

# No "Zero-Shot" Without Exponential Data: Pretraining Concept Frequency Determines Multimodal Model Performance











Vishaal Udandarao



Ameya Prabhu



Yash Sharma



Philip Torr



Adel Bibi



Samuel Albanie





In the olden days (classic ML) ...

In the olden days (classic ML) ...



In the olden days (classic ML) ...



Small-scale and controllable! We know what's in here. Usually held-out! Totally unseen samples. Then, training sets started getting **bigger**...

Then, training sets started getting **bigger**...

Annotating them started getting **costlier**...

Then, training sets started getting **bigger**...

Annotating them started getting **costlier**...

Solution: "Zero-shot Learning/Generalization"

#### What is "zero-shot" generalization?

**Importance of Semantic Representation: Dataless Classification** 

Ming-Wei Chang, Lev Ratinov, Dan Roth and Vivek Srikumar Department of Computer Science University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign {mchang21, ratinov2, danr, vsrikum2}@uiuc.edu

AAAI'08

Zero-data Learning of New Tasks

Hugo Larochelle and Dumitru Erhan and Yoshua Bengio Université de Montréal Montréal, Québec {larocheh, erhandum, bengioy}@iro.umontreal.ca

#### AAAI'08

#### Zero-Shot Learning with Semantic Output Codes

Mark Palatucci Robotics Institute Carnegie Mellon University Pittsburgh, PA 15213 mpalatuc@cs.cmu.edu Dean Pomerleau Intel Labs Pittsburgh, PA 15213 dean.a.pomerleau@intel.com

Geoffrey Hinton Computer Science Department University of Toronto Toronto, Ontario M5S 3G4, Canada hinton@cs.toronto.edu Tom M. Mitchell Machine Learning Department Carnegie Mellon University Pittsburgh, PA 15213 tom.mitchell@cs.cmu.edu

NeurIPS'09

# What is "zero-shot" generalization?

And perhaps the most famous one...

And perhaps the most famous one...

#### Learning To Detect Unseen Object Classes by Between-Class Attribute Transfer

Christoph H. Lampert Hannes Nickisch Stefan Harmeling Max Planck Institute for Biological Cybernetics, Tübingen, Germany

{firstname.lastname}@tuebingen.mpg.de

And perhaps the most famous one...

#### Learning To Detect Unseen Object Classes by Between-Class Attribute Transfer

Christoph H. Lampert Hannes Nickisch Stefan Harmeling Max Planck Institute for Biological Cybernetics, Tübingen, Germany

 $\{\texttt{firstname.lastname}\}\texttt{@tuebingen.mpg.de}$ 

Basic premise: Training and testing classes are disjoint!





In the old 'attribute-based' zero-shot times, the assumption was that you have seen furry animals, brown animals, and animals living in the wood, but technically you have not seen any bear (if that's e.g. your test class) ... the problem is that now you don't know if a bear is really in your dataset (resp. if you check, you will find a lot of bears mentioned on webscale data) ... this is what the no-zero-shot paper is about (huggingface.co/papers/2404.04...) and what we also found in our VL-Taboo paper when we looked at attributes (arxiv.org/abs/2209.06103)

...

So I would argue the best we can claim is that VL models were not trained on the downstream datasets (but might have the class knowledge), but even this can be questioned now if we follow arxiv.org/abs/2404.04125

# Along comes CLIP!

Cut to 2021...



Cut to 2021...

We're introducing a neural network called CLIP which efficiently learns visual concepts from natural language supervision. CLIP can be applied to any visual classification benchmark by simply providing the names of the visual categories to be recognized, similar to the "zero-shot" capabilities of GPT-2 and GPT-3.



Figure 1. Summary of our approach. While standard image models jointly train an image feature extractor and a linear classifier to predict some label, CLIP jointly trains an image encoder and a text encoder to predict the correct pairings of a batch of (image, text) training examples. At test time the learned text encoder synthesizes a zero-shot linear classifier by embedding the names or descriptions of the target dataset's classes.



Figure 1. Summary of our approach. While standard image models jointly train an image feature extractor and a linear classifier to predict some label, CLIP jointly trains an image encoder and a text encoder to predict the correct pairings of a batch of (image, text) training examples. At test time the learned text encoder synthesizes a zero-shot linear classifier by embedding the names or descriptions of the target dataset's classes.

## The term "zero-shot" has diffused over time – Opaque and massive training datasets!



## The term "zero-shot" has diffused over time – Opaque and massive training datasets!

We have no idea what's in here anymore!



Take a sober look at the **"zero-shot"** generalization of multimodal models.

#### Understand what's here



#### Understand what's here



and

#### Understand what's here



and





Model Performance

Concept Frequency

How is the performance of multimodal models on downstream concepts influenced by the frequency of these concepts in their pretraining datasets?



Model Performance

Concept Frequency

#### **Pretraining Datasets:**

CC-3M CC-12M YFCC-15M LAION-400M LAION-Aesthetics

#### **Downstream Datasets:**

17 "zero-shot" classification2 image-text retrieval8 text-to-image generation

#### **Tested Models:**

10 CLIP models 24 text-to-image gen models We first collate 4,029 concepts from 27 downstream tasks.



We then estimate concept frequencies in text captions of the pretraining datasets.



Next, we estimate concept frequencies in images of the pretraining datasets.



Finally, we estimate concept frequencies where both images and text captions capture the concept.



#### Key Result with CLIP models: Frequency determines Performance, log-linearly!





- Log-linear scaling between concept frequency and zero-shot performance.
- To linearly improve performance, we have to scale up data exponentially!
- Extremely sample-inefficient (data-hungry) learning.

## We control for two important confounders:

- Similarity of pretraining samples to downstream samples

## We control for two important confounders:

- Similarity of pretraining samples to downstream samples

- Synthetic and balanced pretraining data distribution



#### **Testing with Synthetic Pretraining Concept Distributions**

- Pretraining datasets exhibit long-tailed concept distribution.
- Quantifying misalignment between concepts in image-text pairs.
- Concept frequencies across pretraining datasets are correlated

## Pretraining datasets exhibit long-tailed concept distribution



## Pretraining datasets exhibit long-tailed concept distribution



Even for explicitly balanced datasets (MetaCLIP, SynthCLIP). Why?

- Concepts are repeated. e.g., sneaker, running\_shoes - Concept co-occur. e.g., woodpeckers and trees

Dataset/ Misalignment	Number of Misaligned pairs	Misalignment Degree (%)	
CC3M	$557,\!683$	16.81%	
$\mathbf{CC12M}$	$2,\!143,\!784$	17.25%	
YFCC15M	$5,\!409,\!248$	36.48%	
LAION-A	$23,\!104,\!076$	14.34%	
LAION400M	$21,\!996,\!097$	5.31%	

Dataset/ Misalignment	Number of Misaligned pairs	Misalignment Degree (%)	
$\mathbf{CC3M}$	$557,\!683$	16.81%	
$\mathbf{CC12M}$	$2,\!143,\!784$	17.25%	
YFCC15M	$5,\!409,\!248$	36.48%	
LAION-A	$23,\!104,\!076$	14.34%	
LAION400M	$21,\!996,\!097$	5.31%	

Reason why recaptioning methods are getting popular. Simple yet efficient way to improve "data quality"

Correlations	CC3M	<b>CC12</b> M	YFCC15M	L400M
CC3M	1.00	0.79	0.96	0.63
$\mathbf{CC12M}$	-	1.00	0.97	0.74
YFCC15M	_	-	1.00	0.76
L400M	—	—	—	1.00

Correlations	CC3M	<b>CC12</b> M	YFCC15M	L400M
CC3M	1.00	0.79	0.96	0.63
$\mathbf{CC12M}$	-	1.00	0.97	0.74
YFCC15M	_	-	1.00	0.76
L400M	—	—	—	1.00

All web-crawled data is 'different' yet 'similar'. The web naturally induces a long-tailed distribution—best to make peace with it and find better curation and training strategies. To foster further research, we collect a true 'long-tailed' dataset.

We curate images from 290 most infrequent concepts in LAION400M.

Test multiple image-text and text-to-image models.



# Let-It-Wag! image generation



- The web is long-tailed and there is a lack of high-quality data for all use-cases
- Current multimodal models are extremely sample inefficient—to improve performance linearly, we need exponentially more data samples
- What do we want our models to generalize to?
- Downstream task-aware curation the way to go? Improving dataset priors improves model performance!

- Effect of model scaling? Where do our results leave us with respect to scaling laws?
- Effects on compositional generalization?
- What are effective measures to curate data and combat the long-tailed nature?
  - Retrieval augmentation to the rescue?
  - Better balancing strategies while preserving diversity?
  - Is "quality filtering" always better?

Thanks for your attention!

