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Abstract
Recent state-of-the-art computer vision systems are trained from natural language supervision, ranging from simple object category names to descriptive captions. This free form of supervision ensures high generality and usability of the learned visual models, based on extensive heuristics on data collection to cover as many visual concepts as possible. Alternatively, learning with external knowledge about images is a promising way which leverages a much more structured source of supervision. In this paper, we propose K-LITE™, a simple strategy to leverage external knowledge to build transferable visual systems: In training, it enriches entities in natural language with WordNet and Wiktionary knowledge, leading to an efficient and scalable approach to learning image representations that can understand both visual concepts and their knowledge; In evaluation, the natural language is also augmented with external knowledge and then used to reference learned visual concepts (or describe new ones) to enable zero-shot and few-shot transfer of the pre-trained models. We study the performance of K-LITE on two important computer vision problems, image classification and object detection, benchmarking on 20 and 13 different existing datasets, respectively. The proposed knowledge-augmented models show significant improvement in transfer learning performance over existing methods.

1 Introduction
One of the core aspirations in computer vision (CV) is to develop systems that endow computers with the ability to effectively learn general visual representations, that can be transferred to a variety of downstream recognition datasets with arbitrary visual concepts in the wild. Though excellent performance is achieved on standard benchmarks, the traditional supervised approaches are limited to learning a fix set of concepts, e.g., 22K concepts on ImageNet and 18K concepts on JFT-300M. This renders a few issues: (i) Annotating each individual vision dataset is not only labor intensive, but also results in a narrow set of visual concepts; (ii) Visual models trained on such datasets are good at one task (with the given concept set) and this task only, and show poor transfer learning performance for customized datasets that usually come with a different set of concepts.

To tackle this problem, recent large-scale language-augmented visual models, such as CLIP, ALIGN and Florence, are trained on a wide variety of images with natural language supervision that is abundantly available on the Internet. These models demonstrate strong zero-shot transfer capability, since they acquire open-set recognition abilities through problem reformulation from classification to retrieval. Moreover, model generalization is improved as natural language supervision typically contains much richer semantics. While these models usually perform well on
recognizing common objects, they struggle on visual concepts that are absent or poorly covered in the pre-training stage. To ensure good transfer performance, it is required to train such models on huge datasets (e.g., >400M image-text pairs) with sufficient concept coverage, a process that is both labor and compute expensive.

As an alternative to scaling the number of image-text pairs to increase concept coverage, we propose to leverage structured external knowledge to augment language supervision. The inspiration follows from how humans generalize to recognize novel concepts: instead of trying to memorize all concepts, humans leverage the structured knowledge such as commonsense, definitions, and rules/relationships between concepts. For example, when we are the first time in a Japanese restaurant, we may get confused to understand the menu by only looking at the dish names (e.g., Takoyaki/Sashimi), and it is hard to imagine their visual appearance (see Figure 1). The picture becomes much more clear after a waitress explains the concept with her knowledge, which further leads to a success in food ordering (i.e., matching correct content to the name). Similar intuitions have been exploited in computer vision for class-level transfer in individual domains [70, 9], but not explored for task-level transfer settings as in CLIP.

To this end, we explore a systematic approach to acquire and learn with external knowledge sources from databases such as WordNet [47] and Wiktionary [46] to train more transferable and sample-efficient visual models. The concept descriptions and concept hierarchies are purely textual, and the process of collecting external knowledge is fully automatic without extra human annotation. The acquired knowledge typically provides information that is shared between seen and unseen concepts to facilitate effective transfer. For example, the rare concepts “Takoyaki/Sashimi” in Figure 1 are explained with more common concepts. Such knowledge sources are generally available for a variety of domains/datasets, thus making it possible to build a generic approach for task-level transfer.

Our main findings and contributions can be summarized as follows:

• We present the first strong evidence that external knowledge can benefit large-scale task-level transfer for two core CV problems, image classification (IC) and object detection (OD), by exploring external knowledge sources, including WordNet and Wiktionary.

• A simple and effective strategy K-LITE is proposed: The acquired external knowledge is appended to the original textual concepts as model input in both pre-training and evaluation stages. It can be viewed as an automatic knowledge-aware language prompting method, making it easier for the model to access the similar information it has shared in the training and evaluation. A modularized modeling approach is also developed to enable efficient adaptation from vanilla visual models to their knowledge-augmented version.

• To demonstrate the generality of the proposed K-LITE, we instantiate it with two recent visual models and develop our knowledge-augmented counterparts: UniCL [71] for IC and GLIP [36] for OD. Extensive experimental results in zero-shot and few-shot learning settings demonstrate that knowledge-augmented models can significantly improve the performance. Notably, our model can achieve a similar zero-shot performance to previous methods using only half of pre-training image-text pairs in some scenarios, demonstrating the sample-efficiency of the proposed knowledge-augmented approach.

2 Related Work

2.1 Zero-shot Visual Recognition

Zero-shot learning, i.e., classifying images where there is a lack of labeled training data, has been studied for decades [14], and its popularity has recently increased further [70]. Based on the technique
evolution, it can be broadly categorized into two generations: the traditional class-level zero-shot and recently popular task-level zero-shot setting.

**Class-level Transfer.** In the traditional setting, class-level zero-shot learning aims to recognize object classes whose instances have not been observed during training. The crux of the matter for all zero-shot learning methods is to associate observed and non-observed classes through some form of auxiliary information, which can be either implicit such as pre-trained semantic embeddings \[68, 59, 7\], or explicit such as attributes \[14, 30, 25\], text \[12, 13, 54, 52\], knowledge graphs \[67, 56\], or rules and ontologies \[15\]. Please, refer to the recent survey on knowledge-aware zero-shot learning for a more detailed review \[9\]. Recently, it has been suggested to abstract away from the restricted nature of standard zero-shot evaluation and make the task more practical by including training classes at test time, i.e., generalized zero-shot learning setting \[70\]. Despite the progress in this area, the traditional setting is typically limited to studying zero-shot transfer across classes in a single domain with manually defined splits, such as Animal with Attributes (AwA) \[31\], Birds-200 \[65\], SUN attributes \[49\], or ZS-ImageNet \[55, 17\].

**Task-level Transfer.** Another line of work focuses on task-level zero-shot transfer \[33, 53, 26\]. They pre-train visual models on hundreds of millions of web-crawled image-caption or image-tags pairs, and evaluate their transfer ability by directly performing inference in a wide range of downstream datasets, without further tuning any model weights. Other works in this area include FILIP \[73\], DeCLIP \[38\] and SLIP \[48\]. We argue that the task-level transfer is more practical and attractive than class-level transfer, as it is more relevant to real-world scenarios, where we may want to develop models that can serve many visual recognition applications.

Our work bridges the gap between the two lines of works above: it borrows the spirit of exploring knowledge in class-level transfer, and generalizes it for task-level transfer, thus leverages the best of both. To summarize, our work is different in two major aspects: (i) **Settings.** We focus on the more practical task-level transfer learning across domains, i.e., from a large corpus to a diverse set of downstream datasets in different domains, and demonstrate that external knowledge benefits task-level transfer. (ii) **Modeling.** Existing class-level transfer works are built upon pre-trained visual features/backbones and shallow word embeddings or tf-idf, and only train the classifiers. For example, one representative method is DeViSE \[16\] where a skip-gram word embedding model and an image classifier are fine-tuned jointly. In contrast, we are training large Transformer-based models in an end-to-end manner from scratch as in CLIP/ALIGN, providing the first empirical evidence that external knowledge can help train a general visual backbone.

### 2.2 Knowledge-Intensive Models in NLP and Vision-and-Language

In natural language processing (NLP), with the increase of model capacity brought by pre-trained language models \[11\], there emerges boosting needs for more knowledgeable models \[41\] with advanced functionalities including providing and making flexible use of encyclopedic \[64, 3, 4\] and commonsense knowledge \[60, 77\]. The mere pre-trained language models, however, lack the capacity to handle such knowledge-intensive NLP tasks alone \[51\], e.g., open-domain question answering \[29\]. To address this challenge, a large number of pre-trained language models augmented with external knowledge sources have been recently proposed \[50, 20, 32, 42, 75, 5\]. These models have achieved strong empirical performance on a variety of NLP tasks, largely due to the modeling mechanism that enables absorbing extra knowledge as supervision. Please refer to a recent survey \[74\] for a comprehensive review.

In vision-and-language (V+L) domain, researchers have also started exploring knowledge-intensive tasks, such as OK-VQA \[45\] and WebQA \[6\]. They often require additional information sources (e.g., factual and commonsense knowledge) beyond the QA pairs, compared to the established V+L tasks such as VQA \[2, 24\] and image captioning \[40, 1\]. Hence, existing pre-trained models \[43, 37, 61, 28, 27, 55, 21\] would perform poorly on these knowledge-intensive V+L tasks \[6\]. To address the problem, a mechanism to acquire external knowledge becomes an essential component for success \[60, 44, 72\].

The success of knowledge in NLP and V+L tasks inspires us to ask a natural question: Can we learn a transferable visual backbone model with external knowledge? Thus, we dissect and borrow the
vital elements such as knowledge sources \cite{47,46} and modeling techniques \cite{66,75}, and carry out studies for core computer vision tasks.

3 Knowledge-Augmented Visual Models

Problem setup. Computer vision systems have achieved strong transfer performance, when learning with large-scale image-label data \cite{28} and image-caption data \cite{53}. Recently, it has been demonstrated in \cite{71,76} that the unification of image-label and image-text as image-text-label achieves superior performance over either one of them. We follow the setting in \cite{71}, and define a unified triplet-wise data format \( D = \{(x_n, t_n, y_n)\}_{n=1}^N \), where \( x \in \mathcal{X} \) is an image, \( t \in \mathcal{T} \) is its language description, and \( y \in \mathcal{Y} \) is a label indicating the index of the grouped or unique language description in the dataset. In a general form, the language description is a text sequence \( t = [t_1, \ldots, t_L] \). It ranges from simple category names representing visual concepts when \( L \) is small, to more free-form and semantic-rich sentences such as captions when \( L \) is relatively large.

In this paper, we assume there exists an external knowledge source \( S \), where one may leverage the language description \( t \) as a query to seek additional knowledge description \( s \in S \) for \( t \). Given these triplet data instances \( D \) and an external knowledge source \( S \), our goal is to learn generic visual-semantic representations, which are readily transferable to a wide range of downstream datasets, whose category names are not necessarily observed during training. In Figure 2 we visually illustrate the proposed knowledge-augmentation process as well as two applicable scenarios, and describe the details as below.

3.1 External Knowledge

Query Construction. For a text sequence associated with an image, different tokens may play different roles in contributing to describing the main semantics of the image. Humans leverage this prior inherently in parsing the sentences to understand the image. Further, it is infeasible to employ the entire sequence as a query, as this may lead to the lack of coverage in the knowledge bases. Instead, we propose to construct a query \( q \in Q \) as a compact form of original language description \( t \), represented with the words that convey the main concepts of the image.

Specifically, we consider a divide-and-conquer approach. For short text sequences such as category names in image-tag/label datasets (e.g., ImageNet \cite{10}), we directly use the category name as the query, as it usually concisely summarizes the image content. For example, "tench, electric ray, stingray". For long text sequences such as captions (e.g., YFCC \cite{63}), we first parse the sentence to extract the noun-phrases, among which the most rare noun-phrase over a corpus is used as query for this sentence. The intuition is to convert the rare concepts into explanations represented in common words using external knowledge. A noun phrase is typically a chunk of the sentence that has a noun as its head. It could also include other kinds of words, such as adjectives, ordinals, determiners. Noun phrases are useful for explaining the context of the sentence, inferring what is being talked about in the sentence, and thus the image. For example, in "professional boxer is introduced to the crowd", the noun-phrases are "professional boxer" and "the
crowd”. We summarize the query construction process \( g_{query} \) below for clarity:

\[
q = g_{query}(t) = \begin{cases} 
  t, & \text{when } t \text{ is a category, class or tag name} \\
  \text{Noun-phrase}(t), & \text{when } t \text{ is a caption}
\end{cases}
\]  

(1)

**Knowledge Acquisition from External Sources.** We consider three knowledge sources \( S \) to enrich the language descriptions \( t \). They are constructed based on the two knowledge bases: WordNet [47] and Wiktionary [46]. To measure the breadth of a knowledge base, we define the *concept coverage* as the percentage of non-empty knowledge items retrieved for a given set of issued queries. (i) WordNet [47] is a lexical database which links words into semantic relations including synonyms, hyponyms, and meronyms. Both nouns and verbs are organized into hierarchies, defined by hypernym relationships. The synsets in WordNet are grouped into *synsets*, expressing the same distinct concept. The synsets serve as a natural link between language and vision domains. For example, ImageNet is an image database organized according to the WordNet hierarchy, where each node is depicted by hundreds/thousands of images. Since synsets in WordNet usually include simple words or collocations like “eat out” and “car pool”, rendering it difficult to retrieve any knowledge for rare concepts that usually appear with complex words, thus resulting in low concept coverage. (ii) Wiktionary [46] is a web-based content dictionary of terms (including words, phrases, proverbs, linguistic reconstructions). These entries may contain definitions, images for illustrations, pronunciations, usage examples, among other features. Wiktionary has a higher concept coverage than WordNet, and is frequently used in various NLP tasks. When multiple meanings/senses exist for a given query, we simply consider the first definition to ease the process, and leave more sophisticated design as future work. Next, we provide our knowledge retrieval process \( s = g_{retrieve}(q) \) for each source \( S \), followed by an example result for the query “boxer”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Source</th>
<th>Retrieved Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WordNet Hierarchy</strong> ( S_{wn.path} )</td>
<td>boxer, combatant, person, causal_agent, physical_entity, entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WordNet Definition</strong> ( S_{wn.def} )</td>
<td>someone who fights with his fists for sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wiktionary Definition</strong> ( S_{wiki.def} )</td>
<td>a participant (fighter) in a boxing match</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After querying each knowledge source, we represent the external knowledge for each language description \( t \) in the form of concatenation of its query and the corresponding retrieved result: \( [q, s] \). This external knowledge introduces additional supervision signals to guide visual models, to learn better aligned visual-semantic representations, as we explain later. To demonstrate its generality, we describe how to encode knowledge in language-image models for training and evaluation, to improve transfer in two representative tasks, including the image-level task of image classification and the region-level task of object detection.

### 3.2 Image Classification

Recent works [53] that learn visual models with language supervision often employ a dual-encoder architecture. For each image \( x \), an image encoder model \( f_\theta \) parameterized by \( \theta \) first represents \( x \) as a visual feature vector \( \hat{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times 1} : \hat{v} = f_\theta(x) \). For each language description \( t \in T \), we encode it with a text encoder \( f_\phi(t) \) parameterized by \( \phi \), and get the [EOS] feature as the vector representation of the sentence \( \hat{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times 1} : \hat{u} = f_\phi(t) \). In this paper, we further leverage this text encoder to encode the external knowledge. First, the query \( q \) is represented in natural language \( p = g_{prompt}(q) \) using the language prompt as in [53]. Second, together with external knowledge, the knowledge-augmented text sequence \( t^k \in T^k \) is represented as the concatenation:

\[
t^k = [ p ; q ; s ].
\]

(2)
For category names, we use \( t^k \) to replace \( t \). For captions, we consider two schemes: (i) Concat: we simply concatenate the external knowledge on the original caption \( t^k = [t, q, s] \) (ii) Combine: we treat \( t^k \) as the knowledge-augmented version of the original caption, and use both \( t^k \) and \( t^k \). We re-use the same text encoder \( f_{\phi} \) to encode the knowledge-augmented language description \( t^k \) as the original \( t \) as supervision for image \( x \).

Training. During training, for \( i \)-th image \( x_i \) and \( j \)-th language description \( t_j \) in a batch \( B \), we normalize their feature vectors in a hyper-sphere using \( u_i = \frac{f_{\phi}(x_i)}{\|f_{\phi}(x_i)\|} \) and \( v_j = \frac{f_{\phi}(t_j)}{\|f_{\phi}(t_j)\|} \), and their similarity is calculated as \( u_i^\top v_j \). A bidirectional supervised contrastive objective is considered to train the model:

\[
\min_{\{\theta, \phi\}} \mathcal{L}_{\text{IC}} = \mathcal{L}_{i2i} + \mathcal{L}_{i2i}, \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{L}_{i2i} = -\sum_{i \in B} \frac{1}{|P(i)|} \sum_{k \in P(i)} \log \frac{\exp(\tau u_i^\top v_k)}{\sum_{j \in B} \exp(\tau u_i^\top v_j)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_{i2i} = -\frac{1}{|Q(j)|} \sum_{k \in Q(j)} \sum_{j \in B} \log \frac{\exp(\tau u_i^\top v_j)}{\sum_{i \in B} \exp(\tau u_i^\top v_j)}
\]

where \( P(i) = \{k | k \in B, y_k = y_i \} \), \( Q(j) = \{k | k \in B, y_k = y_j \} \), and \( \tau \) is a temperature hyper-parameter controlling the strength of penalties on hard negative samples. Note (3) is a general form; it reduces to the training objective of CLIP [53] or ALIGN [26] when there is an one-to-one mapping between an image and its paired caption in a batch, i.e., \( P(i) = \{i\} \) and \( Q(j) = \{j\} \).

Evaluation. Given a downstream image classification task with a custom set of category names, we represent them with the knowledge-augmented prompt form in \( \mathcal{K} \); they are fed into the pre-trained text encoder \( f_{\phi} \) to obtain the class embedding. The test image \( x \) is encoded with \( f_{\phi}(x) \), and compared to all class embeddings to get its label from the best matching class.

Extensions with Modularized Modeling. In our study, we found it is key to ensure consistency between training and evaluation stages: if a model is trained with knowledge, the model is favored to be evaluated with knowledge. Similarly, if a model is trained without knowledge (e.g., CLIP/UniCL), adding knowledge directly in the evaluation stage results in a performance drop. However, due to the limited knowledge coverage in existing knowledge bases, \( s \) could be empty for a large number of queries \( q \). When the low coverage happens for a downstream evaluation dataset, we hypothesize that it may result in a train-evaluation inconsistency for our knowledge-augmented models, and thus lower performance.

To alleviate this issue, it is desired to have a modularized model that can switch between the cases with and without knowledge. Inspired by [66], we propose to employ adapters [23] to build the network branch to encode knowledge-augmented language \( t^k \), where serial MLP adapters are inserted after each self-attention and MLP modules for all Transformer layers of the text encoder, and \( t^k \) is passed through \( f_{\phi} \) and adapters. Meanwhile, the original \( f_{\phi} \) is reserved as the branch to encode vanilla natural language \( t \). Further, the proposed adapter-modularized architecture can also be used for efficient stage-wise model continual pre-training: one may start with a vanilla language-image model pre-trained on \( D \), and continue pre-train the adapters with knowledge-augmented data \( (\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{S}) \) to build its knowledge version.

3.3 Object Detection

Object detection (OD) typically involves two tasks: \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{OD}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{cls}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}} \), where the localization task \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}} \) aims to locate the presence of objects in an image with a bounding box, and classification task \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{cls}} \) determines what object categories are present in that box. Similar to the IC task above, we improve the categorization task of individual boxes \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{cls}} \) in OD with external knowledge, and keep \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}} \) the same. Specifically, we leverage GLIP [36] to reformulate OD as a phrase grounding task, by grounding each region proposed by \( \mathcal{L}_{\text{loc}} \) to phrases in a text sequence. For language encoding, we first augment a category name \( t \) into its knowledge-augmented form \( t^k = [q, s] \). This is different from IC in that \( p \) is excluded, as no prompt engineering is used in OD, as in [36]. In the original GLIP, a sequential text encoding scheme is used: a concatenated long sequence \( [q_1, \ldots, q_K, s_1, \ldots, q_K] \) over category names is considered as the text encoder input. In our case, simple concatenation \( [q_1, s_1, \ldots, q_K, s_K] \) will quickly break the max length requirement of the language encoder.
To resolve the issue, we propose a parallel text encoding scheme: each $t^k = [q, s]$ is passed through language encoder independently, we use the top-layer feature of [CLS] token as the contextual vector representation $\tilde{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times 1}$ of $t^k$: $\tilde{u} = f_\phi(t^k)$. Given $K$ categories, they can be encoded in parallel simultaneously in a batch, the encoded phrase feature sequence is the concatenation $U \in \mathbb{R}^{P \times K}$: $U = [\tilde{u}_1, \ldots, \tilde{u}_K]$. The region encoding is the same as in GLIP. The feature pyramid is $V \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times P}$: $V = f_\theta(x)$, where $M$ is the number of box features. The alignment scores $S_{\text{ground}}$ are computed:

$$S_{\text{ground}} = VU, \quad \mathcal{L}_{\text{cls}} = \mathcal{M}(S_{\text{ground}}; T)$$

where $T \in \{0, 1\}^{M \times K}$ is the target indicating match or no match, and $\mathcal{M}(S; T)$ is the focal loss [39]. The grounding model, consisting of the image encoder $f_\theta$, the language encoder $f_\phi$ and a cross-modal interaction head introduced in [36], is trained end-to-end by minimizing the loss defined in (4). In the evaluation stage, the external knowledge is also retrieved, and encoded in the same parallel encoding manner to enrich the category names in the downstream OD tasks.

4 Experimental Results

In this section, we examine our knowledge-augmented approach to answer three research questions. Q1: What are the general external knowledge sources for task-level transfer for core computer vision problems such as IC and OD? Q2: To what extent external knowledge benefits visual transfer learning? i.e., sample-efficiency in pre-training and downstream. Q3: Why does external knowledge help zero-shot transfer, illustrated with success and failure case studies?

4.1 Settings

Evaluation benchmark. We evaluate the transferability of the learned representations, by applying the proposed knowledge-augmented models to two computer vision task-level transfer settings, formally defined in [34]:

- **Zero/Few-shot image classification.** Following UniCL [71], this task evaluates to what extent a model understands novel concepts. We pre-train on ImageNet-21K [10] and GCC [58, 8] / YFCC [65] datasets, and report results on ImageNet-1K [10] and a suite of 20 datasets used in [53]. We use the same text prompts as in [53, 71], and report scores averaged over 20 datasets. UniCL/Florence [76] show superior performance to CLIP or ALIGN counterparts; UniCL is Florence in a controlled academic setting, trained on the large publicly available datasets [71].
- **Zero-shot object detection.** Following GLIP [36], we pre-train on Object365 [57], and transfer the learned visual representations for object detection on LVIS [19] and a suite of 13 small OD datasets, to check the generalization ability. The box mAP is reported.

Dataset statistics. The breakdown statistics of downstream 20 IC datasets and 13 OD datasets are reported in Appendix. We study our models based on the datasets described in Table 1. Due to the limited computational resources, our pre-training datasets are limited to the large publicly available datasets used in [71, 36]. This setting is also friendly to the academic community to allow...
reproducibility of the results. The number of visual concepts is identical to the number of categories for datasets with category names (e.g., ImageNet and Object-365). For image-text data (bottom 3 rows) of the IC block, we use Spacy [22] to extract the noun phrases. We also use a merged version of GCC-3M and GCC-12M denoted as GCC-15M. Given the pool of concepts, we then calculate the number of unique words and report it as the vocabulary size. For Concepts and Vocab Size, we report 2 numbers, representing the full set and for items whose frequency is larger than 5, respectively. The latter provides a sense of long-tailness. The statistics (e.g., ratio of #Instance / #Concept) clearly illustrates the varied trade-off over different datasets: image diversity, semantic-richness and long-tailness. For example, YFCC is the most long-tail dataset in IC, as it has low mean value and the largest standard derivation value in #Instance / #Concept. The concept overlap is computed as the percentage of concepts in a downstream dataset that are covered by the pre-training dataset. For 20-datasets and 13-datasets, the averaged overlap across individual datasets is reported. It measures the gap or difficulty in concept transfer between the pre-training and the downstream data.

### 4.2 Image Classification

**ImageNet-21K pre-training.** We start with a canonical setting, by pre-training on ImageNet-21K, where all ImageNet-1K images are excluded. We still see a small amount of concept overlap in Table[1] and hypothesize that some category names are given based on different level of WordNet hierarchy. The benefits of this setting are two-fold: it ensures distinctively less concept overlap, and all concepts can find their full WordNet knowledge. We report the results in Table[2]. For each checkpoint, we report the results without and with knowledge in the evaluation stage. We confirm two major findings below.

**F1:** All three knowledge sources are beneficial. In Section[3.1] we have introduced WordNet hierarchy $S_{wn}$, WordNet definition $S_{wn_def}$, and Wiktionary definition $S_{wiki_def}$ as external knowledge sources. It is shown that all three of them are effective, improving the zero-shot accuracy by absolute gain 1-2% on ImageNet-1K (from 27.61% to 29.61%) and 2-6% on the dataset suite in average (from 27.15% to 33.44%), respectively. Among them, Wiktionary definition $S_{wiki_def}$ turns out to be the most effective, therefore, we use it as the default knowledge source throughout the remaining experiments.

**F2:** The modularized approach is effective. Our results in Table[2] reveal that training-evaluation inconsistency in terms of involving knowledge can dramatically degrade the model performance. For example in the 1st row, the baseline UniCL is pre-trained without knowledge, its performance decreases from 27.61% to 5.26% when knowledge is added in the evaluation stage. In contrast, in the 4th row, our K-LITE is pre-trained with knowledge, its performance decrease from 33.44% to 29.03% if knowledge is excluded in the evaluation stage. Therefore, we consider a modularized approach with 2-branch in the model. First, we continue pre-train our modularized model from a 32-epoch knowledge-free checkpoint by only updating the Adapters on knowledge-augmented image-text pairs for 10 epochs. It already shows a performance gain from 27.61% to 28.40%. This suggests a more affordable solution to obtain knowledge-augmented models from existing models. Moreover, we can further boost the performance to 28.90% if we evaluate with two branches, each of which only passes its corresponding language version. Finally, we also train the modularized model from scratch, and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Method</th>
<th>Knowledge $\mathcal{S}$</th>
<th>ImageNet-1K</th>
<th>20 datasets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-branch, from scratch</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$S_{wn}$</td>
<td>27.43</td>
<td>29.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$S_{wn_def}$</td>
<td>22.87</td>
<td>29.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$S_{wiki_def}$</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>29.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-branch, continue pre-training</td>
<td>$S_{wiki_def}$</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>28.40/28.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-branch, from scratch</td>
<td>$S_{wiki_def}$</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>32.52/32.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Zero-shot task transfer performance by pre-training on ImageNet-21K dataset. The top block studies the effectiveness of knowledge sources $\mathcal{S}$, and the bottom block studies the modularized approach. For each downstream task, the 1st and 2nd column reports the results evaluated without and with knowledge, respectively. In other words, **green cells** indicate the consistency case while **orange cells** indicate the mis-matching case in terms of adding knowledge in training and evaluation. In the 2nd block with 2-branch approach, we report two numbers when evaluated with knowledge: using the knowledge branch only, and using two branches selectively.
Table 3: Overall comparisons of our knowledge-augmented models. Each model is pre-trained with 32 epochs following CLIP [53]/UniCL [71]. ♦ It indicates that the Combine scheme is used for the image-caption data, otherwise the default is the Concat scheme described in Section 3.2. The linear probing and fine-tuning results are reported for 5-shot settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th># Samples</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>ImageNet-1K</th>
<th>20 datasets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zero-shot</td>
<td>Zero-shot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImageNet-21K</td>
<td>13M (full)</td>
<td>UniCL</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>27.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13M (full)</td>
<td>K-LITE</td>
<td>29.61</td>
<td>33.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YFCC-14M +</td>
<td>14M (half)</td>
<td>UniCL</td>
<td>34.83</td>
<td>34.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImageNet-21K</td>
<td>14M (half)</td>
<td>K-LITE</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>35.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14M (half)</td>
<td>K-LITE♦</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>36.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27M (full)</td>
<td>UniCL</td>
<td>42.59</td>
<td>35.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27M (full)</td>
<td>K-LITE</td>
<td>45.28</td>
<td>38.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCC-15M +</td>
<td>15M (half)</td>
<td>UniCL</td>
<td>41.09</td>
<td>36.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImageNet-21K</td>
<td>15M (half)</td>
<td>K-LITE</td>
<td>44.08</td>
<td>39.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15M (half)</td>
<td>K-LITE♦</td>
<td>47.25</td>
<td>40.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28M (full)</td>
<td>UniCL</td>
<td>46.55</td>
<td>38.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28M (full)</td>
<td>K-LITE♦</td>
<td>48.65</td>
<td>41.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

it demonstrates a significant gain (absolute 4%) on ImageNet-1K, but comparable results on the 20 datasets. For fair comparisons with knowledge-free models, we train our models with one branch in the rest of experiments.

To demonstrate the performance of K-LITE in the extreme large-scale settings, we leverage the largest checkpoint of Florence [76] trained on 800M image-text pairs, and continue pre-training the model on ImageNet-21K with external knowledge. It improves the zero-shot ImageNet-1K accuracy of Florence from 83.74% to 85.80%. As a ablation baseline, continuing pre-training without knowledge yields 85.35%. The absolute 0.45% performance gain shows that external knowledge can still benefit transfer learning, though a huge amount of pre-training data is employed.

Pre-training on image-text-label data. The unification of image-label and image-caption as image-text-label has been demonstrated superior over either one of them [71]. Therefore, we report overall results on the combined data in Table 3. The few-shot learning results are reported with 5 training examples, using two model adaptation method: linear probing and full model fine-tuning. The average numbers over 3 random seeds are reported. K-LITE improves its knowledge-free counterpart UniCL in almost all the cases. Importantly, K-LITE can outperform UniCL using only half of the pre-training image-text pairs in several cases. It demonstrate the high sample-efficiency of K-LITE, and that external knowledge is an effective source to consider, when collecting large-scale image-text pairs to develop language-augmented visual models at scale.

Breakdown Analysis. One may wonder, what is the intuition for why external knowledge improves the zero-shot task transfer performance on a broad range of datasets. To answer this question, we compare the breakdown performance on all 20 dataset in Figure 3 for the ImageNet-21K checkpoints trained with and without Wiki knowledge. Out of 20 datasets, external knowledge shows superior/comparable/inferior performance to the baseline on 16/1/3 datasets, respectively. One prominent observation is that Wiki knowledge improves concept overlap for train-evaluation from 13.26% to 51.24% by average. It is easy to understand, concepts are explained in more commonly used words in Wiktionary, providing a bridge for train and evaluation. This is more detailedly reflected by the increased height of blue bar for most datasets in Figure 3. Interestingly, for all datasets with increased accuracy scores, there shows an increase of the concept overlap. In summary, knowledge is an effective approach to improve concept overlap, a prerequisite for good task transfer performance. In Figure 3(a), we provide success examples from three datasets with the most performance gain after adding knowledge.

Limitations. The failure cases that knowledge-augmented approach does not help mainly come from two scenarios: (i) No external knowledge is extracted from the given knowledge base (i.e., Wiktionary in this case), e.g., StanfordCars and FGVC Aircraft. They often require domain-specific
Figure 3: Performance improvement analysis with external knowledge. External knowledge can largely improve concept overlap between pre-training and evaluation stages, hence usually yields higher recognition scores. Knowledge coverage indicates the percentage of concepts that exist in the knowledge base for each downstream dataset.

(a) Success examples. The three datasets with largest improvement in Fig. 3: Flowers102, Food101 and OxfordPets. The description of the parent concept, material, shape, color etc. clarifies the concepts, boosting performance for the fine-grained classification tasks.

(b) Failure examples. The two datasets with the largest performance loss in Fig. 3: Left (EuroSat): both class name have the same knowledge. Middle & Right (VOC2007): The knowledge contains certain spurious words that confuse the models.

Figure 4: Case study of success and failure for the knowledge-augmented model in image classification. For each image, the top row is the knowledge-based prediction, while the bottom row is the baseline prediction without knowledge.

knowledge explanations to define a car brand (e.g., Volvo C30 Hatchback 2012 or Lamborghini Reventon Coupe 2008) or a aircraft model type (e.g., 737-200 or Tu-154), while Wiktionary can hardly provide such professional definitions. (ii) Despite the fact that knowledge is available, the quality is too low to provide useful information. In Figure 4(b), we provide failure examples from two datasets with the most performance lose after adding knowledge, which unfortunately introduces certain spurious words/concepts that confuse the models. In Figure 6 in Appendix, we show more...
4.3 Object detection

We evaluate the model’s ability to recognize diverse objects on LVIS [19] and 13 downstream datasets used in [36] in a zero-shot setting. We report on MiniVal containing 5,000 images on LVIS. Our K-LITE GLIP is trained with Wiktionary definitions. The results are presented in Table 4. The 1st row are the original numbers reported in [36], using the sequential text encoding. The 2nd row is our implementation of GLIP using parallel text encoding, whose effectiveness is validated by the comparable numbers with 1st row. The 3rd row is our knowledge-augmented GLIP, i.e., K-LITE. The benefit of using external knowledge is evident. On LVIS, the categories are divided into rare, common, frequent groups, based on the number of training images per category. K-LITE improves the detection performance for all three groups with an average of 2.8 points on LVIS, and particularly brings a 4.7 points improvement on MiniVal APc over the GLIP-A reported in [36]. We conclude that the enriched semantics of external knowledge significantly helps the model recognize concepts with a decent number of instances. Since LVIS has its own knowledge source $S_{LVIS}$, mostly built upon WordNet definitions [19], we evaluate our model with $S_{LVIS}$. We alter the external knowledge source to $S_{wn_path}$, $S_{wn_def}$, and $S_{wiki_def}$ in evaluation, which yields mAP 18.7, 21.4, 20.5, respectively. It verifies that our knowledge source extraction process is reliable. Similarly, K-LITE improve the 13 downstream OD datasets from 28.8 (or 27.5 with its own knowledge-free counterpart) to 31.7.

In Figure 5, we provide examples of object detection results. The pre-training dataset Object365 has concepts "bread/bun, fire hydrant", but does not contain concepts “doughnut, fireplug”. With external knowledge, the unseen concept “doughnut, fireplug” are explained with its shape and similar seen concepts, and thus help the model to precisely locate objects regions and categorize them into the correct class with higher confidence. However, similar to IC, there are failure cases.

---

Table 4: Zero-shot task transfer performance on object detection. APr/APc/APf indicates the AP values for rare, common, frequent group of categories on LVIS. Cell coloring follows the same protocol in Table 2. The baseline GLIP is implemented with parallel text encoding in Section 3.3 without external knowledge.
due to the fact that external knowledge contains spurious words (the last example in Figure 5), e.g., "water" appears in the definition of both "fireplug" and "garden hose". It confuses model in the categorization task, though the localization task is better executed.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we have presented a knowledge-augmented approach K-LITE to learn generic visual model for task-level transfer. General external knowledge sources including WordNet and Wiktionary are explored to enrich the natural language supervision, which is then used in both the language-image pre-training stage and the prompt-based evaluation stage. We have demonstrated the generality and effectiveness of our knowledge-augmented task-transfer framework in two core computer vision problems: image classification and object detection. Extensive experimental results show that K-LITE can achieve superior performance over existing methods on 20 IC datasets and 13 OD datasets, respectively. K-LITE also outperforms its knowledge-free counterpart UniCL using half of the pre-training dataset in the large-scale academic data setting, demonstrating that leveraging external knowledge is a promising direction in improving pre-training sample-efficiency for learning transferable visual models.
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A Experimental Results

We show more examples to illustrate how external knowledge affects visual recognition in Figure 6.

![Examples](image)

**Ukraine**: A country in Eastern Europe; was long part of the Russian Empire and Austro-Hungarian Empire, then of the Soviet Union.

**China**: A communist nation that covers a vast territory in eastern Asia; the most populous country in the world.

0: a mathematical element that when added to another number yields the same number

1: the smallest whole number or a numeral representing this number

**Lymph node**: Each of the small oval bodies of the lymphatic system, distributed along the lymphatic vessels, that are clustered in the armpits, groin, neck, chest and abdomen. They act as filters, with an internal honeycomb of connective tissue filled with lymphocytes and macrophages that collect and destroy bacteria, viruses and foreign matter from lymph. …

**Lymph node containing metastatic tumor tissue**: Thin, woven, gauze-like fabric.

Figure 6: More case studies for the knowledge-augmented model: Top (Country211), Middle (MNIST), Bottom (PatchCamelyon). External knowledge does not benefit the first 2 datasets significantly (performance gain +1.09% and 0.0%), as the extracted knowledge is not quite relevant to the specific classification task. In PatchCamelyon, the external knowledge improve the baseline with +14.0% absolutely accuracy, we hypothesize the knowledge describes visual appearance of tumor tissue.