

How clever is the FiLM model, and how clever can it be?

Alexander Kuhnle

Department of Computer
Science and Technology
University of Cambridge
aok25@cam.ac.uk

Huiyuan Xie

Department of Computer
Science and Technology
University of Cambridge
hx255@cam.ac.uk

Ann Copestake

Department of Computer
Science and Technology
University of Cambridge
aac10@cam.ac.uk

Abstract

The FiLM model achieves close-to-perfect performance on the diagnostic CLEVR dataset and is distinguished from other such models by having a comparatively simple and easily transferable architecture. In this paper, we investigate in more detail the ability of FiLM to learn various linguistic constructions. Our main results show that (a) FiLM is not able to learn relational statements straight away except for very simple instances, (b) training on a broader set of instances as well as pretraining on simpler instance types can help alleviate these learning difficulties, (c) mixing is less robust than pretraining and very sensitive to the compositional structure of the dataset. Overall, our results suggest that the approach of big all-encompassing datasets and the paradigm of “*the effectiveness of data*” may have fundamental limitations.

1 Introduction

The task of Visual Question Answering (VQA) lies at the intersection of Computer Vision and Natural Language Processing. It generalizes the vision tasks of object detection/recognition to arbitrary visual-linguistic inferences, limited only by what can be queried by language. At the same time, systems can more easily be evaluated than this is the case for related multimodal tasks like image captioning. The task became popular in recent years, particularly the VQA Dataset (Antol et al., 2015), based on which a third edition of the VQA Challenge is run this year.

In reaction to various issues that allow comparatively naive models – for instance, a text-only system ignoring visual information and solely relying on language statistics – to achieve competitive performance on the VQA Dataset (Agrawal et al., 2016; Goyal et al., 2017; Mudrakarta et al., 2018), abstract and (semi-)automatically generated datasets were introduced (Johnson et al.,

2017a; Kuhnle and Copestake, 2017; Suhr et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2018). Their motivation is to provide diagnostic tasks, with the aim of analyzing core abilities for visually grounded language understanding like spatial reasoning or counting, and which cannot be ‘cheated’ as easily by just relying on surface statistics. CLEVR (Johnson et al., 2017a) is the most widely adopted of these, and several systems by now achieve near-perfect performance on it (Hu et al., 2017; Johnson et al., 2017b; Santoro et al., 2017; Perez et al., 2018; Suarez et al., 2018; Hudson and Manning, 2018; Mascharka et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2018).

One of the advantages of CLEVR is that it annotates questions from a set of instance types, like “*count*” or “*compare attribute*”, which makes a more detailed evaluation and model comparison possible. Building on the ‘unit-testing’ proposal of Kuhnle and Copestake (2018) and related work such as the bAbI tasks for reading comprehension (Weston et al., 2015), which further emphasize the importance and value of targeted evaluation, we analyzed the FiLM model (Perez et al., 2018) on the ShapeWorld evaluation framework (Kuhnle and Copestake, 2017). In doing so, we aim to investigate whether its close-to-perfect performance on CLEVR translates to ShapeWorld data as expected, and to shed more light on the strengths and weaknesses of FiLM in general.

Why FiLM? Arguably, it is one of the simplest models on that performance level for CLEVR. In particular, it does not rely on the semantic program trees underlying its instances, as compared to (Hu et al., 2017; Mascharka et al., 2018; Johnson et al., 2017b). The first two strictly require the CLEVR-specific program vocabulary, which is different from the one used by ShapeWorld to generate data. The latter is agnostic to the vocabulary, but still sensitive to the size of the vocabulary, which is bigger for ShapeWorld (we ran

Existential: “There is a red square.”, “A red shape is a square.”

Single-shape: same as above, with only one object present

Logical: two existential statements connected by: and, or, if, if and only if

Numbers: zero to five; with modifiers: less/more than, at most/least, exactly, not

Quantifiers: with modifiers as above: no, half, all, a/two third(s), a/three quarter(s)

Relational: left, right, above, below, closer, farther, darker, lighter, smaller, bigger, same/different shape/color


Simple-spatial: the first four spatial relations, with only two objects per scene

Relational-negation: relational plus negated relations

Implicit-relational: left, right, upper, lower, smaller, bigger, darker, lighter, closer, farther (of two target objects)

Superlatives: superlative forms of the above, of an arbitrary number of target objects

Examples for visual scenes



Examples for true or false statements

- “There is a cyan square or a circle is green.”
- “At least two shapes are green.”
- “More than half the pentagons are red.”
- “A red cross is to the left of a yellow shape.”
- “The left circle is blue.”
- “The lowermost yellow shape is a circle.”

Figure 1: *Top:* All basic datasets we experimented with, together with their central words/constructions. *Bottom left:* Two example visual scenes. *Bottom right:* Some example captions taken from different datasets (LOGICAL, NUMBERS, QUANTIFIERS, RELATIONAL, IMPLICIT-RELATIONAL, SUPERLATIVES).

into memory issues when trying to run this model on ShapeWorld data). Moreover, the code for FiLM is open-source, and in our experiments we found that the model shows robust learning behavior on ShapeWorld data without any tuning of the CLEVR-based default hyperparameters.

While FiLM manages to solve many tasks perfectly, it fails to learn anything on almost all datasets consisting of relational statements. We investigate how two approaches – broader training sets including simpler instances, and a version of curriculum learning (Elman, 1993; Bengio et al., 2009) – can make the difference between no learning at all and perfectly solving these datasets. However, we find that the first approach is very sensitive to details of the dataset structure.

These results put into question the common assumption of “the effectiveness of data” (Halevy et al., 2009) underlying datasets such as the VQA Dataset (Antol et al., 2015), or SQuAD (Rajpurkar et al., 2016) for reading comprehension, or SNLI (Bowman et al., 2015) for language inference: that all necessary abilities for a task can simply be learned from one big all-encompassing dataset, and that more data should lead to improved performance. Curriculum learning, on the other hand, shows promise as a robust approach to solving more complex instances of a task.


2 Experimental setup

2.1 Task

We look at the task of image caption agreement, that is, given a visual scene and a statement, decide whether the latter is true for the former. See figure 1 for some examples. The captions here are formal-semantics-style statements and not necessarily good descriptions, which is a vaguer concept and thus not as useful for evaluation. Instead, this task corresponds more to yes/no questions in VQA. Formulating the task as a binary choice problem is interesting from an evaluation perspective, as it allows for difficult *minimally* incorrect instances (Hodosh and Hockenmaier, 2016).

2.2 Datasets

We generated various datasets based on existing ShapeWorld configurations. The different datasets are defined by the types of captions they contain. See figure 1 for more details. Each dataset consists of 500k training instances, plus 10k validation and test instances. Training and validation scenes generally contain 1-4, 6-9 or 11-14 non-overlapping (unless mentioned otherwise) objects, further constrained depending on the dataset. Test scenes may in addition exhibit the withheld object numbers 5, 10 and 15, and contain withheld object



Dataset	CNN-LSTM		CNN-LSTM-SA		FiLM	
single-shape	—		—		100.0	87.2
existential	100.0	81.1	100.0	99.7	100.0	99.9
logical	79.7	62.2	76.5	58.4	99.9	98.9
numbers	75.0	66.4	99.1	98.2	99.6	99.3
quantifiers	72.1	69.1	84.8	80.8	97.7	97.0
simple-spatial	81.4	64.8	81.9	57.7	85.1	61.3
relational	—		—		50.6	51.0
implicit-rel	—		—		52.9	53.2
superlatives	—		—		50.8	50.2

Figure 2: *Left diagram*: validation performance of the FiLM model trained on various ShapeWorld datasets (*x-axis*: iterations in 1000, *y-axis*: accuracy). *Right table*: final validation (*left*) and test (*right*) performance of the trained FiLM models, plus performance of the two baselines CNN-LSTM and CNN-LSTM-SA on selected datasets (accuracy in percent, *green*: $\geq 95\%$, *orange*: $\geq 75\%$, *red*: $< 75\%$).

types: “red square”, “green triangle”, “blue circle”, “yellow rectangle”, “magenta cross”, “cyan ellipse”. Consequently, the test data follows a slightly different distribution, where models are required to generalize to unseen object numbers and new attribute combinations to achieve a comparable score, similar to the CoGenT version of the CLEVR dataset¹.

2.3 Models

We focus on the FiLM model (Perez et al., 2018) in this paper. The image is processed using a six-layer CNN (stride of 2 after the third and sixth layer) trained from scratch on the task. We found that the common approach of using a pretrained ResNet module did not perform well on our data. The caption as ‘question’ is processed by a GRU. In four residual blocks, the processed image tensor is linearly modulated, conditioned on the caption embedding. Following global max-pooling, the classifier module produces the ‘answer’, i.e. “true” or “false” in our case. We train the model for 100k iterations in all experiments, using the default hyperparameters. Training performance is measured on the validation set every 1k iterations for the first 10k iterations and every 5k afterwards. We also compare performance to two common baselines (Johnson et al., 2017a) on selected datasets: CNN-LSTM and CNN-LSTM-SA. We will release the ShapeWorld-adapted FiLM repository and the generator configurations to create the datasets on acceptance of the paper.

¹Note, however, that CLEVR CoGenT requires stronger generalization skills, as more shape-color combinations per shape/color are withheld.

3 Results

Pretrained ResNet does not perform well. We started off experimenting with the FiLM default of using a pretrained ResNet module instead of a custom CNN. Versions with either a fixed or a trainable ResNet reach an accuracy of 65-70% after 100k iterations on EXISTENTIAL, which is substantially lower than our final result of 100% (see appendix A.1). This is surprisingly different from findings for CLEVR, where others previously reported the level of performance for either a pretrained ResNet or a custom CNN to be on a par (Perez et al., 2018; Santoro et al., 2017).

Overlapping objects can impede learning. Initially, we also did not explicitly configure data generation to prevent overlapping objects. This turned out to be a major obstacle for learning in some cases: while FiLM solves EXISTENTIAL (99.7%), performance on NUMBERS stays at chance level (55.2%). To investigate this further, we configured the generator to only permit a lower degree of overlap (default: 25% max area overlap). 17.5% shows no improvement, performance for 10% is slightly better, but only in the case of 5% area overlap we observe a substantially improved accuracy of $\sim 73\%$ after 100k iterations (see appendix A.2). Since the background is black by default, we assume that having to learn to recognize objects contrasted with an unusual color can have a destructive influence on the overall learning process, at least in the case of more difficult tasks. Unless stated otherwise, we thus use overlap-free data for the following experiments, where number statements are learned perfectly.




Figure 3: Performance per dataset of the FiLM model trained on broader combinations of datasets.

Many datasets solved and simple generalization works. Overall, the FiLM model successfully learns many of our datasets (see figure 2). EXISTENTIAL is mastered after only 10k iterations and at the same speed as the trivial SINGLE-SHAPE variant. LOGICAL, NUMBERS and QUANTIFIERS reach close-to-perfect accuracy after around 60k iterations. The learning curves for these three tasks look remarkably alike and thus suggest a similar learning complexity for the model. Moreover, the FiLM model successfully generalizes to the test set in most cases (see figure 2), showing that it learned the ability for simple compositional recombination. Only for the simplified variants SINGLE-SHAPE and SIMPLE-SPATIAL test performance is markedly lower, indicating that there is not enough incentive to learn a compositional representation here. This is presumably because their simplicity makes overfitting a feasible option, due to the lack of distractors which may require to distinguish individual attributes.

Stacked attention is not consistently superior. We investigated the performance of two common baselines, CNN-LSTM and CNN-LSTM-SA (see figure 2 as well as appendix A.3 and A.4). While FiLM consistently outperforms both baselines as

expected, the supposedly superior CNN-LSTM-SA (Yang et al., 2016; Johnson et al., 2017a) does not always improve upon the results of CNN-LSTM. However, CNN-LSTM-SA in some cases shows stronger generalization to the test distribution, whereas performance always drops for CNN-LSTM. We note, though, that it is unclear whether the ability to generalize is expected of a system that does not fully solve a task to begin with.

Failure to learn relational statements. Surprisingly, we find that, with the exception of SIMPLE-SPATIAL, FiLM struggles to learn anything when trained on the various datasets requiring some form of relational reasoning (see figure 2): RELATIONAL, IMPLICIT-RELATIONAL and SUPERLATIVES (referred to as RELATIONAL-LIKE below). We also tried subsets of relations in RELATIONAL (e.g., only spatial relations), with the same result. The only exception is the simplistic two-object variant SIMPLE-SPATIAL. But even here, learning is comparatively slow and, after plateauing for around 50k iterations at $\sim 75\%$, reaches only $\sim 85\%$ after 100k iterations (similar to baselines, although the curve indicates that performance is still improving). This further emphasizes the complexity for FiLM to learn relational statements.




Figure 4: Performance on RELATIONAL/-NEGATION or EXISTENTIAL+NUMBERS (with overlap), when augmented with / pretrained on SIMPLE-SPATIAL or EXISTENTIAL instances, respectively.

Training on a broader set of instances.

Datasets like CLEVR consist of a mix of instance types requiring different understanding abilities. Our assumption is that the simpler instances help to stabilize and guide the overall learning process, so that the more complex instances are also learned eventually², hence models are able to achieve close-to-perfect performance overall. We tested this assumption by training on a broader mix of EXISTENTIAL, LOGICAL, NUMBERS, QUANTIFIERS in combination with some of the RELATIONAL-LIKE datasets (see figure 3 and appendix A.5). Indeed, FiLM is able to successfully learn mixer datasets involving one of the more difficult datasets, or two in the case of IMPLICIT-RELATIONAL and SUPERLATIVES.

Augmenting with a simpler dataset. Additionally, we looked at the situation of a complex dataset paired with a simpler one, where instances of the latter can act as ‘pedagogical’ examples of a more general instance type (see figure 4). First, the FiLM model reaches $\sim 95\%$ accuracy on a dataset augmenting the complex RELATIONAL with the simple SIMPLE-SPATIAL dataset. Second, in the failure case of NUMBERS with overlapping objects, training on a combination with EXISTENTIAL instances (with overlap) helps the model to also solve instances of the former.

Improvements by mixing/augmenting are unstable. Further investigation reveals that this ‘synergy effect’ of combining different datasets is

²When referring to “simple” and “complex” or “difficult” instances here and in the following, we always mean with respect to the ability of the FiLM model to learn these instances.

very sensitive to the composition of the training set. On the one hand, FiLM fails to learn most mixer datasets with two or more RELATIONAL-LIKE components (see figure 3 and appendix A.5). These results further indicate that RELATIONAL seems to be the most complex of the RELATIONAL-LIKE datasets. On the other hand, even a slightly unbalanced distribution of 45% or 60% SIMPLE-SPATIAL instances with 55% or 40% RELATIONAL shows no improvement above chance level (see appendix A.6). Moreover, instead of skewing the distribution, performance also stagnates when training on a combination with the more complex RELATIONAL-NEGATION instead of its negation-free variant (see figure 4).

The effectiveness of pretraining.

In another series of experiments we investigated whether pretraining on simpler instances can bootstrap a successful learning process on more complex datasets, which is the assumption underlying curriculum learning (Elman, 1993; Bengio et al., 2009). For this, we take the model trained for 100k iterations on SIMPLE-SPATIAL and apply it to other RELATIONAL-LIKE datasets (see figure 4). For both RELATIONAL as well as RELATIONAL-NEGATION we observe a sharp increase in performance at the start, reaching $\sim 95\%$ accuracy after 100k iterations. We particularly want to draw attention to the fact that the pretrained model reaches and eventually surpasses its previous performance level of $\sim 85\%$ after only 20k/40k iterations, despite the more complex instances. Note also that the model trained on RELATIONAL-NEGATION at some point seems to benefit from this dataset’s increased complexity. Finally, we also confirmed that, in the case of overlapping objects, the system pretrained on EXISTENTIAL can subsequently also be trained to learn added NUMBERS instances (see figure 4).

Differences to findings for CLEVR

- Pretrained ResNet does not perform well.
- Overlapping objects can impede learning.
- Simple compositional generalization (simpler than CLEVR CoGenT) is learned perfectly.
- Relational statements are substantially more difficult to learn, at least in isolation.
- The presence of simpler instances likely benefits the learning of more complex ones.
- Performance on CLEVR does not transfer to all kinds of ‘CLEVR-like’ abstract data.

4 Related work

Besides ShapeWorld and CLEVR, there is a number of other abstract VQA-like datasets, most notably, the NLVR (Suhr et al., 2017) and the COG dataset (Yang et al., 2018). Of these, COG is most similar to ShapeWorld in its explicit focus on providing a test platform for a variety of tasks, while NLVR uses crowdsourced captions and consequently makes controlling for certain instance types more difficult. Other examples include SHAPES (Andreas et al., 2016) and Sort-of-CLEVR (Santoro et al., 2017), both of which act as proofs of concept in the respective paper.

Automatically generated language(-like) data is sometimes used to analyze the algorithmic capabilities of neural network models to efficiently process data of a certain structure. From early investigations into the ability of LSTMs to handle various formal grammars (Gers and Schmidhuber, 2001), to an analysis of stack-augmented RNNs (Joulin and Mikolov, 2015), to recently published negative findings on the compositional skills of sequence-to-sequence models (Lake and Baroni, 2017). Like ShapeWorld, the bAbI test suite (Weston et al., 2015) is an example of a more general and task-focused evaluation platform, using synthetic data for a range of targeted subtasks.

An alternative to automatically generating abstract data is to automatically modifying real-world datasets in a systematic way, with regard to evaluating a model’s ability to spot invalid alterations. This can be seen as a form of ‘lightly’ artificial data for evaluation purposes. Hodosh and Hockenmaier (2016) investigate image captioning models by swapping, replacing or removing noun phrases. Similarly, Shekhar et al. (2017) replace nouns based on semantically related but incorrect words. Jia and Liang (2017), in contrast, insert adversarially chosen distractor sentences into reading comprehension problems.

Besides multiple examples of a state-of-the-art model with surprisingly low performance on such diagnostic datasets/modifications, other recent findings emphasize the need for a more thorough analysis of existing systems and results. On the one hand, there is a range of papers showing competitive performance of simple, sometimes trivial, baseline systems for supposedly difficult benchmark datasets (Poliak et al., 2018; Merity et al., 2018). On the other hand, attempts to replicate experiments and large-scale comparisons of

extensively tuned systems reveal the brittleness of many reported results/improvements (Melis et al., 2018; Lucic et al., 2017; Henderson et al., 2018).

5 Discussion and conclusion

We have shown how the FiLM model is not able to learn to correctly understand relational statements when trained on a dataset of such statements only. Furthermore, we have investigated two mechanisms which help alleviate these difficulties: augmenting training data with instances that are easier to learn, and pretraining on such simpler instances before moving to more complex ones. The first approach turns out to be very sensitive to the precise composition of the training set, while the second one leads to more robust improvements in our experiments.


In essence, mixing instances ultimately results in big all-encompassing datasets for general tasks like VQA, where a variety of skills is assumed to be learned implicitly from a lot of input-output pairs. While our results confirm that this is possible (at least for synthetic data), they strongly question the robustness of this process. We showed how otherwise successful learning breaks down when the combined dataset is too complex or the mixing distribution is chosen wrongly. We emphasize that these findings are based on clean and controlled abstract data, while the situation is even more complex for real-world datasets.

Such sensitivity of the learning process to structural details of the training data is usually not considered, but might be able to explain some of the instability effects that are generally attributed to hyperparameter choice, random seeds, etc. Since it is hard to conceive how real-world data could ever be controlled to the degree possible with synthetic data, researchers should be more skeptical of complex architectures for only a single dataset, and instead encourage the reporting of negative instability/transferability results.


Our findings resulted from a careful in-depth analysis of a single model on a range of instance types and configurations, as opposed to a single dataset – even an explicitly diagnostic one, like CLEVR. This motivates our recommendation to abandon the idea of ‘*datasets as tasks*’, and to shift focus from model building to model analysis. As a way forward, our findings suggest the potential of curriculum learning as a more robust and effective alternative to bigger monolithic datasets.

A Learning curves for other experiments


A.1 Pretrained ResNet module




A.2 Overlapping objects






A.3 CNN-LSTM baseline




A.4 CNN-LSTM-SA baseline



A.5 Broader combinations of datasets



A.6 Distribution simple-spatial vs relational



Acknowledgments

We thank the anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback. AK is grateful for being supported by a Qualcomm Research Studentship and an EPSRC Doctoral Training Studentship.

References

- Aishwarya Agrawal, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. 2016. Analyzing the behavior of visual question answering models. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, EMNLP 2016, pages 1955–1960.
- Jacob Andreas, Marcus Rohrbach, Trevor Darrell, and Dan Klein. 2016. Neural module networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, CVPR 2016.
- Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jiasen Lu, Margaret Mitchell, Dhruv Batra, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. 2015. VQA: Visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, ICCV 2015.
- Yoshua Bengio, Jérôme Louradour, Ronan Collobert, and Jason Weston. 2009. Curriculum learning. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML 2009, pages 41–48.
- Samuel R. Bowman, Gabor Angeli, Christopher Potts, and Christopher D. Manning. 2015. A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, EMNLP 2015, pages 632–642.
- Jeffrey L. Elman. 1993. Learning and development in neural networks: the importance of starting small. *Cognition*, 48(1):71–99.
- Felix A. Gers and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2001. LSTM recurrent networks learn simple context-free and context-sensitive languages. *Transactions on Neural Networks*, 12(6):1333–1340.
- Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. 2017. Making the V in VQA matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in Visual Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, CVPR 2017, pages 6325–6334.
- Alon Halevy, Peter Norvig, and Fernando Pereira. 2009. The unreasonable effectiveness of data. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 24(2):8–12.
- Peter Henderson, Riashat Islam, Philip Bachman, Joelle Pineau, Doina Precup, and David Meger. 2018. Deep reinforcement learning that matters. In *AAAI*. AAAI Press.
- Micah Hodosh and Julia Hockenmaier. 2016. Focused evaluation for image description with binary forced-choice tasks. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on Vision and Language*, pages 19–28.
- Ronghang Hu, Jacob Andreas, Marcus Rohrbach, Trevor Darrell, and Kate Saenko. 2017. Learning to reason: End-to-end module networks for visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, ICCV 2017.
- Drew A. Hudson and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. Compositional attention networks for machine reasoning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations*, ICLR 2018.
- Robin Jia and Percy Liang. 2017. Adversarial examples for evaluating reading comprehension systems. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, EMNLP 2017, pages 2021–2031.
- Justin Johnson, Bharath Hariharan, Laurens van der Maaten, Li Fei-Fei, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Ross Girshick. 2017a. CLEVR: A diagnostic dataset for compositional language and elementary visual reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, CVPR 2017.
- Justin Johnson, Bharath Hariharan, Laurens van der Maaten, Judy Hoffman, Li Fei-Fei, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Ross Girshick. 2017b. Inferring and executing programs for visual reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, ICCV 2017.
- Armand Joulin and Tomas Mikolov. 2015. Inferring algorithmic patterns with stack-augmented recurrent nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28*, pages 190–198. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Alexander Kuhnle and Ann Copestake. 2017. ShapeWorld - A new test methodology for multimodal language understanding. *ArXiv e-prints 1704.04517*.
- Alexander Kuhnle and Ann Copestake. 2018. Deep learning evaluation using deep linguistic processing. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Generalization in the Age of Deep Learning*, NAACL 2018, pages 17–23.
- Brenden M. Lake and Marco Baroni. 2017. Still not systematic after all these years: On the compositional skills of sequence-to-sequence recurrent networks. *ArXiv e-prints 1711.00350*.
- Mario Lucic, Karol Kurach, Marcin Michalski, Sylvain Gelly, and Olivier Bousquet. 2017. Are GANs created equal? A large-scale study. *CoRR*, abs/1711.10337.
- David Mascharka, Philip Tran, Ryan Soklaski, and Arjun Majumdar. 2018. Transparency by design: Closing the gap between performance and interpretability in visual reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE*

- Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, CVPR 2018.
- Gábor Melis, Chris Dyer, and Phil Blunsom. 2018. On the state of the art of evaluation in neural language models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations*, ICLR 2018.
- Stephen Merity, Nitish Shirish Keskar, and Richard Socher. 2018. An analysis of neural language modeling at multiple scales. *ArXiv e-prints 1803.08240*.
- Pramod Kaushik Mudrakarta, Ankur Taly, Mukund Sundararajan, and Kedar Dhamdhere. 2018. Did the model understand the question? *ArXiv e-prints 1805.05492*.
- Ethan Perez, Florian Strub, Harm de Vries, Vincent Dumoulin, and Aaron C. Courville. 2018. FiLM: Visual reasoning with a general conditioning layer. In *AAAI*.
- Adam Poliak, Jason Naradowsky, Aparajita Haldar, Rachel Rudinger, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2018. Hypothesis only baselines for natural language inference. In *The Seventh Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics*, *SEM 2018.
- Pranav Rajpurkar, Jian Zhang, Konstantin Lopyrev, and Percy Liang. 2016. SQuAD: 100,000+ questions for machine comprehension of text. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, EMNLP 2016, pages 2383–2392.
- Adam Santoro, David Raposo, David G. T. Barrett, Mateusz Malinowski, Razvan Pascanu, Peter Battaglia, and Timothy P. Lillicrap. 2017. A simple neural network module for relational reasoning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017*, pages 4974–4983.
- Ravi Shekhar, Sandro Pezzelle, Yauhen Klimovich, Aurélie Herbelot, Moin Nabi, Enver Sangineto, and Raffaella Bernardi. 2017. FOIL it! Find one mismatch between image and language caption. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, ACL 2017, pages 255–265.
- Joseph Suarez, Justin Johnson, and Fei-Fei Li. 2018. DDRprog: A CLEVR differentiable dynamic reasoning programmer. *ArXiv e-prints 1803.11361*.
- Alane Suhr, Mike Lewis, James Yeh, and Yoav Artzi. 2017. A corpus of natural language for visual reasoning. In *55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, ACL 2017.
- Jason Weston, Antoine Bordes, Sumit Chopra, and Tomas Mikolov. 2015. Towards AI-complete question answering: A set of prerequisite toy tasks. *ArXiv e-prints 1502.05698*.
- Guangyu Robert Yang, Igor Ganichev, Xiao-Jing Wang, Jonathon Shlens, and David Sussillo. 2018. A dataset and architecture for visual reasoning with a working memory. *ArXiv e-prints 1803.06092*.
- Zichao Yang, Xiaodong He, Jianfeng Gao, Li Deng, and Alexander J. Smola. 2016. Stacked attention networks for image question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, CVPR 2016.