A Additional details of dataset collection

A.1 Examples of rejected questions

With a focus on overall question quality, we removed around 60% of questions written for having any of several flaws. The vast majority of questions removed exhibited one or more four flaws: 1) Only required recognition of a common object, 2) only required counting a readily specified object, 3) did not require looking at the image to answer, 4) only asked about the color of a readily specified object. Examples of questions from each of these categories are shown in Fig. 4.

What are the round fruits in the bowl	How many pieces of luggage are in the snow	When were modern traffic lights invented	What color is the door in this image
A) orange	A) two	A) 1920	A) tan
B) grapefruit	B) three	B) 1930	B) gray
C) apple	C) four	C) 1940	C) burgundy
D) peach	D) five	D) 1950	D) white
Reason rejected: Question only requires recognition of a common object.	Reason rejected: Question only requires counting specified objects.	Reason rejected: Question doesn't require looking at the image to answer.	Reason rejected: Question only asks about the color of a clearly specified object.

Fig. 4: Examples of questions rejected for not meeting our criteria.

A.2 Data collection interface

The data-collection interface used by crowdworkers to write questions is shown in Fig. 5. Detailed instructions along with examples of good and bad questions were provided. After writing a question, workers were required to press the "Check for similar question" button. This sent a request to a server which returned the five questions closest to those already written in our growing dataset. We asked workers to rewrite or rephrase questions that were too similar, but did not enforce a minimum distance cutoff. The set of questions queried were reset when collecting the val and test sets to allow a greater degree of overlap with the training set. After satisfied with their question, workers advanced to the next image. Each task workers performed included four images, nearby neighbors in a CLIP embedding space, which encouraged creative differences in questions written for similar images. Workers were only required to write two questions (out of four possible images) to allow them to skip images they didn't feel they could write a suitable questions for. This cut down on unsuitable questions that they would have otherwise been forced to write in order to complete the task.



Fig. 5: Instructions and interface used for question collection.

After completing two questions, workers were allowed to submit their work and advance to the next image set.

The data-collection interface used by crowdworkers to write rationales is shown in Fig. 6. Detailed instructions along with examples of good rationales were provided. We first asked workers to confirm the correct answer or provide the answer they thought was correct. This allowed a check on the correctness of the original question, and questions with a disagreement were removed from the dataset. Workers then provided a 1-2 sentence explanation of why the answer was correct that included any external knowledge needed to arrive there.

B Additional Details for Large-scale Pre-trained Models

We produce the vocabulary for the experiments in Sec. 5.2 from the training set by selecting all correct choices, as well as all choices and direct answers that appear in at least three questions. This results in a vocabulary with 10,424 answers.



Fig. 6: Instructions and interface used for rationale collection.

B.1 Discriminative models

We train all of our discriminative models for 500 epochs with a learning rate of 0.01 and batch size of 128, except the model with ResNet input features, which is trained with a learning rate of 0.001.

B.2 Contrastive models

The CLIP zero-shot setting requires no training. In the trained setting, we train our linear layer for 500 epochs with a learning rate of 0.01 and batch size of 128. We further elaborate on our "CLIP-style contrastive loss" below and visualize it in Fig. 7.

Recall that we have passed CLIP representations (for questions and/or images) through a linear layer to produce a 512-d embedding (the same size as a CLIP text encoding). For a batch of embeddings E and the CLIP text encodings of their corresponding answers A, we produce a cosine similarity matrix between E and A (i.e. the purple matrix in Fig. 7, showing a batch size of 4). We apply softmax over each matrix row (producing embedding–answer matching proba-



Fig. 7: As described in Sec. B.2. CLIP-style contrastive loss between embeddings (of questions and images) and CLIP text encodings (of answers). Shown for a batch size of 4.

bilities per embedding over answers in A) and compute a cross-entropy loss to maximize the similarity between each embedding and its corresponding answer.

B.3 Generative models

We show our modified ClipCap model in Fig. 8. As in ClipCap [33], we provide CLIP image representations to a mapping network, which produces prefix tokens as input for GPT-2. We then tokenize our question and ground-truth answer (appended with an end-of-sequence string, $\langle EOS \rangle$) and also provide these tokens as input. The remaining input tokens (in black) are zero-padding. As mentioned in our paper, we also appended the (pre-tokenized) question string with "Choices: ..." during the MC setting.

This model is trained autoregressively. I.e., O_i is generated conditionally, given $I_0 \cdots I_i$ (for input tokens I and output logits O), and supervised with a cross-entropy loss against the next sequence token I_{i+1} . In our case, we only compute this cross-entropy loss for outputs corresponding with the ground-truth answer tokens (including $\langle \text{EOS} \rangle$).

At inference time, we prompt GPT-2 with our image prefix and question tokens. We have the model predict the most likely next token (i.e. generating a token in the answer) from the output logits. We append this token to the input and repeat this step, until the model predicts $\langle EOS \rangle$. We can use the tokenizer to decode these output tokens (excluding $\langle EOS \rangle$), producing our model's textual answer prediction. Note that beam search is an alternative way to generate text

from autoregressive language models, but we found that it led to worse results, likely because the answers we are trying to generate are short (e.g. 1-3 words).

We fine-tuned the models in our experiments (choosing the checkpoint with the best F1 validation score for generated answers over 10 epochs), using the settings and COCO pre-trained weights (for the MLP mapping network) made available by the ClipCap authors ⁸. For the pre-trained MLP model, they used CLIP ViT-B/32 features, produced 10 image prefix tokens, and had also fine-tuned GPT-2 (for their image captioning task). We further fine-tuned the GPT-2 weights on our task.



Fig. 8: Diagram of modified ClipCap architecture for VQA tasks.

C Additional Details for Rationale Generation

We generated rationales from ClipCap in a nearly identical manner to how we generated answers (see Sec. B.3 and Fig. 8 above). However, we replace the ground-truth answer string/tokens with a ground-truth rationale. And, we don't provide "Choices: ..." in the ClipCap prompt for the MC setting. We also use beam search during generation, as it seems to perform better for these longer strings. We also use the MLP mapping network and continue to fine-tune GPT-2, as it demonstrates the best performance for this task. We again fine-tuned this model on our training data for 10 epochs and picked the checkpoints with best BLEU and METEOR validation scores.

We show some examples of generated rationales in Fig. 9.

⁸ https://github.com/rmokady/CLIP_prefix_caption



Fig. 9: Examples of rationales generated by our modified ClipCap method for examples in our validation set.

D Additional Details for Specialized Models

For all of these models, we use the same training hyperparameters as the original implementation. For all of the discriminative methods in the paper we use a fixed vocabulary constructed from direct answers that appeared two or more times in the training set. This includes 2,133 bi-grams or unigrams, with 1,937 words.

Pythia [20] Pythia is a modification of [1] that introduces changes to the architecture and learning schedule and utilizes more training data. We fine-tune it on the A-OKVQA dataset. For fine-tuning, we replace the top classification layer with a randomly initialized layer for our set of answer vocabulary.

LXMERT [45] LXMERT is a Transformer-based vision and language model pre-trained using a large amount of image-sentence pairs for a set of pre-training tasks such as masked language modeling and object prediction. The model is pre-trained on VQAv2 [12], GQA [14], VG-QA [56], COCO captions [7], and Visual Genome captions [23]. We then fine-tune the model using the training set of A-OKVQA.

VilBERT [28] ViLBERT is an extension of the BERT architecture to process vision and language modalities for learning a joint representation for them. ViLBERT has been pre-trained on proxy tasks, but it has been evaluated on VQA as a downstream task. ViLBERT is pre-trained using Conceptual Captions [42] and fine-tuned on A-OKVQA. To evaluate how well a model trained on VQAv2 or OK-VQA performs on A-OKVQA, we fine-tune ViLBERT after training them on thoese datasets. These models are referred to as 'ViLBERT-VQA' and 'ViLBERT-OK-VQA' in Table 5.

KRISP [31] KRISP is a method for knowledge-based VQA which combines multi-modal Transformers with graph neural networks methods on knowledge graphs. We use the same models and data and knowledge sources and pre-processing steps as in that work, but filter the knowledge graph based on A-OKVQA rather than OK-VQA (see Sec. 3.2 of [31]).

GPV-2 [22] GPV-2 [22] is a generative vision and language model built using the T5 [39] language model and VinVL [54] image features. It was pre-trained on Conceptual Captions [42] and then fine-tuned in a multi-task setting on image captioning, visual question answering, object localization, and classification, as well on web-search images for 10,000 visual concepts.

We fine-tune the fully-trained model on A-OKVQA by training it to generate the most common answer for each question. For direct answer evaluations, answers are then generated using beam search with 20 beams. For multiple choice, the answers are ranked by the log-probability score assigned to them by the model.

We perform two additional experiments with rationales with this model. First, ground-truth rationales are appended to the question as additional input text. Recall that we do not provide rationales at test time. However, for this experiment we use them during test. We refer to this model as 'GPV-2 + GT Ratl.'. Second, we use the same setting, but we replace every occurrence of the ground-truth answer in the rationale with the [answer] token. We refer to this model as 'GPV-2 [22] + Masked Ans.' in Table 5.

E Knowledge Type Results

We use the test subset that we collected knowledge types on (see Sec. 4) to look at the accuracy of these models for different types of knowledge. In Table 8, we see that while again GPV is the best overall and in every category, the results show some interesting distinctions. KRISP, which is specifically designed with access to explicit knowledge sources such as ConceptNet [26] performs better on "Knowledge Base" questions compared with other discriminative multimodal transformer methods such as VilBERT and LXMERT as well compared to ClipCap which has an overall higher performance. It also performs better on "Physical Knowledge" which also tends to overlap with its knowledge sources.

Table 8: Analysis of results based on knowledge type.

Model	Commonsense	Knowledge Base	Physical Knowledge	Visual Knowledge
VilBERT [28]	24.30	19.96	29.76	26.55
LXMERT [45]	25.51	16.01	27.38	27.23
KRISP [31]	26.63	20.72	39.29	26.09
ClipCap [33]	27.19	16.57	30.95	33.41
GR-GPT	21.42	12.99	17.86	24.79
GPV-2 [22]	39.76	25.24	44.05	41.19

F Biases

Our dataset has its own set of biases. Here are some examples: (1) The dataset is based on COCO, originally intended for identifying 80 object categories. Hence, the same biases exist in our dataset. For instance, because of the composition of those 80 categories, images of baseball fields and safaris (and hence questions) are more common than one might otherwise expect. (2) Selecting the choice that appears most frequently in the train set achieves above chance performance in the multiple-choice setting (although it performs poorly in the direct answer setting) as shown in Table 3-row (c). (3) For automated filtering, we used Pythia and RoBERTa trained on specific datasets. Hence, our data is biased by those methods as well. Regarding social biases, we checked the entire dataset and removed questions including offensive language, racial or gender biases, and stereotypes.