.g., sherwani, kurta, kimono, saree), *food* (e.g., shawarma, dosa, paneer tikka) etc. The aim is to capture the locale specific vocabulary so the downstream models can pick them up instead of using generic abstract terms.

For *art pieces*, include art styles, time periods, mediums, moods, viewpoints, subject matters, cultures as much as possible from the visual cues.

7.2 Dataset Collection

Human Annotation Worker Pool We employed and worked with a fixed human annotator pool comprising of 20+ annotators with mixed backgrounds in creative writing, art, history, photography and related relevant domain subjects to utilize critical domain expertise and perspectives. The pool is based in multiple countries, with a US majority currently. In the future, we plan to intentionally increase diversity in our annotator pool to ensure more locale-specific vocabulary in our image descriptions. The annotators were compensated appropriately taking their skill-set, qualifications, location and the complexity of the task into account.

For text-to-image generation rankings, we employed an internal group of six people to rank the images generated by different model-generated image descriptions (i.e., we did not hire crowd workers). People participating are domain experts, familiar with text-to-image generation technology.

Annotation Methodology Seeded Annotation Considerations to keep in mind:

1. **Quality of the seeding data** is critical. It is counter productive if it's noisy as the human annotators will take longer to comb signal from the noise than to come up with the information themselves. We recommend to restrict the use of seeding signal to high precision only.
2. Risk of **biasing** the outputs as the human annotators may take the easy route of relying on the seed signal more heavily than intended. We suggest to note this point explicitly in the annotation guidelines and spot check the annotations for quality control. Additionally, running annotations with no seeding and comparing the outputs can be helpful to judge the bias being induced.

Sequential Augmentation Considerations to keep in mind:




Fig. 7: Human-in-the-Loop Learning. Over time with a constant annotator pool, each annotator gets an opportunity to read and learn from others’ perspective via an *implicit feedback loop*. This has shown to improve individual annotator quality as shown in the main paper.

1. Heavy reliance on the quality of the base dense description from the first annotator. If the quality is not good, the annotator in the next round will spend considerable time fixing the input. There are 2 mitigating steps:
 - (a) Monitor this at the beginning of the annotation project when the annotators are still new to the task using metrics like edit-distance and provide explicit feedback back to the annotators as needed.
 - (b) Annotators in each round have the option to start from scratch if they deem the quality from the previous round to be considerably low. Use this as feedback for the annotator from the previous round by presenting them the edited output to learn from.

Human-in-the-Loop Learning Our annotation framework implicitly unlocks a feedback loop for the annotators due to the sequential augmentation process discussed above. Each annotator gets an opportunity to read and learn from other’s perspective which in turn improves their individual quality. As an example from Fig. 7, we demonstrate how Annotator-1 get an opportunity to learn from Annotator-3 for the first image and Annotator-2 gets an opportunity to learn from Annotator-1 in the second image.

Model-in-the-Loop Annotation We employ an active learning loop for the VLMs where after some initial annotation data is available, a model version M_1 can be trained over the base VLM to improve the seed description quality. As more data gets annotated, M_1 can be updated by $M_2, M_3, \dots, M_n$ to reduce the human effort needed.




Fig. 8: IIW Annotation UI for Task-1. We illustrate the seed object-detection objects and VLM generated object-level captions with object cropped image bytes as input.

Advantages:

1. Reduces the dependency on the *human* both in terms of number of rounds and annotation time.
2. Provides a way to evaluate current model quality by monitoring the time, volume and patterns of augmentations during the human annotation stage.

Some considerations to keep in mind:

1. As discussed above, the effectiveness relies very heavily on the capability of the model, *i.e.*, having high comprehensiveness and low hallucinations.

Annotation Framework We now discuss the annotation framework with concrete examples and UI illustrations:

Annotation Task-1: Fine Grained Objects and Attributes In Task-1, the human annotators are presented with seed annotations for the objects from an Object-Detection (OD) model and VLM generated seed captions for each object (see Figure 8). The annotators can then annotate to note the salient objects and their corresponding description (see Figure 9).

Annotators can make the following augmentations to annotate salient objects:

- **Edit** make adjustments to the label and/or bounding box. This can include:
 - Making the labels more specific, e.g *Animal* to *German Shepherd*
 - Enlarging or tightening the bounds of the bounding box by expanding or contracting the seed box.



Fig. 9: IIW Annotation UI for Task-1. We illustrate the human augmented salient objects and their human-authored descriptions. The annotations are built on seed information from Figure 8. This example demonstrates how humans can alter the seed annotations based on the annotation guidelines, which can include merging, deleting, editing and adding new salient objects and then describing each.

- **Remove** any invalid pre-populated objects or considerably invalid bounding boxes.
- **Add** any missing salient object by drawing out a tight bounding box and adding an appropriate fine-grained label to it.
- **Merge** if object(s) are fragmented and/or pre-populated as two or more objects, the annotators can remove the individual objects and create a new single object.
 - Closely placed objects of the same/similar label/type which individually hold low value but can be described as a collection to hold a higher context value should be combined, e.g: five identical cups in an image lined up next to each other do not need to be tagged as separate objects. If there are attributes that separate one or more of them from the others, we expect the annotators to split them in groups and proceed accordingly.
 - Sub-components of a larger object should not be explicitly tagged unless there is something unique and/or worth mentioning about them. Think *if missing this detail would create a different mental picture than the actual image*, e.g., doors, windows, or tires of a *Car* can be omitted unless there is something unique about them, as they are standard expectations from a *Car* object.




Fig. 10: IIW Annotation UI for Task-2 with seed VLM description. This VLM has been fine-tuned in an active learning mode as data was collected iteratively. The seed caption from the same VLM (PaLI-5B) without the IIW fine-tuning is “a pink bicycle with a basket of flowers on it.” The seed annotation is then refined and augmented by human annotators, see Figure 11 for the final resulting description.

For each (label, bounding box) pair, we ask the annotators to generate a detailed description focused on the object in the context of the image considering the several axes as reference (see Section 7.1).

Annotation Task-2: Overall Image Description In Task-2, human annotators are presented with the annotations from Task-1 and a seeded VLM description (see Figure 10) which is then refined by human annotators in sequential rounds to produce the final hyper-detailed description (see Figure 11).

7.3 IIW Fine-Tuning Tasks

We define seven tasks with the IIW Task-1 and Task-2 annotations to fine-tune two IIW based VLM model variants of PaLI-3 5B [8]. Our models include *IIW Combined*, trained on a mixture of all seven tasks and *IIW-Task-2* based aka *IIW Model*, which is only trained on the final most detailed image description output. The seven tasks can be grouped into three categories: image region, salient objects, and detailed description based tasks, see Figure 12 for illustration.

As we later discuss, we generally find the IIW (Task 2 only) Model to be preferred over the IIW Combined variant, but include details on the additional training tasks and resulting ablations here for completeness. All results in the main paper use the IIW Model.

Image Region Tasks Using one object at a time from the list of (*label, bounding box, description*) Task 1 annotations, we perform three region-based tasks. We use normalized bounding boxes in $[ymin, xmin, ymax, xmax]$ format as in Pix2Seq [7]. Our first task is description-label grounding. In multi-object dense




Fig. 11: IIW Final Annotation UI for Task-2. We illustrate the human annotations available from Task-1 as the human annotators hover over the salient objects in the image. The annotators can additionally switch between hiding all salient objects to view the image properly. Task-2 annotations starts with the seed caption from the VLM and is then refined by human annotators in sequential rounds, building on top of the previous round's output.

images, a label in itself is not enough to uniquely identify an object. Thus, we create a grounding task with $(image, label, description)$ inputs that are tasked to predict the corresponding normalized bounding box coordinates.

Our second image region task is label prediction, in which we predict an open vocab label for the object with input $(image, bounding\ box)$. Lastly, we perform object description generation, which produces descriptions for each object in the image given $(image, bounding\ box, label)$.

Salient Objects Tasks Our next category of fine-tuning tasks concerns the salient objects in an image. We target the aggregated list of $(label, bounding\ box)$ object features per image from Task 1. Our first task is label generation, in which given an image, we aim to generate a text list of the salient object labels. The object labels are sorted alphabetically for consistency, but in future work ordering by saliency would be useful. Our second object-level task is *grounded* label generation. The task is to generate the list of $(label, bounding\ box)$ pairs per object in the image; we similarly sort the list alphabetically with respect to label name.

Detailed Description Tasks Finally, our last fine-tuning tasks relate to the sequentially annotated descriptions from Task 2. We perform description elaboration in addition to direct description generation. Given the image and description from N^{th} step, description elaboration trains the model to elaborate the current description to the final description. We also create synthetically corrupted versions of the final description to serve as additional training samples.




Fig. 12: IIW based VLM Fine-tuning Tasks. We show tasks based on data collected from Task-1 and Task-2 per the IIW annotation framework. Different tasks enable the fine-tuning to focus on the image at (object, attribute), (image, objects) or (image, hyper-detailed description) levels.

Specifically, we randomly drop $X\%$ of sentences. Sentences are dropped starting from the last sentence so that the structure of the overall text piece is maintained (as opposed to random sentence removal). For final description generation, given the image, a VLM learns to generate the final most hyper-detailed description available from the entire annotation framework. This final task (and not description elaboration), is the only task used to train the IIW model (whereas all are used for the IIW Combined ablation).

7.4 Experiments

Automatic Readability Measurements Building on the discussion from the main paper around the automatic readability metrics, we study additional distribution based readability metrics in Figure 13. The distributions further support the previous metrics to demonstrate a more mature writing style in both the IIW human-authored dataset and fine-tuned model generated outputs.

Side-by-Side (SxS) Evaluation Framework We demonstrate the Human SxS annotation UI to show the input (see Figure 14) and the corresponding human responses (see Figure 15) across the 5 metrics, each on a 5 point scale. The metrics are defined as:

- **Comprehensiveness:** The description should capture all of the important elements of the image, including objects, people, locations, actions, relationships between objects, *etc.*




Fig. 13: Distribution-based Readability Metrics. We compare both human authored and model generated outputs from IIW and prior work to show the distribution of Education based units reflected in the writing style. IIW outputs from both the human annotators and the model produce a more mature style across the metrics.

- **Specificity:** The description should use precise and descriptive language to avoid vagueness and ambiguity. *e.g.* "3 apples" and "Taj Mahal" are more specific than "some apples" and "a white marble structure" respectively.
- **Hallucinations:** The description should be factually correct and avoid making assumptions or interpretations that are not visually supported by the image.
- **First few line(s) as tldr:** The first few line(s) should paint a high level picture of what to expect in the image and create a succinct summary.
- **Human-Like:** The descriptions should feel as if an educated person wrote them and be free from artifacts hinting that a machine generated them (*e.g.* stuttering, repeating facts, fragmented chain of thought, *etc.*).

The 5 metrics are defined to capture 3 broad umbrella metrics of precision, recall and writing-style. An *overall metric* score can further be computed by taking an average of the 3 umbrella metrics. Each can be defined as follows:

$$\text{Recall} = \text{avg}(\text{Comprehensiveness}, \text{Specificity})$$

$$\text{Precision} = \text{Hallucination}$$

$$\text{Writing Style} = \text{avg}(\text{TLDR}, \text{Human Like})$$

$$\text{Overall} = \text{avg}(\text{Recall}, \text{Precision}, \text{Writing Style})$$

**A**

This is a close up photo of a lizard. The lizard is sitting on a large green leaf. The lizard is looking to the left of the image. The lizard's head is turned towards the left side of the image. The lizard's eyes are closed. The lizard's neck is visible. The lizard's tail is visible. The lizard's legs are visible. The lizard's claws are visible. The lizard's feet are visible. The leaves in the background are blurry and out of focus. The leaves in the foreground are blurry and out of focus.

B

A vivid close-up captures a lizard perched on a verdant leaf, set against a softly blurred backdrop of lush green foliage. The lizard's body is adorned with a striped pattern of light brown and tan scales, punctuated by a distinctive black spot on its head. The lizard's eyes are closed, adding a sense of tranquility to its demeanor. The leaf it's perched on is a vibrant green, its edges tinged with a reddish hue, adding a pop of color to the otherwise monochromatic scene. The lizard's claws are visible, adding to the overall composition of the shot.

Fig. 14: Human SxS Annotation UI. Annotators are shown the input image and two input image descriptions to evaluate side-by-side. The input descriptions could be from any combination of (human, model) sources. This information is not shared with the annotators and the sources are randomly flipped and marked as *A* or *B* to prevent any source or order based bias.

IIW Fine-tuned Model Ablations As an IIW ablation study, we fine-tune a separate PaLI-5B model, *IIW-Combined*, using all the data from Task 1 and Task 2 as a mixture of 7 training tasks, defined in Section 7.3. Table 9 shows that this has no clear significant gains on Task-2’s final description eval set. This currently remains a less explored area and we aim to investigate this in future work to further improve the model on Task-2 evaluations.

Additional Automatic Metrics In addition to reporting BLEU-4, ROUGE-1, and ROUGE-2 automatic metrics, we now include CIDEr [54], BERTScore [67], and BLEURT [40] metrics in Table 10. We include BERTScore and BLEURT as they are newer, model-based metrics which have been shown to correlate more closely with human judgements. CIDEr, like BLEU and ROUGE metrics are not limited by sequence length. BERTScore and BLEURT have a maximum sequence length of 512 (we specifically use the “wvm_cased_L-24_H-1024_A-16” BERT checkpoint and the latest BLEURT-20 model), but for our descriptions, they likely fit under this maximum length, with only outliers being truncated.

CIDEr and BERTScore generally show the same trend of each fine-tuned model performing best on the same test domain (*i.e.*, DCI fine-tuned models perform best on DCI test set, DOCCI models perform best on DOCCI test set, and so on). One anomaly occurs with CIDEr on the DCI test set, where PaLI models fine-tuned with DOCCI slightly outperform the DCI trained model (4.91 versus 4.57). Due to how low the metric values are, these differences may

	A is substantially better	A is marginally better	Neutral	B is marginally better	B is substantially better	
Hallucination ②	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	Both of them say the eyes are close, but the visible eye is open. A has the tail in view when it is not, and also has all the foreground leaves out of focus. There is a stripe on the lizard, but B calls it a "striped pattern".
Comprehensiveness ②	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	B does not give the direction the lizard is facing, however if gives more description of the lizard and leaves.
Specificity ②	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	B provides colors on the lizard, scales, and the color of the leave's edges.
First few line(s) as tldr ②	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	A provides the lizard but nothing else.
Human Like ②	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	A repeats sentence stems such as "The lizard" and "The leaves". B has an overall better flow.

Fig. 15: Human SxS Annotation UI responses for the input image and two image description pairs (see Figure 14). The annotators respond to the 5 metrics independently on a 5 point scale. They are additionally asked to justify their choices which can be used to sanity check and perform quality sweeps.

not be significant. When evaluating the DCI, DOCCI, and IIW test sets with BLEURT, we instead find a slight preference for IIW models. Across all three datasets, BLEURT shows PaLI-IIW variants perform better or similarly to the same-domain test set. Thus, newer metrics may reveal IIW fine-tuned models generalize better than models fine-tuned on other datasets.

Reconstructing Images with IIW Descriptions For reconstructing images sentence-by-sentence, we fed T2I model with the *first sentence*, *first two sentences*, *first three sentences*, *etc.* as prompts from each of the three datasets

Table 8: Human SxS to Evaluate IIW Fine-tuned PaLI-3 5B Model Predictions when compared to IIW Human-Authored Data on IIW-400 using 100 samples.

Metric	IIW-400				
	IIW-Human			IIW-Model	
	++	+	-	+	++
Comprehensiveness	40	43	12	4	1
Specificity	79	14	5	2	0
Hallucinations	6	46	33	17	4
TLDR	29	43	14	10	4
Human-Like	27	32	34	6	1

Table 9: Ablation Results Comparing IIW Variants on Automatic Metrics

PaLI-ft	DCI Test (112)			DOCCI Test (5k)			IIW Test (445)		
	bleu-4	rouge-1	rouge-2	bleu-4	rouge-1	rouge-2	bleu-4	rouge-1	rouge-2
IIW	3.02	31.59	8.02	4.60	38.10	10.06	5.66	38.57	11.73
IIW Combined	2.95	30.63	7.30	4.76	38.25	10.48	5.40	37.64	11.62

Table 10: Additional Automatic Metric Results. We report CIDEr, BERTScore (referred to as BERT in table due to space), and BLEURT metrics for all fine-tuned models. We compare DCI, DOCCI, IIW, and IIW Comb. (Combined).

PaLI-ft	DCI Test (112)			DOCCI Test (5k)			IIW Test (445)		
	CIDEr	BERT	BLEURT	CIDEr	BERT	BLEURT	CIDEr	BERT	BLEURT
DCI	4.57	0.60	0.41	4.71	0.61	0.42	0.75	0.56	0.40
DOCCI	4.91	0.58	0.39	11.09	0.65	0.45	2.40	0.59	0.41
IIW	1.87	0.56	0.41	4.52	0.59	0.46	4.04	0.61	0.45
IIW Comb.	0.61	0.56	0.43	4.15	0.59	0.46	1.77	0.60	0.46

(DCI, DOCCI and IIW). Figure 16 showcases the prompts and the T2I model outputs from three descriptions along with the original image.

We then asked human annotators to rank the generated images by how similar they are to the original image. The image most similar to the original image is ranked number 1. We allowed generated images to be ranked the same if they are very similar. Figure 17(a) shows the reconstruction rank counts for all the sentence counts and Figure 17(b) shows the rank counts when we use sentence 1, sentence 1 and 2, sentence 1, 2 and 3, and sentence 1, 2, 3, and 4. Sentences from IIW descriptions are ranked first much more frequently than sentences from DCI and DOCCI descriptions. Specifically, for the first sentence, the difference is most notable, supporting our claim that IIW descriptions are higher quality earlier on and IIW first sentences are designed to capture a TLDR.

Compositional Reasoning with IIW Descriptions In our downstream evaluation of ARO, SVO-Probes, and Winoground compositional reasoning benchmarks with IIW descriptions, we formulate a new LLM-only method of evaluation. We prompt a LLM (*e.g.*, PaLM 2) to determine which is the true matching caption given the generated image description and the image caption options to select from. We define the LLM prompt which includes an image description as:

“Given the following image description and image caption options, choose the most likely OPTION number :
 IMAGE-DESCRIPTION : <DESCRIPTION>
 OPTIONS : <CHOICES>
 RESPONSE : ”

where we fill in the <DESCRIPTION> from each VLM description model (*e.g.*, either our IIW fine-tuned model, InstructBLIP or LLaVA) and the list

of <CHOICES> are from the corresponding evaluation dataset, respectively. Choices are enumerated in a list-like fashion, and we ask the model to generate the number of the most likely caption. We define a different prompt for the language bias baseline, which serves as a sanity check that the image/image description is truly needed for these datasets. It provides a lower bound for comparison, too. While the prompt is different as we do not input any image description, we try to make it as similar as possible to the prior prompt. We set the language bias prompt to:

“Given the following image caption options, choose the most likely OP-
TION number :
OPTIONS : <CHOICES>
RESPONSE : ”

where <CHOICES> are filled in in the same format as previously described.

Importantly, when filling in the caption choices, we deterministically swap the index of the “answer,” *i.e.*, true matching caption, among the choices list in the prompt. This is done to ensure an equal distribution and reduce any order bias (*e.g.*, a LLM may be more prone to believing the first option is the correct option).

To obtain the image description which is then fed into the LLM, we prompt our fine-tuned models with “Generate a detailed image description.” For the InstructBLIP and LLaVA models, we define similar prompts given the prompts used in their published papers: “Write a long and detailed description for the photo.” and “Provide a detailed description of the given image” for InstructBLIP and LLaVA, respectively.

We process the LLM outputs as classes, (*e.g.*, when choosing between image caption choices [1] and [2], LLM responses are ‘1’ or ‘2’) and calculate accuracy with respect to the true image caption class. If the LLM does not produce a valid class, it’s considered an incorrect prediction. Note that this task set up is different from how VLM models are typically evaluated on these reasoning datasets: prior work considers a sample to be correctly reasoned about if the image-text similarity of the true image caption is higher than the image-text similarity of incorrect image caption. Due to the long length of our descriptions, we cannot compute image-text similarity reasonably with models like CLIP without significantly truncating our image descriptions. In future work, once input length limitations are mitigated, dual-encoder VLMs like CLIP can be fine-tuned with our rich data, which will help to improve VLM reasoning.

Note that ARO and Winoground datasets are built with positive and negative captions for each image. SVO-Probes differs in that it originally contained a positive and negative *image* for each positive caption. For our experiments, we need a true and false caption associated with an image. A large portion (~90%) of the SVO-Probes negative images also serve as separate samples (where they are considered positive images, with associated captions). Thus, we can pull these captions to serve as the negative caption for the original sample.

For the remaining ~10%, we use the negative triplet (the S, V, O triplet specifying the subject, object, and verb, with one of them being modified) to

Table 11: VL Compositional Reasoning Accuracy with Image Descriptions. We evaluate whether rich descriptions can distinguish the true matching image caption in ARO, SVO-Probes, and Winoground datasets. The COCO and Flickr30k Order subsets of ARO are not reported due to a very high language bias baseline of 98%.

Image Description Model	ARO [66]		SVO-Probes [15]	Winoground [51]
	VG-A	VG-R		
None (Language Bias Baseline)	56.50	59.94	50.71	49.88
InstructBLIP-Vicuna-7B	83.99	62.73	89.35	65.25
LLaVA-V1.5-7B	84.80	63.71	87.89	63.38
PaLI-3 + DCI 5B	88.19	66.47	86.50	64.62
PaLI-3 + DOCCI 5B	89.70	68.85	88.73	69.50
PaLI-3 + IIW 5B	90.37	66.19	88.66	69.38
PaLI-3 + IIW Combined 5B	89.46	64.88	87.78	66.88

automatically flip the negative S, V, or O in the positive caption. Ten of these samples did not have negative triplets in the dataset, so they were removed. Lastly, there were 114 samples with positive captions not containing the S, V, or O that needed to be swapped to form the negative caption. This happens as a result of SVO triplets containing root forms of the words, which were not spelled the same way in the caption. For example, an SVO may be “man,lie,beach” with the caption stating “A man lying on a beach.” Due to the verb tense differences, it would require additional processing to match “lie” to “lying.” We remove these edge cases for simplicity.

Finally, we include more vision language compositional reasoning results with different PaLI fine-tuned models in Table 11. Here we additionally include the models fine-tuned with DCI and DOCCI datasets. The IIW descriptions still result in highest reasoning accuracy for ARO VG-A and are comparable with DOCCI on Winoground. Trends also stay the same with SVO-Probes, with DOCCI performing similarly to IIW, but InstructBLIP performing slightly better (by less than 1 accuracy point). Finally, we find that DOCCI performs best on VG-R, which might be result of its dataset being designed to explicitly contain connected and contrasting images, which might more frequently capture similar images that only differ by the visual relationship between objects.

While performance differences between DCI, DOCCI, and IIW are smaller, this could be an artifact of the reasoning datasets; ARO, SVO-Probes, and Winoground are all built upon short caption datasets, so the utility and quality differences between DCI, DOCCI, and IIW are not fully captured by these probing datasets.

7.5 Enriching Image Caption Datasets

As discussed in the main paper, we enrich 1k samples from two existing image caption datasets, namely, Localized Narratives and Crossmodal (XM) 3600, with new image descriptions generated by IIW fine-tuned models. The goal of

Table 12: Dataset Statistics Comparing ImageInWords (IIW) Descriptions of Prior Work to their Original Annotations. We include the number of samples (*i.e.*, subset of captions/descriptions that we enrich) and the average number of tokens, sentences, nouns (NN), adjectives (ADJ), adverbs (ADV), and verbs (VB). Language statistics are averages reported per description unless otherwise noted.

Dataset	Sample Count	Tokens	Tokens	Sentences	NN	ADJ	ADV	VB
		/ Sent.	/ Desc.					
LocNar [39]	1000	14.35	30.56	2.12	8.02	1.09	0.16	2.39
IIW Enriched		22.19	128.87	5.80	32.37	16.02	1.82	11.44
XM3600 [50]	1000	10.40	10.40	1.00	3.45	1.08	0.04	0.61
IIW Enriched		22.25	130.56	5.86	33.18	15.82	1.72	11.87

releasing these enriched versions is to provide longer, hyper-detailed image descriptions that can be used for evaluation or fine-tuning purposes in future work. The enriched versions not only allow for finer-grained, full coverage evaluations of the content in images (via new metrics or probing datasets), but also may enable autorater models which learn from the precision and recall errors in the generated descriptions.

In Table 12, we report the language statistics on the original 1k samples from each dataset and the enriched versions. It is clear that the IIW descriptions are significantly longer and richer, as we have higher counts of tokens, sentences, and each part of speech.

7.6 Percentages Reported in the Main Paper

We re-quote and define all analysis percentages reported in the main paper for clarity on how they were calculated in Tables 13-15. The reference location is defined by the section, paragraph, and line it appeared in. We only include paragraph number for multi-paragraph sections, and only include line number if the same percentage occurs more than once within a paragraph. For example, “S4.3 P2 L3” means Section 4, Paragraph 2, Line 3. Most percentages were rounded to the nearest point in the main paper.

7.7 Limitations


Finally, we discuss the limitations of our annotation framework and evaluations. In our annotation framework, we define a seeded and sequential annotation process, with both aspects having potential limitations. The quality of the seeded data is of high importance as it will ultimately affect the rest of our human annotation pipeline. Additionally, even with the best possible seeds, they may limit the scope of what our crowd workers write by biasing them towards certain objects or phrases. In terms of limitations for the sequential augmentation used, unnecessary time may be spent by annotators if the first annotator output quality is low. By monitoring the initial draft descriptions, quality can be better ensured so that the framework is as efficient as possible.

With respect to the evaluation of our human annotated data and model generated outputs, we do only perform evaluations on hundreds of samples (as opposed to thousands or more). This is due to how expensive and time consuming human SxS evaluations are, but we note that IIW is rated marginally and substantially better at a much higher rate, which would likely scale to more samples. Our work is also inherently limited by the lack of metrics available for long descriptions. We still report standard text similarity metrics and complement them with human SxS, but in future work the text length limitations should be addressed so that automated metrics can be applied.


While we currently do not plan to open source our models or training set, we do release an evaluation set over images that can serve as a unified benchmark for IIW, recent and future related work. We also open source the human SxS judgements and samples enriched from Localized Narratives and XM3600. Lastly, as also mentioned in the Conclusion of the main text, our initial IIW dataset and resulting models are English-only. In the future, we plan to expand our work to have multilingual coverage. We also would like to curate image descriptions that have more specifics with respect to locale/geographical location, so that we do not strictly have descriptions with a western lens.

Original Image	DCI	DOCCI	IIW
			
Sentence 1 (prompt to T2I)	A close up photo of a large sphere hanging from the ceiling.	A medium-close-up view of a yellow lamp that is hanging from the ceiling.	A detailed close-up captures a spherical light fixture suspended from a black cord, set against a stark black backdrop.
Human ranking	Ranked 3rd	Ranked 2nd	Ranked 1st
			
Sentence [1-2] (prompt to T2I)	A close up photo of a large sphere hanging from the ceiling. The background of the image is very dark with nothing visible at all.	A medium-close-up view of a yellow lamp that is hanging from the ceiling. The lamp is made up of a grid that is made up of thin black lines that run vertically and horizontally; these lines make up the grid.	A detailed close-up captures a spherical light fixture suspended from a black cord, set against a stark black backdrop. The fixture's outer sphere is adorned with a network of squares, each encased within a larger sphere.
Human ranking	Ranked 3rd	Ranked 2nd	Ranked 1st
			
Sentence [1-3] (prompt to T2I)	A close up photo of a large sphere hanging from the ceiling. The background of the image is very dark with nothing visible at all. The focus of the image is on the large sphere.	A medium-close-up view of a yellow lamp that is hanging from the ceiling. The lamp is made up of a grid that is made up of thin black lines that run vertically and horizontally; these lines make up the grid. Inside the grid, there is a yellow light that is made up of lines that run vertically and horizontally.	A detailed close-up captures a spherical light fixture suspended from a black cord, set against a stark black backdrop. The fixture's outer sphere is adorned with a network of squares, each encased within a larger sphere. The sphere's interior is bathed in a warm, yellowish glow, punctuated by a solitary light source at its heart.
Human ranking	Ranked 3rd	Ranked 2nd	Ranked 1st
			
All sentences (prompt to T2I)	A close up photo of a large sphere hanging from the ceiling. The background of the image is very dark with nothing visible at all. The focus of the image is on the large sphere. The sphere is lit up bright yellow in the center with a bright white light shining out from the center of it. All of the sections of the sphere are made of black frames. The frame around the sphere is very intricate and meticulous.	A medium-close-up view of a yellow lamp that is hanging from the ceiling. The lamp is made up of a grid that is made up of thin black lines that run vertically and horizontally; these lines make up the grid. Inside the grid, there is a yellow light that is made up of lines that run vertically and horizontally. Along the top portion of the globe, there is a black line that runs vertically and horizontally. The bottom portion of the lamp is made up of thin black lines that run vertically and horizontally. The area where the light is shining is completely pitch black.	A detailed close-up captures a spherical light fixture suspended from a black cord, set against a stark black backdrop. The fixture's outer sphere is adorned with a network of squares, each encased within a larger sphere. The sphere's interior is bathed in a warm, yellowish glow, punctuated by a solitary light source at its heart. The sphere's surface is etched with swirling patterns, adding a dynamic element to its design.
Human ranking	Ranked 3rd	Ranked 2nd	Ranked 1st

Fig. 16: T2I Outputs and Human Ranking Evaluations. We show example T2I results where the first sentence, first two sentences, ..., all the sentences of the image descriptions from DCI, DOCCI and IIW models are fed sequentially as inputs, *i.e.*, at each step an additional sentence chunk is fed to the T2I model.



(a) Reconstruction Rank Counts across Inputs over All Cumulative Sentence Chunks



(b) Reconstruction Rank Counts across Inputs of Specific Cumulative Sentence Chunks

Fig. 17: T2I Human Rank Distributions. We illustrate bar plots for the image reconstruction evaluation results using image descriptions from finetuned PaLI-5B models on three datasets (DCI, DOCCI, IIW). Images reconstructed from IIW descriptions are consistently ranked better than other descriptions.

Table 13: Percentages from the Main Text. We reference each percentage and define how they were calculated for clarity.

Percent	Reference	Equation and Explanation
+66%	Abstract, Intro P4, S4.3 P4, Conclusion	Average difference of IIW preference vs. other dataset preference, averaged over DCI and DOCCI datasets and averaged over the five metrics corresponding to (comprehensiveness, specificity, hallucinations, tldr, human-likeness). Differences of IIW marginally and substantially better - other dataset marginally and substantially better for (comprehensiveness, specificity, hallucinations, tldr, human-likeness) metrics from Table 3 correspond to DCI (61, 80, 42, 91, 82) and DOCCI (42, 82, 35, 79, 68). The final average preference over the five metrics and two datasets is 66.2%.
+48%	Abstract, Intro P4, S4.3 P4	Average difference of IIW preference vs. GPT-4V outputs, averaged over the five metrics corresponding to (comprehensiveness, specificity, hallucinations, tldr, human-likeness). Differences of IIW marginally and substantially better - GPT-4V marginally and substantially better for (comprehensiveness, specificity, hallucinations, tldr, human-likeness) metrics from Table 5 correspond to (35, 53, 59, 70, 21). The final average preference over the five metrics is 47.6%.
+31%	Abstract, Intro P5, S4.4 P2, Conclusion	Average difference of IIW model output preference vs. other fine-tuned model output preference, averaged over DCI and DOCCI fine-tuned models and averaged over the five metrics corresponding to (comprehensiveness, specificity, hallucinations, tldr, human-likeness). Differences of IIW marginally and substantially better - other dataset marginally and substantially better for (comprehensiveness, specificity, hallucinations, tldr, human-likeness) metrics from Table 5 correspond to DCI (42, 54, -9, 51, 57) and DOCCI (4, 37, -7, 57, 23). The final average preference over the five metrics and two datasets is 30.9%.
20% more	S3.2 P3	The average increase in token count from annotation round 1 to round 3: $(205-170)/170 = 20\%$.
30% less	S3.2 P3	The average decrease in time spent annotating from round 1 to round 3 compared to if three individual round 1s occurred: $((800*3)-(800+600+300))/(800*3) = 30\%$.
+61%	S4.3 P2 L3	The amount IIW is more comprehensive than DCI in Table 3: $(30+41) - (3+7) = 61\%$.
+42%	S4.3 P2 L3	The amount IIW is more comprehensive than DOCCI in Table 3: $(33+19) - (4+6) = 42\%$.
+80%	S4.3 P2 L3	The amount IIW is more specific than DCI in Table 3: $(20+68) - (5+3) = 80\%$.

Table 14: Percentages from the Main Text. We reference each percentage and define how they were calculated for clarity.

Percent	Reference	Equation and Explanation
+82%	S4.3 P2 L3	The amount IIW is more specific than DOCCI in Table 3: $(22+65) - (3+2) = 82\%$.
42%	S4.3 P2 L4	The amount IIW contains fewer hallucinations than DCI in Table 3: $(32+15) - (2+3) = 42\%$.
35%	S4.3 P2 L4	The amount IIW contains fewer hallucinations than DOCCI in Table 3: $(34+13) - (0+12) = 35\%$.
+91%	S4.3 P2 L4	The amount IIW contains better TLDR than DCI in Table 3: $(20+74) - (3+0) = 91\%$.
+79%	S4.3 P2 L4	The amount IIW contains better TLDR than DOCCI in Table 3: $(30+54) - (1+4) = 79\%$.
+82%	S4.3 P2 L5	The amount IIW is more human-like than DCI in Table 3: $(25+59) - (1+1) = 82\%$.
+68%	S4.3 P2 L5	The amount IIW is more human-like than DOCCI in Table 3: $(46+23) - (1+0) = 68\%$.
+35%	S4.3 P3	The amount IIW is more comprehensive than GPT-4V outputs in Table 5: $(29+19)-(3+10) = 35\%$.
+53%	S4.3 P3	The amount IIW is more specific than GPT-4V outputs in Table 5: $(35+34) - (6+10) = 53\%$.
+59%	S4.3 P3	The amount IIW is contains fewer hallucinations than GPT-4V outputs in Table 5: $(34+31) - (0+6) = 59\%$.
+70%	S4.3 P3	The amount IIW contains better TLDR than GPT-4V outputs in Table 5: $(47+34) - (5+6) = 70\%$.
+21%	S4.3 P3	The amount IIW is more human-like than GPT-4V outputs in Table 5: $(27+13) - (6+13) = 21\%$.
+42%	S4.4 P2	The amount IIW is more comprehensive than DCI in Table 5: $(32+27) - (7+10) = 42\%$.
+4%	S4.4 P2	The amount IIW is more comprehensive than DOCCI in Table 5: $(26+5) - (5+22) = 4\%$.
+54%	S4.4 P2	The amount IIW is more specific than DCI in Table 5: $(24+46) - (6+10) = 54\%$.
+37%	S4.4 P2	The amount IIW is more specific than DOCCI in Table 5: $(33+24) - (6+14) = 37\%$.

Table 15: Percentages from the Main Text. We reference each percentage and define how they were calculated for clarity.

Percent	Reference	Equation and Explanation
+51%	S4.4 P2	The amount IIW contains better TLDR than DCI in Table 5: $(30+41) - (9+11) = 51\%$.
+57%	S4.4 P2	The amount IIW contains better TLDR than DOCCI in Table 5: $(42+28) - (6+7) = 57\%$.
+55%	S4.4 P2	The amount IIW is more human-like than DCI in Table 5: $(32+39) - (11+5) = 55\%$.
+23%	S4.4 P2	The amount IIW is more human-like than DOCCI in Table 5: $(27+14) - (6+12) = 23\%$.
-9%	S4.4 P2	The amount IIW contains fewer hallucinations than DCI in Table 5: $(11+13) - (12+21) = -9\%$.
-7%	S4.4 P2	The amount IIW contains fewer hallucinations than DOCCI in Table 5: $(21+6) - (9+25) = -7\%$.
34%	S4.6 P4	The accuracy improvement on VG-A from using IIW over the language bias baseline: $(90.37) - (56.50) = 33.87\%$.
6%	S4.6 P4	The accuracy improvement on VG-R from using IIW over the language bias baseline: $(66.19) - (59.94) = 6.25\%$.
20%	S4.6 P4	The accuracy improvement on Winoground from using IIW over the language bias baseline: $(69.38) - (49.88) = 19.5\%$.
6%	Abstract, S4.6 P4, Conclusion	The accuracy improvement on VG-A from using IIW over the next best baseline LLaVA: $(90.37) - (84.80) = 5.57\%$.
2%	S4.6 P4	The accuracy improvement on VG-R from using IIW over the next best baseline LLaVA: $(66.19) - (63.71) = 2.48\%$.
4%	S4.6 P4	The accuracy improvement on Winoground from using IIW over the next best baseline InstructBLIP: $(69.38) - (65.25) = 4.13\%$.