

A Continual Learning Paradigm for Non-differentiable Visual Programming Frameworks on Visual Reasoning Tasks

Wentao Wan
Sun Yat-sen University
wanwt3@mail2.sysu.edu.cn

Zhuojie Yang
Sun Yat-sen University
yangzhj53@mail2.sysu.edu.cn

Nan Kang
Central South University
8209200623@csu.edu.cn

Liang Lin
Sun Yat-sen University
linlng@mail.sysu.edu.cn

Zeqing Wang
Sun Yat-sen University
wangzq73@mail2.sysu.edu.cn

Keze Wang
Sun Yat-sen University
kezewang@gmail.com

Abstract

Recently, the visual programming framework (VisProg) has emerged as a significant framework for executing compositional visual tasks due to its interpretability and flexibility. However, the performance of VisProg on specific Visual Reasoning (VR) tasks is markedly inferior compared to well-trained task-specific models since its employed visual sub-modules have limited generalization capabilities. Due to the non-differentiability of VisProg, it is quite challenging to improve these visual sub-modules within VisProg for the specific VR task while maintaining their generalizability on the un-seen tasks. Attempt to overcome these difficulties, we propose CLVP, a **C**ontinuous **L**earning paradigm for VisProg across various visual reasoning tasks. Specifically, our CLVP distills the capabilities of well-trained task-specific models into the visual sub-modules in a stepwise and anti-forgetting manner. This can continually improve the performance of VisProg on multiple visual tasks while preserving the flexibility of VisProg. Extensive and comprehensive experimental results demonstrate that our CLVP obtains significant performance gains on specific VR benchmarks, i.e., GQA (+1.4%) and NLVRv2 (+5.6%), compared to the VisProg baseline, and also maintains a promising generalizability for VR on un-seen and previous learned tasks.

1. Introduction

Visual Programming (VisProg) [7] uses a large language model (LLM [3, 5, 20, 23]) to generate visual programs, then executes these programs by invoking Python functions and the most powerful pre-trained visual models available to solve the target visual tasks. As a modular approach, VisProg is highly interpretable and has cross-task general-




Figure 1. Comparison of the original VisProg [7] and our proposed CLVP. Due to the limited ability of visual sub-modules, VisProg performs sub-optimal on given VR tasks, and can not be fine-tuned directly for its non-differentiability. There are three possible solutions to enhance the sub-modules (VQA module in this figure) to improve the performance of VisProg. Our CLVP not only does well in the target task but also maintains the most strong capabilities on other tasks among the three solutions.

ity (different tasks just require the generation of different visual programs and the invocation of different visual sub-modules). However, the accuracy of VisProg on visual reasoning (VR) tasks such as GQA [12] and NLVRv2 [24] is significantly lower than proprietary models [11, 16, 21, 27] trained with supervision on these tasks. Enhancing the performance of VisProg on VR tasks, without compromising the interpretability and cross-task generality of VisProg, is a crucial requirement for increasing the practical utility of this framework.

To enhance the performance of VisProg on specific VR tasks, there are two solutions: one is improving the quality of the generated visual programs [28, 31]. However, our analysis reveals that the proportion of errors caused by sub-modules is quite higher than that of code errors in VisProg

on VR tasks (Sec. 5.2); The other is enhancing the capabilities of the visual sub-modules invoked by VisProg to make those modules better adapt the target VR task. As shown in Fig. 1, there are two straightforward solutions for enhancing the capability of VisProg on the target VR task: i) Directly fine-tuning VisProg on the target task. However, the non-differentiability of VisProg makes it unfeasible to fine-tune the framework directly; ii) Replacing the model for the corresponding visual sub-module (e.g., VQA Module) in VisProg with a proprietary model well-trained on the target task. This solution would improve the performance of VisProg on the target task but would lead to a dramatic performance collapse on other tasks, severely compromising the versatility of VisProg.

Attempt to address these challenges, we propose CLVP, a continual learning paradigm for improving the performance of VisProg on VR tasks. To overcome the non-differentiable limitation of VisProg, our CLVP proposes to select the differentiable visual sub-modules from VisProg. Contrary to directly fine-tuning these visual sub-modules with the training data of the target VR task in a supervised manner, our CLVP adopts a stepwise distillation strategy to fine-tune these modules in a self-supervised fashion with pseudo-labels, which are provided by proprietary models well-trained on the target VR task. In this way, our CLVP not only can achieve superior performance over VisProg but also can maintain the generalizability on un-seen tasks as VisProg (Sec. 4.2). Furthermore, we present an anti-forgetting strategy to further enhance our CLVP by introducing an additional self-distillation task. This task encourages our CLVP to regularize the fine-tuning process of visual sub-modules across different VR tasks.

Our **main** contributions are as follows: i) To the best of our knowledge, our proposed CLVP is the first continual learning paradigm for fine-tuning the non-differentiable VisProg on specific VR tasks, thanks to our introduced distillation strategy that is stepwise and self-supervised; ii) We incorporate a forgetting prevention strategy into the stepwise distillation process of our CLVP. Hence, our CLVP still maintains the cross-task generality of the interpretable VisProg, even after being distilled for a specific VR task. Extensive and comprehensive experimental results demonstrate the superiority of our proposed CLVP. Besides, continual learning experiments on multiple VR tasks such as GQA and NLVRv2, demonstrate that our CLVP can sequentially learn these tasks while preventing catastrophic forgetting of previously learned knowledge.

2. Related Work

2.1. VisProg based on Large Language Models

VisProg [7] can be regarded as a new version of the neuro-symbolic approach for dealing with composite vi-

sual tasks. It utilizes Large Language Models (LLMs) to generate and execute visual programs, to handle specific composite visual tasks. The execution process often invokes predefined visual sub-modules and various functions from Python libraries (e.g., sorting, mathematical operations, etc.). Since the performance of VisProg on VR tasks is not good enough, we attempt to find various ways to improve it. However, VisProg is non-differentiable, so it cannot be fine-tuned on specific tasks. In addition, although the code generation quality of LLMs has been improving with each version iteration, our analysis reveals that the main errors of VisProg originate from its visual sub-modules (Sec. 5.2). These errors cannot be rectified through improvements in code quality. Therefore, enhancing the capabilities of the visual sub-modules is a necessary requirement for improving the performance of VisProg. Considering this, our CLVP utilizes a well-trained model on the target VR task to distill the invoked visual sub-modules to let VisProg perform better on the target VR task.

2.2. Knowledge Distillation

Knowledge distillation [6] is a method that distills the capabilities of a teacher model into a student model by having the student model mimic the output of the teacher model given the same input. This method was first proposed by Hinton et al. [9]. In previous studies, knowledge distillation has generally served several purposes. i) Model compression[10, 25]: Usually, knowledge is distilled from one model into another model with significantly fewer parameters. ii) Enhancing accuracy[22]: In this case, the student model learns the soft label of the teacher model under the same input of the training set, often achieving better generalization than directly learning the hard label, which results in higher accuracy on the test set. iii) Domain transfer[4]: This typically involves using the soft label of the teacher model trained on the source domain on the input of the target domain, distilled into the student model learning on the target domain, aiding the student model in gaining better generalization capabilities on the target domain when labels are lacking.

Our CLVP can be seen as a type of knowledge distillation used for domain transfer. Unlike previous research, here the source domain is the original question(or statement) and image data domain of VR tasks, and the target domain is the input image (usually a cropped sub-area of the original image) for the relevant visual sub-module VisProg invoked, as well as one of the multiple sub-questions decoupled from the original question(or statement). In our work, we are not distilling knowledge from a large-scale model into a small-scale model, but distilling knowledge from a small-scale proprietary visual model into a larger pre-trained visual model(used for the relevant visual sub-module) with cross-dataset capabilities, while trying to maintain the abil-

ity of the visual sub-modules of VisProg on other visual tasks.

2.3. Catastrophic Forgetting

Catastrophic forgetting[18] is a substantial challenge in continual learning. It generally manifests in two forms: one is a significant performance degradation on old tasks when proprietary models are trained on new tasks[29]; the other is a substantial decrease in the versatility of general-purpose models, after fine-tuning on specific task data, despite extensive pre-training. Solutions to catastrophic forgetting are typically categorized into three types: dynamic networks[1], gradient regularization[14], and data replay strategies[8].

VisProg usually invokes large-size pre-trained multi-modal models(e.g., BLIP, GLIP, etc.) as visual sub-modules. Our experiments reveal that directly fine-tuning these models on the original data of the target VR tasks will also make these models encounter catastrophic forgetting, causing loss of their inherent cross-task generality. Consequently, In our CLVP, we employ a stepwise distillation strategy to narrow the input domain gap of the visual sub-modules under different tasks. Furthermore, we combine the stepwise distillation with sequential self-distillation to improve the ability of models to alleviate catastrophic forgetting.

3. Methodology

3.1. Task Formalization

Our CLVP aims to enhance the performance of VisProg across multiple VR tasks without catastrophic forgetting. This section introduces VR tasks and the formal description of handling VR tasks using VisProg.

For a VR task T_i , Q^{T_i} represents the question of one sample in T_i , and I^{T_i} represents the corresponding image. For VisProg, a visual program $Prog$ to solve Q^{T_i} is first generated under $prompt^{T_i}$ through an LLM:

$$Prog = f((prompt^{T_i}, Q^{T_i}); \theta_{llm}) \quad (1)$$

in which $f(; \theta_{llm})$ means a LLM model with parameter θ_{llm} . $Prog$ often contains multiple steps, breaking down Q^{T_i} into several visual sub-tasks, usually decomposing the original complex Q^{T_i} into multiple sub-questions. $Prog_k$ denotes the k -th line of $Prog$. Let us assume that $Prog_k$ processes the j -th sub-question $Q_{sub-j}^{T_i}$. Executing $Prog_k$ to get the answer prediction $y_{sub-j}^{T_i}$ for $Q_{sub-j}^{T_i}$:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{sub-j}^{T_i} &= \mathbf{Exe}[Prog_k(I_{sub-j}^{T_i}; \theta_{vqa})] \\ &= f((I_{sub-j}^{T_i}, Q_{sub-j}^{T_i}); \theta_{vqa}) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

in which $\mathbf{Exe}[Prog_k]$ means executing $Prog_k$, $f((I_{sub-j}^{T_i}, Q_{sub-j}^{T_i}); \theta_{vqa})$ means an output of a VQA

model with $(I_{sub-j}^{T_i}, Q_{sub-j}^{T_i})$ as input and θ_{vqa} as parameter. This VQA model is invoked by VisProg in $Prog_k$ as the VQA module. Here, $I_{sub-j}^{T_i}$ is the sub-image input corresponding to the sub-question $Q_{sub-j}^{T_i}$, which is usually a part of the original image I^{T_i} , and is generated in several previous lines before $Prog_k$ in the visual program $Prog$ through:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{sub-j}^{T_i} &= \mathbf{crop_op}[\mathbf{Exe}[Prog_l(I^{T_i}; \theta_{loc})]] \\ &= \mathbf{crop_op}[f((I^{T_i}, obj_name); \theta_{loc})] \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $f((I^{T_i}, obj_name); \theta_{loc})$ is an bbox output of an object detection model with (I^{T_i}, obj_name) as input and θ_{loc} as parameter. This detection model is invoked by $Prog_l$ as the LOC module. $\mathbf{crop_op}$ is one operation of the crop operation set $\{\mathbf{crop}, \mathbf{crop_above}, \mathbf{crop_below}, \mathbf{crop_left}, \mathbf{crop_right}\}$. It is specifically determined by the next program line of $Prog_l$, representing cropping the target area or one part of its surrounding areas. By executing the entire visual program $Prog$, we get the answer prediction for the sample under the T_i task:

$$y^{T_i} = \mathbf{Exe}[Prog(I^{T_i}; \Theta_{sub-modules})] \quad (4)$$

where $\Theta_{sub-modules}$ means parameters of all visual sub-modules invoked by $Prog$. The objective of our methodology is to enhance the estimation of y^{T_i} in the absence of the ground-truth label $y_{gt}^{T_i}$, while concurrently minimizing the detriment to y^{T_m} , where $m \neq i$.

We propose CLVP to chase this object. Our CLVP includes two parts: a stepwise distillation (**SD**) strategy for fine-tuning visual sub-modules invoked by VisProg on the target VR task, and a sequential self-distillation (**SSD**) strategy for anti-forgetting on previous capabilities.

3.2. Stepwise Distillation

To enhance the prediction y^{T_i} on task T_i by VisProg, we performed a sampling error analysis(Sec. 5.2). This revealed that the principal errors in y^{T_i} stem from incorrect answer predictions $y_{sub-j}^{T_i}$ for sub-questions $Q_{sub-j}^{T_i}$ in Eq. 2. We consider that the primary reason is the inability of the pre-trained visual sub-module $f(; \theta_{vqa})$, employed by VisProg to execute the VQA [2] task, to effectively generalize to the unseen inputs $(I_{sub-j}^{T_i}, Q_{sub-j}^{T_i})$ in Eq. 2. This leads to the goal of how to optimize y^{T_i} without the corresponding ground-truth labels $y_{sub-j-gt}^{T_i}$ for $(I_{sub-j}^{T_i}, Q_{sub-j}^{T_i})$. An intuitive approach would be to directly fine-tune $f(; \theta_{vqa})$ on the original inputs (I^{T_i}, Q^{T_i}) in the training set of task T_i , but this requires the ground-truth label $y_{gt}^{T_i}$, and the results are subpar. Moreover, a significant performance degradation is observed on other VR tasks T_m (Sec. 4.2).




Figure 2. The overview of our proposed CLVP pipeline. CLVP is to guide the visual sub-modules in providing correct sub-answers, so as to access the correct final answer of the original question. The SD part displays the process of stepwise distillation. In Step_k of this example, asked the question (“Is the clothing red?”), the original “VQA module” would answer “no” wrongly. To rectify it, we use the teacher model to answer the same question, then we let the “VQA module” learn it through distillation. Similarly, in Step_{k+j}, after distillation the “VQA module” would answer “shirt” correctly instead of “dress”. Because of the correct reasoning of each sub-module, in the final step, we could get the correct answer “shirt” to the original question “Which kind of clothing is red?” with the given image. Meanwhile, to prevent the sub-module from forgetting previous knowledge after learning new knowledge, we employ the sequential self-distillation approach. The SSD part depicts the process of sequential self-distillation. We preserve the capability of sub-modules by inputting questions and images from the common task to the pre-distilled model, generating pseudo-labels, and using these image-question-answer pairs as part of the distilled knowledge.

Considering these, in our CLVP we propose a strategy of stepwise distillation on a special VR task T_i . Our stepwise distillation is primarily based on the following two insights: a. The abilities of a proprietary model well-trained on the original question and image dataset for task T_i can effectively generalize to the sub-question and sub-image inputs of VisProg; b. Directly replacing the VQA module invoked by VisProg with the proprietary model would lead to a significant reduction in capabilities on other tasks $T_m (m \neq i)$ that require the use of the VQA module. However, this can be mitigated by distilling the abilities of the proprietary model into the VQA module used by VisProg through the domain of sub-questions. Furthermore, the decoupling of VR tasks by VisProg reduces the gap between different tasks in terms of sub-questions inputs, which can significantly alleviate the impact of stepwise distillation for VisProg on task T_i on the performance of task $T_m (m \neq i)$. Please refer to Sec. 4.2 for relevant experimental results,

and Sec. 5.1 for further analysis. We will next describe the specific operations for stepwise distillation for VisProg on task T_i .

The SD part of Fig. 2 shows the pipeline of our stepwise distillation. Initially, we select a model that has been well-trained on the dataset of the “Target VR Task” T_i to serve as the “Teacher Model (Outcome-Supervised)” $T_e^{T_i}$. We then invoke $f(\cdot; \theta_{T_e^{T_i}})$ to execute $Prog_k$ in “Step k”, yielding $y_{sub-j-T_e^{T_i}}^{T_i}$ according to

$$\begin{aligned} y_{sub-j-T_e^{T_i}}^{T_i} &= \mathbf{Exe}[Prog_k(I_{sub-j}^{T_i}; \theta_{T_e^{T_i}})] \\ &= f((I_{sub-j}^{T_i}, Q_{sub-j}^{T_i}); \theta_{T_e^{T_i}}) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We utilize $y_{sub-j-T_e^{T_i}}^{T_i}$ as a pseudo-label for $y_{sub-j}^{T_i}$, and employ cross-entropy loss

$$\begin{aligned} L_{SD}^{T_i} &= -y_{sub-j-T_e^{T_i}}^{T_i} \log(y_{sub-j}^{T_i}) \\ &= -y_{sub-j-T_e^{T_i}}^{T_i} \log[f((I_{sub-j}^{T_i}, Q_{sub-j}^{T_i}); \theta_{vqa})] \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

to supervise the optimization of the visual sub-module $f(\cdot; \theta_{vqa})$ that VisProg invoked in $Prog_k$ while tackling VR task T_i .

3.3. Sequential Self-distillation for Anti-forgetting

To enhance the performance of VisProg on multiple VR tasks, we need to perform stepwise distillation on each of these tasks sequentially. As mentioned before, our CLVP, inherently possesses strong anti-catastrophic forgetting capabilities, ensuring that the performance of VisProg on other tasks is minimally affected after learning on one task. Here, we propose Sequential Self-distillation(SSD), which is an innovative anti-forgetting technique during the stepwise distillation process of CLVP to further reduce the forgetting of the capabilities of VisProg on other tasks (Although the forgetting is already quite limited).

Inspired by [18], we hypothesize that the input-data pairs in data domain A and their corresponding outputs from a model trained in data domain B can significantly transfer the capabilities of the model in domain B. Unlike [18] which utilizes the new task data domain to transfer the capabilities of the model on the old tasks and partially stores them in the added network layers, we do not need to add additional layers to the model. Instead, we maintain a common task T_s , which is a standard large-scale dataset of (image, single-hop question) pairs that can be collected through the internet, and we also do not require ground-truth labels.

As the SSD part of Fig. 2 shows, before starting the stepwise distillation on task T_i , we first input the data pairs (I^{T_s}, Q^{T_s}) of T_s into the VQA module $f(\cdot; \theta_{vqa,0})$ which has not yet been distilled on T_i , yielding

$$y^{T_s} = f((I^{T_s}, Q^{T_s}); \theta_{vqa,0})$$

We then construct the sequential self-distillation loss L_{SSD} as

$$L_{SSD} = -y^{T_s} \log[f((I^{T_s}, Q^{T_s}); \theta_{vqa})] \quad (7)$$

Note that all y^{T_s} should be produced before the VQA module is distilled on T_i . Then we construct sequential self-distillation loss $L_{CLVP}^{T_i}$ for fine-tuning VisProg on T_i , as

$$L_{CLVP}^{T_i} = L_{SD}^{T_i} + \lambda L_{SSD} \quad (8)$$

Where λ is a hyperparameter used to balance the weights of learning on task T_i and anti-forgetting. $L_{SD}^{T_i}$ is the stepwise distillation loss on T_i described in Eq. 6, and L_{SSD} is the sequential self-distillation described in Eq. 7. By optimizing $L_{CLVP}^{T_i}$, we can complete the sequential self-distillation of VisProg on task T_i .

3.4. Implementation Details

Interface Alignment. During the stepwise distillation on some VR tasks, we may encounter the issue of inconsistent input interfaces between the teacher model and the student model. As shown in Fig.2, we employ an input adapter

to transform the input of the student model in step $Prog_k$ into a format that can be accepted by the teacher model. These transformations typically include resizing cropped local images and constructing corresponding sub-questions based on the parameters in $Prog_k$. Particularly for tasks like NLVRv2, since its teacher model accepts a statement and two images as input, we first categorize the question and construct appropriate prompts (see Supp.) to turn the sub-question parameter in $Prog_k$ into a statement. General questions are directly converted into corresponding statements while questions like "How many..." are not. For each question beginning with "How many", we generate 11 statements describing the number of objects in question, ranging from 0 to 10. We then select the pseudo-label from answers produced by the teacher model, either choosing the statement with the highest probability of being True(if more than one is True) or the one with the lowest probability of being False (if all are False).

4. Experiments

4.1. Dataset and Experimental Setting

We sequentially distill the knowledge of teacher models well-trained on GQA[12] and NLVRv2[24] into the visual sub-modules. We assess the performance of CLVP on GQA, NLVRv2, and Visual Grounding (VG[30]) tasks after each round of distillation, to evaluate and compare the performance enhancement of CLVP on the currently focused VR task, and whether this round of distillation has impaired the performance of VisProg on other tasks.

GQA[12] is a VR database based on real-world scenario question answering. We randomly drew 140,000 samples (excluding labels) from the GQA train balanced split for CLVP, maintaining proportionality by question type. We evaluate the performance of CLVP on GQA using the GQA test-dev balanced split and the sub-dataset constructed according to VisProg[7]. NLVRv2[24] is a VR benchmark with two real-world images and a statement as input. We use the train set data (excluding labels) for distillation and evaluate CLVP on the public test set split of the NLVRv2 benchmark. Additionally, we evaluate CLVP on the testA split of RefCOCO[13] and RefCOCO+ for the VG task.

In our CLVP, we respectively choose CFR[21] and Beit3[27] as teacher models on GQA and NLVRv2. And choosing the "VQA" module as the student model which is implemented by BLIP[16].

4.2. Results

To evaluate the effectiveness of our CLVP in improving the performance of VisProg on target VR tasks, we sequentially distill the visual sub-modules in the framework on GQA and NLVRv2. After each distilling round, we tested the performance of CLVP on GQA, VG (RefCOCO, Ref-







<p>Are the knives made of the same material as the forks?</p> 	 <p>← $BOX0=LOC(image=IMAGE,object='forks')$</p>	1
	 <p>← $IMAGE0=CROP(image=IMAGE,box=BOX0)$</p>	2
	<p>metal (Ori) ← $ANSWER0=VQA(image=IMAGE0,question='What material is the forks made of?')$</p> <p>metal (T)</p> <p>metal (CLVP)</p>	3
	 <p>← $BOX1=LOC(image=IMAGE,object='knives')$</p>	4
	 <p>← $IMAGE1=CROP(image=IMAGE,box=BOX1)$</p>	5
	<p>plastic (Ori) ← $ANSWER1=VQA(image=IMAGE1,question='What material is the knives made of?')$</p> <p>metal (T)</p> <p>metal (CLVP)</p>	6 (key step)
	<p>Ans: no ×</p> <p>GT: yes</p> <p>Ans(CLVP): yes ✓</p> <p>no (Ori) ← $ANSWER2=EVAL(expr='\"'yes' if {ANSWER0} == {ANSWER1} else 'no\"')$</p> <p>yes (CLVP) ← $FINAL_RESULT=RESULT(var=ANSWER2)$</p>	7
<p>One image shows a rectangle of folded dough on a wood board, with fingertip impressions on one edge of the dough.</p> 	<p>yes (Ori) ← $ANSWER0=VQA(image=LEFT,question='Does the image show a rectangle of folded dough on a wood board?')$</p> <p>no (T)</p> <p>no (CLVP)</p>	1 (key step)
	<p>yes (Ori) ← $ANSWER2=VQA(image=LEFT,question='Are there fingertip impressions on one edge of the dough?')$</p> <p>yes (T)</p> <p>yes (CLVP)</p>	2
	<p>yes (Ori) ← $ANSWER1=VQA(image=RIGHT,question='Does the image show a rectangle of folded dough on a wood board?')$</p> <p>no (T)</p> <p>no (CLVP)</p>	3 (key step)
	<p>yes (Ori) ← $ANSWER3=VQA(image=RIGHT,question='Are there fingertip impressions on one edge of the dough?')$</p> <p>yes (T)</p> <p>yes (CLVP)</p>	4
	<p>yes (Ori) ← $ANSWER4=EVAL(expr='{ANSWER0} and {ANSWER2}')$</p> <p>no (CLVP)</p>	5
	<p>yes (Ori) ← $ANSWER5=EVAL(expr='{ANSWER1} and {ANSWER3}')$</p> <p>yes (CLVP)</p>	6
	<p>False (Ori) ← $ANSWER6=EVAL(expr='{ANSWER4} xor {ANSWER5}')$</p> <p>Ture (CLVP)</p>	7
	<p>False (Ori) ← $FINAL_ANSWER=RESULT(var=ANSWER6)$</p> <p>True (CLVP)</p> <p>Ans: False ×</p> <p>GT: True</p> <p>Ans(CLVP): True ✓</p>	8

Figure 3. Qualitative examples showing the program execution flow of VisProg and our CLVP. For each example, we provide a detailed process with sub-answers during execution and the final answers of VisProg and CLVP, in which Ans means the final answer, GT means the ground truth, Ori means the original answer of VisProg, T means the teacher answer and CLVP means the answer of CLVP.

COCO+), and NLVRv2. The results are recorded in Tab. 1 and Tab. 2 respectively.

Results after Distilling on GQA. In Tab. 1, we perform quantitative evaluation on different methods across several VR tasks. We consider the original implementation of VisProg as our baseline. It can be observed that when replacing the corresponding visual module of VisProg with the teacher model CFR (VisProg_CFR), although there is a growth of 15.2% on the test-dev balanced split of GQA, the cost is a significant decrease in performance on other tasks, with a maximum decline of 20.7% (in the NLVRv2 task). Fine-tuning the sub-module on the original GQA only achieves a growth of 0.8% on GQA, but suffers severe performance degradation on NLVRv2, with a decrease in accuracy of 10.4%. Our approach proved to be beneficial in improving the performance of the VisProg framework on the target task GQA without compromising its performance on other tasks.

Results after Distilling on NLVRv2. After distilling on GQA, we try to distill the knowledge of NLVRv2 into the visual sub-modules in CLVP. In Tab. 2, we take the CLVP_G as our baseline. It is evident that replacing the corresponding visual module with the teacher model Beit3 (VisProg Beit3-NLVRv2) leads to an increase of 8.3% on the public test split of NLVRv2. However, this improvement comes at the expense of a significant decrease in performance on previous tasks, with a maximum decline of 36.6% on the GQA task. In contrast, our method(CLVP_{G,N} w/o SSD) not only achieves a gain of 5.6% on NLVRv2 but also expe-

riences only a 2.6% decrease in performance on the GQA task. Moreover, with the inclusion of the SSD technique, the performance drop on the GQA task was further reduced to just 0.9%. This demonstrates that our method empowers VisProg with the ability of continual learning while preserving its interpretability and flexibility.

4.3. Ablation Study

Different Dataset Sizes for CLVP. In Fig. 4 we look at the impact of data volume. The full train balanced split of GQA contains about 940,000 questions, which we sampled 1400, 2100 and 5100 questions per question type for this ablation. The decomposed questions originating from the sampled questions, along with the labels generated by the teacher model constitute the sub datasets of GQA with 3 different sizes. The results demonstrate that CLVP performs better on GQA with a larger size of train set. As depicted in the figure, as the data size increased from 100,000 to 240,000, the accuracy of the distilled student model on the GQA dataset increased by 1%, which implies that our CLVP has the potential to achieve even better results on the GQA task.

Different Distillation Settings for Student. To investigate the optimal distillation setting, we have conducted the following experiment with BLIP[15] as the sub-module to be distilled. In Tab. 3 we present the results of distilled BLIP of varying distillation settings. We observe that unfreezing the last 4 layers of the vision encoder and the last 4 layers of the answer decoder(VE4+AD4) may be the opti-

Method	GQA(Distilled on)		RefCOCO	RefCOCO+	NLVRv2	
	test-dev balanced	sampled	testA	testA	public test	
	Accuracy(%)		IOU		Accuracy(%)	
Supervised	CFR	72.1	-	-	-	
	CCO[19]	56.1	-	-	-	
	VisProg_M_FT	45.9(+0.8)	60.1(+2.4)	53.8(-1.2)	49.8(-1.4)	55.3(-10.4)
Zero-shot	PnP-VQA[26]	42.3	-	-	-	
	BLIP-2[17]	44.7	-	-	-	
	VisProg	-	50.0	-	-	61.8
	VisProg†(Baseline)	45.1	57.7	55.0	51.2	65.7
TR	VisProg_CFR	60.3(+15.2)	69.4(+11.7)	44.5(-9.5)	35.0(-16.2)	45.0(-20.7)
Self-supervised	CLVP_G w/o SSD(Ours)	47.5(+2.4)	61.4(+3.7)	54.1(-0.9)	50.6(-0.6)	64.4(-1.3)
	CLVP_G(Ours)	46.5(+1.4)	59.8(+2.1)	54.9(-0.1)	50.8(-0.4)	64.8(-0.9)

Table 1. Results for CLVP with sub-modules learning on GQA. VisProg_M_FT represents VisProg with the “VQA” module finetuned on the original questions and labels in GQA datasets. VisProg_CFR represents VisProg with the “VQA” module replaced by the teacher model CFR. CLVP_G represents VisProg with the “VQA” module distilled on GQA. “CLVP_G w/o SSD” means CLVP_G without our proposed anti-forgetting strategy. †denotes our implementation.

Method	GQA		RefCOCO	RefCOCO+	NLVRv2(Distilled on)	
	test-dev balanced	sampled	testA	testA	public test	
	Accuracy(%)		IOU		Accuracy(%)	
Supervised	ViLT-NLVRv2	-	-	-	76.3	
	BLIP-NLVRv2	-	-	-	83.1	
	Beit3-NLVRv2	-	-	-	89.4	
Zero-shot	VisProg†	45.1	57.7	55.0	51.2	65.7
TR	VisProg_Beit3-NLVRv2	22.4(-25.1)	51.4(-10.0)	49.0(-5.1)	39.8(-10.8)	72.7(+8.3)
Self-supervised	CLVP_G(Baseline)	47.5	61.4	54.1	50.6	64.4
	CLVP_{GN} w/o SSD(Ours)	44.9(-2.6)	59.2(-2.2)	54.4(+0.3)	50.5(-0.1)	70.6(+6.2)
	CLVP_{GN}(Ours)	46.6(-0.9)	60.3(-1.1)	54.1(-0.0)	50.6(-0.0)	70.0(+5.6)

Table 2. Results for CLVP with sub-modules learning on NLVRv2. Here, the baseline framework is CLVP_G, whose visual sub-modules have already distilled on GQA. ViLT-NLVRv2, BLIP-NLVRv2, and Beit3-NLVRv2 mean models fine-tuned on NLVRv2; VisProg_Beit3-NLVRv2 means using Beit3-NLVRv2 as the “VQA” module in VisProg; CLVP_G means CLVP with visual sub-modules distilled on GQA; CLVP_{GN} means CLVP with the sub-modules in CLVP_G distilled on NLVRv2. “CLVP_{GN} w/o SSD” means CLVP_{GN} without our proposed anti-forgetting strategy. †denotes our implementation.




Figure 4. Impacts of data volume on the student performance. We report the performance of the distilled student model on the test-dev balanced split of GQA after stepwise distillation on the sub GQA datasets of different sizes.

mal setting. Although the performance of this setting on VG is marginally lower than that of VE4+TE4+AD4, it achieves higher accuracy improvement(+2.4%) on GQA and results

in lower performance degradation(-1.3%) on NLVRv2 compared to other settings. All other experiments follow the distillation settings of VE4+AD4.

4.4. Case Study

Given a VR image-question pair, we employ CLVP to rectify the VQA module to get the correct answer. We provide qualitative examples in Fig. 3 to show how CLVP works. In the first example, facing the image and the question “Are the knives made of the same material as the forks?”, we first use the LOC module to find the forks, and crop them for further questions. Then we call the VQA module to learn what material of the forks is made of. The same operations are done for the knives. However, in VisProg the VQA module gives a wrong answer “plastic” as the material of the knives, which causes the final answer wrongly be “no”. We use CLVP to distill the teacher’s an-

distillation settings	GQA(Distilled on)		RefCOCO	RefCOCO+	NLVRv2
	test-dev balanced	sampled	testA	testA	public test
	Accuracy(%)		IOU		Accuracy(%)
VE4	46.6	60.0	54.0	49.2	62.4
VE4+AD4	47.5	61.4	54.1	50.5	64.4
VE2+AD2	46.5	60.0	54.2	50.9	63.0
VE4+TE4+AD4	47.3	60.7	55.3	51.1	60.7

Table 3. Comparison of different distillation settings. For this experiment, we take BLIP as the sub-module for visual question answering. VE4 denotes the last 4 layers of the vision encoder. VE2 denotes the last 2 layers of the vision encoder. TE4 denotes the last 4 layers of the text encoder. AD2 denotes the last 2 layers of the answer decoder. AD4 denotes the last 4 layers of the answer decoder. We unfreeze different parameters when performing distillation on GQA and test the performance of distilled BLIP on other tasks.

swers with the questions to the VQA module. After distillation, the VQA module answer “metal” correctly in the key step, and we get the answer to the original question “yes”, which is the same as the ground truth.

In the second example, we call the VQA module to answer if a rectangle of folded dough on a wood board, with fingertip impressions on one edge of the dough in each image, and evaluate if only one answer “yes”. In VisProg, we get the wrong final answer “False”. After employing CLVP, the VR ability of the VQA module is enhanced and we get the correct final answer “True”.

More quantitative examples are provided in the supplementary material.

5. Discussion

5.1. Why "CLVP w/o SSD" Still Resist Forgetting

Even without SSD incorporated in CLVP, we have observed strong resistance to forgetting when directly using the stepwise distillation strategy in CLVP. We attribute this primarily to the fact that under the stepwise distillation setup of CLVP, the interfaces of the modules to be distilled are relatively fixed, and their inputs are sub-images and sub-questions processed by the visual program. These sub-images typically contain only one single object, and the corresponding sub-questions are simple one-hop queries about this object. This setup reduces the domain gap between different task inputs when the relevant visual sub-modules of CLVP, thereby alleviating the forgetting of old tasks when fine-tuning new ones. For a more detailed analysis, please refer to our supplementary materials.

5.2. Error Analysis

To validate whether our method is effective in improving the performance of sub-modules, we manually inspect programs for 100 examples to analyze the source of errors for the GQA task. As is depicted in Fig. 5, the primary source of errors in VisProg stems from faults in the visual sub-module. The error rate of the visual sub-module in CLVP decreased by 3%, leading to an overall accuracy improve-




Figure 5. Sources of errors in VisProg and CLVP.

ment of 3%. This demonstrates that our CLVP enhances the performance of the framework on target tasks by enhancing the capabilities of visual sub-modules invoked.

5.3. Limitation

Though CLVP shows anti-forgetting capability, its ability to improve the accuracy of the target task is limited by the performance of teacher models since there are only pseudo labels generated by teacher models involved in our method. Moreover, as CLVP is a variant of VisProg and both of them depend on the programs generated by LLMs, CLVP also inherits the risks of LLMs, such as outputting programs with syntax errors or semantic errors, which still cannot be dealt with by our method.

6. Conclusion

We propose CLVP, a continual learning paradigm for the non-differentiable VisProg across various VR tasks. Our CLVP integrates both sequential self-distillation and stepwise distillation strategies, enabling it to enhance the performance of VisProg on multiple specific visual reasoning tasks while maintaining its performance on unseen and previous tasks. Continuous learning on GQA and NLVRv2 validates the aforementioned statements.

References

- [1] Mohammed Amer and Tomás Maul. Reducing catastrophic forgetting in modular neural networks by dynamic information balancing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.04508*, 2019. **3**
- [2] Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jiasen Lu, Margaret Mitchell, Dhruv Batra, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. Vqa: Visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2425–2433, 2015. **3, 2**
- [3] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021. **1**
- [4] Gongfan Fang, Yifan Bao, Jie Song, Xinchao Wang, Donglin Xie, Chengchao Shen, and Mingli Song. Mosaicking to distill: Knowledge distillation from out-of-domain data. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 11920–11932, 2021. **2**
- [5] Luciano Floridi and Massimo Chiriatti. Gpt-3: Its nature, scope, limits, and consequences. *Minds and Machines*, 30: 681–694, 2020. **1**
- [6] Jianping Gou, Baosheng Yu, Stephen J Maybank, and Dacheng Tao. Knowledge distillation: A survey. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 129:1789–1819, 2021. **2**
- [7] Tanmay Gupta and Aniruddha Kembhavi. Visual programming: Compositional visual reasoning without training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14953–14962, 2023. **1, 2, 5**
- [8] Tyler L Hayes, Kushal Kafle, Robik Shrestha, Manoj Acharya, and Christopher Kanan. Remind your neural network to prevent catastrophic forgetting. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 466–483. Springer, 2020. **3**
- [9] Geoffrey Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeff Dean. Distilling the knowledge in a neural network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*, 2015. **2**
- [10] Yu-Wei Hong, Jenq-Shiou Leu, Muhamad Faisal, and Setya Widyanawan Prakosa. Analysis of model compression using knowledge distillation. *IEEE Access*, 10:85095–85105, 2022. **2**
- [11] Drew Hudson and Christopher D Manning. Learning by abstraction: The neural state machine. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019. **1**
- [12] Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning. Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6700–6709, 2019. **1, 5**
- [13] Sahar Kazemzadeh, Vicente Ordonez, Mark Matten, and Tamara Berg. Referitgame: Referring to objects in photographs of natural scenes. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*, pages 787–798, 2014. **5**
- [14] James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, et al. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 114(13):3521–3526, 2017. **3**
- [15] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022. **6, 2**
- [16] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022. **1, 5**
- [17] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12597*, 2023. **7**
- [18] Zhizhong Li and Derek Hoiem. Learning without forgetting. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 40(12):2935–2947, 2017. **3, 5**
- [19] Zhuowan Li, Elias Stengel-Eskin, Yixiao Zhang, Cihang Xie, Quan Tran, Benjamin Van Durme, and Alan Yuille. Calibrating concepts and operations: Towards symbolic reasoning on real images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2021. **7**
- [20] Ziyang Luo, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Qingfeng Sun, Xiubo Geng, Wenxiang Hu, Chongyang Tao, Jing Ma, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. Wizardcoder: Empowering code large language models with evol-instruct. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08568*, 2023. **1**
- [21] Binh X Nguyen, Tuong Do, Huy Tran, Erman Tjiputra, Quang D Tran, and Anh Nguyen. Coarse-to-fine reasoning for visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4558–4566, 2022. **1, 5**
- [22] Setya Widyanawan Prakosa, Jenq-Shiou Leu, and Zhao-Hong Chen. Improving the accuracy of pruned network using knowledge distillation. *Pattern Analysis and Applications*, 24:819–830, 2021. **2**
- [23] Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, et al. Code llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*, 2023. **1**
- [24] Alane Suhr, Stephanie Zhou, Ally Zhang, Iris Zhang, Huanjun Bai, and Yoav Artzi. A corpus for reasoning about natural language grounded in photographs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.00491*, 2018. **1, 5**
- [25] Siqi Sun, Yu Cheng, Zhe Gan, and Jingjing Liu. Patient knowledge distillation for bert model compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.09355*, 2019. **2**
- [26] Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junnan Li, Boyang Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven CH Hoi. Plug-and-play vqa: Zero-shot vqa by conjoining large pretrained models with zero training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.08773*, 2022. **7**

- [27] Wenhui Wang, Hangbo Bao, Li Dong, Johan Bjorck, Zhiliang Peng, Qiang Liu, Kriti Aggarwal, Owais Khan Mohammed, Saksham Singhal, Subhojit Som, et al. Image as a foreign language: Beit pretraining for all vision and vision-language tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.10442*, 2022. 1, 5
- [28] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022. 1
- [29] Xin Yao, Tianchi Huang, Chenglei Wu, Rui-Xiao Zhang, and Lifeng Sun. Adversarial feature alignment: Avoid catastrophic forgetting in incremental task lifelong learning. *Neural computation*, 31(11):2266–2291, 2019. 3
- [30] Licheng Yu, Patrick Poirson, Shan Yang, Alexander C Berg, and Tamara L Berg. Modeling context in referring expressions. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part II 14*, pages 69–85. Springer, 2016. 5
- [31] Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, Hai Zhao, George Karypis, and Alex Smola. Multimodal chain-of-thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00923*, 2023. 1

A Continual Learning Paradigm for Non-differentiable Visual Programming Frameworks on Visual Reasoning Tasks

Supplementary Material

7. More Implementation Details

7.1. Interface Alignment on NLVRv2

In **Figure 2** of the main text, we employ stepwise distillation to rectify the VQA module with the sub-questions and the pseudo-labels given by the teacher model[21, 27]. However, for the sub-questions of NLVRv2[24], we cannot feed them to the teacher model directly, because there exists a gap between the inputs of VQA[12] and NLVRv2. In order to get the pseudo-labels, We need to achieve the interface alignment. In **Section 3.4** of the main text, we mention some implementation details about that, here we will provide a more complete process.

Since each input set of the NLVRv2 teacher model is a statement and two images, we need to convert these questions into corresponding statements, which can be finished by LLM[5]. First of all, we categorize these questions into four types: “How many”, “Is there/Are there”, “Is/Are/Do/Does” and “other” according to the first two words of each question. The numbers and proportion of the four types are below.

question type	number	proportion(%)
How many	68347	27.99%
Is there/Are there	61074	25.01%
Is/Are/Do/Does	111927	45.84%
other	2836	1.16%

Table 4. the numbers and proportion of different question types

Since the answers to the questions of “Is there/Are there” and “Is/Are/Do/Does” are only “True” or “False”, it’s easy to convert these questions into corresponding statements by the prompt in Fig. 6

However, the answers to the questions of “How many” and “other” are unknown. Due to the little proportion, we call the VQA module to get the pseudo-labels of “other” questions directly. For each question of “How many”, we generate 11 statements describing the number of objects, ranging from 0 to 10. The prompt we use to generate statements is in Fig. 7

After getting the statements, since a question corresponds to only one image, we specify the corresponding image in each statement. Specifically, if the original question corresponds to the left image, we add “in the left image” in the middle or at the end of the statement, otherwise we add “in the right image” in the middle or at the end.

We take each statement and the corresponding two images as a set of inputs to the teacher model. For each set of inputs, the teacher model returns a “True” or “false” and the corresponding probability. For the questions of “Is there/Are there” and “Is/Are/Do/Does”, the pseudo label is the result of the teacher model. For the questions of “How many”, if there is at least one “True”, the pseudo label is the number corresponding to the statement with the highest probability of being True. If all are “False”, the pseudo label is the number corresponding to the statement with the smallest probability.

7.2. More Details for Experimental Results Reproduction

In **Section 2.1** of the main text, we mention that VisProg utilizes LLMs [3, 5, 20, 23] to generate visual programs. Similarly, we also use LLMs to generate programs. Specifically, We reproduced VisProg[7] separately on the test sets of GQA and NLVRv2 using codellama-python-34B[23] and gpt-3.5-turbo, respectively. On GQA, the accuracy of programs generated by codellama-python-34B is 45.1%, while the accuracy of programs generated by gpt-3.5-turbo is 43.5%. On NLVRv2, the accuracy of programs generated by codellama-python-34B is 64.2%, whereas the accuracy of programs generated by gpt-3.5-turbo is 65.7%. To achieve better results, we chose codellama-python on GQA and gpt-3.5-turbo on NLVRv2 to generate visual programs. However, it is important to note that our distillation and corresponding baselines on each dataset were generated using the same model and visual programs. This ensures that any differences in results are due to the varying capabilities of the invoked visual models.

In **Section 4.2** of the main text, we evaluate the performance of CLVP on GQA using the GQA test-dev balanced split and the sub-dataset constructed according to VisProg. To construct the sub-dataset, specifically, we randomly sample up to k samples per question type from the balanced val (k = 5) and test-dev (k = 20) sets. The above sub-dataset of GQA is used as the “sampled” split in **Table 1** and **Table 2** of the main text.

8. Why does “CLVP w/o ssd” still mitigate forgetting?

Table 1 and **Table 2** of the main text demonstrate that “CLVP w/o SSD” still possesses a certain level of resistance to forgetting. In this section, we conduct a preliminary exploration of the reasons behind this phenomenon.

```
prompt = """"You are a linguist. You need to convert one question into a statement. You don't need to answer the question, just follow the example below to make the transition.
```

```
Question: Is there a person holding up a leopard in the image?  
Statements: there is a person holding up a leopard in the image
```

```
Question: Are there any small square boxes in the image?  
Statements: there are any small square boxes in the image
```

```
Question: Does the image show a saxophone with a curved bell in a metallic color?  
Statements: the image shows a saxophone with a curved bell in a metallic color
```

```
Question: Is the nose of the horned animal on the ground?  
Statements: the nose of the horned animal is on the ground
```

```
Question: Are the zebras running and kicking up dust?  
Statements: the zebras are running and kicking up dust
```

```
Question: Do the dogs sleep on the floor?  
Statements: the dogs sleep on the floor
```

```
Question: {new_question}  
Statements: """"
```

Figure 6. the prompt for the questions of “Is there/Are there” and “Is/Are/Do/Does”

```
prompt = """"You are a linguist. You need to convert one question into eleven statements in a list. You don't need to answer the question, just follow the example below to make the transition.
```

```
Question: How many round pizzas are in the image?  
Statements: ['there is no round pizza in the image', 'there is one round pizza in the image', 'there are two round pizzas in the image', 'there are three round pizzas in the image', 'there are four round pizzas in the image', 'there are five round pizzas in the image', 'there are six round pizzas in the image', 'there are seven round pizzas in the image', 'there are eight round pizzas in the image', 'there are nine round pizzas in the image', 'there are ten round pizzas in the image']
```

```
Question: How many people are lying in bed?  
Statements: ['there is no people lying in bed', 'there is one people lying in bed', 'there are two people lying in bed', 'there are three people lying in bed', 'there are four people lying in bed', 'there are five people lying in bed', 'there are six people lying in bed', 'there are seven people lying in bed', 'there are eight people lying in bed', 'there are nine people lying in bed', 'there are ten people lying in bed']
```

```
Question: How many cubs are close to the mother cheetah?  
Statements: ['there are no cubs close to the mother cheetah', 'there is one cub close to the mother cheetah', 'there are two cubs close to the mother cheetah', 'there are three cubs close to the mother cheetah', 'there are four cubs close to the mother cheetah', 'there are five cubs close to the mother cheetah', 'there are six cubs close to the mother cheetah', 'there are seven cubs close to the mother cheetah', 'there are eight cubs close to the mother cheetah', 'there are nine cubs close to the mother cheetah', 'there are ten cubs close to the mother cheetah']
```

```
Question: How many products are uncovered?  
Statements: ['there are no products uncovered', 'there is one product uncovered', 'there are two products uncovered', 'there are three products uncovered', 'there are four products uncovered', 'there are five products uncovered', 'there are six products uncovered', 'there are seven products uncovered', 'there are eight products uncovered', 'there are nine products uncovered', 'there are ten products uncovered']
```

```
Question: {new_question}  
Statements: """"
```

Figure 7. the prompt for the questions of “How many”

To further clarify this phenomenon, we conducted an external experiment. This experiment started with the Blip[15] model fine-tuned on VQA[2], we measured its performance on the original VQA and GQA dataset inputs. We then separately adopted fine-tuning on the original dataset questions and the stepwise distillation technique in our CLVP for learning on GQA, and then respectively measured the performance of the model when using the VQA

and GQA original datasets as inputs, as well as the performance of the model as VQA module in an interpretable VisProg on the VQA (randomly drew ten thousand samples from the val_set) and GQA (the entire test-dev balanced split) datasets. The results are recorded in Tab. 5.

From the table, we can see that after directly fine-tuning on the original GQA data, the accuracy of Blip on original GQA inputs increased by 1.7% (the limited increase is due

Method	VQA(previous task)		GQA(target task)	
	ori_input	under_VisProg	ori_input	under_VisProg
Blip_ori	85.4	72.6	49.2	45.1
Blip_FT_{G_ori}	70.7(-14.7)	-	50.9(+1.7)	-
Blip_SD_G	83.7(-1.7)	65.1(-7.5)	-	47.5(+2.4)

Table 5. A comparison of the degree of forgetting between direct fine-tuning and stepwise distillation. “ori_input” means using original task data as input, “under_VisProg” means getting the accuracy using VisProg which invokes the learned Blip model as the VQA Module. “**Blip_ori**” means the Blip model just fine-tuned on VQA, and have not learned on GQA yet. “**Blip_FT_{G_ori}**” means the Blip model fine-tuned on GQA original data after fine-tuned on VQA. “**Blip_SD_G**” means the Blip model is stepwise distilled on GQA after fine-tuned on VQA.

to the smaller scale of GQA training data used for aligning with the stepwise distillation experiment, as the stepwise distillation experiment requires code generated by LLM, which is costly, so we limited the scale of the training set). Meanwhile, the accuracy of the original data of the previous task VQA dropped by 14.7 percentage points, showing a significant decline.

Considering the results under the interpretable framework—VisProg, using the stepwise distillation technique in our CLVP can help improve the performance of VisProg in GQA from 45.1% to 47.5% (an increase of 2.4 percentage points). At the same time, the accuracy on the previously learned VQA task dropped from 72.6% to 65.1% (only a decline of 7.5 percentage points), demonstrating stronger resistance to forgetting compared to the control group.

Of course, VisProg, compared to end-to-end models, exhibits a lower overall score performance on VQA while enhancing interpretability and flexibility. When we abandon this interpretability and allow the VQA module in VisProg that has been stepwise distilled on GQA (Blip model) to accept original data input from the VQA task dataset, it can achieve an accuracy of 83.7%, forgetting only 1.7 percentage points, thus exhibiting remarkable resistance to forgetting.

The aforementioned experimental results indicate that the stepwise distillation in our CLVP demonstrates a stronger resistance to forgetting compared to direct fine-tuning on the original task data. We guess that the primary reason might be that the inputs for the stepwise distillation in our CLVP are processed sub-images (for the GQA task) and sub-questions through VisProg. This results in a smaller domain gap for the inputs of the VQA module invoked by VisProg during the distillation learning process across previous and target tasks, as compared to using the original images and questions directly as inputs. Consequently, after the distillation learning on the target task is completed, the model tends to forget less about its abilities on the previous tasks.

Next, we illustrate through intuitive examples that, com-

pared to fine-tuning on the original task data, the input domain gap in different tasks for the VQA Module in the stepwise distillation of our CLVP may be smaller. This is manifested as the inputs of previous and new tasks are more similar. From Fig. 8 we can see, compared with the original input image in those cases, after the “crop” manipulation, the input sub-image of the VQA Module in VisProg looks more similar to the below input image of the case in the NLVRv2 task.

The same thing happened for the question (or text) inputs. We speculate that the similarity between the sub-questions on GQA and NLVRv2, which are decoupled through VisProg, would be higher than the similarity between the original composite long-form questions on these two tasks. For instance, there exists an original question in GQA: “Are the trees brown and abundant?” and another original statement in NLVRv2: “There are two trees in the image on the right.” When these two questions are decoupled by VisProg, the former question becomes two separate ones: “Are the trees brown?”, “How many trees are there?”. The latter question is decoupled into a single sub-question: “How many trees are in the image?” Intuitively, the sub-questions after decoupling are more similar between these two examples from different tasks.

Our preliminary observation led us to speculate that the inputs of sub-steps after decoupling across different tasks are more similar than the original inputs, which could be a general phenomenon. We believe the underlying reason might be that under a general metric, the distance between sets of independent variable distributions is smaller than the distance between two complex joint distributions. However, the aforementioned statement is currently only our speculation and requires further investigation, including more rigorous formal proofs or more comprehensive sample analyses using statistical means. We hope our discussion here provides some relevant insights.

9. More Cases

In Fig.9, Fig.10, Fig.11 and Fig.12, we show some additional examples of our CLVP. After stepwise distillation, CLVP can now correctly perform the previously incorrect intermediate step, resulting in the correct final answer.

Input Image:



Query: Are the gloves large?

```

BOX0=LOC(image=IMAGE,object='gloves')
IMAGE0=CROP(image=IMAGE,box=BOX0)
ANSWER0=VQA(image=IMAGE0,question='Are the gloves large?')
FINAL_RESULT=RESULT(var=ANSWER0)

```



GQA

NLVRv2

Query:

Each image contains a pair of hand coverings, and one image contains a pair of gloves with five full-length fingers that cover the finger tips.



LEFT



RIGHT

Input Image:



Query: What type of device is not on, the laptop or the keyboard?

```

BOX0=LOC(image=IMAGE,object='laptop')
IMAGE0=CROP(image=IMAGE,box=BOX0)
BOX1=LOC(image=IMAGE0,object='keyboard')
ANSWER0=COUNT(box=BOX1)
ANSWER1=EVAL(expr="'keyboard' if {ANSWER0} > 0 else 'laptop'")
BOX2=LOC(image=IMAGE,object=ANSWER1)
IMAGE1=CROP(image=IMAGE,box=BOX2)
ANSWER2=VQA(image=IMAGE1,question='What type of device is not on?')
FINAL_RESULT=RESULT(var=ANSWER2)

```



GQA

NLVRv2

Query:

The right image contains exactly one laptop.






LEFT



RIGHT

Figure 8. Examples of original input images in the GQA and NLVRv2 dataset and cropped images in Visprog. In the first example, the cropped image shows a pair of gloves holding a ball, which appears more similar to the images in NLVRv2 compared to the original image. In the second example, the cropped image primarily contains a laptop, which is more similar to the images displaying laptops in NLVRv2.

<p>Which kind of furniture is underneath the jacket?</p>  <p>Ans: couch ✗ GT: chair Ans(CLVP): chair ✓</p>	 <p>← <code>BOX0=LOC(image=IMAGE,object='jacket')</code></p> <p style="text-align: right;">1</p>
	 <p>← <code>IMAGE0=CROP_BELOW(image=IMAGE,box=BOX0)</code></p> <p style="text-align: right;">2</p>
	<p>couch (Ori) chair (T) chair (CLVP)</p> <p>← <code>ANSWER0=VQA(image=IMAGE0,question='What kind of furniture is this?')</code></p> <p style="text-align: right;">(key step) 3</p>
	<p>couch (Ori) chair (CLVP)</p> <p>← <code>FINAL_RESULT=RESULT(var=ANSWER0)</code></p> <p style="text-align: right;">4</p>







<p>Is the cup made of glass?</p>  <p>Ans: yes ✗ GT: no Ans(CLVP): no ✓</p>	 <p>← <code>BOX0=LOC(image=IMAGE,object='cup')</code></p> <p style="text-align: right;">1</p>
	 <p>← <code>IMAGE0=CROP(image=IMAGE,box=BOX0)</code></p> <p style="text-align: right;">2</p>
	<p>yes (Ori) no (T) no (CLVP)</p> <p>← <code>ANSWER0=VQA(image=IMAGE0,question='Is the cup made of glass?')</code></p> <p style="text-align: right;">(key step) 3</p>
	<p>yes (Ori) no (CLVP)</p> <p>← <code>ANSWER1=EVAL(expr="'yes' if {ANSWER0} == 'yes' else 'no')</code></p> <p style="text-align: right;">4</p>
	<p>yes (Ori) no (CLVP)</p> <p>← <code>FINAL_RESULT=RESULT(var=ANSWER1)</code></p> <p style="text-align: right;">5</p>

Figure 9. More cases of CLVP with sub-modules distilled on GQA. “Ans” means the final answer prediction of VisProg, “GT” means the ground truth, “Ori” means the original value produced by executing the code on the right-hand side, “CLVP” means the value produced after employing our CLVP, “T” means the answer prediction of the teacher model in this step.

<p>Which material was used to make the pipe, plastic or</p>  <p>Ans: metal ✗ GT: plastic Ans(CLVP): plastic ✓</p>	 <p>← $BOX0=LOC(image=IMAGE,object='pipe')$</p> <p style="text-align: right;">1</p>
	 <p>← $IMAGE0=CROP(image=IMAGE,box=BOX0)$</p> <p style="text-align: right;">2</p>
	<p>metal (Ori) plastic (T) plastic (CLVP)</p> <p>← $ANSWER0=VQA(image=IMAGE0,question='What material was used to make the pipe, plastic or chrome?')$</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(key step) 3</p>
	<p>metal (Ori) plastic (CLVP)</p> <p>← $FINAL_RESULT=RESULT(var=ANSWER0)$</p> <p style="text-align: right;">4</p>








<p>Does the blanket look soft and white?</p>  <p>Ans: no ✗ GT: yes Ans(CLVP): yes ✓</p>	 <p>← $BOX0=LOC(image=IMAGE,object='blanket')$</p> <p style="text-align: right;">1</p>
	 <p>← $IMAGE0=CROP(image=IMAGE,box=BOX0)$</p> <p style="text-align: right;">2</p>
	<p>no (Ori) yes (T) yes (CLVP)</p> <p>← $ANSWER0=VQA(image=IMAGE0,question='Does the blanket look soft?')$</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(key step) 3</p>
	<p>yes (Ori) yes (T) yes (CLVP)</p> <p>← $ANSWER1=VQA(image=IMAGE0,question='Does the blanket look white?')$</p> <p style="text-align: right;">4</p>
	<p>yes (Ori) yes (CLVP)</p> <p>← $ANSWER2=EVAL(expr="'yes' if {ANSWER0} == 'yes' and {ANSWER1} == 'yes' else 'no'")$</p> <p style="text-align: right;">5</p>
	<p>no (Ori) yes (CLVP)</p> <p>← $FINAL_RESULT=RESULT(var=ANSWER2)$</p> <p style="text-align: right;">6</p>

Figure 10. More cases of CLVP with sub-modules distilled on GQA. Abbreviations in the figure are the same as in Fig.9.

<p>The left image contains exactly two dogs.</p> <p>LEFT  RIGHT </p> <p>Ans: False ✗ GT: True Ans(CLVP): True ✓</p>	<p>1 (Ori) ← ANSWER0=VQA(image=LEFT,question='How many dogs are in the image?') (key step) 1 2 (T) 2 (CLVP)</p>
	<p>False (Ori) ← ANSWER1=EVAL(expr='{ANSWER0} == 2') 2 True (CLVP)</p>
	<p>False (Ori) ← FINAL_ANSWER=RESULT(var=ANSWER1) 3 True (CLVP)</p>

<p>Each image includes a red convertible, and each convertible has its top uncovered.</p> <p>LEFT </p> <p>RIGHT </p> <p>Ans: False ✗ GT: True Ans(CLVP): True ✓</p>	<p>yes (Ori) ← ANSWER0=VQA(image=LEFT,question='Does the image include a red convertible?') 1 yes (T) yes (CLVP)</p>
	<p>yes (Ori) ← ANSWER1=VQA(image=RIGHT,question='Does the image include a red convertible?') 2 yes (T) yes (CLVP)</p>
	<p>no (Ori) ← ANSWER2=VQA(image=LEFT,question='Is the top of the convertible uncovered?') (key step) 3 yes (T) yes (CLVP)</p>
	<p>no (Ori) ← ANSWER3=VQA(image=RIGHT,question='Is the top of the convertible uncovered?') (key step) 4 yes (T) yes (CLVP)</p>
	<p>False (Ori) ← ANSWER4=EVAL(expr='{ANSWER0} and {ANSWER2}') 5 True (CLVP)</p>
	<p>False (Ori) ← ANSWER5=EVAL(expr='{ANSWER1} and {ANSWER3}') 6 True (CLVP)</p>
	<p>False (Ori) ← ANSWER6=EVAL(expr='{ANSWER4} and {ANSWER5}') 7 True (CLVP)</p>
	<p>False (Ori) ← FINAL_ANSWER=RESULT(var=ANSWER6) 8 True (CLVP)</p>

Figure 11. More cases of CLVP with sub-modules distilled on GQA and NLVRv2 sequentially. Abbreviations in the figure are the same as in Fig.9.

<p>The left image includes a row of barbells, and the right image features a man lying back on a bench with a barbell held up in each hand.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>LEFT</p>  </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>RIGHT</p>  </div> </div> <p>Ans: True ✗ GT: False Ans(CLVP): False ✓</p>	<p>yes (Ori) ← ANSWER0=VQA(image=LEFT,question='Does the image show a row of barbells?')</p> <p>yes (T) yes (CLVP)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">1</p>
	<p>yes (Ori) ← ANSWER1=VQA(image=RIGHT,question='Does the image show a man lying back on a bench with barbells in each hand?')</p> <p>no (T) no (CLVP)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(key step) 2</p>
	<p>True (Ori) ← ANSWER2=EVAL(expr='{ANSWER0} and {ANSWER1}')</p> <p>False (CLVP)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">3</p>
	<p>True (Ori) ← FINAL_ANSWER=RESULT(var=ANSWER2)</p> <p>False (CLVP)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">4</p>



<p>At least one image shows a bookstore interior with glowing yellow tent-shaped lights suspended from an astronomy-inspired blue ceiling.</p> <div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; gap: 10px;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>LEFT</p>  </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>RIGHT</p>  </div> </div> <p>Ans: True ✗ GT: False Ans(CLVP): False ✓</p>	<p>yes (Ori) ← ANSWER0=VQA(image=LEFT,question='Does one image show a bookstore interior?')</p> <p>yes (T) yes (CLVP)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">1</p>
	<p>yes (Ori) ← ANSWER1=VQA(image=RIGHT,question='Does one image show a bookstore interior?')</p> <p>yes (T) yes (CLVP)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">2</p>
	<p>yes (Ori) ← ANSWER2=VQA(image=LEFT,question='Are there glowing yellow tent-shaped lights suspended from an astronomy-inspired blue ceiling?')</p> <p>no (T) no (CLVP)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(key step) 3</p>
	<p>yes (Ori) ← ANSWER3=VQA(image=RIGHT,question='Are there glowing yellow tent-shaped lights suspended from an astronomy-inspired blue ceiling?')</p> <p>no (T) no (CLVP)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(key step) 4</p>
	<p>True (Ori) ← ANSWER4=EVAL(expr='{ANSWER0} and {ANSWER2}')</p> <p>False (CLVP)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">5</p>
	<p>True (Ori) ← ANSWER5=EVAL(expr='{ANSWER1} and {ANSWER3}')</p> <p>False (CLVP)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">6</p>
	<p>True (Ori) ← ANSWER6=EVAL(expr='{ANSWER4} or {ANSWER5}')</p> <p>False (CLVP)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">7</p>
	<p>True (Ori) ← FINAL_ANSWER=RESULT(var=ANSWER6)</p> <p>False (CLVP)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">8</p>

Figure 12. More cases of CLVP with sub-modules distilled on GQA and NLVRv2 sequentially. Abbreviations in the figure are the same as in Fig.9.