

# InfoVisDial: An Informative Visual Dialogue Dataset by Bridging Large Multimodal and Language Models

Bingbing Wen<sup>1\*</sup>, Zhengyuan Yang<sup>2</sup>, Jianfeng Wang<sup>2</sup>, Zhe Gan<sup>2</sup>, Bill Howe<sup>1</sup>, Lijuan Wang<sup>2</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>University of Washington, USA    <sup>2</sup>Microsoft Azure AI, USA

## Abstract

In this paper, we build a visual dialogue dataset, named *InfoVisDial*, which provides rich informative answers in each round even with external knowledge related to the visual content. Different from existing datasets where the answer is compact and short, *InfoVisDial* contains long free-form answers with rich information in each round of dialogue. For effective data collection, the key idea is to bridge the large-scale multimodal model (e.g., *GIT*) and the language models (e.g., *GPT-3*). *GIT* can describe the image content even with scene text, while *GPT-3* can generate informative dialogue based on the image description and appropriate prompting techniques. With such automatic pipeline, we can readily generate informative visual dialogue data at scale. Then, we ask human annotators to rate the generated dialogues to filter the low-quality conversations. Human analyses show that *InfoVisDial* covers informative and diverse dialogue topics: 54.4% of the dialogue rounds are related to image scene texts, and 36.7% require external knowledge. Each round’s answer is also long and open-ended: 87.3% of answers are unique with an average length of 8.9, compared with 27.37% and 2.9 in *VisDial*. Last, we propose a strong baseline by adapting the *GIT* model for the visual dialogue task and fine-tune the model on *InfoVisDial*. Hopefully, our work can motivate more effort on this direction.

## 1. Introduction

Visual dialogue is a vision-language (VL) problem that aims to build AI models that could interact with humans based on the understanding of input images. Such systems can have many potential applications, ranging from information-seeking chatbots [41], interactive visual descriptions, to assisting visually-impaired people. *VisDial* [9] is a widely-used dataset developed for this task, and numerous approaches have been proposed based on the benchmark. For example, prior works [12, 16] have fo-

\*Work done while interning at Microsoft




Figure 1. Examples of *VisDial* [9] and our *InfoVisDial* datasets. Answers in *VisDial* [9] are typically compact and short, while those in our *InfoVisDial* are rich, informative, and knowledgeable.

cused on designing various attention mechanisms to capture the interactions between the question, dialogue history, and the input image. Other studies [6, 29] have leveraged pre-trained models with new introduced losses. However, prior studies mainly focus on the dialogue model design but neglect the importance of the visual dialogue problem setup and the corresponding data. The output texts in current datasets are typically compact and short, e.g., an average answer length of 2.9 on the *VisDial* dataset [9]. The short answer intuitively contains limited information nor external knowledge about the visual content. Therefore, we aim to develop a new visual dialogue dataset with more *informative* dialogue responses, e.g., a descriptive answer containing the scene text or the external information. Figure 1 shows examples of our dataset and the comparison to *VisDial*.

The classic approach for dataset collection is via human annotations, e.g., with two annotators talking to each other [9]. Although crowd-sourcing is one popular approach to create new datasets, it is expensive and could bring annotation artifacts [24]. Inspired by the strong gen-

Dataset	Multi-turn	Visual Component	Scene Text	Knowledge	Long Answer
VisDial [9]	✓	✓			
QuAC [7]	✓			✓	✓
CoQA [23]	✓			✓	✓
TextVQA [26]		✓	✓		
OKVQA [19]		✓		✓	
InfoVisDial (Ours)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 1. Comparison of our InfoVisDial dataset to other dialogue and visual question answering datasets.

eralization capability of large pre-trained language models [4], we explore automatic dataset curation methods for informative visual dialogues. Generating informative visual dialogue requires two core capabilities. First, to understand the input visual content, the model needs the multimodal understanding ability to link visual entities with the corresponding textual concepts. Second, to generate fluent text and provide relevant information during the conversation, the model also needs strong language modeling ability to understand the dialogue history and generate proper responses. Luckily, recent large-scale vision-language models (*e.g.*, SimVLM [31], GIT [27], and CoCa [39]) and language models (*e.g.*, GPT-3 [4] and PaLM [8]) have shown such capabilities. On the one hand, vision-language models perform well in converting visual contents into textual descriptions, but alone lack the ability of open-ended dialogue. On the other hand, language models show strong finetuned or even zero-/few-shot dialogue capabilities, but alone do not understand visual contents.

To this end, we propose to bridge these two types of foundation models to generate visual dialogue data on the fly. Specifically, inspired by previous studies on prompting language models for vision-language tasks [30, 34, 36, 41], we convert the input image into textual descriptions at different granularities with a pre-trained GIT model [27], and uses GPT-3 [4] to paraphrase the related contents into a piece of dialogue in a few-shot manner. We examine different prompts and textual descriptions for an effective recipe for generating visual dialogue. By doing so, we can already generate reasonable visual dialogues with free-form texts and open-ended topics as shown in Figure 1.

We collect dialogues based on images from the TextVQA and TextCap dataset [25, 26], which is a scene-text-rich subset selected from the OpenImages dataset. We name our dataset as InfoVisDial, as the dialogues now become more informative and human-like. As summarized in Table 1, compared with existing dialogue and visual question answering datasets, InfoVisDial is the only dataset that contains multiple turns, scene text, visual components, knowledge and free-form long answers. We collect dialogues by prompting GPT-3 with ground-truth captions or captions generated by GIT, and involve human annotators to

perform fact checking and filter out low-quality dialogues.

With the new dataset, we adapt the GIT framework by adding all the history dialogues and the current question as the text prefix, and train the model to complete the text as answers. The fine-tuned model effectively absorbs GPT-3’s dialoguing capability. As the answer is in free form, it is challenging to automatically evaluate the performance. Motivated by the captioning task, we also use the captioning metric in addition to the key-word accuracy metrics [7] to evaluate the model. The metrics also align well with human evaluation.

Our contributions are summarized as follows.

- We present a new framework that generates visual dialogues by bridging multimodal and language foundation models and letting them interplay with each other, which provides a solution for automatic visual dialogue dataset curation.
- We introduce a newly collected dataset InfoVisDial, which contains informative visual dialogues that require the model to read scene text and reason about relevant knowledge. We present a detailed analysis of the dataset, providing valuable insights on the challenges of this new task.
- We finetune the pre-trained GIT model on the new InfoVisDial dataset, and conduct experiments to show the effectiveness of our finetuned GIT model. We hope our new dataset can provide a solid new playground for researchers interested in the visual dialogue task.

## 2. Related Work

**Visual dialogue.** Compared with visual question answering [2, 3, 11, 13, 19], visual dialogue not only requires that the agent is able to answer the question, but also demands the agent to fully utilize the information in previous questions and answers. Prior visual dialogue models [12, 16, 42] focus on designing various attention mechanisms to capture the interactions between a question, a dialogue history and an image. With the increasing attention paid to pre-trained models, transformer-based models with various structures




Figure 2. We curate the InfoVisDial dataset by proposing a new framework that generates informative visual dialogues by bridging multimodal (GIT) and language foundation models (GPT-3) and letting them interplay with each other. GIT converts the input image into textual descriptions. Then, we prompt GPT-3 with these textual descriptions and get the informative visual dialogue. This process could also be understood as knowledge distillation from GPT-3 to corpus. With human filtering, we could get InfoVisDial dataset. Then, we fine-tune GIT on our newly collected dataset to empower GIT with the dialogue ability.

are also introduced into visual dialogue tasks [20, 21]. VDBERT [29] leverages the pre-trained BERT model for visual dialogue task. Instead of taking discriminative and generative tasks separately, some recent work explores the relationship between these two tasks [10, 21] by training two decoders simultaneously. UTC [6] combines discriminative and generative tasks into a unified transformer by introducing two inter-task contrastive losses. Apart from model improvement, GST [15] adopts semi-supervised learning and produces machine-generated visual dialogues which are similar to VisDial dataset for data augmentation.

However, the output texts of these models are still short and not human-like due to the limitation of the training dataset (the average answer length of VisDial dataset is 2.9). Since the research area of informative visual dialogues is under-explored, our newly proposed dataset InfoVisDial might shed light on the scarce landscape of visual dialogue.

**Vision-language pre-training.** Vision-Language pre-training (VLP) has achieved rapid progress in the vision-language community aiming to learn joint multimodal representations for downstream tasks. From the representation perspective, CLIP [22], ALIGN [14], and Florence [40] encode image and text into a common latent space to align representations from various modalities. They show strong zero-shot ability in image classification tasks, *etc.* From the generation perspective, SimVLM [31], CoCa [39], GIT [27] and many others adopt encoder-decoder models trained with generative losses. These models demonstrate remarkable zero-shot/few-shot abilities in image captioning, visual question answering and *etc.* There are also other stud-

ies bridging the gap between vision-language and language models. For example, PICa [36] adopts GPT-3 to extract commonsense knowledge for visual question answering.

Socratic Models [41] use LM prompting to leverage multiple pre-trained models to generate assistive dialogue. However, our approach not only generates informative dialogue but also propose a new dataset curation method for low-resource area such as visual dialogue. Furthermore, by distilling the informative dialogue ability from GPT-3 to VL models, we could eliminate the constraints of GPT-3 and empower the VL models' dialogue ability.

#### Distilling knowledge from large language models.

Knowledge distillation draws increasing attention recently due to the rise of massive pre-trained LMs such as GPT-3 [4], which achieves huge success in downstream NLP tasks and superior in-context few-shot learning ability. Symbolic Knowledge Distillation [33] follows a model-corpus-model knowledge distillation strategy and extracts the commonsense knowledge from GPT-3 into two forms: a large commonsense knowledge graph and a compact commonsense model. However, our method does not take GPT-3 as the teacher. GPT-3 and VL models are equally interacting with each other. Specifically, GIT provides GPT-3 with the textual representation of images and help GPT-3 understand visual content. Note that knowledge distillation usually requires a large amount of data to guarantee the transfer quality, which may not be easily obtained in real-world applications. Our method does not have the data bottleneck in nature, since we could generate as much data as we want.




Figure 3. Example of few-shot prompt.




Figure 4. Finetuning GIT on InfoVisDial Dataset.

**Dataset curation.** Although human-annotated datasets are expensive and subjective [24], crowdsourcing remains the most popular method for creating new datasets. Prior work on automatic data curation mainly focuses on extraction methods and pattern matching [17]. With the ever-growing capability of large pre-trained language models, some recent works study automatic dataset curation methods by finetuning LMs on existing datasets [1, 35]. In this study, we provide a solution for automatic data curation via bridging multimodal and language foundation models.

### 3. Methodology

In Figure 2, we propose a new framework to automatically curate the informative visual dialogue dataset by bridging multimodal and language foundation models.

#### 3.1. Problem Formulation

Given a question  $Q_k$  grounded on an image  $I$  at the  $k$ -th turn and the previous dialogue history  $H_t = (Q_1, A_1), (Q_2, A_2), \dots, (Q_{k-1}, A_{k-1})$ , our task aims to generate the target answer.

#### 3.2. LLM to InfoVisDial: Knowledge Distillation

We propose to address the knowledge-lacking problem in existing visual dialogues by harnessing the in-context few-shot learning capability of large language models (LLM) like GPT-3.

**Prompting methods.** The goal is to design a prompt appropriately such that GPT-3 can generate a dialogue. Specifi-

cally, our designed prompts consist of three parts: instruction, few-shot context and image textual descriptions. The instruction is a concise description of the generation task. *e.g.*, “Generate a longer conversation about an image based on the context that describes the image content. Casey asks questions about the image content, and Riley answers them based on the context.”, which has shown its effectiveness in zero-shot and few-shot settings [4, 32]. The few-shot context contains in-context examples shown in Figure 3. These dialogues work as a shared template for all tasks. We design two kinds of image descriptions: (i) ground-truth captions from TextCap dataset; (ii) captions generated by pre-trained vision-language models (*e.g.*, GIT [27]). In order to generate longer conversations, we inject this (add the word of *longer*) explicit intention into instructions and few-shot context. While constructing the in-context examples, we found that using fewer but longer dialogues are more effective than using more but shorter dialogues.

**Human in the loop.** Inspired by [28, 38], we adopt a human-in-the-loop annotation strategy to further study the quality of GPT-3 generated dialogue. Existing visual dialogue datasets [9] adopt fully human-annotated methods to let two annotators write questions and answers respectively, which is super expensive and labor-intensive. Instead, we design a simple and easy annotation method to obtain a good trade-off between annotation cost and dialogue quality. After generating a big dialogue corpus, we involve humans in the fact checking process. We ask 1 annotators to rate each round of dialogue given an image and its complete dialogue as context, with options including “1:

Filtering strategy	Train	Val	Overall
Keep all	346676	51000	397675
keep the longest	69335	10200	79535
Keep rate1	42023	5601	47524

Table 2. There are three filtering strategies and their corresponding dataset size. InfoVisDial adopts “keep the longest” in the training set and “keep rate1” in the evaluation set.

	Train	Val	Overall
questions	69335	5601	74936
dialogues	21953	2086	24039
tokens/question	5.9	6.1	5.9
tokens/answer	8.9	8.8	8.9
questions/dialogue	3.0	3.1	3.0

Table 3. Statistics summarizing the InfoVisDial dataset.

the question is relevant to the image and answer is correct”, “2: the question is relevant to the image and I’m not sure answer is correct”, “3: the question is relevant to the image and answer is not correct” and “4: the question is not relevant to the image”. The details of human annotation is provided in the Appendix. The filtering strategies will be introduced in Section 4. By mixing GPT-3 and the human-in-the-loop method, we could collect a benchmark dataset for informative visual dialogue at scale.

### 3.3. InfoVisDial to VLM: Knowledge Transferring

The final step of our framework is to transfer the dialogue ability to vision-language models by finetuning GIT [27] on InfoVisDial, as shown in Figure 4. An image encoder is used to extract the image features and a text decoder transformer is to predict the text tokens with the language modeling task. The dialogue is converted into one special *image caption* by concatenating all the question answer pairs separated by the [EOS] token. In the training, the loss is imposed only on the answer part; while in the inference, the model is able to predict the answer based on the dialogue history and current question. If the dialogue has only one question-answer pair, the fine-tuning strategy is degenerated to the case of how GIT is adapted to the VQA task as presented in [27].

## 4. InfoVisDial Dataset

In order to study the task of informative visual dialogue, we collect a new dataset named InfoVisDial. In this section, we start with dataset collection pipeline. We then provide statistics and an analysis of the dataset. Finally, we formulate two tasks based on the dataset.

### 4.1. Dataset collection

We use TextVQA dataset [26] as the source of our images. Most images in TextVQA dataset contain informative text, which is closer to our real life. We collect InfoVisDial’s training and validation set from TextVQA’s training while the evaluation set is collected from TextVQA’s validation set.

To collect dialogue for each image, we generate dialogue according to our proposed framework. Given an image and its textual representation, we repeat the prompting GPT-3 process five times and get five different dialogues. We put these dialogue candidates into the dialogue corpus. Then we involve humans in the loop to perform fact-checking. We propose three different filtering strategies. Keep all means no filtering. Keep the longest means only keeping the one with the longest dialogue length. Keep one means only keeping the dialogues with all rate1 in all turns. Not surprisingly, keep rate1 has the smallest dataset size. More details about filtering strategies is shown in Table 2.

Figure 5 shows 78.88% of QA pairs are labeled as rate1 which means the question is reasonable and the answer is correct. 13.88% of QA pairs are labeled as the question is not relevant to the image. Not surprisingly, dialogues with GT captions have better quality than those with GIT-generated captions.

We conduct diversity analysis to see whether “keep rate1” filtering strategy hurts diversity. We surprisingly observe proportionally more diverse examples. One possible reason is that if GPT-3 prefers to generate some type of question and answer, these would be highly recognizable across human filtering, and removing the would increase both quality and diversity.

### 4.2. Statistics and Analysis

**Analyzing questions.** We first analyze the diversity of the questions in the dataset. InfoVisDial contains 69335 questions and 56.2% questions are unique. Figure 6 shows the distribution of question length along with the statistics for the VisDial and TextVQA datasets for reference. The average question length in InfoVisDial is 5.93 words which are similar to VisDial(5.96) but less than TextVQA (7.18). Unsurprisingly, the average length of questions from the dialogue dataset is usually short than the length of questions from QA tasks. We also note that the minimum length of questions from InfoVisDial is 1 which is the same as VisDial, while the minimum length of questions from TextVQA is 3. Some questions whose length is 1 like “Why”, “Who”, “How” and “So” are prevalent in conversations. We ask annotators to label the type of questions. The details of human evaluation will be included in the supplementary materials. Figure 11 illustrates the annotation result. 54.4% questions are about scene text, 36.7% questions are about external knowledge and 2.4% questions are




Figure 5. Human evaluation of the dialogue quality in InfoVisDial.




Figure 6. Distribution of question length.




Figure 7. Distribution of answer length.




Figure 8. Top 20 most occurring questions in InfoVisDial.




Figure 9. Top 20 most occurring answers in InfoVisDial.




Figure 10. Distribution of dialogue length.




Figure 11. Examples of four types of questions.

about visual details. Figure 8 shows top 20 most occurring questions in the dataset with their count. We could see We find GPT-3 is more likely to generate questions that appear in the prompts. Even after human filtering, the distribution still skewed to the prompt questions. We find the question type becomes more diverse after filtering all the prompt questions. We will leave the task of building a more balanced dataset as future work. We include more question analysis figures in supplementary materials.

**Analyzing answers.** Figure 7 shows the distribution of answer lengths. InfoVisDial contains 69335 answers and 87.3% answers are unique. The percentage is quite high

compared to TextVQA (49.2%) and VisDial(27.37%). The average answer length in InfoVisDial is 8.9 which is much longer than VisDial(2.9). Figure 9 shows the top 20 most occurring answers in the dataset with their count. We find answers in InfoVisDial are longer, more informative and descriptive. Some answers of InfoVisDial are extremely long because they include external knowledge. *e.g.*, when asked about the specialty of Rolleiflex, the answer will be “The Rolleiflex 35 is a compact 35mm film camera that was first introduced in 1966. It’s special because it was one of the first 35mm cameras to be designed as a compact camera”. We also find that answers appear on the prompts have a higher possibility to be generated and will apply the same filtering approach as questions in the future. We include more answer analysis figures in supplementary materials.

**Analyzing dialogue.** Figure 10 shows the average turns of InfoVisDial is 3.0. We could see the majority of dialogues have no less than 3 turns. We find that 12% of dialogues require reading the dialogue history to resolve coreferences by human annotation. We compare the length of dialogue before and after filtering. We find they follow similar distribution in general. But filtering does slightly decrease the portion of dialogues whose lengths are more than 4. Finally, we examine the properties of the question in various turn positions in the dialogue. The frequency of yes/no ques-




Figure 12. Results comparison between different size of fine-tuned GIT models.

tions increases significantly as the dialogue progress; The percentage of hard questions also increases.

## 5. Experiments

We conduct experiments on our newly proposed task and dataset InfoVisDial to show that our model Fine-tuned GIT achieves great performance on dialogue ability. Further ablation studies and a qualitative analysis provide more insights into our approach.

### 5.1. Experiment setup

**Dataset.** To evaluate our proposed model, we conduct extensive experiments on our proposed dataset InfoVisDial. InfoVisDial dataset has 21953 and 2086 images for training and evaluation, respectively. Each image is associated with a open-ended and free-text form dialogue.

**Evaluation metrics.** We propose to use caption and word accuracy [7] metrics to evaluate the text quality and content accuracy, respectively. Inspired by [37], we conduct a user study to show that our metrics align with human judgments.

**Implementation Details.** In this study, we use GPT-3 *text-davinci-002* API to perform the prompting. Our model baseline is Fine-tuned GIT [27]. GIT-large and GIT-small are trained on two smaller pre-training dataset. GIT adopts coswin as image encoder [40]. GIT-large uses CLIP/ViT-L/14 [22] as image encoder. GIT-small uses CLIP/ViT-B/16 [22] as image encoder. The number of training epoch is 20 and the learning rate is 1e-5. The input image size is 576 for GIT, 480 for GIT-large and 560 for GIT-small. The batch size is 16 and parameter optimizer is AdamW [18].



**Q1: What's the sweatshirt say?**  
 GPT-3: It says ""weghta.""  
 Fine-tuned GIT: it says " "weganta. " " "

**Q2: What does that mean?**  
 GPT-3: I don't know.  
 Fine-tuned GIT: i'm not sure, but i think it has something to do with the word weganta.

(a)

**Q1: What kind of book is that?**  
 GPT-3: It's a history book.  
 Fine-tuned GIT: it's a book about the edgware road.

**Q2: What's it about?**  
 GPT-3: It's about Eddware, a town in London.  
 Fine-tuned GIT: it's about a busy street in london.

(b)

Figure 13. Comparison the results between the GPT-3 (without human cleaning) and our fine-tuned GIT. We could see our model fine-tuned GIT has better visual understanding ability in terms of scene text.

### 5.2. Experiments on InfoVisDial

We consider the following two training settings: single round VQA and multi round VQA. Like existing dialogue tasks, multi round VQA need to predict the answer based on dialogue history. Meanwhile, we also introduce single round VQA which has simple settings and could be easily used as benchmark for other tasks.

**Single-round VQA.** We compare the results from various size of Fine-tuned GIT models shown in Table 4. GIT has much better performance both on content accuracy and text quality compared to large and base models. Figure 12 shows some qualitative comparison. We could see Fine-tuned GIT has great ability to read scene text in the image. In Figure 12 (a), when asked “what’s the significance of that time”, Fine-tuned GIT not only could read and understand that “9:09” is time, but also connects “emergency call” with “significance”. Although it doesn’t answer the question in a perfect way due to lack of background knowledge, it gives a reasonable response. In Figure 12 (b), Fine-tuned GIT also gives more relevant answers than the large and base model. When asked “What’s that on the table?”, Fine-tuned GIT’s answer “that’s chanel perfume” is quite reasonable. We observe that Fine-tuned GIT-base easily answers “I don’t know” or give totally irrelevant answers.

#### Metrics evaluation and estimating human performance.

To validate the effectiveness of our metrics, we conduct a user study to ask annotator rate the turn-level dialogue answer on a likert scale. We find our proposed metrics are

Method	F1	CIDEr	B <sub>1</sub>	B <sub>2</sub>	B <sub>3</sub>	B <sub>4</sub>	METEOR	R <sub>L</sub>	SPICE
Fine-tuned GIT <sub>B</sub>	26.0	95.9	27.4	21.2	17.2	14.7	12.7	32.4	12.1
Fine-tuned GIT <sub>L</sub>	32.9	143.3	32.7	26.1	21.6	18.4	16.1	37.8	18.5
Fine-tuned GIT	35.9	170.9	35.5	28.5	23.7	20.2	17.9	40.3	21.9

Table 4. We follow caption metrics and word-level F1 [7] to evaluate the performance of our model on InfoVisDial dataset on the single round VQA training setting.

Method	F1	CIDEr	B <sub>1</sub>	B <sub>2</sub>	B <sub>3</sub>	B <sub>4</sub>	METEOR	R <sub>L</sub>	SPICE
Fine-tuned GIT <sub>B</sub>	11.9	54.5	13.2	10.0	7.8	6.1	7.9	23	6.8
Fine-tuned GIT <sub>L</sub>	16.2	93.6	19.7	15.4	12.3	10.15	11.8	30.1	13.8
Fine-tuned GIT	18.8	134.3	22.5	17.9	14.5	11.9	13.4	33.7	17.1

Table 5. We follow caption metrics and word-level F1 [7] to evaluate the performance of our model on InfoVisDial dataset on the multi round VQA training setting.

significantly correlate with human judgments. We also estimate an upper bound on model performance given our metrics, we assess the answers that annotated as “5”. Then we calculate the human F1 based on these answers. Note that this is a lower bound on human performance. Details about the user study will be introduced in the Appendix.

**Does fine-tuned GIT overcome the visual information bottleneck of GPT-3?** One motivation of proposing fine-tuned GIT instead of just prompting GPT-3 is that GPT-3 cannot fully understand visual information through textual description. Therefore, we validate if fine-tuned GIT overcomes this limitation. We compare the dialogue generated by fine-tuned GIT and GPT-3 (without filtering) respectively based on the GIT-generated captions. In Figure 13 (a), GPT-3 is misled by the incorrect textual description “weghta” while fine-tuned GIT could recognize the scene text correctly. We also observe that fine-tuned GIT generates more human-like answers when facing hard questions. Instead of just answering “I don’t know”, fine-tuned GIT makes a reasonable guess “but i think it has something to do with the word weganta”. In Figure 13 (b), fine-tuned GIT provides correct answer about scene text and external knowledge.

**Multi-round VQA.** Fine-tuned GIT demonstrates its effectiveness both on content accuracy and text quality compared to fine-tuned GIT-large and GIT-base models. We observe a performance decrease in multi-round training setting in Table 5. There are several possible reasons: (i) The current model may not be good at modeling long sequences, since they are pre-trained on caption datasets whose length are much smaller than dialogue history. (ii) The answer in each turn contains a large amount of external knowledge. Simple concatenation would not catch the clues in dialogue history. We come up with two solutions and leave them to

future work: (i) strengthening the model’s long sequence modeling ability; (ii) data augmentation. We are also building a larger-scale informative visual dialogue dataset based on CC3M [5], and will also add them into the training set.

**Error analysis.** To gain insights into the model’s errors, we sample 50 evaluation questions with predicted F1 scores below 0.10 from the fine-tuned GIT model trained under single VQA training setting. We remove cases in which the predicted answers are actually correct. We summarize the common errors in the Appendix.

**Prompt tuning for generative dialogue.** Although we find one-shot prompt will generate some dialogue which is similar to the one-shot example, it will be easily recognized and filtered by annotators. One-shot prompt could generate similar quality of dialogue than few-shot prompts. More details about different prompt designs are provided in the Appendix.

## 6. Conclusion

We have revisited the visual dialogue problem and presented a new dataset named InfoVisDial. InfoVisDial contains informative visual dialogues that require the model to read scene text and reason about relevant knowledge to generate. We automatically curate this dataset by proposing a new framework that synergistically combines the image-to-text GIT captioning model and the GPT-3 language model. Human analyses show that this scalable data collection framework leads to the desired informative dialogue dataset. InfoVisDial contains dialogues that are diverse and informative in topics, with free-form long answers. Furthermore, we propose a strong baseline by fine-tuning GIT on the InfoVisDial dataset. We hope our proposed dataset would provide a solid playground for the visual dialogue community.

## References

- [1] Ateret Anaby-Tavor, Boaz Carmeli, Esther Goldbraich, Amir Kantor, George Kour, Segev Shlomov, Naama Tepper, and Naama Zwerdling. Do not have enough data? deep learning to the rescue! In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, pages 7383–7390, 2020. 4
- [2] Peter Anderson, Xiaodong He, Chris Buehler, Damien Teney, Mark Johnson, Stephen Gould, and Lei Zhang. Bottom-up and top-down attention for image captioning and visual question answering. In *CVPR*, 2018. 2
- [3] 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. 2
- [4] Tom B Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. In *NeurIPS*, 2020. 2, 3, 4
- [5] 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 *CVPR*, 2021. 8
- [6] Cheng Chen, Zhenshan Tan, Qingrong Cheng, Xin Jiang, Qun Liu, Yudong Zhu, and Xiaodong Gu. Utc: A unified transformer with inter-task contrastive learning for visual dialog. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18103–18112, 2022. 1, 3
- [7] Eunsol Choi, He He, Mohit Iyyer, Mark Yatskar, Wen-tau Yih, Yejin Choi, Percy Liang, and Luke Zettlemoyer. QuAC: Question answering in context. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2174–2184, Brussels, Belgium, Oct.-Nov. 2018. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2, 7, 8
- [8] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311*, 2022. 2
- [9] Abhishek Das, Satwik Kottur, Khushi Gupta, Avi Singh, Deshraj Yadav, José MF Moura, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. Visual dialog. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 326–335, 2017. 1, 2, 4
- [10] Zhe Gan, Yu Cheng, Ahmed El Kholy, Linjie Li, Jingjing Liu, and Jianfeng Gao. Multi-step reasoning via recurrent dual attention for visual dialog. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.00579*, 2019. 3
- [11] Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Making the v in vqa matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in visual question answering. In *CVPR*, pages 6904–6913, 2017. 2
- [12] Dalu Guo, Chang Xu, and Dacheng Tao. Image-question-answer synergistic network for visual dialog. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10434–10443, 2019. 1, 2
- [13] Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning. Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering. In *CVPR*, 2019. 2
- [14] Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc V Le, Yunhsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.05918*, 2021. 3
- [15] Gi-Cheon Kang, Sungdong Kim, Jin-Hwa Kim, Donghyun Kwak, and Byoung-Tak Zhang. The dialog must go on: Improving visual dialog via generative self-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.12502*, 2022. 3
- [16] Satwik Kottur, José MF Moura, Devi Parikh, Dhruv Batra, and Marcus Rohrbach. Visual coreference resolution in visual dialog using neural module networks. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, pages 153–169, 2018. 1, 2
- [17] Zhongyang Li, Xiao Ding, Ting Liu, J Edward Hu, and Benjamin Van Durme. Guided generation of cause and effect. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.09846*, 2021. 4
- [18] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*, 2017. 7
- [19] Kenneth Marino, Mohammad Rastegari, Ali Farhadi, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. Ok-vqa: A visual question answering benchmark requiring external knowledge. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/cvf conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3195–3204, 2019. 2
- [20] Vishvak Murahari, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Abhishek Das. Large-scale pretraining for visual dialog: A simple state-of-the-art baseline. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 336–352. Springer, 2020. 3
- [21] Van-Quang Nguyen, Masanori Suganuma, and Takayuki Okatani. Efficient attention mechanism for visual dialog that can handle all the interactions between multiple inputs. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 223–240. Springer, 2020. 3
- [22] 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. 3, 7
- [23] Siva Reddy, Danqi Chen, and Christopher D Manning. Coqa: A conversational question answering challenge. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:249–266, 2019. 2
- [24] Roy Schwartz, Maarten Sap, Ioannis Konstas, Leila Zilles, Yejin Choi, and Noah A. Smith. The effect of different writing tasks on linguistic style: A case study of the ROC story cloze task. In *Proceedings of the 21st Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL 2017)*, pages 15–25, Vancouver, Canada, Aug. 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics. 1, 4
- [25] Oleksii Sidorov, Ronghang Hu, Marcus Rohrbach, and Amanpreet Singh. Textcaps: a dataset for image caption-

- ing with reading comprehension. In *ECCV*, pages 742–758, 2020. [2](#)
- [26] Amanpreet Singh, Vivek Natarajan, Meet Shah, Yu Jiang, Xinlei Chen, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Marcus Rohrbach. Towards vqa models that can read. In *CVPR*, 2019. [2](#), [5](#)
- [27] 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. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [7](#)
- [28] Shuohang Wang, Yang Liu, Yichong Xu, Chenguang Zhu, and Michael Zeng. Want to reduce labeling cost? GPT-3 can help. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 4195–4205, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, Nov. 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. [4](#)
- [29] Yue Wang, Shafiq Joty, Michael R Lyu, Irwin King, Caiming Xiong, and Steven CH Hoi. Vd-bert: A unified vision and dialog transformer with bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.13278*, 2020. [1](#), [3](#)
- [30] Zhenhailong Wang, Manling Li, Ruochen Xu, Luwei Zhou, Jie Lei, Xudong Lin, Shuohang Wang, Ziyi Yang, Chenguang Zhu, Derek Hoiem, et al. Language models with image descriptors are strong few-shot video-language learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10747*, 2022. [2](#)
- [31] Zirui Wang, Jiahui Yu, Adams Wei Yu, Zihang Dai, Yulia Tsvetkov, and Yuan Cao. Simvlm: Simple visual language model pretraining with weak supervision. In *ICLR*, 2022. [2](#), [3](#)
- [32] Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. In *ICLR*, 2022. [4](#)
- [33] Peter West, Chandra Bhagavatula, Jack Hessel, Jena D Hwang, Liwei Jiang, Ronan Le Bras, Ximing Lu, Sean Welleck, and Yejin Choi. Symbolic knowledge distillation: from general language models to commonsense models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07178*, 2021. [3](#)
- [34] Yujia Xie, Luwei Zhou, Xiyang Dai, Lu Yuan, Nguyen Bach, Ce Liu, and Michael Zeng. Visual clues: Bridging vision and language foundations for image paragraph captioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.01843*, 2022. [2](#)
- [35] Yiben Yang, Chaitanya Malaviya, Jared Fernandez, Swabha Swayamdipta, Ronan Le Bras, Ji-Ping Wang, Chandra Bhagavatula, Yejin Choi, and Doug Downey. Generative data augmentation for commonsense reasoning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2020*, pages 1008–1025, Online, Nov. 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. [4](#)
- [36] Zhengyuan Yang, Zhe Gan, Jianfeng Wang, Xiaowei Hu, Yumao Lu, Zicheng Liu, and Lijuan Wang. An empirical study of gpt-3 for few-shot knowledge-based vqa. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 3081–3089, 2022. [2](#), [3](#)
- [37] Yi-Ting Yeh, Maxine Eskenazi, and Shikib Mehri. A comprehensive assessment of dialog evaluation metrics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.03706*, 2021. [7](#)
- [38] Kang Min Yoo, Dongju Park, Jaewook Kang, Sang-Woo Lee, and Woomyoung Park. GPT3Mix: Leveraging large-scale language models for text augmentation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 2225–2239, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, Nov. 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. [4](#)
- [39] Jiahui Yu, Zirui Wang, Vijay Vasudevan, Legg Yeung, Mojtaba Seyedhosseini, and Yonghui Wu. Coca: Contrastive captioners are image-text foundation models. *TMLR*, 2022. [2](#), [3](#)
- [40] Lu Yuan, Dongdong Chen, Yi-Ling Chen, Noel Codella, Xiyang Dai, Jianfeng Gao, Houdong Hu, Xuedong Huang, Boxin Li, Chunyuan Li, et al. Florence: A new foundation model for computer vision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.11432*, 2021. [3](#), [7](#)
- [41] Andy Zeng, Adrian Wong, Stefan Welker, Krzysztof Choromanski, Federico Tombari, Aavek Purohit, Michael Ryoo, Vikas Sindhwani, Johnny Lee, Vincent Vanhoucke, et al. Socratic models: Composing zero-shot multimodal reasoning with language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.00598*, 2022. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#)
- [42] Zilong Zheng, Wenguan Wang, Siyuan Qi, and Song-Chun Zhu. Reasoning visual dialogs with structural and partial observations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6669–6678, 2019. [2](#)