

Story-oriented Image Selection and Placement

Sreyasi Nag Chowdhury Simon Razniewski Gerhard Weikum

sreyasi, srazniew, weikum@mpi-inf.mpg.de

Max Planck Institute for Informatics, Saarbrücken, Germany

ABSTRACT

Multimodal contents have become commonplace on the Internet today, manifested as news articles, social media posts, and personal or business blog posts. Among the various kinds of media (images, videos, graphics, icons, audio) used in such multimodal stories, images are the most popular. The selection of images from a collection – either author’s personal photo album, or web repositories – and their meticulous placement within a text, builds a succinct multimodal commentary for digital consumption. In this paper we present a system that automates the process of selecting relevant images for a story and placing them at contextual paragraphs within the story for a multimodal narration. We leverage automatic object recognition, user-provided tags, and commonsense knowledge, and use an unsupervised combinatorial optimization to solve the selection and placement problems seamlessly as a single unit.

1 INTRODUCTION

It is well-known (and supported by studies [17, 22]) that the most powerful messages are delivered with a combination of words and pictures. On the Internet, such multimodal content is abundant in the form of news articles, social media posts, and personal blog posts where authors enrich their stories with carefully chosen and placed images. As an example, consider a vacation trip report, to be posted on a blog site or online community. The backbone of the travel report is a textual narration, but the user typically places illustrative images in appropriate spots, carefully selected from her photo collection from this trip. These images can either show specific highlights such as waterfalls, mountain hikes or animal encounters, or may serve to depict feelings and the general mood of the trip, e.g., by showing nice sunsets or bar scenes. Another example is brochures for research institutes or other organizations. Here, the text describes the mission, achievements and ongoing projects, and it is accompanied with judiciously selected and placed photos of buildings, people, products and other images depicting the subjects and phenomena of interest, e.g., galaxies or telescopes for research in astrophysics.

The generation of such multimodal stories requires substantial human judgement and reasoning, and is thus time-consuming and labor-intensive. In particular, the effort on the human side includes selecting the right images from a pool of story-specific photos (e.g., the traveler’s own photos) and possibly also from a broader pool for visual illustration (e.g., images licensed from a PR company’s catalog or a big provider such as Pinterest). Even if the set of photos were exactly given, there is still considerable effort to place them within or next to appropriate paragraphs, paying attention to the semantic coherence between surrounding text and image. In this paper, we set out to automate this human task, formalizing it as a *story-images alignment* problem.

Problem Statement. Given a story-like text document and a set of images, the problem is to automatically decide where individual images are placed in the text. Figure 1 depicts this task. The problem comes in different variants: either all images in the given set need to be placed, or a subset of given cardinality must be selected and aligned with text paragraphs. Formally, given n paragraphs and $m \leq n$ images, assign these images to a subset of the paragraphs, such that each paragraph has at most one image. The variation with image selection assumes that $m > n$ and requires a budget $b \leq n$ for the number of images to be aligned with the paragraphs.

Prior Work and its Inadequacy. There is ample literature on computer support for multimodal content creation, most notably, on generating image tags and captions. Closest to our problem is prior work on story illustration [12, 27], where the task is to select illustrative images from a large pool. However, the task is quite different from ours, making prior approaches inadequate for the setting of this paper. First, unlike in general story illustration, we need to consider the text-image alignments jointly for all pieces of a story, rather than making context-free choices one piece at a time. Second, we typically start with a pool of story-specific photos and expect high semantic coherence between each narrative paragraph and the respective image, whereas general story illustration operates with a broad pool of unspecific images that serve many topics. Third, prior work assumes that each image in the pool has an informative caption or set of tags, by which the selection algorithm computes its choices. Our model does not depend on pre-defined set of tags, but detects image concepts on the fly.

Research on Image Tagging may be based on community input, leading to so-called “social tagging” [10], or based on computer-vision methods, called “visual tagging”. In the latter case, bounding boxes are automatically annotated with image labels, and relationships between objects may also be generated [20, 25]. Recent works have investigated how to leverage commonsense knowledge as a background asset to further enhance such automatically computed tags [2]. Also, deep-learning methods have led to expressive forms of multimodal embeddings, where textual descriptions and images are projected into a joint latent space [6, 7] in order to compute multimodal similarities.

In this paper, in addition to manual image tags where available, we harness visual tags from deep neural network based object-detection frameworks and incorporate background commonsense knowledge, as automatic steps to enrich the semantic interpretation of images. This, by itself, does not address the alignment problem, though. The alignment problem is solved by combinatorial optimization. Our method is experimentally compared to baselines that makes use of multimodal embeddings.



Figure 1: The story-and-images alignment problem.

Our Approach – SANDI. We present a framework that casts the story-images alignment task into a combinatorial optimization problem. The objective function, to be maximized, captures the semantic coherence between each paragraph and the image that is placed there. To this end, we consider a suite of features, most notably, the visual tags associated with an image (user-defined tags as well as tags from automatic computer-vision tools), text embeddings, and also background knowledge in the form of commonsense assertions. The optimization is constrained by the number of images that the story should be enriched with. As a solution algorithm, we devise an integer linear program (ILP) and employ the Gurobi ILP solver for computing the exact optimum. Experiments show that SANDI produces semantically coherent alignments.

Contributions. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to address the story-images alignment problem. Our salient contributions are:

- (1) We introduce and define the problem of story-images alignment.
- (2) We analyze two real-world datasets of stories with rich visual illustrations, and derive insights on alignment decisions and quality measures.
- (3) We devise relevant features, formalize the alignment task as a combinatorial optimization problem, and develop an exact-solution algorithm using integer linear programming.
- (4) We present experiments that compare our method against baselines that use multimodal embeddings.

2 RELATED WORK

Existing work that has studied associations between images and text can be categorized into the following areas.

Image Attribute Recognition. High level concepts in images lead to better results in Vision-to-Language problems [32]. Identifying image attributes is the starting point toward text-image alignment. To this end, several deep-learning based modern architectures detect concepts in images – object recognition [11, 25, 26],



scene recognition [38], activity recognition [9, 35, 37]. Since all these frameworks work with low level image features like color, texture, gradient etc., noise creep in often leading to incoherent or incorrect detections – for example, a blue wall could be detected as “ocean”. While some of the incoherence can be refined using background knowledge [2], there still exists considerable inaccuracy. We leverage some frameworks from this category in our model to detect visual concepts in images.

Story Illustration. Existing research finds suitable images from a big image collection to illustrate personal stories [12] or news posts [5, 27]. Traditionally, images are searched based on textual tags associated with image collections. Occasionally they use visual similarity measures to prune out images very similar to each other. More recent frameworks use deep neural networks to find suitable representative images for a story [24]. Story Illustration only addresses the problem of image selection, whereas we solve two problems simultaneously: image selection and image placement – making a joint decision on all pieces of the story. [24] operates on small stories (5 sentences) with simple content, and retrieves 1 image per sentence. Our stories are much longer texts, the sentences are more complex, and the stories refer to both general concepts and named entities. This makes our problem distinct. We cannot systematically compare our full-blown model with prior works on story illustration alone.



Multimodal Embeddings. A popular method of semantically comparing images and text has been to map textual and visual features into a common space of multimodal embeddings [6, 7, 30]. Semantically similar concepts across modalities can then be made to occur nearby in the embedding space. Visual-Semantic-Embeddings (VSE) has been used for generating captions for the whole image [6], or to associate textual cues to small image regions [13] thus aligning text and visuals. Visual features of image content – for example color, geometry, aspect-ratio – have also been used to align image regions to nouns (e.g. “chair”), attributes (e.g. “big”), and pronouns (e.g. “it”) in corresponding explicit textual descriptions [15]. However, alignment of small image regions to text snippets play little role in jointly interpreting the correlation between the whole image and a larger body of text. We focus on the latter in this work.

Image-text Comparison. Visual similarity of images has been leveraged to associate single words [36] or commonly occurring phrases [39] to a cluster of images. While this is an effective solution for better indexing and retrieval of images, it can hardly be used for contextual text-image alignment. For example, an image with a beach scene may be aligned with either “relaxed weekend” or “this is where I work best” depending on the context of the full text.

Yet another framework combines visual features from images with verbose image descriptions to find semantically closest paragraphs in the corresponding novels [40], looking at images and paragraphs in isolation. In a similar vein, [4] align images with one semantically closest sentence in the corresponding article for viewing on mobile devices. In contrast, we aim to generate a complete longer multimodal content to be read as a single unit. This calls for distinction between paragraphs and images, and continuity of the story-line.

Image	Ground Truth Paragraph
	...Table Mountain Cableway. The revolving car provides 360 degree views as you ascend this mesmerizing 60-million-year-old mountain. From the upper cableway station...
	...On the east flank of the hill is the old Muslim quarter of the Bo-Kaap; have your camera ready to capture images of the photogenic pastel-painted colonial period homes...

(a) Sample image and corresponding paragraph from Lonely Planet

Image	Ground Truth Paragraph
	If you are just looking for some peace and quiet or hanging out with other students...library on campus, a student hangout space in the International College building...
	...I was scared to travel alone. But I quickly realized that there's no need to be afraid. Leaving home and getting out of your comfort zone is an important part of growing up...

(b) Sample image and corresponding paragraph from Asia Exchange

Figure 2: Image-text semantic coherence in datasets.

Image Caption Generation. Generation of natural language image descriptions is a popular problem at the intersection of computer vision, natural language processing, and artificial intelligence [1]. Alignment of image regions to textual concepts is a prerequisite for generating captions. While most existing frameworks generate factual captions [21, 29, 34], some of the more recent architectures venture into producing stylized captions [8] and stories [16, 40]. Methodologically they are similar to visual-semantic-embedding in that visual and textual features are mapped to the same multimodal embedding space to find semantic correlations. Encoder-decoder LSTM networks are the most common architecture used. An image caption can be considered as a precise focused description of an image without much superfluous or contextual information. For e.g., the caption of an image of the Eiffel Tower would not ideally contain the author's detailed opinion of Paris. However, in a multimodal document, the paragraphs surrounding the image could contain detailed thematic descriptions. We try to capture the thematic indirection between an image and surrounding text, thus making the problem quite different from crisp caption generation.

Commonsense Knowledge for Story Understanding. One of the earliest applications of Commonsense Knowledge to interpret the connection between images and text is a photo agent which automatically annotated images from user's multi-modal (text and image) emails or web pages, while also inferring additional commonsense concepts [18]. Subsequent works used commonsense reasoning to infer causality in stories [31], especially applicable to question answering. The most commonly used database of commonsense concepts is ConceptNet [28]. We enhance automatically detected concepts in an image with relevant commonsense assertions. This often helps to capture more context about the image.

3 DATASET AND PROBLEM ANALYSIS

3.1 Datasets

To the best of our knowledge, there is no experimental dataset for text-image alignment, and existing datasets on image tagging or image caption generation are not suitable in our setting. We

therefore compile and analyze two datasets of blogs from Lonely Planet¹ and Asia Exchange².

- Lonely Planet: 2178 multimodal articles containing on average 20 paragraphs and 4.5 images per article. Most images are accompanied by captions. Figure 2a shows two image-paragraph pairs from this dataset. Most of the images and come from the author's personal archives and adhere strictly to the content of the article.
- Asia Exchange: 200 articles about education opportunities in Asia, with an average of 13.5 paragraphs and 4 images per article. The images may be strongly adhering to the content of the article (top image in Figure 2b), or they may be generic stock images complying with the abstract theme as seen in the bottom image in Figure 2b). Most images have captions.

Text-Image Semantic Coherence. To understand the specific nature of this data, we had two annotators analyze the given placement of 50 randomly chosen images in articles from the Lonely Planet dataset. The annotators assessed whether the images were specific to the surrounding paragraphs as opposed to merely being relevant for entire articles. The annotators also determined to how many paragraphs an image was specifically fitting, and indicated the main reason for the given alignments. For this purpose, we defined 6 possibly overlapping meta-classes: (i) specific man-made entities such as monuments, buildings or paintings, (ii) natural objects such as lakes and mountains, (iii) general nature scenes such as fields or forest, (iv) human activities such as biking or drinking, (v) generic objects such as animals or cars, and (vi) geographic locations such as San Francisco or Rome.

The outcome of the annotation is shown in Table 1. As one can see, 91% of the images were indeed more specifically relevant to surrounding text than to the article in general, and 86% of these were placed before the relevant text. We therefore assume the paragraph following the image as ground truth. As to the main reasons for this relevance, we observe quite a mix of reasons, with geographic

¹www.lonelyplanet.com/blog

²www.asiaexchange.org

	Criterion	% of images
Relevance	Placement specific to surrounding paragraphs	91%
	Relevant text after image	86%
	Avg. #relevant paragraphs	1.65
Main reason	Natural named objects	9%
	Human activities	12%
	Generic objects	15%
	General nature scenes	20%
	Man-made named objects	21%
	Geographic locations	29%

Table 1: Analysis of image placement for 50 images from Lonely Planet travel blogs.

locations being most important at 29%, followed by man-made objects at 21% and general nature scenes at 20% and so on.

3.2 Image Descriptors

Based on the analysis in Table 1, we consider the following kinds of tags for describing images:

Visual Tags (CV). State-of-the-art computer-vision methods for object and scene detection yield visual tags from low-level image features. We use three frameworks for this purpose. First, deep convolutional neural networks based architectures like LSDA [11] and YOLO [25], are used to detect objects like *person*, *frisbee* or *bench*. These models have been trained on ImageNet object classes and denote “Generic objects” from Table 1. For stories, general scene descriptors like *restaurant* or *beach* play a major role, too. Therefore, our second asset is scene detection, specifically from the MIT Scenes Database [38]. Their publicly released pre-trained model “Places365-CNN”, trained on 365 scene categories with 5000 images per category, predicts scenes in images with corresponding confidence scores. We pick the most confident scene for each image. These constitute “General nature scenes” from Table 1. Thirdly, since stories often abstract away from explicit visual concepts, a framework that incorporates generalizations and abstractions into visual detections [2] is also leveraged. For e.g., the concept “hiking” is supplemented with the concepts “walking” (Hypernym of “hiking” from WordNet) and “fun” (from ConceptNet [28] assertion “hiking, HasProperty, fun”).

User Tags (MAN). Owners of images often have additional knowledge about content and context – for e.g., activities or geographical information (“hiking near Lake Placid”), which, from Table 1 play a major role in text-image alignment. In a down-stream application, users would have the provision to specify tags for their images. For experimental purposes, we use the nouns and adjectives from image captions from our datasets as proxy for user tags.

Big-data Tags (BD). Big data and crowd knowledge allow to infer additional context that may not be visually apparent. We utilize the Google reverse image search API³ to incorporate such tags. This API allows to search by image, and suggests tags based on those accompanying visually similar images in the vast web image

³www.google.com/searchbyimage

repository⁴. These tags often depict popular places and entities, such as “Savarnati Ashram”, or “Mexico City insect market”, and thus constitute “Natural names objects”, “Man-made named objects”, as well as “Geographic locations” from Table 1.

Commonsense Knowledge (CSK). Commonsense Knowledge can bridge the gap between visual and textual concepts [3]. We use the following ConceptNet relations to enrich the image tag space: *used for*, *has property*, *causes*, *at location*, *located near*, *conceptually related to*. As ConceptNet is somewhat noisy, subjective, and diverse, we additionally filter its concepts by *informativeness* for a given image following [33]. If the top-10 web search results of a CSK concept are semantically similar to the image context (detected image tags), the CSK concept is considered to be *informative* for the image. For example, consider the image context “*hike, Saturday, waterproof boots*”. CSK derived from “hike” are *outdoor activity*, and *fun*. The top-10 Bing search results⁴ for the concept *outdoor activity* are semantically similar to the image context. However, those for the term *fun* are semantically varied. Hence, *outdoor activity* is more informative than *fun* for this particular image. Cosine similarity between the mean vectors of the image context and the search results is used as a measure of semantic similarity.

Figure 3 shows examples for the different kinds of image tags.

4 MODEL FOR STORY-IMAGES ALIGNMENT

Without substantial amounts of labeled training data, there is no point in considering machine-learning methods. Instead, we tackle the task as a Combinatorial Optimization problem in an unsupervised way.

Our *story-images alignment* model constitutes an Integer Linear Program (ILP) which jointly optimizes the placement of selected images within an article. The main ingredient for this alignment is the pairwise similarity between images and units of text. We consider a paragraph as a text unit.

Text-Image Pairwise Similarity. Given an image, each of the four kinds of descriptors of Section 3.2 gives rise to a bag of features. We use these features to compute *text-image semantic relatedness scores* $srel(i, t)$ for an image i and a paragraph t .

$$srel(i, t) = \text{cosine}(\vec{i}, \vec{t}) \quad (1)$$

where \vec{i} and \vec{t} are the mean word embeddings for the image tags and the paragraph respectively. For images, we use all detected tags. For paragraphs, we consider only the top 50% of concepts w.r.t. their TF-IDF ranking over the entire dataset. Both paragraph concepts and image tags capture unigrams as well as bigrams. We use word embeddings from word2vec trained on Google News Corpus.

$srel(i, t)$ scores serve as weights for variables in the ILP. Note that model for text-image similarity is orthogonal to the combinatorial problem solved by the ILP. Cosine distance between concepts (as in Eq. 1) could be easily replaced by other similarity measures over the multimodal embedding space.

Tasks. Our problem can be divided into two distinct tasks:

- Image Selection – to select relevant images from an image pool.

⁴The image descriptors would be made publicly available along with the dataset so that changes in web search results do not affect the reproducibility of our results.



CV: country store, person, bench, lodge outdoor
 MAN: unassuming ashram, Mahatma Gandhi
 BD: Sabarmati Ashram



CV: person, sunglasses, stage
 MAN: Globe Theatre, performance, Shakespeare, Spectators
 BD: Shakespeare's Globe
 CSK: show talent, attend concert, entertain audience



CV: adobe brick, terra cotta, vehicle, table, village
 MAN: tiled rooftops
 BD: uzès languedoc, languedoc rousillon
 CSK: colony, small town



CV: umbrella, beach
 MAN: white sands, Playa Ancon
 BD: ancon cuba, playa ancon
 CSK: sandy shore, vacation

Figure 3: Characterization of image descriptors: CV adds visual objects/scenes, MAN and BD add location details, CSK adds high-level concepts.

- Image Placement – to place selected images in the story.

These two components are modelled into one ILP where Image Placement is achieved by maximizing an objective function, while the constraints dictate Image Selection. In the following subsections we discuss two flavors of our model consisting of one or both of the above tasks.

4.1 Complete Alignment

Complete Alignment constitutes the problem of aligning *all images* in a given image pool with relevant text units of a story. Hence, only Image Placement is applicable. For a story with $|T|$ text units and an associated image pool with $|I|$ images, the alignment of images $i \in I$ to text units $t \in T$ can be modeled as an ILP with the following definitions:

Decision Variables: The following binary decision variables are introduced:

$X_{it} = 1$ if image i should be aligned with text unit t , 0 otherwise.

Objective: Select image i to be aligned with text unit t such that the semantic relatedness over all text-image pairs is maximized:

$$\max \left[\sum_{i \in I} \sum_{t \in T} srel(i, t) X_{it} \right] \quad (2)$$

where $srel(i, t)$ is the text-image semantic relatedness from Eq. 1.

Constraints:

$$\sum_i X_{it} \leq 1 \forall t \quad (3) \quad \sum_t X_{it} = 1 \forall i \quad (4)$$

We make two assumptions for text-image alignments: no paragraph may be aligned with multiple images (3), and each image is used exactly once in the story (4). The former is an observation from multimodal presentations on the web such as in blog posts or brochures. The latter assumption is made based on the nature of our datasets, which are fairly typical for web contents. Both are designed as hard constraints that a solution must satisfy. In principle, we could relax them into soft constraints by incorporating violations as a loss-function penalty into the objective function. However, we do not pursue this further, as typical web contents would indeed mandate hard constraints. Note also that the ILP has no hyper-parameters; so it is completely unsupervised.

4.2 Selective Alignment

Selective Alignment is the flavor of the model which *selects a subset* of thematically relevant images from a big image pool, and places them within the story. Hence, it constitutes both tasks – Image Selection and Image Placement. Along with the constraint in (3), Image Selection entails the following additional constraints:

$$\sum_t X_{it} \leq 1 \forall i \quad (5) \quad \sum_i \sum_t X_{it} = b \quad (6)$$

where b is the budget for the number of images for the story. b may be trivially defined as the number of paragraphs in the story, following our assumption that each paragraph may be associated with a maximum of one image. (5) is an adjustment to (4) which implies that not all images from the image pool need to be aligned with the story. The objective function from (2) rewards the selection of best fitting images from the image pool.

5 QUALITY MEASURES

In this section we define metrics for automatic evaluation of text-image alignment models. The two tasks involved – Image Selection and Image Placement – call for separate evaluation metrics as discussed below.

5.1 Image Selection

Representative images for a story are selected from a big pool of images. There are multiple conceptually similar images in our image pool since they have been gathered from blogs of the domain “travel”. Hence evaluating the results on strict precision (based on exact matches between selected and ground-truth images) does not necessarily assess true quality. We therefore define a relaxed precision metric (based on semantic similarity) in addition to the strict metric. Given a set of selected images I and the set of ground truth images J , where $|I| = |J|$, the precision metrics are:

$$RelaxedPrecision = \frac{\sum_{i \in I} \max_{j \in J} (\cosine(\vec{i}, \vec{j}))}{|I|} \quad (7)$$

$$StrictPrecision = \frac{|I \cap J|}{|I|} \quad (8)$$

5.2 Image Placement

For each image in a multimodal story, the ground truth (GT) paragraph is assumed to be the one following the image in our datasets. To evaluate the quality of SANDI’s text-image alignments, we compare the GT paragraph and the paragraph assigned to the image by SANDI (henceforth referred to as “aligned paragraph”). We propose the following metrics for evaluating the quality of alignments:

BLEU and ROUGE. BLEU and ROUGE are classic n-gram-overlap-based metrics for evaluating machine translation and text summarization. Although known to be limited insofar as they do not recognize synonyms and semantically equivalent formulations, they are in widespread use. We consider them as basic measures of concept overlap between GT and aligned paragraphs.

Semantic Similarity. To alleviate the shortcoming of requiring exact matches, we consider a metric based on embedding similarity. We compute the similarity between two text units t_i and t_j by the average similarity of their word embeddings, considering all unigrams and bigrams as words.

$$SemSim(t_i, t_j) = cosine(\vec{\bar{t}}_i, \vec{\bar{t}}_j) \quad (9)$$

where \vec{x} is the mean vector of words in x . For this calculation, we drop uninformative words by keeping only the top 50% with regard to their TF-IDF weights over the whole dataset.

Average Rank of Aligned Paragraph. We associate each paragraph in the story with a ranked list of all the paragraphs on the basis of semantic similarity (Eq. 9), where rank 1 is the paragraph itself. Our goal is to produce alignments ranked higher with the GT paragraph. The average rank of alignments produced by a method is computed as follows:

$$ParaRank = 1 - \left[\left(\frac{\sum_{t \in T'} rank(t)}{|I|} - 1 \right) / \left(|T| - 1 \right) \right] \quad (10)$$

where $|I|$ is the number of images and $|T|$ is the number of paragraphs in the article. $T' \subset T$ is the set of paragraphs aligned to images. Scores are normalized between 0 and 1; 1 being the perfect alignment and 0 being the worst alignment.

Order Preservation. Most stories follow a storyline. Images placed at meaningful spots within the story would ideally adhere to this sequence. Hence the measure of pairwise ordering provides a sense of respecting the storyline. Lets define order preserving image pairs as: $P = \{(i, i') : i, i' \in I, i \neq i', i' \text{ follows } i \text{ in both GT and SANDI alignments}\}$, where I is the set of images in the story. The measure can be defined as number of order preserving image pairs normalized by the total number of GT ordered image pairs.

$$OrderPreserve = \frac{|P|}{(|I|(|I| - 1)/2)} \quad (11)$$

6 EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

We evaluate the two flavors of SANDI – Complete Alignment and Selective Alignment – based on the quality measures described in Section 5.

6.1 Setup

Tools. Deep convolutional neural network based architectures similar to LSDA [11], YOLO [25], VISIR [2] and Places-CNN [38] are used as sources of *Visual tags*. Google reverse image search tag suggestions are used as *Big-data tags*. We use the Gurobi Optimizer for solving the ILP. A Word2Vec [23] model trained on the Google News Corpus encompasses a large cross-section of domains, and hence is a well-suited source of word embeddings for our purposes.

SANDI Variants. The variants of our text-image alignment model are based on the use of image descriptors from Section 3.2.

- SANDI-CV, SANDI-MAN, and SANDI-BD use CV, MAN, and BD tags as image descriptors respectively.
- SANDI* combines tags from all sources.
- +CSK: With this setup we study the role of commonsense knowledge as a bridge between visual features and textual features.

Alignment sensitivity. The degree to which alignments are specific to certain paragraphs varies from article to article. For some articles, alignments have little specificity, for instance, when the whole article talks about a hiking trip, and images generically show forests and mountains. We measure alignment sensitivity of articles by comparing the semantic relatedness of an image to its ground-truth paragraph against all other paragraphs in the same article. We use the cosine similarity between the image’s vector of MAN tags and the text vectors, for this purpose. The alignment sensitivity of an article then is the average of these similarity scores over all its images. We restrict our experiments to the top-100 most alignment-sensitive articles in each dataset.

6.2 Complete Alignment

In this section we evaluate our Complete Alignment model (defined in Section 4.1), which places *all* images from a given image pool within a story.

Baselines. To the best of our knowledge, there is no existing work on story-image alignment in the literature. Hence we modify methods on joint visual-semantic-embeddings (VSE) [6, 14] to serve as baselines. Our implementation of VSE is similar to [6], henceforth referred to as VSE++. We compare SANDI with the following baselines:

- Random: a simple baseline with random image-text alignments.
- VSE++ Greedy or simply VSE++: for a given image, VSE++ is adapted to produce a ranked list of paragraphs from the corresponding story. The best ranked paragraph is considered as an alignment, with a greedy constraint that one paragraph can be aligned to at most one image.
- VSE++ ILP: using cosine similarity scores between image and paragraph from the joint embedding space, we solve an ILP for the alignment with the same constraints as that of SANDI.

Table 2: Complete Alignment on the Lonely Planet dataset.

	BLEU	ROUGE	SemSim	ParaRank	Order Preserve
Random	3.1	6.9	75.1	50.0	50.0
VSE++ [6]	11.0	9.5	84.6	59.1	55.2
VSE++ ILP	12.56	11.23	83.98	58.08	47.93
SANDI-CV	18.2	17.6	86.3	63.7	54.5
SANDI-MAN	45.6	44.5	89.8	72.5	77.4
SANDI-BD	26.6	25.1	84.7	61.3	61.2
SANDI*	44.3	42.9	89.7	73.2	76.3

Table 4: Role of Commonsense Knowledge.

		Standard	+CSK
SANDI-CV	<i>SemSim</i>	86.2	86.3
	<i>ParaRank</i>	59.9	59.7
SANDI-MAN	<i>SemSim</i>	85.1	85.5
	<i>ParaRank</i>	53.8	55.0

Since there are no existing story-image alignment datasets, VSE++ has been trained on the MSCOCO captions dataset [19], which contains 330K images with 5 captions per image.

Evaluation. Tables 2 and 3 show the performance of SANDI variants across the different evaluation metrics (from Section 5.2) on the Lonely Planet and Asia Exchange datasets respectively. On both datasets, SANDI outperforms VSE++, especially in terms of paragraph rank (+14.1%/+10.5%) and order preservation (+11.1%/+14.5%). While VSE++ looks at each image in isolation, SANDI captures context better by considering all text units of the article and all images from the corresponding album at once in a constrained optimization problem. VSE++ ILP, although closer to SANDI in methodology, does not outperform SANDI. The success of SANDI can also be attributed to the fact that it is less tied to a particular type of images and text, relying only on word2vec embeddings that are trained on a much larger corpus than MSCOCO.

On both datasets, SANDI-MAN is the single best configuration, while the combination, SANDI* marginally outperforms it on the Asia Exchange dataset. The similarity of scores across both datasets highlights the robustness of the SANDI approach.

Role of Commonsense Knowledge. While in alignment-sensitive articles the connections between paragraphs and images are often immediate, this is less the case for articles with low alignment sensitivity. Table 4 shows the impact of adding common sense knowledge on the 100 least alignment sensitive articles from the Lonely Planet dataset. As one can see, adding CSK tags leads to a minor improvement in terms of semantic similarity (+0.1/+0.4%), although the improvement is too small to argue that CSK is an important ingredient in text-image alignments.

Table 3: Complete Alignment on the Asia Exchange dataset.

	BLEU	ROUGE	SemSim	ParaRank	Order Preserve
Random	6.8	8.9	70.8	50.0	50.0
VSE++ [6]	19.4	17.7	85.7	51.9	48.0
VSE++ ILP	23.5	20.11	85.98	52.55	46.13
SANDI-CV	21.5	20.6	87.8	58.4	52.0
SANDI-MAN	35.2	32.2	89.2	61.5	61.5
SANDI-BD	24.1	22.3	86.7	56.0	53.6
SANDI*	33.4	31.5	89.7	62.4	62.5

6.3 Selective Alignment

This variation of our model, as defined in Section 4.2, solves two problems simultaneously – selection of representative images for the story from a big pool of images, and placement of the selected images within the story. The former sub-problem relates to the topic of “Story Illustration” [5, 12, 24, 27], but work along these lines has focused on very short texts with simple content (in contrast to the long and content-rich stories in our datasets).

6.3.1 Image Selection

Setup. In addition to the setup described in Section 6.1, following are the requirements for this task:

- Image pool – We pool images from all stories in the slice of the dataset we use in our experiments. Stories from a particular domain – for e.g. travel blogs from Lonely Planet – are largely quite similar. This entails that images in the pool may also be very similar in content – for e.g., stories on *hiking* contain images with similar tags like *mountain, person, backpack*.
- Image budget – For each story, the number of images in the ground truth is considered as the image budget b for Image Selection (Equation 4.2).

Baselines. We compare SANDI with the following baselines:

- Random: a baseline of randomly selected images from the pool.
- NN: a selection of nearest neighbors from a common embedding space of images and paragraphs. Images are represented as centroid vectors of their tags, and paragraphs are represented as centroid vectors of their distinctive concepts. The basic vectors are obtained from Word2Vec trained on Google News Corpus.
- VSE++: state-of-the-art on joint visual-textual embeddings; the method presented in [6] is adapted to retrieve the top- b images for a story.

Evaluation. We evaluate Image Selection by the measures in Section 5.1. Table 5 and Table 6 show the results for Story Illustration, that is, image selection, for SANDI and the baselines. For the Lonely Planet dataset (Table 5), a pool of 500 images was used. We study the effects of a bigger images pool (1000 images) in our experiments with the Asia Exchange dataset (Table 6). As expected, average strict precision (exact matches with ground truth) drops. Recall from Section 3.1 that the Asia Exchange dataset often has stock

Table 5: Image Selection on the Lonely Planet dataset.

Tag Space	Precision	Random	NN	VSE++	SANDI
CV	<i>Strict</i>	0.4	2.0	1.14	4.18
	<i>Relaxed</i>	42.16	52.68	29.83	53.54
MAN	<i>Strict</i>	0.4	3.95	-	14.57
	<i>Relaxed</i>	37.14	42.73		49.65
BD	<i>Strict</i>	0.4	1.75	-	2.71
	<i>Relaxed</i>	32.59	37.94		38.86
*	<i>Strict</i>	0.4	4.8	-	11.28
	<i>relaxed</i>	43.84	50.06		54.34

images for general illustration rather than only story-specific images. Hence the average relaxed precision on image selection is higher. The nearest-neighbor baseline (NN) and SANDI, both use Word2Vec embeddings for text-image similarity. SANDI’s better scores are attributed to the joint optimization over the entire story, as opposed to greedy selection in case of NN. VSE++ uses a joint text-image embeddings space for similarity scores. The results in the tables clearly show SANDI’s advantages over the baselines.

Our evaluation metric *RelaxedPrecision* (Eq. 7) factors in the semantic similarity between images which in turn depends on the image descriptors (Section 3.2). Hence we compute results on the different image tag spaces, where ‘*’ refers to the combination of CV, MAN, and BD. The baseline VSE++ however, operates only on visual features; hence we report its performance only for CV tags.

Figure 4 shows anecdotal image selection results for one story. The original story contains 17 paragraphs; only the main concepts from the story have been retained in the figure for readability. SANDI is able to retrieve 2 ground-truth images out of 8, while the baselines retrieve 1 each. Note that the remaining non-exact matches retrieved by SANDI are also thematically similar. This can be attributed to the wider space of concepts that SANDI explores through the different types of image descriptors described in Section 3.2.

6.3.2 Image Placement

Having selected thematically related images from a big image pool, SANDI places them within contextual paragraphs of the story. Note that SANDI actually integrates the Image Selection and Image Placement stages into joint inference on selective alignment seamlessly, whereas the baselines operate in two sequential steps.

Table 7: Selective Alignment on the Lonely Planet dataset.

	BLEU	ROUGE	SemSim	ParaRank
Random	0.31	0.26	69.18	48.16
VSE++ [6]	1.04	0.8	79.18	53.09
VSE++ ILP	1.23	1.03	79.04	53.96
SANDI-CV	1.70	1.60	83.76	61.69
SANDI-MAN	8.82	7.40	82.95	66.83
SANDI-BD	1.77	1.69	84.66	76.18
SANDI*	6.82	6.57	84.50	75.84

Table 6: Image Selection on the Asia Exchange dataset.

Tag Space	Precision	Random	NN	VSE++	SANDI
CV	<i>Strict</i>	0.45	0.65	0.44	0.79
	<i>Relaxed</i>	55.0	57.64	30.05	57.2
MAN	<i>Strict</i>	0.45	0.78	-	3.42
	<i>Relaxed</i>	40.24	52.0		52.87
BD	<i>Strict</i>	0.45	0.82	-	0.87
	<i>Relaxed</i>	31.12	33.27		33.25
*	<i>Strict</i>	0.45	1.04	-	1.7
	<i>relaxed</i>	55.68	58.1		58.2

We evaluate the alignments by the measures from Section 5.2. Note that the measure *OrderPreserve* does not apply to Selective Alignment since the images are selected from a pool of mixed images which cannot be ordered. Tables 7 and 8 show results for the Lonely Planet and Asia Exchange datasets respectively. We observe that SANDI outperforms the baselines by a clear margin, harnessing its more expressive pool of tags. This holds for all the different metrics (to various degrees). We show anecdotal evidence of the diversity of our image descriptors in Figure 3 and Table 9.

6.4 Role of Model Components

Image Descriptors. Table 9 shows alignments for a section of a single story from three SANDI variants. Each of the variants capture special characteristics of the images, hence aligning to different paragraphs. The paragraphs across variants are quite semantically similar. The highlighted key concepts bring out the similarities and justification of alignment. The wide variety of image descriptors that SANDI leverages (CV, BD, MAN, CSK) is unavailable to VSE++, attributing to the latter’s poor performance.

Embeddings. The nature of embeddings is decisive towards alignment quality. Joint visual-semantic-embeddings trained on MSCOCO (used by VSE++) fall short in capturing high-level semantics between images and story. Word2Vec embeddings trained on a much larger and domain-independent Google News corpus better represents high-level image-story interpretations.

ILP. Combinatorial optimization (Integer Linear Programming) wins in performance over greedy optimization approaches. In Tables 5 and 6 this phenomenon can be observed between NN (greedy) and SANDI (ILP). This pair of approaches make use of the same embedding space, with SANDI outperforming NN.

Table 8: Selective Alignment on the Asia Exchange dataset.

	BLEU	ROUGE	SemSim	ParaRank
Random	2.06	1.37	53.14	58.28
VSE++ [6]	2.66	1.39	58.00	64.34
VSE++ ILP	2.78	1.47	57.65	64.29
SANDI-CV	1.04	1.51	60.28	75.42
SANDI-MAN	3.49	2.98	61.11	82.00
SANDI-BD	1.68	1.52	76.86	70.41
SANDI*	1.53	1.84	64.76	80.57




Figure 4: Image Selection. Images within green boxes are exact matches with ground truth (GT). SANDI retrieves more exact matches than the baselines (NN, VSE++). SANDI's non-exact matches are also much more thematically similar.

7 CONCLUSION

In this paper we have introduced the problem of story-images alignment – selecting and placing a set of representative images for a story within contextual paragraphs. We analyzed features towards meaningful alignments from two real-world multimodal datasets – Lonely Planet and Asia Exchange blogs – and defined measures to evaluate text-image alignments. We presented SANDI, a methodology for automating such alignments by a constrained optimization problem maximizing semantic coherence between text-image pairs jointly for the entire story. Evaluations show that SANDI produces alignments which are semantically meaningful. Nevertheless, some follow-up questions arise.

Additional Features. While our feature space covers most natural aspects, in downstream applications additional image metadata such as GPS location or timestamps may be available. GPS location may provide cues for geographic named entities, lifting the reliance on user-provided tags. Timestamps might prove to be useful for temporal aspects of a storyline.




Abstract and Metaphoric Relations. Our alignments were focused largely on visual and contextual features. We do not address stylistic elements like metaphors and sarcasm in text, which would entail more challenging alignments. For example, the text “the news was a dagger to his heart” should not be paired with a picture of a dagger. Although user knowledge may provide some cues towards such abstract relationships, a deeper understanding of semantic coherence is desired.

The datasets used in this paper, along with the image descriptors, will be made available.

REFERENCES

- [1] Raffaella Bernardi, Ruket Cakici, Desmond Elliott, Aykut Erdem, Erkut Erdem, Nazli Ikingler-Cinbis, Frank Keller, Adrian Muscat, and Barbara Plank. 2016. Automatic Description Generation from Images: A Survey of Models, Datasets, and Evaluation Measures. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.* (2016).
- [2] Sreyasi Nag Chowdhury, Niket Tandon, Hakan Ferhatosmanoglu, and Gerhard Weikum. 2018. VISIR: Visual and Semantic Image Label Refinement. *WSDM*.
- [3] Sreyasi Nag Chowdhury, Niket Tandon, and Gerhard Weikum. 2016. Know2Look: Commonsense Knowledge for Visual Search. *AKBC*.
- [4] Wei-Ta Chu and Ming-Chih Kao. 2017. Blog Article Summarization with Image-Text Alignment Techniques. *ISM*.
- [5] Diogo Delgado, João Magalhães, and Nuno Correia. 2010. Automated Illustration of News Stories. *ICSC*.
- [6] Fartash Faghri, David J. Fleet, Jamie Kiros, and Sanja Fidler. 2018. VSE++: Improving Visual-Semantic Embeddings with Hard Negatives. *BMVC*.
- [7] Andrea Frome, Gregory S. Corrado, Jonathon Shlens, Samy Bengio, Jeffrey Dean, Marc'Aurelio Ranzato, and Tomas Mikolov. 2013. DeViSE: A Deep Visual-Semantic Embedding Model. *NIPS*.
- [8] Chuang Gan, Zhe Gan, Xiaodong He, Jianfeng Gao, and Li Deng. 2017. StyleNet: Generating Attractive Visual Captions with Styles. *CVPR*.
- [9] Georgia Gkioxari, Ross B. Girshick, and Jitendra Malik. 2015. Contextual Action Recognition with R²CNN. *ICCV*.
- [10] Manish Gupta, Rui Li, Zhijun Yin, and Jiawei Han. 2010. Survey on social tagging techniques. *SIGKDD Explorations* (2010).
- [11] Judy Hoffman, Sergio Guadarrama, Eric Tzeng, Ronghang Hu, Jeff Donahue, Ross B. Girshick, Trevor Darrell, and Kate Saenko. 2014. LSDA: Large Scale Detection through Adaptation. *NIPS*.
- [12] Dhiraj Joshi, James Ze Wang, and Jia Li. 2006. The Story Picturing Engine - a system for automatic text illustration. *TOMCCAP* 2, 1 (2006), 68–89.
- [13] Andrej Karpathy and Fei-Fei Li. 2015. Deep visual-semantic alignments for generating image descriptions. *CVPR*.
- [14] Ryan Kiros, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Richard S. Zemel. 2014. Unifying Visual-Semantic Embeddings with Multimodal Neural Language Models. *CoRR* (2014).
- [15] Chen Kong, Dahua Lin, Mohit Bansal, Raquel Urtasun, and Sanja Fidler. 2014. What Are You Talking About? Text-to-Image Coreference. *CVPR*.
- [16] Jonathan Krause, Justin Johnson, Ranjay Krishna, and Li Fei Fei. 2017. A Hierarchical Approach for Generating Descriptive Image Paragraphs. *CVPR*.
- [17] Paul Martin Lester. 2013. *Visual communication: Images with messages*. Cengage Learning.
- [18] Henry Lieberman and Hugo Liu. 2002. Adaptive Linking between Text and Photos Using Common Sense Reasoning. *AH*.

Table 9: Example alignments. Highlighted texts show similar concepts between image and aligned paragraphs.

Image and detected concepts	SANDI-CV	SANDI-MAN	SANDI-BD
 <p>CV: cottage, flower-pot, carrier MAN: Shire, Bilbo Baggins BD: New Zealand, hobbit house</p>	<p>Take advantage of your stay here and visit the memorable scenes shown in the movies. Visit The Shire and experience firsthand the 44 Hobbit Holes from which Bilbo Baggins emerged to commence his grand adventure. Tongariro National Park is home to the feared Mount Doom in The Lord of the Rings. Other famous locations that you can visit are Christchurch, Nelson and Cromwell.</p>	<p>Home to hobbits, warriors, orcs and dragons. If you're a fan of the famous trilogies, Lord of the Rings and The Hobbit, then choosing New Zealand should be a no-brainer.</p>	<p>Take advantage of your stay here and visit the memorable scenes shown in the movies. Visit The Shire and experience firsthand the 44 Hobbit Holes from which Bilbo Baggins emerged to commence his grand adventure. Tongariro National Park is home to the feared Mount Doom in The Lord of the Rings. Other famous locations that you can visit are Christchurch, Nelson and Cromwell.</p>
 <p>CV: snowy mountains, massif, alpine glacier, mountain range MAN: outdoor lover, New Zealand, study destination, BD: New Zealand</p>	<p>New Zealand produced the first man to ever climb Mount Everest and also the creator of the bungee-jump. Thus, it comes as no surprise that this country is filled with adventures and adrenaline junkies.</p>	<p>Moreover, the wildlife in New Zealand is something to behold. Try and find a Kiwi! (the bird, not the fruit). They are nocturnal creatures so it is quite a challenge. New Zealand is also home to the smallest dolphin species, Hector's Dolphin. Lastly, take the opportunity to search for the beautiful yellow-eyed penguin.</p>	<p>Home to hobbits, warriors, orcs and dragons. If you're a fan of the famous trilogies, Lord of the Rings and The Hobbit, then choosing New Zealand should be a no-brainer.</p>
 <p>CV: cup, book, knife, art gallery, cigarette holder, MAN: New Zealand, educational rankings, BD: books</p>	<p>Study in New Zealand and your CV will gain an instant boost when it is time to go job hunting.</p>	<p>The land of the Kiwis consistently tops educational rankings and has many top ranking universities, with 5 of them in the top 300 in the world. Furthermore, teachers are highly educated and more often than not researchers themselves. Active participation, creativity and understanding of different perspectives are some of the many qualities you can pick up by studying in New Zealand.</p>	<p>New Zealand has countless student-friendly cities. Therefore, it should hardly come as a surprise that New Zealand is constantly ranked as a top study abroad destination. To name but a few cities: Auckland, North Palmerston, Wellington and Christchurch all have fantastic services and great universities where you can study and live to your heart's content.</p>

- [19] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge J. Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C. Lawrence Zitnick. 2014. Microsoft COCO: Common Objects in Context. *ECCV*.
- [20] Cewu Lu, Ranjay Krishna, Michael S. Bernstein, and Fei-Fei Li. 2016. Visual Relationship Detection with Language Priors. *ECCV*.
- [21] Jiasen Lu, Caiming Xiong, Devi Parikh, and Richard Socher. 2017. Knowing When to Look: Adaptive Attention via a Visual Sentinel for Image Captioning. *CVPR*.
- [22] Paul Messaris and Linus Abraham. 2001. The role of images in framing news stories. *Framing public life*. Routledge, 231–242.
- [23] Tomas Mikolov, Ilya Sutskever, Kai Chen, Gregory S. Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. Distributed Representations of Words and Phrases and their Compositionality. *NIPS*.
- [24] Hareesh Ravi, Lezi Wang, Carlos Muñiz, Leonid Sigal, Dimitris N. Metaxas, and Mubbasir Kapadia. 2018. Show Me a Story: Towards Coherent Neural Story Illustration. *CVPR*.
- [25] Joseph Redmon and Ali Farhadi. 2017. YOLO9000: Better, Faster, Stronger. *CVPR*.
- [26] Shaoqing Ren, Kaiming He, Ross B. Girshick, and Jian Sun. 2015. Faster R-CNN: Towards Real-Time Object Detection with Region Proposal Networks. *NIPS*.
- [27] Katharina Schwarz, Pavel Rojtbberg, Joachim Caspar, Iryna Gurevych, Michael Goesele, and Hendrik P. A. Lensch. 2010. Text-to-Video: Story Illustration from Online Photo Collections. *KES*.
- [28] Robert Speer, Joshua Chin, and Catherine Havasi. 2017. ConceptNet 5.5: An Open Multilingual Graph of General Knowledge. *AAAI*.
- [29] Ying Hua Tan and Chee Seng Chan. 2016. phi-LSTM: A Phrase-Based Hierarchical LSTM Model for Image Captioning. *ACCV*.
- [30] Ivan Vendrov, Ryan Kiros, Sanja Fidler, and Raquel Urtasun. 2016. Order-Embeddings of Images and Language. *ICLR*.
- [31] Bryan Williams, Henry Lieberman, and Patrick H. Winston. 2017. Understanding Stories with Large-Scale Common Sense. *COMMONSENSE*.
- [32] Qi Wu, Chunhua Shen, Lingqiao Liu, Anthony R. Dick, and Anton van den Hengel. 2016. What Value Do Explicit High Level Concepts Have in Vision to Language Problems?. *CVPR*.
- [33] Zhaohui Wu and C. Lee Giles. 2013. Measuring Term Informativeness in Context. *NAACL HLT*.
- [34] Kelvin Xu, Jimmy Ba, Ryan Kiros, Kyunghyun Cho, Aaron C. Courville, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Richard S. Zemel, and Yoshua Bengio. 2015. Show, Attend and Tell: Neural Image Caption Generation with Visual Attention. *ICML*.
- [35] Bangpeng Yao, Xiaoye Jiang, Aditya Khosla, Andy Lai Lin, Leonidas J. Guibas, and Fei-Fei Li. 2011. Human action recognition by learning bases of action attributes and parts. *ICCV*.
- [36] Baopeng Zhang, Yanyun Qu, Jinye Peng, and Jianping Fan. 2017. An automatic image-text alignment method for large-scale web image retrieval. *Multimedia Tools Appl.* 76, 20 (2017), 21401–21421.
- [37] Zhichen Zhao, Huimin Ma, and Shaodi You. 2017. Single Image Action Recognition Using Semantic Body Part Actions. *ICCV*.
- [38] Bolei Zhou, Ágata Lapedriza, Jianxiong Xiao, Antonio Torralba, and Aude Oliva. 2014. Learning Deep Features for Scene Recognition using Places Database. *NIPS*.
- [39] Ning Zhou and Jianping Fan. 2015. Automatic image-text alignment for large-scale web image indexing and retrieval. *Pattern Recognition* 48, 1 (2015), 205–219.
- [40] Yukun Zhu, Ryan Kiros, Richard S. Zemel, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Raquel Urtasun, Antonio Torralba, and Sanja Fidler. 2015. Aligning Books and Movies: Towards Story Like Visual Explanations by Watching Movies and Reading Books. *ICCV*.