

SADL: An Effective In-Context Learning Method for Compositional Visual QA

Long Hoang Dang, Thao Minh Le, Vuong Le, Tu Minh Phuong, Truyen Tran

Abstract—Large vision-language models (LVLMs) offer a novel capability for performing in-context learning (ICL) in Visual QA. When prompted with a few demonstrations of image-question-answer triplets, LVLMs have demonstrated the ability to discern underlying patterns and transfer this latent knowledge to answer new questions about unseen images without the need for expensive supervised fine-tuning. However, designing effective vision-language prompts, especially for compositional questions, remains poorly understood. Adapting language-only ICL techniques may not necessarily work because we need to bridge the visual-linguistic semantic gap: Symbolic concepts must be grounded in visual content, which does not share the syntactic linguistic structures. This paper introduces SADL, a new visual-linguistic prompting framework for the task. SADL revolves around three key components: SAMpling, DELiberation, and Pseudo-LABELing of image-question pairs. Given an image-question query, we sample image-question pairs from the training data that are in semantic proximity to the query. To address the compositional nature of questions, the deliberation step decomposes complex questions into a sequence of subquestions. Finally, the sequence is progressively annotated one subquestion at a time to generate a sequence of *pseudo-labels*. We investigate the behaviors of SADL under OpenFlamingo on large-scale Visual QA datasets, namely GQA, GQA-OOD, CLEVR, and CRIC. The evaluation demonstrates the critical roles of sampling in the neighborhood of the image, the decomposition of complex questions, and the accurate pairing of the subquestions and labels. These findings do not always align with those found in language-only ICL, suggesting fresh insights in vision-language settings.

Index Terms—visual-linguistic prompting, large vision-language models, in-context learning, compositional visual question answering.

I. INTRODUCTION

Large vision-language models (LVLMs) have recently achieved state-of-the-art in in-context learning (ICL) across various vision-language tasks [1], [5], [6], [25], [39]. In visual question answering (VQA), this is achieved by prompting the LVLMs with a few image-question-answer triplets. This success is particularly important as it is data efficient and allows for straightforward inference-only deployment without the need for costly tuning [32]. Nevertheless, there is still a lack of understanding in effectively devising vision-language prompts, especially for complex compositional questions.

Long Hoang Dang, Tu Minh Phuong are with the Posts and Telecommunications Institute of Technology, Hanoi, Vietnam. Email: {longhd, phuongtm}@ptit.edu.vn. Work done when Long was with Deakin.

Thao Minh Le, Truyen Tran are with the Applied Artificial Intelligence Institute, Deakin University, Australia. Email: {thao.le, truyen.tran}@deakin.edu.au.

Vuong Le is with the Amazon, Melbourne, Australia. Work done when Vuong was with Deakin. Email: levuong@amazon.com.

	Generic Few-shot examples	Reasoning guidance (CoT, sub-questions)	Query-specific samples	Sub-question ordering (optional)	Sub-question Pseudo labelling
Few-shot (Flamingo)	✓				
Deliberation (CoT, L2M)	✓	✓			
SADL (this paper)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Fig. 1. We study the prompting techniques for vision-language reasoning tasks to bridge the gap of compositional reasoning and LVLM inference-free reasoning.

In language-only settings, textual prompts have shown effectiveness when carefully sampled examples are used [22], [26], [36], along with deliberation steps like those found in Chain-of-Thought (CoT) [42] and Least-to-Most (L2M) [48], which break down the reasoning process into a chain of steps. However, it remains uncertain whether these techniques will translate to vision-language settings, where prompts involve both visual content and interleaved text. Visual QA, in particular, requires grounding linguistic concepts in visual content, extracting relevant information related to each step of reasoning [3], [4], [14], [16], [21], [27], [35], [44]. These steps cannot be easily described in linguistic form as in language-only settings. In our preliminary evaluations of these techniques, CoT and L2M offered only minimal differences compared to vanilla few-shot methods as in [1], [23], [24] on large-scale compositional VQA datasets. This result suggests the necessity for new multimodal prompting approaches.

Directly aiming at this challenge, this paper embarks a study on the scheme of ICL using *guided visual-linguistic prompting techniques*. We design a *prompting framework* called *SADL* to guide the inference of LVLMs in *compositional Visual QA* tasks and examine the effectiveness of *this inference-only scheme*. This framework revolves around three key components: SAMpling, DELiberation, and structured Pseudo-LABELing of image-question pairs. When faced with an image-question query, SADL first samples a few semantically related image-question pairs from the training data. This is hypothesized to enable LVLMs to recognize the focused reasoning patterns by learning *in-context* from demonstrations of similar visual content and questions. To handle the compositional nature of questions, we implement the deliberation step, inspired by recent works in LLMs [18], [48], which prompts an LLM to break down complex questions into a sequence of subquestions. Subsequently, the sequence is successively annotated by the same LVLM, one subquestion at a time, resulting in the generation of a sequence of *pseudo-*

labels. See Fig. 1 to see how SADL contributes to the state of the art.

We evaluate SADL using the OpenFlamingo framework [2] on large-scale Visual QA datasets, namely GQA [15], GQA-OD [17], CLEVR [16], and CRIC [10]. The results demonstrate three significant advantages of this guided prompting scheme:

1. Inference-only without fine-tuning, hence readily to use with out-of-the-box LVLMS, alleviating the heavy expertise and work load required in supervised training.

2. Maintaining a reliable performance on visual-linguistic compositional reasoning tasks, improving over state-of-the-art few-shot methods such as CoT and L2M.

3. Demonstrating a harmonic middle-ground hybrid of supervised-learning and few-shot learning where annotated labels and pseudo-labels are used effectively in a training-free inference-only scheme.

Key factors for success include sampling within the neighborhood of the image-question query, decomposing complex questions, and accurately pairing subquestions and pseudo-labels. These observations diverge from those found in language-only ICL, providing valuable insights in the context of vision-language settings.

II. RELATED WORK

a) Inference of LVLMS in VQA: Recent studies have shown that the large vision-language models (LVLMS) exhibit the in-context learning capability in the Visual Question Answering (VQA) task, yielding promising results. Tsimpoukelli et al. (2021) introduced a novel approach to training a vision encoder for a static language model, resulting in a multimodal system that can extend its proficiency to new vision-language tasks [39]. Alayrac et al. (2022) combined the potential of extensively pretrained vision and language models to rapidly adapt to the VQA task, using only a limited set of examples [1]. Yang et al. (2022) encoded the image into captions or tags, incorporating them into the few-shot examples, then asked GPT-3 to answer questions about the given images [46]. More recently, the latest large-scale multimodal model, GPT-4, as evidenced in [5], [33] has showcased the capability to process both image and text as inputs, displaying strong performance under an inference-only setting. However, there remains a big gap in the literature concerning effective methods for prompting LVLMS, especially for compositional VQA. We address this challenge by focusing on the behaviors of our proposed SADL framework under OpenFlamingo [2] using extensive large-scale Visual QA datasets to extract insights in vision-language settings.

b) Demonstrations with deliberation steps : These prompting methods have proved beneficial. Chain-of-thought prompting [42] learns the reasoning process by breaking down the mapping from input to output into a chain of steps. To avoid the manual annotating limitation, Zhang et al. (2022) leveraged a prompt “Let’s think step by step” to automate the generation of chain-of-thought structures [47]. Along the same lines, Press et al. (2022) asked LLMs to deconstruct the complex question into simpler ones, addressing these sub-questions before combine them with a search engine

to create the prompt [34]. Wang et al. (2022) proposed an innovative approach, iCAP, that can adjust the context of the prompt in every deliberation step [40]. Additionally, Zhou et al. (2023) introduce a prompt strategy that comprising two stages: query LLMs to decompose complex problem and solving these subproblems sequentially [48]. SADL pushes along this line by decomposing compositional questions into a succession of subquestions, and ensuring precise alignment between subquestions and corresponding labels.

c) Demonstrations selection: The shared objective among all prompting strategies falling under the demonstration selection category is to retrieve “high-quality” examples for the ICL process. Liu et al. (2022) utilize nearest neighbor algorithm to select the ICL examples that highly relevant to the text query [26]. Beside distance metrics, mutual information has been used to seek the “good” prompt from a set of candidate prompt [37]. Similarly, the selection of top- k cross-lingual demonstrations has been employed to enhance the alignment between source and target inputs [38]. Additionally, Gonen et al. (2022) [11] shown that choosing low perplexity prompts can boost the performance of LLMs model. Levy et al. (2023) focused on retrieving demonstrations that contribute to the diversity of ICL examples [22]. While these efforts have yielded promising results, they are limited in the language-only setting. In contrast, our proposed SADL selects query-specific demonstrations that target visual-linguistic queries whose language-visual content relations play a crucial role.

III. METHOD

A. Preliminaries

We study a VQA setting in which a pre-trained Large Vision Language Model (LVLMS) is parameterized by θ . This model is prompted by a question q regarding a visual content v given a context C . The LVLMS then returns an answer a^* sampled from the conditional distribution:

$$a^* = \arg \max_{a \in A} P_{\theta}(a | C, v, q) \quad (1)$$

In this paper, we will focus on in-context learning (ICL) scenarios, where C consists of k demonstrations in the form:

$$C = \{c_i | c_i \equiv (v_i, q_i, r_i, a_i); \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, k\} \quad (2)$$

where r_i is optional deliberation step. Here the model parameter θ remains unchanged, but the model behaviors are shaped by the demonstrations, implicitly modeling the underlying patterns in the context [30]. For instance, in the context of *chain-of-thought* [42], r_i is a sequence of reasoning steps to arrive at a_i .

It has been shown recently that the sampling and formatting of $C = \{c_i\}$ play a critical role in deriving the performance of the LLMs [12], [28], [38], [43]. However, little is known about how to design an effective context C in vision-language systems. A straightforward idea is to borrow techniques confirmed in LLMs into this new multimodal setting. To test the idea, we perform a preliminary study on how recent language prompting techniques such as




Fig. 2. Overview of the SADL framework. Advancing the direction of in-context learning for VQA, we introduce three new components (dark green boxes) for effective compositional reasoning using LVLm. The *Proximal Sampling* uses L-V similarity to select the *query-specific samples*. Their prioritized list of sub-questions are constructed by *Question Decomposition* and used to guide the compositional reasoning in the *Pseudo-labeling* step, providing the effective context for query answering.

vanilla few-shot, Chain-of-Thought (CoT) [42] and Least-to-Most (L2M) [48] work on VQA. Particularly, we conducted exploratory experiments using an open-source LVLm called OpenFlamingo [2] in a two-shots setting on the three large-scale compositional VQA datasets: GQA [15], CLEVR [16], and CRIC [10] (details in the Experiments section). The results (See Table II, IV, and I) show that more deliberate prompts such as CoT and L2M only slightly improve over the vanilla few-shot by less than 3 percent-points on all datasets, and L2M is not better than CoT. This result contradicts with the findings on language-only similar tasks. *The discrepancy suggests that linguistic prompting techniques that work on language-only setting do not necessarily translate to vision-language settings.* We conjecture that in VQA, encoded visual content is not readily mapped into discrete concepts to allow straightforward visual grounding via standard self-attention mechanisms found in Transformer-based LVLm architectures. Thus fresh multimodal prompting methods are required.

B. SADL

We now present an effective in-context learning method with a novel strategy for *SAM*pling, *DEL*iberation, and *STR*uctured *PSEUDO-L*abeling (abbreviated as *SADL*) to guide the LVLm for this VQA task. The focus of the method is on the coupling between the visual content and compositional linguistic questions, implemented as sampling strategies to construct the context $C = \{c_i\}_{i=1}^k$ in Eq. (2). Drawing from the previous generally transferable insights in LLMs, we hypothesize that the visual-linguistic context C is effective when it contains demonstrations that are both (a) *task-representative*—those demonstrating exemplar reasoning patterns in solving the task, but not necessarily semantically proximal to the query and the content, and (b) *query-specific*—those semantically similar to the current query and content. Intuitively, the former may allow the LVLm to draw from the syntactic analogy between semantically distal instances. On the other hand, the latter makes the context C semantically coherent, thereby sharpening the distribution of internal “topics” recognized by the LVLm [45], which helps generate better answers.

Yet another crucial aspect is the compositionality of the question, which can be dealt with by breaking it into smaller subquestions which are easier to answer. We argue that question decomposition is even more important in visual-linguistic settings because it will be much easier for the LVLm to reason

about a single aspect of the visual content, which is itself typically compositional (e.g., a scene is typically composed of objects and their relations, and an object is composed of parts).

Toward this goal, we design SADL with three new steps: (1) Sample selection, (2) Question decomposition, and (3) Subquestion (pseudo-)labeling. Fig. 2 provides an overview of the SADL prompting techniques.

C. Generic-specific sample selection

For Step 1, the SADL employs two sampling strategies for demonstrations – generic and specific with respect to the visual content and the question.

Query-generic samples: Representative demonstrations highlight inference patterns that one may use to answer a question about a randomly chosen image, which are not necessarily related to the target image. In practice, the patterns can be in the form of chain-of-thoughts [42] or a set of sub-problems generated from the pre-defined complex problem [18], [48]. We use a small set of k_1 such patterns, shared among all test queries.

Query-specific samples: For each image/question pair, query-specific demonstrations are drawn from semantically similar visual content and questions. In particular, given an image-question pair (v, q) from a testing set, we select a small set of $k_2 = k - k_1$ most similar samples from a library of samples. In practice, we use training sets of respective datasets as the library. It is worth mentioning that while the image often contains a significant amount of redundant information, the question does not. Therefore, we first search for samples in the training set with the most similar question to the testing question q . Among the samples with similar questions, we then pick the ones whose associated images are most similar to the testing image v . To represent the semantics of images, we use image captions generated by a LVLm model [2] or high-level features extracted by Vision Transformer [8]. The degree of similarity is measured by cosine distance between the questions and images in feature space.

D. Question decomposition

This step translates each sample question q_i into a set of m subquestions $\{\hat{q}_{i,1}, \hat{q}_{i,2}, \dots, \hat{q}_{i,m}\}$. This is done by prompting an external LLM using few-shot learning, where each shot

has the format: “To answer the question: [compositional question], we need to know: [subquestion 1], [subquestion 2], ... [subquestion m]”.

As an illustration of the question decomposing process, consider the following question: “Are there men to the left of the person holding the umbrella?”, we prompt the Vicuna 13B model [7] to return a set of subquestions: “Is the umbrella present in the image?”, “Is there a person present in the image?”, “Is the person holding the umbrella?”, “Are there men present in the image?”, and “Are there men positioned to the left of the person holding the umbrella?”. Fig. 3 displays our prompt for the question decomposition step.

A chat between a curious user and an artificial intelligence assistant. "The assistant gives helpful, detailed, and polite answers to the user's questions.

USER:
 To answer the question: 'Are there men to the left of the person that is holding the umbrella?', we need to know: 'Is the umbrella in the image?', 'Is the person in the image?', 'Is the person that is holding the umbrella in the image?', 'Are there men in the image?', 'Are there men to the left of the person that is holding the umbrella?'. To answer the question: 'Is the fence behind the gate both brown and metallic?', we need to know: 'Is the gate in the image?', 'Is the fence behind the gate in the image?', 'Is the fence behind the gate brown?', 'Is the fence behind the gate both brown and metallic?'. To answer the question: 'Is the person to the right of the traffic cone wearing a necklace?', we need to know: 'Is the traffic cone in the image?', 'Is the person to the right of the traffic cone in the image?', 'Is a necklace in the image?', 'Is the person wearing a necklace?'. To answer the question: 'Do the sneakers and the pants have different colors?', we need to know: 'Is the sneakers in the image?', 'Is the pants in the image?', 'What is the color of the sneakers?', 'What is the color of the pants?', 'Are the colors of the sneakers and the pants different?'. To answer the question: 'Does the chair at the desk look wooden and yellow?', we need to know: 'Is the desk in the image?', 'Is the chair at the desk in the image?', 'Does the chair look wooden?', 'Does the chair look yellow?', 'Does the chair at the desk look wooden and yellow?'. To answer the question: "' + [compositional question] + "', we need to know:

ASSISTANT:

Fig. 3. Example of our prompt to instruct the Vicuna 13B model to decompose the complex compositional question.

Inspired by the intuition that human often find it more productive to answer easy questions first and gain insight to answer more difficult questions [9], we can optionally orders the resulting subquestions (and corresponding answers when suitable) by their increasing difficulty level. To estimate the difficulty level of each subquestion, we employ the Berkeley Neural Parser [19] to parse each subquestion and obtain its syntactic tree. The level of difficulty to each subquestion is then assigned based on the number of significant noun phrases in its parsed tree. For example, the question “Are there **men** positioned to the left of **the person holding the umbrella**?” has the level of difficulty of 3 because it contains three significant noun phrases as as indicated in bold text.

E. Subquestion (pseudo-)labeling

Once a sample question is decomposed into a series of subquestions, we annotate each subquestion with an answer. For query-generic samples, the answers are manually given. On the other hand, for query-specific samples, the answers are auto-generated, i.e., pseudo-labeling by applying the adjustment procedure. The automated annotation proceeds as follows. Given an initial prompt including the set of query-generic samples, and sample image v_i , the LVLMM is asked to

generated an answer $\hat{a}_{i,1}$ for the simplest subquestion $\hat{q}_{i,1}$. Then, this subquestion $\hat{q}_{i,1}$ and its generated answer $\hat{a}_{i,1}$ are appended to the prompt, and the LVLMM will predict the answer for the second subquestion $\hat{q}_{i,2}$. The iterative process continues until the answer $\hat{a}_{i,m}$ to the last subquestion $\hat{q}_{i,m}$ is obtained. If $\hat{q}_{i,m}$ is answered correctly ($\hat{a}_{i,m} = a_{i,m}$), the model proceeds to the next stage. If not, the ground truth answer $a_{i,m}$ of the question $\hat{q}_{i,m}$ is provided to the LVLMM, and it is compelled to answer the subquestions from the beginning. This iterative adjustment procedure ensures that the LVLMM refines its predictions for pivotal subquestions, mimicking a step-by-step reasoning process to arrive at the correct answer.

F. Query answering

Finally, we ask the LVLMM to answer the testing question q about the testing image v . Here, the question q will be decomposed into a set of subquestions. Then, the LVLMM is called to answer the chain of testing subquestions sequentially, utilizing both query-generic and query-specific samples. As the LVLMM’s output is unconstrained, we need to semantically align the output with one of given possible answers in the answer set A of Eq. (1). More specifically, we align to the closest word in A using cosine similarity.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

We implement our proposed prompting technique SADL with the pretrained OpenFlamingo¹ [2] as the LVLMM. We follow the same setting as in prior studies [48], where the LVLMM are provided with $k = 2$ demonstrations.

A. Datasets

We evaluate the effectiveness of SADL through comprehensive experiments across various compositional VQA benchmarks. These benchmarks include GQA [15], GQA-OOD [17], CLEVR [16], and CRIC [10]. We intentionally choose these benchmarks as they are created to justify different aspects of machine learning models and often necessitate the use of design-specific supervised methods [13], [14], [31]:

GQA comprises over 22M compositional questions, derived from over 110K images from Visual Genome [20]. It is currently the most extensive benchmark for compositional visual reasoning with a diverse set of questions. These questions are challenging as they require different reasoning skills such as spatial reasoning, relational reasoning, logic and comparison.

GQA-OOD is a out-of-distribution variant derived from the GQA dataset. It consists of nearly 54K questions associated with 10K images. Answering questions in this dataset not only requires the same reasoning capability as it does in the GQA data but also the ability to overcome the distribution shifts between train and test splits.

CRIC dataset offers 494K balanced and compositional questions, accompanied by 96K real images from Visual Genome. Unlike the questions in GQA and GQA-OOD, the questions in this dataset focus more on the ability to understand visually grounded commonsense knowledge.

¹https://github.com/mlfoundations/open_flamingo

```
<image>Question:what furniture behind the table can be used for storing
magazines? Short Answer:bookshelf

<image>Question:is the object that is behind the table usually used for
holding books? Short Answer:yes
```

Fig. 4. Example of vanilla few-shot prompting (two-shot setting)

```
<image>Question:what furniture behind the table can be used for storing
magazines? Chain of thought: Look at the image. First, locate the table
in the image. Then find the furniture behind the table can be used for
storing magazines. Short Answer:bookshelf.

<image>Question:is the object that is behind the table usually used for
holding books? Chain of thought: Look at the image and find the object
behind the table. Respond with yes if the object is used for holding books,
and no otherwise. Short Answer:yes
```

Fig. 5. Example of chain-of-thought prompting (two-shot setting)

CLEVR includes 860K questions annotated from 100K synthetic images of 3D objects. Thanks to the synthetic nature of the data, it serves as a true out-of-distribution setting to test the generalization capability of LVLMs as they are never exposed to data of this type. Additionally, questions in this dataset are more complex as they contain higher order of object’s relationships.

B. Computing infrastructure

SADL is implemented using Python 3.9.16 and Pytorch 2.0.0. All experiments in this paper are conducted utilizing GPU NVIDIA A100 SXM4 40GB with total 320 GB of memory, running on Ubuntu 20.04.4 LTS.

C. Baseline prompting techniques

Vanilla few-shot prompting. For the first baseline, we examine the vanilla few-shot prompting [1], wherein the model seeks to identify an answer a^* for a question q that is grounded with an image v , given in-context samples C structured as image-query-answer triplets $C = \{c_i \mid c_i \equiv (v_i, q_i, a_i); \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$. Fig. 4 displays an example prompt.

Chain-of-thought. For the second baseline, we examine the chain-of-thought prompting [42], wherein the in-context samples C is represented as:

$$C = \{c_i \mid c_i \equiv (v_i, q_i, r_i, a_i); \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, k\} \quad (3)$$

where r_i is a sequence of reasoning steps to arrive at a_i . Fig. 5 displays an example prompt.

Least-to-most For the third baseline, we examine the least-to-most prompting [48], where r_i in Eq. 3 is a set of sub-problems generated from the pre-defined complex problem. Fig. 6 displays an example prompt.

D. Comparison against SOTAs

We compare SADL against recent language prompting techniques such as vanilla few-shot prompting, Chain-of-Thought prompting (CoT) [42], and Least-to-Most (L2M) prompting

```
<image>Question:what furniture behind the table can be used for storing
magazines? Subquestion: is the table in the image? Short Answer:yes.
Subquestion: is there any furniture behind the table? Short Answer:yes.
Subquestion: what there any furniture behind the table? Short Answer:
bookshelf. Subquestion: what furniture behind the table can be used for
storing magazines? Short Answer: bookshelf.
```

```
<image>Question:is the object that is behind the table usually used for
holding books? Subquestion: is the table in the image? Short Answer:yes.
Subquestion: is there any object behind the table? Short Answer:yes.
Subquestion: what is the object behind the table? Short Answer:bookshelf.
Subquestion: is the object that is behind the table usually used for
holding books? Short Answer: yes.
```

Fig. 6. Example of least-to-most prompting (two-shot setting)

[48] on the mentioned datasets. More details about these techniques are available in the supplementary material.

Results on CRIC: Table I presents experimental results on commonsense questions on CRIC dataset. It is clear that SADL significantly outperforms the others by large margins on all question types. Among these question types, we observe that knowledge graph related questions are beneficial the most from our sample selection, as the knowledge retrieved from our provided samples are more transferable to answer these questions. These other question types, including “QueryObjSG”, “QueryAtt” and “VerifyAtt”, are more scene-specific questions hence, the improvements are mostly from better visual grounding capabilities offered by SADL. We provide more insights on the effects of each designed component of SADL on the overall performance later in the ablation studies.

Results on GQA: Table II details the experiment results on the GQA validation set. As shown, SADL surpasses all the considered baselines across various metrics by large margins. Particularly, SADL achieves an overall accuracy of 40.67%, gaining an improvement of over 8.0 absolute points compared to CoT and L2M. This improvement is evenly distributed across both binary and open-ended questions. More importantly, we observe unprecedented improvements regarding “validity”, “plausibility” and “distribution” that are on par with supervised methods [15]. We believe this is a direct result of our local sample selection that facilitates LVM to draw topic-focused analogies relevant to the question scope (See our Discussion section). It is to note that like all other prompting methods, ours also suffers from hallucinations and inconsistent responses, resulting in poor “consistency” of only around 10.0%, while SoTA supervised methods reportedly score over 80.0% on this metric [15]. This suggests a need for future studies in this space.

Results on GQA-OOD: Interestingly, SADL achieves even more significant improvement over the other prompting methods in out-of-distribution settings, as evidenced in Table III. Specifically, it gains around 28.0% performance increase compared to CoT overall with a 30.0% relative improvement of prediction of the head distribution of answers and 22.8% relative improvement of the tail distribution of answers. We speculate this is a benefit of our subquestion pseudo-labeling that provides better local reasoning patterns to infer rare concepts (See more in our Discussion section).

Results on CLEVR: Our proposed SADL also outperforms all other prompting methods when answering questions in the

TABLE I
EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS ON CRIC. (OBJ = OBJECT; KG = KNOWLEDGE GRAPH; SG = SCENE GRAPH; ATT = ATTRIBUTE)

Model	KG-specific questions		Scene-specific questions			Overall↑
	QueryObjKG↑	VerifyKG↑	QueryObjSG↑	QueryAtt↑	VerifyAtt↑	
Vanilla prompting	27.65	37.07	16.82	18.16	22.99	24.55
Chain-of-thought (CoT)	24.02	39.49	13.56	21.10	36.64	25.19
Least-to-Most (L2M)	27.08	32.32	18.89	24.18	28.21	25.69
SADL (Ours)	42.85	55.54	27.30	30.38	47.00	39.47

TABLE II
EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS ON GQA.

Model	Binary↑	Open↑	Consistency↑	Validity↑	Plausibility↑	Distribution↓	Accuracy↑
Vanilla prompting	41.64	19.85	9.60	67.55	63.56	30.79	30.39
Chain-of-thought (CoT)	42.93	22.18	12.16	71.18	67.07	31.32	32.22
Least-to-Most (L2M)	46.96	18.78	10.21	69.48	65.77	35.09	32.42
SADL (Ours)	56.10	26.19	8.97	92.47	87.66	7.68	40.67

TABLE III
EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS ON GQA-OOD; “ACC” IS SHORT FOR ACCURACY.

Model	acc-all↑	acc-tail↑	acc-head↑
Vanilla prompting	25.39	21.15	27.53
Chain-of-thought (CoT)	27.69	22.65	30.25
Least-to-Most (L2M)	26.60	20.96	29.45
SADL (Ours)	35.46	27.82	39.33

TABLE IV
EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS ON CLEVR.

Model	Accuracy↑
Vanilla prompting	34.38
Chain-of-thought (CoT)	37.04
Least-to-Most (L2M)	37.15
SADL (Ours)	41.14

CLEVR dataset, although with smaller gap than the other real-world datasets. Experimental results on this dataset is provided in Table IV. Particularly, SADL achieves 41.14% overall accuracy on validation set, nearly 4.0 points gained from L2M. These results once again confirm the effectiveness of our prompting technique in solving compositional questions, even on synthetic images.

E. What make SADL work?

To gain deeper insights into the three-step design of SADL, we conduct ablation studies on design choices using the CRIC dataset (See Table V). Overall, skipping any of the proposed steps would negatively impact the overall performance. Our ablation experiments include:

Random, non-specific demonstrations: We replace the query-specific samples by a random subset of samples drawn from the training set to observe the impact of the query semantic proximity. This leads to a significant decrease in performance, by nearly 12.0 points, equivalently a 29.5% relative drop. The result confirms the role of using similar in-context samples in the few-shot prompting setting.

W/o question decomposition: Without decomposing questions, the performance is drastically down to 26.54% from 39.47% of the full method. The result aligns with prior studies [34] and again confirms the critical role of this deliberation

TABLE V
MODEL BEHAVIORS AGAINST DESIGN CHOICES ON CRIC.

Model	Val. Acc.↑
Full model	39.47
- random, non-specific demonstrations	27.81
- w/o question decomposition	26.54
- randomizing position of pseudo-labels	30.46
- fixed pseudo-labels as “unknown”	16.83




Fig. 7. Performance of SADL against the other few-shot prompting techniques on a set of multi-step compositional questions in CRIC.

step in the ICL demonstration towards answering compositional questions.

Randomizing position of pseudo-labels: To test whether exact pairing of sub-questions and pseudo-labels is crucial, we shuffle the positions of auto-generated pseudo-labels. This results in a significant drop of 9 points, or a 22.8% decrease from the full method. The result reveals that observations in language-only ICL are not necessarily generalizable to vision-language large models as [29] has found that exact input-output pairing is not required (Also see the third point in our Discussion section).

Fixed pseudo-labels as “unknown”: To further validate




Fig. 8. Illustration of the dataflow inside SADL prompting framework on an example query. Query-specific and query-generic sample questions are decomposed into respective sets of subquestions. They guide the process of autonomous pseudo-labels generation and adjustment, leading LVLMM to answer the query correctly.

the impact of quality pseudo-labels of subquestions on the performance, we conduct another ablation study where prefix them as all “unknown”. These noisy labels seem to spoil the contextual information to LVLMs and mislead the predictions, resulting in a poor performance of only 16.83%. This again confirms the strong correlation between the quality of pseudo-labels and correct responses by LVLMs.

F. Performance on highly complex questions

To assess the advantages of our proposed SADL in answering complex compositional questions, we conduct an experiment using a subset of highly intricate questions extracted from the CRIC dataset. These questions necessitate a minimum of five reasoning steps to reach the answers. The findings, as shown in Fig. 7, clearly demonstrate that SADL outperforms current SoTA methods by large margins, i.e., 45% relative gain over L2M, when tackling complex questions. These results strongly evidenced the efficacy of SADL in facilitating multi-step compositional reasoning tasks in comparison with existing approaches.

G. Visualization

Fig. 8 provides a representative example that illustrates the decomposed demonstrations produced through our proposed SADL prompting framework. It clearly showcases how SADL leverages relevant information from query-specific samples, decomposes complex questions, iteratively generates high-quality pseudo-labels, and gathers all this contextual information to arrive at the correct answer.

V. CONCLUSION

In-context learning (ICL) is a recent phenomenon, thought to be an “emergent ability” found in sufficiently large language models [41] and vision-language models [1]. Consequently, we have not yet established a widely accepted understanding of the underlying principles driving the effectiveness of ICL in language-only settings; and our understanding in vision-language contexts is very limited. Our work contributes in this direction by investigating design choices for visual-linguistic prompting, tested on compositional Visual QA. The findings include:

- 1) **Local sample selection:** Random sampling of demonstrations was found to hurt performance substantially. While this outcome aligns with earlier observations in language-only scenarios, we anticipate the impact to be even more pronounced in Visual QA due to the distinctly content-centric nature of the task. Compositional questions necessitate a sophisticated deliberation by decomposing the answering process into multiple reasoning steps, each of which asks for language grounding and language-induced visual relations [14], [21]. When related samples are introduced in the prompt, their deliberations might facilitate LVLMs to draw topics-focused analogies about these step-by-step language-vision interactions.

- 2) **Deliberation:** Question decomposition by prompting an LLM was a key to SADL’s performance, although we did

not perform extensive search on the best prompting format. This is inline with the “self-ask” technique used by [34] but differs in the way we used a separate LLM for the step. We note that our question decomposition is a problem-solving strategy, but it does not result in a precise chain of logical reasoning. While answering easier questions might give some early clues and insights, compositional question might benefit more from parallel collecting of evidences – the topics/Bayesian assumption [45]. Also, the underlying neural architecture of LVLMs, the Transformer, does not depend on orders.

- 3) **The structured pseudo-label space:** Random ordering of pseudo-labels for subquestions resulted in a large performance drop, which sharply contrasts with the findings observed in few-shot language-only scenarios [29]. This divergence could stem from the fact that subquestions are strongly connected, resulting in a structured label space for each question. Shuffling the labels could potentially disrupt this structural coherence. Another plausible explanation could be the intrinsic contextual nature of Visual QA, wherein associating answers with their corresponding subquestions provides more meaningful local reasoning patterns.² Introducing randomness to the pairing might have disrupted the coherent deliberative patterns. This effect is further emphasized by the considerably more pronounced decline in performance when pairing subquestions with placeholder answers. In such instances, LVLMs lack semantic reasoning analogies to draw upon, thus contributing to the major drop in performance.

- 1) **Limitations:** We caution the readers that our study used a single open LVLM (for visual-linguistic QA) and an open LLM (for question decomposition), namely the recent OpenFlamingo and Vicuna 13B, respectively. However, the SADL framework is generic and can be applied with any LVLMs. Since OpenFlamingo is based on Flamingo [1], it inherits weaknesses of the original model including sporadic instances of hallucinations and ungrounded assumptions. Moreover, it may struggle to generalize effectively to sequences longer than those encountered during training. The computational cost of inference does not scale too well with the number of shots. We acknowledge that the outcomes of our study are not yet comparable to the state-of-the-art supervised learning accompanied by domain knowledge. Nevertheless, as LVLMs continue to advance in sophistication in the foreseeable future, there is a possibility that these limitations will be mitigated.

- 2) **Conclusion:** We have introduced SADL, a novel multimodal prompting framework designed to guide in-context few-shot learning in pretrained Large Vision Language Models (LVLMs), focusing on complex compositional Visual QA tasks. This approach holds the promise of a novel training-free, inference-only strategy that facilitates rapid deployment. Through the utilization of SADL, we demonstrated that query-focused semantic sampling of demonstrations plays a crucial role in Visual QA, highlighting the difference between language-only and vision-language settings. To devise deliberative reasoning demonstrations, we decompose a composi-

²We did not put the image before the subquestion-answer pair to reduce the context length.

tional question into subquestions, each of which is automatically labelled using only the label for the original question. We demonstrate the efficacy of SADL coupled with OpenFlamingo on large-scale Visual QA datasets, namely GQA, GQA-OOD, CLEVR, and CRIC. The results highlight the critical roles of sampling in the neighborhood of the image, the decomposition of complex questions, and the precise pairing of the subquestions and labels. These findings offer new insights in vision-language settings.

REFERENCES

- [1] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:23716–23736, 2022.
- [2] Anas Awadalla, Irena Gao, Joshua Gardner, Jack Hessel, Yusuf Hanafy, Wanrong Zhu, Kalyani Marathe, Yonatan Bitton, Samir Gadre, Jenia Jitsev, Simon Kornblith, Pang Wei Koh, Gabriel Ilharco, Mitchell Wortsman, and Ludwig Schmidt. Openflamingo, Mar. 2023.
- [3] Yandong Bi, Huajie Jiang, Yongli Hu, Yanfeng Sun, and Baocai Yin. Fair attention network for robust visual question answering. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, pages 1–1, 2024.
- [4] Yandong Bi, Huajie Jiang, Yongli Hu, Yanfeng Sun, and Baocai Yin. See and learn more: Dense caption-aware representation for visual question answering. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 34(2):1135–1146, 2024.
- [5] Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott Lundberg, et al. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with GPT-4. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12712*, 2023.
- [6] Yi-Syuan Chen, Yun-Zhu Song, Cheng Yu Yeo, Bei Liu, Jianlong Fu, and Hong-Han Shuai. Sinc: Self-supervised in-context learning for vision-language tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 15430–15442, October 2023.
- [7] Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality, March 2023.
- [8] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *ArXiv*, abs/2010.11929, 2020.
- [9] Dheeru Dua, Shivanshu Gupta, Sameer Singh, and Matt Gardner. Successive prompting for decomposing complex questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.04092*, 2022.
- [10] Difei Gao, Ruiping Wang, Shiguang Shan, and Xilin Chen. Cric: A vqa dataset for compositional reasoning on vision and commonsense. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(5):5561–5578, 2023.
- [11] Hila Gonen, Srini Iyer, Terra Blevins, Noah A. Smith, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Demystifying prompts in language models via perplexity estimation, 2022.
- [12] Or Honovich, Uri Shaham, Samuel R Bowman, and Omer Levy. Instruction induction: From few examples to natural language task descriptions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10782*, 2022.
- [13] Drew Hudson and Christopher D Manning. Learning by abstraction: The neural state machine. In *NeurIPS*, pages 5901–5914, 2019.
- [14] Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning. Compositional attention networks for machine reasoning. *ICLR*, 2018.
- [15] Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning. Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6700–6709, 2019.
- [16] Justin Johnson, Bharath Hariharan, Laurens van der Maaten, Li Fei-Fei, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Ross Girshick. Clevr: A diagnostic dataset for compositional language and elementary visual reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2901–2910, 2017.
- [17] Corentin Kervadec, Grigory Antipov, Moez Baccouche, and Christian Wolf. Roses are red, violets are blue... but should vqa expect them to? In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2776–2785, 2021.
- [18] Tushar Khot, Harsh Trivedi, Matthew Finlayson, Yao Fu, Kyle Richardson, Peter Clark, and Ashish Sabharwal. Decomposed prompting: A modular approach for solving complex tasks. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [19] Nikita Kitaev, Steven Cao, and Dan Klein. Multilingual constituency parsing with self-attention and pre-training. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2018.
- [20] Ranjay Krishna, Yuke Zhu, Oliver Groth, Justin Johnson, Kenji Hata, Joshua Kravitz, Stephanie Chen, Yannis Kalantidis, Li-Jia Li, David A. Shamma, Michael S. Bernstein, and Li Fei-Fei. Visual genome: Connecting language and vision using crowdsourced dense image annotations. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 123:32 – 73, 2016.
- [21] Thao Minh Le, Vuong Le, Svetha Venkatesh, and Truyen Tran. Dynamic language binding in relational visual reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.14603*, 2020.
- [22] Itay Levy, Ben Bogin, and Jonathan Berant. Diverse demonstrations improve in-context compositional generalization. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1401–1422, 2023.
- [23] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Liangyu Chen, Jinghao Wang, Fanyi Pu, Jingshan Yang, Chunyuan Li, and Ziwei Liu. Mimic-it: Multi-modal in-context instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05425*, 2023.
- [24] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12597*, 2023.
- [25] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- [26] Jiachang Liu, Dinghan Shen, Yizhe Zhang, Bill Dolan, Lawrence Carin, and Weizhu Chen. What makes good in-context examples for GPT-3? In *Proceedings of Deep Learning Inside Out (DeeLIO 2022): The 3rd Workshop on Knowledge Extraction and Integration for Deep Learning Architectures*, pages 100–114, Dublin, Ireland and Online, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [27] Jin Liu, Jialong Xie, Fengyu Zhou, and Shengfeng He. Question type-aware debiasing for test-time visual question answering model adaptation. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, pages 1–1, 2024.
- [28] Yao Lu, Max Bartolo, Alastair Moore, Sebastian Riedel, and Pontus Stenetorp. Fantastically ordered prompts and where to find them: Overcoming few-shot prompt order sensitivity. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8086–8098, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [29] Sewon Min, Xixi Lyu, Ari Holtzman, Mikel Artetxe, Mike Lewis, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Rethinking the role of demonstrations: What makes in-context learning work? In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11048–11064, 2022.
- [30] Suvir Mirchandani, Fei Xia, Pete Florence, Brian Ichter, Danny Driess, Montserrat Gonzalez Arenas, Kanishka Rao, Dorsa Sadigh, and Andy Zeng. Large language models as general pattern machines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04721*, 2023.
- [31] Binh X. Nguyen, Tuong Khanh Long Do, Huy Tran, Erman Tjiputra, Quang D. Tran, and A. Nguyen. Coarse-to-fine reasoning for visual question answering. *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops (CVPRW)*, pages 4557–4565, 2021.
- [32] Xing Nie, Bolin Ni, Jianlong Chang, Gaofeng Meng, Chunlei Huo, Shiming Xiang, and Qi Tian. Pro-tuning: Unified prompt tuning for vision tasks. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 34(6):4653–4667, 2024.
- [33] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023.
- [34] Ofir Press, Muru Zhang, Sewon Min, Ludwig Schmidt, Noah A Smith, and Mike Lewis. Measuring and narrowing the compositionality gap in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03350*, 2022.
- [35] Tianwen Qian, Jingjing Chen, Shaoxiang Chen, Bo Wu, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Scene graph refinement network for visual question answering. *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia*, 25:3950–3961, 2023.
- [36] Ohad Rubín, Jonathan Herzig, and Jonathan Berant. Learning to retrieve prompts for in-context learning. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 2655–2671, 2022.
- [37] Taylor Sorensen, Joshua Robinson, Christopher Rytting, Alexander Shaw, Kyle Rogers, Alexia Delorey, Mahmoud Khalil, Nancy Fulda, and David Wingate. An information-theoretic approach to prompt engineering without ground truth labels. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 819–862, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association

- for Computational Linguistics.
- [38] Eshaan Tanwar, Subhabrata Dutta, Manish Borthakur, and Tanmoy Chakraborty. Multilingual LLMs are better cross-lingual in-context learners with alignment. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki, editors, *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6292–6307, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [39] Maria Tsimpoukelli, Jacob Menick, Serkan Cabi, S. M. Ali Eslami, Oriol Vinyals, and Felix Hill. Multimodal few-shot learning with frozen language models. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [40] Boshi Wang, Xiang Deng, and Huan Sun. Iteratively prompt pre-trained language models for chain of thought. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2714–2730, 2022.
- [41] Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. Emergent abilities of large language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022.
- [42] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, brian ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In Alice H. Oh, Alekh Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, and Kyunghyun Cho, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [43] Zhiyong Wu, Yaoxiang Wang, Jiacheng Ye, and Lingpeng Kong. Self-adaptive in-context learning: An information compression perspective for in-context example selection and ordering, 2023.
- [44] Jiayuan Xie, Wenhao Fang, Yi Cai, Qingbao Huang, and Qing Li. Knowledge-based visual question generation. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 32(11):7547–7558, 2022.
- [45] Sang Michael Xie, Aditi Raghunathan, Percy Liang, and Tengyu Ma. An Explanation of In-context Learning as Implicit Bayesian Inference. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [46] 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.
- [47] Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, and Alex Smola. Automatic chain of thought prompting in large language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [48] Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc V Le, and Ed H. Chi. Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.

VI. BIOGRAPHY SECTION



Long Hoang Dang received the PhD degree in Applied Artificial Intelligence Institute, Deakin University, Australia, in 2024. He is currently a Lecturer at the Faculty of Information Technology, Posts and Telecommunications Institute of Technology (PTIT), Hanoi, Vietnam. His research interests include image and video processing, machine learning and computer vision, especially vision and language reasoning.



Thao Minh Le is a Research Fellow at the Applied Artificial Intelligence Institute, Deakin University. His research interests focus on deep learning for computer vision tasks, and exploring the interplay between vision and language. His other research topics include machine learning for health and large-scale data analytics across different input modalities.



been cited more than 3200 times making up to an h-index of 19. He is also holding eleven U.S. patents on related topics.

Vuong Le is a Machine Learning Scientist at Amazon Australia. He is also holding an affiliation with the Applied Artificial Intelligence Institute at Deakin University. His research interests include multimodal reasoning, especially on video understanding and human behavior analysis. Dr. Le's works have resulted in one monograph, one book chapter and more than thirty scholarly articles published at major machine learning and computer vision journals and conferences, including the top venues of the field: CVPR, ICCV, ECCV, IJCV, IJCAI. His works have



Tu Minh Phuong received the PhD degree in Control in technical systems from National Academy of Sciences, Uzbekistan, in 1995. He joined Faculty of Information Technology, Posts and Telecommunications Institute of Technology (PTIT), Hanoi, Vietnam, in 2000, and became Professor of computer science in 2019. He is Chairman of University Council at PTIT. His research interests include machine learning, recommender systems, natural language processing, and bioinformatics.



ence from Curtin University (2008).

Truyen Tran is Associate Professor at Deakin University where he is pushing the AI boundaries of deep learning, machine reasoning, unifying language and vision, cognitive architectures and artificial social intelligence. With his role as the Head of AI, Health and Science, he is also driving the effort for transforming science, healthcare and engineering through AI. Dr Tran has received multiple international recognition, awards and prizes for his research contributions. He holds a BSc. from the University of Melbourne (2001) and a PhD in Computer Science from Curtin University (2008).