

---

# Multi-Modal Generative Embedding Model

---

Feipeng Ma<sup>1,\*</sup>, Hongwei Xue<sup>1,3,†</sup>, Guangting Wang<sup>2</sup>, Yizhou Zhou<sup>2,‡</sup>, Fengyun Rao<sup>2</sup>  
Shilin Yan<sup>4</sup>, Yueyi Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Siying Wu<sup>5</sup>, Mike Zheng Shou<sup>3</sup>, Xiaoyan Sun<sup>1,5,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Science and Technology of China    <sup>2</sup>WeChat, Tencent Inc.

<sup>3</sup>Show Lab, National University of Singapore    <sup>4</sup>Fudan University

<sup>5</sup>Institute of Artificial Intelligence, Hefei Comprehensive National Science Center

{maf, xuehongwei}@mail.ustc.edu.cn

harryizhou@tencent.com, sunxiaoyan@ustc.edu.cn

## Abstract

Most multi-modal tasks can be formulated into problems of either generation or embedding. Existing models usually tackle these two types of problems by decoupling language modules into a text decoder for generation, and a text encoder for embedding. To explore the minimalism of multi-modal paradigms, we attempt to achieve *only one model per modality* in this work. We propose a Multi-Modal Generative Embedding Model (MM-GEM), whereby the generative and embedding objectives are encapsulated in one Large Language Model. We also propose a PoolAggregator to boost efficiency and enable the ability of fine-grained embedding and generation. A surprising finding is that these two objectives do not significantly conflict with each other. For example, MM-GEM instantiated from ViT-Large and TinyLlama shows competitive performance on benchmarks for multimodal embedding models such as cross-modal retrieval and zero-shot classification, while has good ability of image captioning. Additionally, MM-GEM can seamlessly execute region-level image caption generation and retrieval tasks. Besides, the advanced text model in MM-GEM brings over 5% improvement in Recall@1 for long text and image retrieval.

## 1 Introduction

In recent years, the multi-modal learning field has witnessed a unifying trend [3, 17, 30, 33, 54]. This trend is driven by the advanced understanding ability and more efficient computation brought by shared representations. Moreover, the simplification of the model structure makes it much more direct to perform various downstream tasks [30, 40].

Most cutting-edge multi-modal models can be categorized into two paradigms: embedding models and generative models. Embedding models [20, 40, 50] typically utilize a dual encoder structure. This framework projects distinct modalities into a unified latent space, thereby facilitating efficient cross-modal retrieval and classification tasks. Generative models [2, 32, 55] forge a connection between visual representations and Large Language Models (LLMs). This integration enables the models to harness capabilities such as instruction following [32, 55] or in-context learning [2]. These two paradigms intersect in the visual modality, i.e., the vision module of the generative model is usually derived from a powerful embedding model [40]. However, the textual modality reveals a divergence in approach. While generative models commonly employ an auto-regressive text decoder, embedding models favor a text encoder to extract a global representation of the text.

---

\*This work was performed while Feipeng Ma and Hongwei Xue were interns at WeChat, Tencent Inc.

†Project Leader.

‡Corresponding authors.

The divergence in textual modality remains as a pivotal obstacle to achieving the goal of unification, namely, using *only one model per modality*. Several works step in different directions towards this goal. BLIP [30] shares all parameters in the text encoder and decoder except for the self-attention layers. CoCa [52] splits the text decoder into unimodal and multimodal components, by removing the cross-attention module in the unimodal decoder layers. These methods differentiate the forward path of unimodal and multimodal, introducing a hindrance to the direct use of pre-trained text models. FROMAGe [24] truly achieves unification by grounding the image feature to the inputs and outputs of a frozen large language model. However, the lack of joint training with the visual modality results in a performance deficiency.

To explore the minimalism of multi-modal paradigms, we propose Multi-Modal Generative Embedding Model (MM-GEM) in this paper. MM-GEM is an end-to-end optimized model that combines two paradigms by encapsulating the generative and embedding objectives in the same language model. Specifically, for embedding, we align the image features with the sentence embeddings derived from the last token. Concurrently, for the generative task, we concatenate the image features with the word embeddings of the language model to execute the captioning process. Notably, both objectives leverage a shared forward path within the language model. To boost efficiency and enable the ability of fine-grained embedding and generation, we propose a PoolAggregator to represent an image by the feature map, instead of a global feature on [CLS] token [12, 40].

Experimental results demonstrate the superiority of MM-GEM. MM-GEM instantiated from ViT-Large and TinyLlama [53] achieves comparable results with OpenCLIP [19] on image-text retrieval benchmarks such as COCO [31] and Flickr30K [39], and zero-shot image classification benchmark ICinW [29]. Meanwhile, MM-GEM shows competitive performance on image captioning benchmarks such as COCO [31] and NoCaps [1]. Additionally, qualitative results show that MM-GEM can generate region-level image captions and fine-grained text-to-image retrieval without further training or modification. Besides, the advanced text module in MM-GEM brings better ability of text understanding. MM-GEM achieves over 5% higher Recall@1 for long text and image retrieval, compared to CLIP.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

1. We propose a Multi-Modal Generative Embedding Model (MM-GEM), whereby the generative and embedding objectives are encapsulated to achieve unification.
2. A PoolAggregator and Multi-Stage Training strategy are proposed to represent an image from the feature map, which efficiently enables the fine-grained ability.
3. Experimental result demonstrates that MM-GEM shows competitive performance on benchmarks for embedding models, while still keeps the good ability of generation.

## 2 Related Works

**Vision-Language Pre-trained Models** have undergone a significant evolution in their application to downstream tasks. Earlier works [7, 18, 22, 28, 48, 49] learn cross-modal representations through proxy tasks such as masked modeling and image-text matching, but require further fine-tuning for specific downstream tasks. Modern works build pre-trained models in a manner that mirrors their ultimate use to achieve seamless integration with downstream tasks. These works can be categorized into two paradigms: embedding models and generative models. Embedding models [20, 40, 50] independently extract and map features from each modality into a shared space, facilitating efficient cross-modal retrieval and open-set classification. Generative models [2, 32, 47, 55] reformulate downstream tasks like Visual Question Answering (VQA) as auto-regressive generation tasks. Inheriting capabilities such as instruction following [32, 55] or in-context learning [2] from LLMs, generative models are often utilized to tackle complex understanding tasks that cannot be well solved by embedding models.

**Modality Unification** has been a long standing goal to pursue better understanding ability and higher computation efficiency brought by shared representations. However, the distinct requirements of embedding and generative models often lead to the preference for separate text encoders and decoders. BLIP [30] and InternVL [8] approach this by sharing most parameters across the text encoder and decoder, with the exception of the self-attention or cross-attention layers. CoCa [52] splits the text decoder into unimodal and multimodal components, then remove the cross-attention module in the




Figure 1: Overview of MM-GEM, in which a large language model acts as both text encoder for embedding and text decoder for generation. The visual feature is aligned with the LLM by several projection layers and a PoolAggregator.

unimodal decoder layers. FROMAGE [24] grounds the image feature to the inputs and outputs of a frozen large language model by several projection layers. However, the lack of joint training results in a performance deficiency. One very recent work GRIT [35] successfully unifies embedding and generative Natural Language Processing (NLP) tasks. It is worth noting that unimodal models imply a natural correspondence in embedding. For example, generative-only models show a certain level of performance on embedding NLP tasks [35]. However, whether there is a significant conflict between the multi-modal embedding and generative objectives remains under explored.

### 3 Approach

The primary goal of Multi-Modal Generative Embedding Model (MM-GEM) is unifying text encoder and decoder, while supporting both embedding and generative paradigms. However, there are three uncertainties or challenges to achieve this unification: 1) Whether the superposition of two learning targets in the same language model will significantly conflict with each other. 2) Embedding models like CLIP extract one global visual feature for each image, which is insufficient for generative tasks. 3) The data suitable for training embedding models is often noisy, which resulting in the sub-optimal ability of generation. In this section, we will introduce our approach of tackling these three problems.

#### 3.1 Encapsulated Generative and Embedding Objectives

A generative language model consists of a word embedding layer, a stacked transformer, and a prediction head. The word embedding layer can be regarded as a linear transformation to project the one-hot probability distribution  $p_{i=1,2,\dots,L}$  of the input sequence to the latent space  $\mathcal{W}_{in}$ . The prediction head acts as a linear transformation to project the latent space  $\mathcal{W}_{out}$  to the unnormalized probability distribution  $\hat{p}_{i=1,2,\dots,L}$ . As the  $\hat{p}_t$  is a well estimation of  $p_{t+1}$ , the transformation between latent space  $\mathcal{W}_{in}$  and  $\mathcal{W}_{out}$  is approximately linear. Therefore, we leverage light projection layers  $h_1$ ,  $h_2$  and  $h_3$  to transform latent space between visual space  $\mathcal{V}$ ,  $\mathcal{W}_{in}$  and  $\mathcal{W}_{out}$ :

$$\mathcal{V}_{Emb} = h_1(\mathcal{V}), \quad \mathcal{W}_{Emb} = h_2(\mathcal{W}_{out}), \quad \mathcal{V}_{in} = h_3(\mathcal{V}_{Emb}), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{V}_{Emb}$  and  $\mathcal{W}_{Emb}$  is the space of image and text embeddings, respectively.  $\mathcal{V}_{in}$  is the space of visual features  $V_{in}$  to be concatenated with word embeddings from space  $\mathcal{W}_{in}$ .

For embedding, we follow [40] and adopt the info-NCE loss to learning the cross-modal alignment:

$$\mathcal{L}_{v2t} = -\frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \log \frac{e^{v_i^\top t_i / \tau}}{\sum_{j=1}^B e^{v_i^\top t_j / \tau}}, \quad \mathcal{L}_{t2v} = -\frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \log \frac{e^{t_i^\top v_i / \tau}}{\sum_{j=1}^B e^{t_i^\top v_j / \tau}}, \quad (2)$$

and  $\mathcal{L}_{Emb} = \mathcal{L}_{v2t} + \mathcal{L}_{t2v}$ , where  $v_i$  and  $t_j$  are the normalized embeddings of  $i$ -th visual feature and  $j$ -th text feature in a batch of size  $B$ .  $\tau$  is a learnable temperature. The visual feature will be discussed

in Section 3.2 and the text feature is the last hidden states on top of a [EMB] token appended to the text sequence.

For generation, we adopt the image captioning loss to predict the next token  $x^{(i)}$  based on the visual input  $V_{\text{in}}$ , a special [CAP] token, and previous tokens  $x^{(<i)}$ :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Gen}} = -\frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \log P(f_{\theta}(x^{(i)}) | f_{\theta}([V_{\text{in}}, [\text{CAP}], x^{(<i)}])), \quad (3)$$

where  $f_{\theta}$  is the language model parameterized by  $\theta$  and [\*] is the concatenate operation.

During training, both learning objectives are applied on all data samples. The language model forwards twice to get two losses and the final loss function is the direct summation without careful adjustment of weighting factors:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{MM-GEM}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{Emb}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{Gen}}. \quad (4)$$

### 3.2 Vision PoolAggregator and Multi-Stage Training

Simultaneously training generative and embedding objectives encounters two main challenges: 1) embedding models usually take the global feature as visual representation, while a global feature is insufficient for image caption generation. 2) the data suitable for training CLIP is large-scale alt-texts. Sometimes a alt-text is noisy, lacking of linguistic coherence, and the relevance to visual information is weak. To alleviate these issues, we propose a multi-stage training strategy equipped with a Vision PoolAggregator.

Instead of extracting a global visual feature on top of a [CLS] token, MM-GEM represents an image as a spatial feature map  $V \in \mathbb{R}^{C \times H \times W}$ , where  $C$ ,  $H$  and  $W$  indicate the dimension, height and width of the feature map. A Vision PoolAggregator flexibly aggregates the visual information from  $V$ . To boost the training efficiency, in stage-one pre-training, we apply both embedding and generative loss on the mean-pooled visual feature:

$$V_{\text{in}}^1 = h_3(h_1(\text{MeanPool}(V))), \quad V_{\text{Emb}} = h_1(\text{MeanPool}(V)). \quad (5)$$

This significantly improves the training efficiency of stage one, and enables larger batch size preferred by contrastive learning. To further improve MM-GEM’s ability of generation and fine-grained understanding, we set a stage-two pre-training procedure on image-caption and dense caption data. In this stage, visual feature  $V$  is aggregated to a fix-sized feature map shape of  $H \times W$  according to the region  $R$  of the description (whole image for regular image-caption data):

$$V_{\text{in}}^2 = h_3(h_1(\text{RoIAlign}(V, R))). \quad (6)$$

In stage two, the [CAP] token is replaced with a series of soft prompts  $[\text{CAP}_i], i \in [1, N]$ , only  $h_3$  layer and soft prompts are updated in this stage. Therefore, the embedding ability learned in stage one is completely maintained. In parallel with dense captioning, we also boost MM-GEM’s fine-grained retrieval ability by training a head on regional image-text pairs. To eliminate interference with existing abilities, we add a linear head  $h_4$  on the output of  $h_1$ :

$$V_{\text{Emb}}^2 = h_4(h_1(\text{RoIAlign}(V, R))), \quad (7)$$

where RoIAlign aggregates visual feature  $V$  to embedding according to the region  $R$ . We find that original CLIP or Captioning model fails in focusing regional visual information, which is dramatically improved by the proposed stage two. More details will be discussed in Section 4.3.

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Implementation Details

**Pre-training Stage One.** We pre-train MM-GEM using LAION-2B [41] and COYO-700M [5] datasets, containing a total of 2.3 billion image-text pairs. The language model is initialized from TinyLlama [53]. For the visual encoder, we study three variants of ViTs: ViT-B/16, ViT-L/14, and ViT-L/14-336, and these visual encoders are initialized from OpenCLIP [19]. We use LAMB [51] optimizer with a weight decay of 0.05. The learning rate for the projection layers is set to  $5e-4$ , while

Table 1: Performance comparison on COCO [31] and Flickr30K [39] image-to-text (I2T) and text-to-image (T2I) retrieval. R@1, R@5, and R@10 indicate recall ratio at top 1, 5, and 10. All models in this table use ViT-Base as vision encoder.

Model	COCO I2T			COCO T2I			Flickr30K I2T			Flickr30K T2I		
	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10
CLIP-Only	57.8	80.3	87.3	41.7	67.2	76.7	86.2	97.7	99.2	70.3	91.4	95.3
MM-GEM	57.0	79.7	87.2	41.4	66.6	76.3	84.6	97.5	99.3	70.1	90.7	95.0

Table 2: Performance comparison on Image Classification in the Wild (ICinW) [29]. The metric of each dataset follows [29]. All models in this table use ViT-Base as vision encoder.

Model	CIFAR-10 [27]	CIFAR-100 [27]	DTD [10]	EuroSAT [16]	FER-2013 [40]	FGVC-Aircraft [34]	KITTI-Dist. [15]	MNIST [11]	PatchCamelyon [46]	VOC-2007 [13]	Caltech-101 [14]	Country-211 [40]	Food-101 [4]	GTSRB [44]	Haeflil Memes [21]	Ox. Flowers [36]	Ox. IIIT Pets [38]	Rendered-SST2 [40]	RESISC-45 [9]	Stanford-Cats [25]	Average
CLIP-Only	94.8	75.5	59.2	54.7	38.6	20.2	27.0	70.3	50.1	79.9	90.3	18.6	82.3	42.4	57.7	58.1	84.0	59.9	64.6	81.8	60.5
MM-GEM	94.6	75.8	60.5	54.8	43.7	19.9	12.1	73.8	50.4	80.2	90.2	18.2	82.1	48.1	58.4	57.6	81.0	63.8	66.6	80.5	60.6

for the visual encoder and the large language model, it is set to  $5e-5$ . Input images are randomly cropped to a resolution of  $224 \times 224$  during pre-training except for ViT-L/14-336. We adopt a linear warm-up then cosine decay learning rate schedule. The training procedure is performed on a total batch size of 81,920 for 80,000 iterations. The text processing follows TinyLlama except that the maximum length of the text is truncated to 50. Following CLIP [40], the learnable temperature parameter  $\tau$  is initialized to 0.07 and clipped at 0.01. We use  $64 \times$  H800 GPUs to train the model in this stage.

**Pre-training Stage Two.** In stage two, For fine-grained captioning, MM-GEM is further trained on CC3M [43], CC12M [6], SBU [37] and LAION [42] filtered by BLIP [30] and Visual Genome’s dense caption data [26], containing 38 million image-caption and 1.8 million region-description pairs in total. In this stage, only the  $h_3$  layer and soft prompts are updated. The number of soft prompts is set as 64. This training procedure utilizes a total batch size of 2048 for 60,000 iterations, and the learning rate is consistent with that of stage one.

For fine-grained retrieval, the training data is in line with fine-grained captioning. The training procedure is performed on a total batch size of 49,152 for 15,000 iterations. To avoid disrupting the alignment learned in Stage one,  $h_4$  is initialized as an Identity Mapping Matrix. Only  $h_4$  is updated during this stage. Thus all results of MM-GEM *stage one* on cross-modal retrieval and image classification will not be altered.

**Evaluation.** To thoroughly evaluate MM-GEM, we include various downstream tasks in the experiment section. Unless otherwise indicated, all results are reported under the zero-shot protocol without further fine-tuning. We evaluate MM-GEM on: 1) **Image-Text Retrieval.** For this task, we utilize two prominent benchmark datasets: COCO [31] and Flickr30K [39], which feature a diverse collection of images with complex scenes. We evaluate on the standard 1K test set for Flickr30K and 5K test set for COCO. The evaluation metrics are Recall@ $K$ , where  $K = 1, 5, 10$ , on both text-to-image and image-to-text retrieval. 2) **Image Classification.** We evaluate the capability of zero-shot image classification on the track “Image Classification in the Wild” of the ELEVATER benchmark [29]. ELEVATER is designed to challenge models with the task of categorizing images that are captured in real-world, unconstrained environments. The predefined categories of each subset could range from common objects to specific scenes. We follow all metrics of ELEVATER for all subsets. 3) **Image Captioning.** In this task, we assess the model’s ability to generate descriptive and coherent captions for images. We employ two well-established datasets: COCO [31] and NoCaps [1]. COCO captions include a wide variety of objects, scenes, and activities, while NoCaps encompass novel visual objects. Besides these benchmarks, we also demonstrate MM-GEM’s special ability by more evaluation manners. The details will be introduced in the specific sections.

Table 3: Performance comparison on zero-shot image captioning task on COCO [31] and NoCaps [1]. All models in this table use ViT-Base as vision encoder.

Model	COCO Caption				NoCaps Caption			
	BLEU@4	Meteor	Rouge	CIDEr	BLEU@4	Meteor	Rouge	CIDEr
Cap-Only <i>stage one</i>	13.4	15.8	36.2	49.8	16.6	15.9	37.3	46.3
MM-GEM <i>stage one</i>	12.9	15.8	37.0	48.8	17.3	16.2	38.6	47.0
Cap-Only <i>stage two</i>	31.2	25.4	53.2	103.9	38.8	26.6	57.0	96.5
MM-GEM <i>stage two</i>	28.7	24.5	52.0	96.3	36.2	25.7	55.6	91.0

Table 4: Performance comparison on COCO [31] and Flickr30K [39] image-to-text (I2T) and text-to-image (T2I) retrieval. R@1, R@5, and R@10 indicate recall ratio at top 1, 5, and 10. All models in this table use ViT-Large as vision encoder.

Model	COCO I2T			COCO T2I			Flickr30K I2T			Flickr30K T2I		
	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10
CLIP [40]	57.4	80.0	87.1	34.3	58.6	69.5	87.0	97.5	99.1	63.5	86.4	91.8
OpenCLIP [19]	61.3	83.4	89.7	45.8	70.2	79.1	89.8	98.7	99.5	74.9	92.5	95.8
MM-GEM	61.0	82.6	89.2	45.6	70.5	79.3	89.0	99.0	99.5	75.4	92.6	96.0

## 4.2 Encapsulated Generative and Embedding Objectives

### 4.2.1 Comparison of Training Objectives

The main risk of MM-GEM is the embedding and generative objectives may conflict with each other in the same text model. The most straightforward way to verify this is to compare the performance of a model trained using the two objectives alone and the objectives together. Therefore, we train three models under the same experimental setting except for training objectives: 1) CLIP-Only which uses embedding objectives  $\mathcal{L}_{Emb}$  alone; 2) Cap-Only which uses generative objectives  $\mathcal{L}_{Gen}$  alone; 3) MM-GEM which uses two objectives simultaneously. These three models adopt ViT-Base as vision encoder and only trained with 1.5 billion seen samples for computational savings. From the result listed in Table 1 and 2, MM-GEM achieves very similar performance to CLIP-Only on both cross-modal retrieval and zero-shot image classification tasks. Table 3 shows that the image captioning performance gap between MM-GEM and Cap-Only is negligible, and this conclusion holds for both stage one and two. For stage one, although MM-GEM lags a little bit behind Cap-Only on COCO in some metrics such as BLEU@4, Rouge and CIDEr, it will be slightly better than Cap-Only on NoCaps, therefore the overall captioning performance is close. After stage-two tuning, the performance gap between Cap-Only and MM-GEM increases. In the meantime we note that MM-GEM still achieves relatively good visual description generation capabilities. Since negligible performance gaps in the first stage can support our conclusions, we leave the continued exploration of this part for future work. These results solidly support our conclusion: encapsulating embedding and generative objectives in the same text model will not lead to significant conflict.

### 4.2.2 Comparison with State-of-the-arts

To verify MM-GEM’s scalability and make comparison with state-of-the-art works, we train MM-GEM with ViT-Large as vision encoder. For embedding model opponents, we mainly compare with OpenAI CLIP [40] and OpenCLIP [19]. Table 4 shows that MM-GEM achieves similar cross-modal performance to OpenCLIP, while outperforming CLIP by a large margin. This margin may come from the pre-training data: MM-GEM’s data is closer to OpenCLIP, while OpenAI CLIP uses private data. In Table 5, the results are similar to the cross-modal retrieval benchmark. MM-GEM achieves 66.3% in average, slightly better than OpenCLIP and 4.5% ahead of OpenAI CLIP. For image captioning models, we choose Flamingo [2] and ClipCap for comparison. Among these models, only ClipCap’s training data include COCO. Flamingo bridges contrastive pretrained vision-only models and language-only models by only training a Perceiver Resampler and gated cross attention layers. ClipCap use CLIP encoding as a prefix to the caption, by employing a simple mapping network. From the results in Table 6, MM-GEM significantly outperforms Flamingo even though the latter adopts a much larger language decoder. As ClipCap is trained on COCO, MM-GEM performs worse than ClipCap on COCO but is substantially ahead on NoCaps.



Table 5: Performance comparison on Image Classification in the Wild (ICinW) [29]. The metric of each dataset follows [29]. All models in this table use ViT-Large as vision encoder.

Model	CFAR-10 [27]	CFAR-100 [27]	DYD [10]	EuroSAT [16]	FER-2013 [40]	FGVC-Aircraft [34]	KITTI-Dist. [15]	MNIST [11]	PatchCamelyon [46]	VOC-2007 [13]	Caltech-101 [14]	Country-211 [40]	Food-101 [4]	GTSRB [44]	Hateful Memes [21]	Ox. Flowers [36]	Ox. IIT Pets [38]	Rendered-SST2 [40]	RESISC-45 [9]	Stanford-Cars [25]	Average
CLIP [40]	94.0	67.4	52.6	49.5	45.5	25.7	20.5	64.4	58.4	79.5	93.0	28.1	90.2	52.9	60.2	71.4	92.2	59.9	62.3	67.4	61.8
OpenCLIP [19]	96.0	82.5	61.5	65.1	47.7	32.4	22.5	65.2	57.2	80.7	94.1	25.4	89.9	56.5	54.5	74.2	92.9	60.6	72.1	91.4	66.1
MM-GEM	97.0	82.8	67.2	69.5	47.4	31.9	26.2	69.5	50.5	80.3	92.7	26.0	89.8	54.3	61.5	69.8	90.6	61.5	68.9	89.3	66.3

Table 6: Performance comparison on image captioning task on COCO [31] and NoCaps [1]. \* denotes model finetuned on COCO training split.

Model	COCO Caption				NoCaps Caption			
	BLEU@4	Meteor	Rouge	CIDEr	BLEU@4	Meteor	Rouge	CIDEr
Flamingo-9B [2]	-	-	-	79.4	-	-	-	-
ClipCap*	33.5	27.5	-	113.1	-	-	-	65.8
MM-GEM	32.8	26.5	54.8	110.9	39.8	27.3	57.8	100.7

### 4.3 Fine-grained Understanding Ability

Instead of aligning vision and language modality from the global perspective, MM-GEM is designed to align on the visual feature map. Therefore, MM-GEM is equipped with fine-grained understanding ability. The goal is that PoolAggregator can be directly utilized on the feature map to get the region feature required by embedding or description. However, we observe that regular training of CLIP or image captioning model achieves results that fall far short of this goal. The whole spatial feature map is dominated by the global visual information, making it difficult to distinguish by location. In this paper, we tackle this problem by tuning or adding light projection layers on region-level data, leading to dramatic improvement on fine-grained ability. In this section, we will present the details in terms of both embedding and description generation.

#### 4.3.1 Fine-grained Description Generation

A straightforward way to learn image captioning is to flatten a visual feature map and use it as input to a language decoder. The ideal visual feature map has the property that features cropped from a region can generate a description of that region. We find that training on regular image-caption data alone is not sufficient to achieve this property. Therefore, we use the strategy presented in the Section 3.2 to train MM-GEM on mixed data of image-caption and region-description data. We adopt BLIP’s filtered data as image-caption data and Visual Genome’s dense caption as region-description data. We compare the results under two different settings and demonstrate in Figure 2. The generated region description on gray background shows that the captioning model trained without region-description data fails in distinguishing visual information by location. For example, it tends to generate global image captions or descriptions of non-corresponding locations, like the red bounding box of the building generates “A boat travelling down a river in front of a large building”. The example in the second row of Figure 2 demonstrates that MM-GEM with region description data can accurately distinguish objects, and still retains the necessary contextual information, like “A car parked on the side of the street”. These results validate the effectiveness of our stage-two training strategy, avoiding MM-GEM from being limited to a regular image captioning model, and enabling the ability of generating fine-grained descriptions based on regions.

#### 4.3.2 Fine-grained Image-Text Retrieval

Traditional cross-modal embedding models like CLIP focus on global alignment, thus can only act as an instance-level retriever. There are two issues with these models: **a.** For the text-to-image retrieval task, the query description may only correspond to part of the image. It is worth exploring how well the model can localize the corresponding visual information based on the text query. **b.** The training approach that focuses only on global alignment may cause the model to focus only on salient objects in the image, which in turn weakens the understanding of fine-grained information.



Figure 2: Visualization of fine-grained description generation. This figure shows the captioning results of using region features from the visual feature map as input. The text in the same color as the bounding box in the figure is the description of the corresponding area. Text on a gray background indicates results without region description data.



Figure 3: Visualization of fine-grained image-text retrieval. This figure shows the similarity between the visual feature map and the text feature at two stages. The blue borders and undertones represent the result from the pre-training stage one, and yellow borders and undertones illustrate the results of stage two. The text superimposed on the image corresponds to the input text.

To study issue **a.**, we compare MM-GEM trained at two stages by showing the similarities between visual feature maps and several given text queries. For the stage-one model, we calculate the cosine similarities between normalized visual features output by  $h_1$  and text features output by  $h_2$ . For the stage-two model, we alter visual features to the output of  $h_4$ . The visualized results are demonstrated in Figure 3. The two columns on the left clearly show that stage-two model well localizes the text query to the corresponding region, while stage-one model totally fails. The rightmost column shows the stage-two model well responds to different text queries for the same image. These results show that stage-two training essentially enables the ability of fine-grained retrieval.

To study issue **b.**, we add a new quantitative benchmark L-DCI based on Densely Captioned Images (DCI) [45]. DCI consists of 8012 images from SA-1B [23], each image corresponds to a complete description aiming to capture the full visual details in the image. We directly evaluate cross-modal retrieval on all images and overall descriptions in DCI. We list the text-to-image retrieval results in



Table 7: Performance comparison on COCO [31], Flickr30K [39] and DCI [45] text-to-image (T2I) retrieval. R@1, R@5, and R@10 indicate recall ratio at top 1, 5, and 10. All models in this table use ViT-Large as vision encoder.

Model	COCO T2I			Flickr T2I			L-DCI T2I		
	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10
CLIP-Only-Base	41.7	67.2	76.7	70.3	91.4	95.3	47.3	66.3	73.0
MM-GEM-Base	41.4	66.6	76.3	70.1	90.7	95.0	46.3	66.0	72.6
MM-GEM-Base stage two	42.5	68.9	78.5	72.3	91.6	95.7	47.9	68.4	74.9
CLIP [40]	34.3	58.6	69.5	63.5	86.4	91.8	30.4	49.4	57.3
OpenCLIP [19]	45.8	70.2	79.1	74.9	92.5	95.8	43.0	62.3	69.2
MM-GEM	45.6	70.5	79.3	75.4	92.6	96.0	49.4	68.1	74.5
MM-GEM stage two	47.2	72.3	81.1	76.4	94.1	96.8	54.1	72.5	78.6

Table 8: Long-form text image retrieval performance comparison on DCI [45]. R@1, R@5, and R@10 indicate recall ratio at top 1, 5, and 10.

Model	L-DCI I2T			L-DCI T2I		
	R@1	R@5	R@10	R@1	R@5	R@10
CLIP-Only-Base	46.7	67.4	73.9	47.3	66.3	73.0
MM-GEM-Base	46.6	67.4	74.4	46.3	66.0	72.6
CLIP-Large [40]	33.7	52.8	60.0	30.4	49.4	57.3
OpenCLIP-Large [19]	44.4	64.0	70.5	43.0	62.3	69.2
MM-GEM-Large	49.4	69.4	75.4	49.4	68.1	74.5
MM-GEM-Large-336	51.0	70.2	76.5	51.8	70.2	76.0

Table 7. The results in the last two rows show that the stage-two trained MM-GEM improves on all retrieval metrics, especially on L-DCI with nearly 5% at Recall@1. This result shows that the proposed stage two can improve the model’s ability to understand fine-grained information.

#### 4.4 Advanced Text Model in MM-GEM

As MM-GEM applies a large language model (LLM) as text module, it’s critical to figure out other benefits besides introducing generative capabilities. LLMs typically have good ability of language processing due to the large amount of language data. We therefore hypothesize that MM-GEM performs better than regular CLIP on data containing more complex text. To verify this, we mainly focus on long-form text image caption data in this work. We evaluate MM-GEM and regular CLIP on L-DCI cross-modal retrieval benchmark described in Section 4.3.2. Results shown in Table 8 indicate that an advanced text module will significantly improves the performance on the benchmark with long-form text, by over 5% margin on Recall@1. And the performance further increases while the image size is 336. It is worth noting that MM-GEM was trained with a maximum text length of 50, which is shorter than CLIP. We adjusted it to 200 when testing on DCI only. The comparison between CLIP-Only-Base and MM-GEM-Base demonstrate that the improvement comes from the text module instead of training objectives. Even though MM-GEM does not show advantage on typical cross-modal retrieval benchmarks like COCO and Flickr30K, according to Table 4, the improvement on a more complex benchmark is significant. The results in this section inspire future works on exploring benefits of an advanced text encoder in CLIP.

## 5 Conclusion

The Multi-Modal Generative Embedding Model (MM-GEM) presents a unified approach to multi-modal learning by integrating generative and embedding objectives within a single Large Language Model (LLM). Our experiments demonstrate that these two objectives do not significantly conflict with each other. MM-GEM achieves competitive performance across a range of tasks, including cross-modal retrieval, zero-shot classification, and image captioning. A key contribution is the

PoolAggregator, enhancing the model’s ability to handle fine-grained tasks. Additionally, MM-GEM’s advanced text module significantly improves performance on long-form text retrieval, showcasing the benefits of leveraging a robust LLM for text processing.

MM-GEM represents a significant step towards unified multi-modal models, yet there are still many subsequent potential directions: 1) We mainly focus on image captioning for generative tasks in this work, the performance impact of adding plain language data needs to be further investigated. 2) MM-GEM enables LLMs generate discriminative outputs besides language tokens, this may benefit multi-modal large language model by retrieving or grounding visual information efficiently. Further investigation into these aspects will be explored in future work.

## 6 Limitations

Although MM-GEM integrates generative and embedding objectives within a single LLM, there are still some limitations. Caption loss allows the model to focus more on the detailed information in the text, but the existing dataset limits its ability. The text we used in pre-training stage one is noisy, of low quality, and has less detailed information, which limits the ability of our model. The design of the PoolAggregator allows our model to handle fine-grained tasks. However, in pre-training stage one, the model does not directly exhibit fine-grained capabilities due to the lack of region-level data. Still, the implied fine-grained capabilities require only a very small amount of region-level data to be bootstrapped. We can try to introduce a very small amount of region-level data in pre-training stage one as well, so that the model can have a stronger fine-grained capability.

## References

- [1] Harsh Agrawal, Karan Desai, Yufei Wang, Xinlei Chen, Rishabh Jain, Mark Johnson, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, Stefan Lee, and Peter Anderson. Nocaps: Novel object captioning at scale. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 8948–8957, 2019.
- [2] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:23716–23736, 2022.
- [3] Hangbo Bao, Wenhui Wang, Li Dong, Qiang Liu, Owais Khan Mohammed, Kriti Aggarwal, Subhojit Som, Songhao Piao, and Furu Wei. Vlmo: Unified vision-language pre-training with mixture-of-modality-experts. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:32897–32912, 2022.
- [4] Lukas Bossard, Matthieu Guillaumin, and Luc Van Gool. Food-101—mining discriminative components with random forests. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 446–461. Springer, 2014.
- [5] Minwoo Byeon, Beomhee Park, Haecheon Kim, Sungjun Lee, Woonhyuk Baek, and Saehoon Kim. Coyo-700m: Image-text pair dataset. <https://github.com/kakaobrain/coyo-dataset>, 2022.
- [6] Soravit Changpinyo, Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, and Radu Soricut. Conceptual 12m: Pushing web-scale image-text pre-training to recognize long-tail visual concepts. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3558–3568, 2021.
- [7] Yen-Chun Chen, Linjie Li, Licheng Yu, Ahmed El Kholy, Faisal Ahmed, Zhe Gan, Yu Cheng, and Jingjing Liu. Uniter: Universal image-text representation learning. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 104–120. Springer, 2020.
- [8] Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhui Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Zhong Muyan, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14238*, 2023.
- [9] Gong Cheng, Junwei Han, and Xiaoqiang Lu. Remote sensing image scene classification: Benchmark and state of the art. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 105(10):1865–1883, 2017.
- [10] Mircea Cimpoi, Subhansu Maji, Iasonas Kokkinos, Sammy Mohamed, and Andrea Vedaldi. Describing textures in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3606–3613, 2014.
- [11] Li Deng. The mnist database of handwritten digit images for machine learning research [best of the web]. *IEEE signal processing magazine*, 29(6):141–142, 2012.

- [12] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [13] Mark Everingham, Luc Van Gool, Christopher K. I. Williams, John M. Winn, and Andrew Zisserman. The pascal visual object classes (VOC) challenge. *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, 88(2):303–338, 2010.
- [14] Li Fei-Fei, Rob Fergus, and Pietro Perona. Learning generative visual models from few training examples: An incremental bayesian approach tested on 101 object categories. In *2004 conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshop*, pages 178–178. IEEE, 2004.
- [15] Jannik Fritsch, Tobias Kuehnl, and Andreas Geiger. A new performance measure and evaluation benchmark for road detection algorithms. In *16th International IEEE Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC 2013)*, pages 1693–1700. IEEE, 2013.
- [16] Patrick Helber, Benjamin Bischke, Andreas Dengel, and Damian Borth. Eurosat: A novel dataset and deep learning benchmark for land use and land cover classification. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 12(7):2217–2226, 2019.
- [17] Yupan Huang, Hongwei Xue, Bei Liu, and Yutong Lu. Unifying multimodal transformer for bi-directional image and text generation. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 1138–1147, 2021.
- [18] Zhicheng Huang, Zhaoyang Zeng, Bei Liu, Dongmei Fu, and Jianlong Fu. Pixel-bert: Aligning image pixels with text by deep multi-modal transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.00849*, 2020.
- [19] Gabriel Ilharco, Mitchell Wortsman, Ross Wightman, Cade Gordon, Nicholas Carlini, Rohan Taori, Achal Dave, Vaishaal Shankar, Hongseok Namkoong, John Miller, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Ali Farhadi, and Ludwig Schmidt. Openclip. [https://github.com/mlfoundations/open\\_clip](https://github.com/mlfoundations/open_clip), 2021.
- [20] Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4904–4916. PMLR, 2021.
- [21] Douwe Kiela, Hamed Firooz, Aravind Mohan, Vedanuj Goswami, Amanpreet Singh, Pratik Ringshia, and Davide Testuggine. The hateful memes challenge: Detecting hate speech in multimodal memes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:2611–2624, 2020.
- [22] Wonjae Kim, Bokyung Son, and Ildoo Kim. Vilt: Vision-and-language transformer without convolution or region supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5583–5594. PMLR, 2021.
- [23] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, et al. Segment anything. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4015–4026, 2023.
- [24] Jing Yu Koh, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Daniel Fried. Grounding language models to images for multimodal inputs and outputs. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 17283–17300. PMLR, 2023.
- [25] Jonathan Krause, Michael Stark, Jia Deng, and Li Fei-Fei. 3d object representations for fine-grained categorization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision workshops*, pages 554–561, 2013.
- [26] Ranjay Krishna, Yuke Zhu, Oliver Groth, Justin Johnson, Kenji Hata, Joshua Kravitz, Stephanie Chen, Yannis Kalantidis, Li-Jia Li, David A Shamma, et al. Visual genome: Connecting language and vision using crowdsourced dense image annotations. *International journal of computer vision*, 123:32–73, 2017.
- [27] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.
- [28] Jie Lei, Linjie Li, Luwei Zhou, Zhe Gan, Tamara L Berg, Mohit Bansal, and Jingjing Liu. Less is more: Clipbert for video-and-language learning via sparse sampling. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7331–7341, 2021.
- [29] Chunyuan Li, Haotian Liu, Liunian Li, Pengchuan Zhang, Jyoti Aneja, Jianwei Yang, Ping Jin, Houdong Hu, Zicheng Liu, Yong Jae Lee, et al. Elevater: A benchmark and toolkit for evaluating language-augmented visual models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:9287–9301, 2022.

- [30] 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.
- [31] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 740–755. Springer, 2014.
- [32] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2024.
- [33] Jiasen Lu, Christopher Clark, Rowan Zellers, Roozbeh Mottaghi, and Aniruddha Kembhavi. Unified-io: A unified model for vision, language, and multi-modal tasks. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [34] Subhansu Maji, Esa Rahtu, Juho Kannala, Matthew Blaschko, and Andrea Vedaldi. Fine-grained visual classification of aircraft. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1306.5151*, 2013.
- [35] Niklas Muennighoff, Hongjin Su, Liang Wang, Nan Yang, Furu Wei, Tao Yu, Amanpreet Singh, and Douwe Kiela. Generative representational instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.09906*, 2024.
- [36] Maria-Elena Nilsback and Andrew Zisserman. Automated flower classification over a large number of classes. In *2008 Sixth Indian Conference on Computer Vision, Graphics & Image Processing*, pages 722–729. IEEE, 2008.
- [37] Vicente Ordonez, Girish Kulkarni, and Tamara Berg. Im2text: Describing images using 1 million captioned photographs. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.
- [38] Omkar M. Parkhi, Andrea Vedaldi, Andrew Zisserman, and C. V. Jawahar. Cats and dogs. In *2012 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3498–3505. IEEE Computer Society, 2012.
- [39] Bryan A Plummer, Liwei Wang, Chris M Cervantes, Juan C Caicedo, Julia Hockenmaier, and Svetlana Lazebnik. Flickr30k entities: Collecting region-to-phrase correspondences for richer image-to-sentence models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2641–2649, 2015.
- [40] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021.
- [41] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, et al. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:25278–25294, 2022.
- [42] Christoph Schuhmann, Richard Vencu, Romain Beaumont, Robert Kaczmarczyk, Clayton Mullis, Aarush Katta, Theo Coombes, Jenia Jitsev, and Aran Komatsuzaki. Laion-400m: Open dataset of clip-filtered 400 million image-text pairs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.02114*, 2021.
- [43] Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, Sebastian Goodman, and Radu Soricut. Conceptual captions: A cleaned, hypernymed, image alt-text dataset for automatic image captioning. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2556–2565, 2018.
- [44] Johannes Stallkamp, Marc Schlipsing, Jan Salmen, and Christian Igel. The german traffic sign recognition benchmark: A multi-class classification competition. In *IJCNN 2011*, pages 1453–1460. IEEE, 2011.
- [45] Jack Urbanek, Florian Bordes, Pietro Astolfi, Mary Williamson, Vasu Sharma, and Adriana Romero-Soriano. A picture is worth more than 77 text tokens: Evaluating clip-style models on dense captions, 2023.
- [46] Bastiaan S Veeling, Jasper Linmans, Jim Winkens, Taco Cohen, and Max Welling. Rotation equivariant cnns for digital pathology. In *International Conference on Medical image computing and computer-assisted intervention*, pages 210–218. Springer, 2018.
- [47] Jianfeng Wang, Zhengyuan Yang, Xiaowei Hu, Linjie Li, Kevin Lin, Zhe Gan, Zicheng Liu, Ce Liu, and Lijuan Wang. Git: A generative image-to-text transformer for vision and language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.14100*, 2022.

- [48] Hongwei Xue, Tiankai Hang, Yanhong Zeng, Yuchong Sun, Bei Liu, Huan Yang, Jianlong Fu, and Baining Guo. Advancing high-resolution video-language representation with large-scale video transcriptions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5036–5045, 2022.
- [49] Hongwei Xue, Yupan Huang, Bei Liu, Houwen Peng, Jianlong Fu, Houqiang Li, and Jiebo Luo. Probing inter-modality: Visual parsing with self-attention for vision-and-language pre-training. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:4514–4528, 2021.
- [50] Hongwei Xue, Yuchong Sun, Bei Liu, Jianlong Fu, Ruihua Song, Houqiang Li, and Jiebo Luo. Clip-vip: Adapting pre-trained image-text model to video-language representation alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.06430*, 2022.
- [51] Yang You, Jing Li, Sashank Reddi, Jonathan Hseu, Sanjiv Kumar, Srinadh Bhojanapalli, Xiaodan Song, James Demmel, Kurt Keutzer, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. Large batch optimization for deep learning: Training bert in 76 minutes. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [52] Jiahui Yu, Zirui Wang, Vijay Vasudevan, Legg Yeung, Mojtaba Seyedhosseini, and Yonghui Wu. Coca: Contrastive captioners are image-text foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01917*, 2022.
- [53] Peiyuan Zhang, Guangtao Zeng, Tianduo Wang, and Wei Lu. Tynyllama: An open-source small language model, 2024.
- [54] Luowei Zhou, Hamid Palangi, Lei Zhang, Houdong Hu, Jason Corso, and Jianfeng Gao. Unified vision-language pre-training for image captioning and vqa. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, pages 13041–13049, 2020.
- [55] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.