

Dual-branch Prompting for Multimodal Machine Translation

Jie Wang, Zhendong Yang, Liansong Zong, Xiaobo Zhang, Dexian Wang, Ji Zhang*

Abstract—Multimodal Machine Translation (MMT) typically enhances text-only translation by incorporating aligned visual features. Despite the remarkable progress, state-of-the-art MMT approaches often rely on paired image-text inputs at inference and are sensitive to irrelevant visual noise, which limits their robustness and practical applicability. To address these issues, we propose D²P-MMT, a diffusion-based dual-branch prompting framework for robust vision-guided translation. Specifically, D²P-MMT requires only the source text and a reconstructed image generated by a pre-trained diffusion model, which naturally filters out distracting visual details while preserving semantic cues. During training, the model jointly learns from both authentic and reconstructed images using a dual-branch prompting strategy, encouraging rich cross-modal interactions. To bridge the modality gap and mitigate training-inference discrepancies, we introduce a distributional alignment loss that enforces consistency between the output distributions of the two branches. Extensive experiments on the Multi30K dataset demonstrate that D²P-MMT achieves superior translation performance compared to existing state-of-the-art approaches.

Index Terms—Multimodal machine translation, Multimedia, Multimodal fusion.

I. INTRODUCTION

NEURAL Machine Translation (NMT) represents the current state-of-the-art in the field of machine translation [1]–[4]. However, conventional NMT systems primarily rely on textual data and often lack the rich contextual cues inherent in real-world environments. To address this limitation, researchers turn to Multimodal Machine Translation (MMT), which incorporates rich visual information into the translation modeling process [5], [6]. The core idea of MMT is to integrate shared visual perceptions of objects and scenes across languages into the translation model, thereby enhancing its understanding of real-world semantics, particularly in ambiguous




Fig. 1: Illustrations of classic MMT model and our proposed D²P-MMT framework. In the authentic image, the red bounding box highlights the main content of the sentence, while the yellow bounding box indicates redundant information. In our method, irrelevant visual information is filtered out by reconstructing the image.

scenarios where text-only NMT systems often struggle [7]. Therefore, MMT research holds great significance for developing more robust, accurate, and contextually-aware translation systems that better reflect real-world communication.

To incorporate aligned visual inputs, early studies adopt specialized **encoder-decoder** architectures [8]–[10] that enable the model to jointly process linguistic and visual signals. Other approaches focus on extracting specific visual object embeddings to enhance translation quality [11], [12]. However, these methods typically require paired images during inference, which limits their practical deployment in scenarios where visual input is unavailable at test time. To reduce the dependency on authentic images, recent research explores alternatives such as generating visual representations directly from the source text. This includes approaches that employ visual hallucination networks to produce pseudo-visual features [7], [13], [14], use **generative models** to synthesize images from text [15], or adopt inverse knowledge distillation schemes to derive multimodal features from text alone [16]. Another strategy **retrieves relevant images** from auxiliary datasets [17].

Despite notable progress, several challenges remain. A major issue lies in the distributional gap between authentic visual data used during training and the synthetic or inferred visual representations employed at inference time. This mismatch hinders the effective integration of visual information and may degrade translation performance. In addition, even when authentic images are available (e.g., via retrieval dur-

*Corresponding author: Ji Zhang.

Jie Wang, Xiaobo Zhang and Ji Zhang are with the School of Computing and Artificial Intelligence, Southwest Jiaotong University, Chengdu, China. Email: jackwang@swjtu.edu.cn (Jie Wang), zhangxb@swjtu.edu.cn (Xiaobo Zhang), jizhang@swjtu.edu.cn (Ji Zhang).

Zhendong Yang is with the School of Computer and Software Engineering, Xihua University, Chengdu 610039, China. Email: Mental80016@163.com.

Liansong Zong is with the School of Computing and Artificial Intelligence, Southwest Jiaotong University, Chengdu, China, and also with the School of Computer and Software Engineering, Xihua University, Chengdu 610039, China. Email: lsong@my.swjtu.edu.cn.

Dexian Wang is with the School of Intelligent Medicine, Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Chengdu, China. Email: wangdexian@cdutcm.edu.cn.

This work is supported by the Supported by the the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grant No. 2682025CX105), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 62406259), the Industry-University Collaborative Education Project of Xihua University (Grants No. CXXT2024014, No. CXXT2024015) and the Project for the Quality of Postgraduate Education of Xihua University (Grant No. YJG202525).

ing training), they often contain redundant information that complicates their effective utilization. As shown in Fig. 1 (a), an example from the Multi30K dataset shows that the authentic image paired with the source sentence (‘a boy strolls by a pond in a park’) often contains substantial background information (e.g., elements highlighted by yellow boxes) that is extraneous to the core semantic content described in the text (represented by the red box). Current MMT models tend to be sensitive to such irrelevant visual noise and struggle to disentangle informative visual cues from distracting content, which negatively impacts translation quality [18]. In contrast, Fig. 1 (b) conceptually illustrates the objective of our work: to refine visual representations through a reconstruction process that filters out irrelevant content and emphasizes core visual elements that directly correspond to the textual description.

In this paper, we propose **D²P-MMT, a diffusion-based dual-branch prompting framework**. Specifically, we employ a pre-trained Stable Diffusion model to generate a textually grounded reconstructed image directly from the source sentence, which filters out visual details that may distract the translation model. During training, our model operates with two parallel branches: one processing the authentic image and the other processing the corresponding reconstructed image, both paired with the source text. When the two types of images are input separately, we apply a dual-branch prompting strategy to enhance interaction between the textual and visual modalities. In the visual branch, we introduce multiple staged prompt modules, which enhance visual representations and guide the learning of textual prompts within the visual context. This dual mechanism facilitates richer cross-modal alignment, helping the model capture both global scene context and fine-grained details. To ensure knowledge transfer and consistency between representations learned from different visual inputs (i.e., authentic and reconstructed images), we incorporate a Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence loss to align the output distributions of the prompt predictors from both branches. This regularization encourages the model to learn robust prompt embeddings that generalize across both visual modalities. During inference, the source text and the reconstructed image are used to generate the translation output, thereby eliminating the reliance on authentic images.

In summary, the main contributions of our work can be summarized as follows:

- We propose D²P-MMT, a novel dual-branch prompting framework that leverages diffusion-based reconstructed images to enhance multimodal machine translation while eliminating the need for authentic images at inference time.
- We design a dual-branch prompting strategy that enables joint learning from both authentic and reconstructed visual inputs. We build a cross-branch coupling function to explicitly bridge the visual and textual modalities, facilitating robust joint training and improving generalization capability.
- We conduct extensive experiments on the Multi30K benchmark, demonstrating that D²P-MMT achieves significant improvements over strong baselines.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Machine Translation

Machine Translation (MT) has been examined through various lenses, experiencing a paradigm shift from Rule-Based Machine Translation (RBMT) to Statistical Machine Translation (SMT) and then to Neural Machine Translation (NMT). Neha Bhadwal et al. [19] achieved Hindi-to-Sanskrit translation through the use of bilingual dictionaries and their associated grammatical, semantic, and morphological rules. Remya Rajan et al. [20] used dictionary rules to transform the structure of the source language into the corresponding target language structure. On the other hand, Muskaan Singh et al. [21] employed deep neural networks to extract phrases and idiomatic expressions from bilingual corpora. Mohammad Masudur Rahman et al. [22] used the corpus-based n-gram (CBN) technique to search for the best match from bilingual corpora for translation. NMT is based on a simpler encoder-decoder structure, using deep learning models to capture complex linguistic relationships and patterns. Sandeep Saini et al. [23] employed a bidirectional encoder that connects the hidden layers from both directions to the same output layer, improving the accuracy of English-to-Hindi translation through a multi-layer LSTM model. While methods like generating pseudo-sentence pairs from monolingual corpora [24] have further advanced text-based translation, their performance remains limited in contexts where semantics are inherently ambiguous or sparse. This is particularly evident in domains like social media, where the lack of rich textual context often makes purely text-based analysis insufficient, highlighting the need for auxiliary modalities like vision to disambiguate meaning.

B. Multimodal Machine Translation

Visual modality-guided neural machine translation, commonly referred to as multimodal machine translation (MMT), has increasingly become a hot topic in machine translation research. MMT enhances the fine-grained representation of language models by incorporating additional visual information [25] (e.g., images or videos), thereby improving their ability to understand complex scenes.

In recent years, the focus of MMT research has gradually shifted from how to utilize visual features [6] and how to integrate them into sequence-to-sequence models based on RNN, to the Transformer architecture based on attention mechanisms [26]. Elliott and Kadar [27] adopted a GRU-based encoder-decoder model to encode the source text and learn visual foundation representations through image prediction tasks. Fei et al. [28] used a graph convolutional network (GCN) to encode visual scene graphs and generate pseudo-representations of visual features. Nishihara et al. [29] introduced a supervised visual attention mechanism, aligning words in sentences with corresponding regions in images to refine the connection between text and visual input. Inspired by these works, researchers have utilized attention mechanisms to fuse and align visual object embeddings [30], [31] to improve MMT tasks. Calixto et al. [32] captured visual representations through an independent double attention module, treating source words and visual features as the focus of attention. Calixto and




Fig. 2: The overall framework of the proposed D²P-MMT model. It consists of four stages: **image feature reconstruction**, **visual prompt generation**, **dual-branch prompting**, and **language translation**. Images are reconstructed using pretrained diffusion models, and text prompts are adjusted based on visual prompts via a coupling function $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ to facilitate cross-modal interaction. The final translation output is derived from two input streams: the reconstructed fused representation Z^d and the authentic fused representation Z^a .

Liu et al. [33] further used global visual features from the source sentences to initialize the encoder or decoder states through these features. Ive et al. [34] proposed a translation-refinement method to improve the draft translation with visual features. Wang and Xiong [35] encouraged MMT to generate translations based on more relevant visual objects by masking irrelevant objects in the visual modality. Additionally, Yin et al. [36] adopted a unified multimodal graph to capture various semantic interactions between multimodal semantic units. Lin et al. [37] proposed a dynamic context-guided double-layer visual interaction module, introducing capsule networks to extract visual features and generate multimodal context vectors to address the challenge of insufficient guidance in multimodal fusion. Sato et al. [38] and Bowen et al. [39] conducted visual masking language modeling by intelligently selecting masking tokens, aiming to enhance the disambiguation ability of the model through image enhancement. These studies are dedicated to achieving a good balance between maintaining translation quality and optimizing the use of images as contextual clues.

By contrast, our approach specifically focuses on two key aspects: the reconstruction of visual representations and the facilitation of comprehensive, multi-level cross-modal interaction between visual and textual modalities.

III. METHOD

This section commences by outlining the problem formulation (Section III-A). Subsequently, we introduce the

key steps of our proposed D²P-MMT: Image Feature Reconstruction (Section III-C), Dual-Branch Prompting Learning (Section III-D), and Consistency Training (Section III-E). Finally, the language translation process is detailed in Section III-F. D²P-MMT's overall structure is shown in Fig. 2.

A. Preliminaries

Multimodal Machine Translation. MMT task is typically defined as the challenge of using visual signals (images or videos) to assist in the translation of text. MMT systems are usually based on an encoder-decoder framework. In this task, given a sequence pair (x, y) , where $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$ is a source sentence of length N , and $y = (y_1, \dots, y_M)$ is a target sentence of length M . Transformer consists of an encoder f_T^{Enc} and a decoder f_T^{Dec} , modeling the conditional probability distribution of the target sentence based on the input sequence. MMT usually uses the encoder f_V^{Enc} to map the image v to a visual latent representation z , and connects this representation with the word embeddings of the text x , inputting it into the decoder f_T^{Dec} to obtain visual information as input conditioning, resulting in a conditional probability representation of the target sentence,

$$\begin{aligned}
 p(y|x, z; \mathbf{f}_T) &= \prod_{i=1}^n p(y_i | y_{<i}, x, z) \\
 &= \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbf{f}_T^{Dec}(y_i | y_{<i}, \mathbf{f}_T^{Enc}(x; \theta_e); \theta_d, z),
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where z is the visual signal $f_V^{Enc}(v)$, $f_T = (f_T^{Enc}, f_T^{Dec})$, θ_e and θ_d are the parameters of the encoder and decoder, respectively. The decoder f_T^{Dec} predicts the probability of each output token at each position i using a cascade attention mechanism, focusing on the encoder output $f_T^{Enc}(x)$ and the previously predicted target tokens $y < i$. The MMT model is trained by optimizing a translation loss function based on cross-entropy, minimizing the following objective function on a triplet (x, v, y) dataset:

$$\ell_T(\mathbf{f}_T; z) = \mathbb{E}_{(x,z,y)} [-\log p(y | x, z; \mathbf{f}_T)]. \quad (2)$$

Multimodal Transformer. The Multimodal Transformer [26] is an efficient architecture specifically designed for MMT (Multimodal Machine Translation). It achieves this by replacing the single-modal self-attention layer in the Transformer [4] encoder with a cross-modal self-attention layer, enabling the model to process both text and visual inputs simultaneously, thereby learning multimodal representations guided by image-perception attention from text representations. The source language word sequence x is represented as $H^x = \{h_1^x, \dots, h_N^x\}$, and the image $I \in \mathbb{R}^{H \times W \times 3}$ is represented as $H^i = \{h_1^i, \dots, h_K^i\}$, where N represents the length of the source sentence, and K represents the number of image features. In the multimodal self-attention layer, the text and visual representations are further concatenated to form joint representations as query vectors:

$$\mathbf{H}_{xv} = [\mathbf{H}^x; \mathbf{H}^i W^i], \quad (3)$$

where W^i is a learnable weight matrix. The text representations H^x are used as key and value vectors. Finally, the output of the multimodal self-attention layer is calculated as follows:

$$\mathbf{A}_i = \sum_{j=1}^N \tilde{\alpha}_{ij} \cdot (W_V \cdot h_j^x), \quad (4)$$

where $\tilde{\alpha}_{ij}$ are the self-attention scores computed by the softmax function:

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{ij} = \text{softmax} \left(\frac{(W_Q \cdot \tilde{h}_i)(W_K \cdot \tilde{h}_j^x)^T}{\sqrt{d_k}} \right), \quad (5)$$

where W_Q , W_K , W_V are learnable weights, and d_k is the dimension of the key vectors. The final output of the Multimodal Transformer Encoder layer is fed into f_T^{Dec} to generate the target translation. In this paper, we adopt the Multimodal Transformer as the base architecture of our model.

Latent Diffusion Model. Latent Diffusion Model (LDM) [40] is a text-to-image generation model based on the diffusion process, which models data distribution in a low-dimensional latent space to generate high-quality images. LDM has demonstrated its strong generative capabilities through its outstanding performance in tasks such as video generation [41], image restoration [42], and prompt engineering [43]. Given the high accuracy requirements for machine translation in MMT tasks, we adopted the Stable Diffusion model, which is based on the latent diffusion model. The model is composed of a VAE, a U-Net, and a CLIP text encoder.

The training process of Stable Diffusion consists of a forward diffusion process and a reverse denoising process.

In the forward process, the VAE encoder projects the input image from pixel space into low-dimensional latent space, obtaining its latent representation. Subsequently, Gaussian noise is progressively added to the latent representation via the diffusion process, simulating the transition of data from its original distribution to a noise distribution. This process is controlled by timesteps, with each step corresponding to a different level of noise perturbation. In the denoising process, the U-Net model, with shared parameters, is iteratively applied to remove noise from the latent representation. At this stage, U-Net is conditioned on the feature representation of the text description by the CLIP text encoder, and the text information is integrated into the process of image generation through the cross-attention mechanism. Finally, the VAE decoder generates a reconstructed image that matches the text description based on the denoised latent representation. In our proposed method, a pre-trained stable diffusion model is used to generate a reconstructed image of the source sentence.

B. Approach Overview

The overall framework of the proposed D²P-MMT is illustrated in Fig. 2. This method aims to effectively mitigate the impact of visual noise by introducing reconstructed images. Simultaneously, we propose a dual-branch prompting strategy to extract multi-level knowledge from both textual and visual modalities and to facilitate effective cross-modal interaction.

Specifically, our method includes four key stages: image feature reconstruction, dual-branch prompt learning, consistency training, and the language translation stage. Firstly, given the source language sentence x and its corresponding authentic image v , we use the stable diffusion model to generate reconstructed images for each source sentence to enhance the training dataset. The MMT model is then jointly trained using authentic images and reconstructed images. During the training stage, prompt blocks are introduced to optimize the visual representations in the visual branch. Meanwhile, in the text branch, visual prompts are used as conditions for text prompts through coupling functions to establish a collaborative relationship between the two modalities. The model predicts the translation output through two parallel information streams: one for the reconstructed image (top of Fig. 2) and the other for the authentic image (bottom of Fig. 2). These two representations are fed into a Multimodal Transformer to perform the MMT task, resulting in two output distributions y^d and y^a , both trained with negative log-likelihood loss against the target sequence y . Additionally, the training loss encourages consistency in the predictions of the reconstructed and authentic visual prompt representations, which is necessary for the reliability of the reconstructed visual module during inference. Finally, the model generates the translation output conditioned on the text input x and the reconstructed image.

C. Image Feature Reconstruction

This section introduces the image feature reconstruction step in the method we propose. We use the stable diffusion model based on latent diffusion models to reconstruct images from




Fig. 3: The forward diffusion and reverse diffusion process of the image.

text. The stable diffusion model applies the diffusion model to the latent space of a VAE, gradually adding noise to the data, and then learning the inverse process to generate new data samples. As shown in Fig. 3, in the forward diffusion process, random Gaussian noise is continuously added to the projected image latent representation until it becomes pure noise. This process can be represented as a Markov chain, where each step is deterministic and depends on the previous state. Specifically, let the original image be v_0 , and the image at time step t after diffusion be v_t , then the diffusion process at each step can be represented as:

$$v_t = \sqrt{\alpha_t} \cdot v_{t-1} + \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t} \cdot \epsilon_t \quad (6)$$

where α_t is a coefficient that changes with time, representing the proportion of image information retained at time step t , and ϵ_t represents noise drawn from the standard normal distribution. In the reverse diffusion process, the model learns how to recover the image from noise, which is a Markov chain in the opposite direction. The reverse process at each step can be represented as:

$$v_{t-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_t}} \cdot \left(v_t - \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t} \cdot \epsilon_\lambda(v_t, t) \right) + \sqrt{1 - \alpha_{t-1}} \cdot \epsilon_\lambda(v_t, t) \quad (7)$$

where $\epsilon_\lambda(v_t, t)$ is the noise predicted by the model, λ represents the model parameters, and v_{t-1} represents the image we want to recover. The SD model first recovers the image by removing a portion of the noise and then adds new noise to maintain the randomness and diversity of the image. This process is repeated until the original image is recovered. The loss function of the latent diffusion model is as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{LDM}} = \mathbb{E}_{\epsilon(v), y, \epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1), t} [\| \epsilon - \epsilon_\theta(z_t, t, \tau_\theta(y)) \|_2^2] \quad (8)$$

where ϵ represents Gaussian noise, \mathbb{E}_ϵ represents the VAE encoder, ϵ_θ and τ_θ respectively represent the U-Net and text encoder, and θ represents the model parameters. y and v represent the input text and image, respectively. t and z_t represent the time step and the latent representation at time t , respectively.

In our work, the SD model guides the image reconstruction generation process by combining source language sentence descriptions. The text embeddings are extracted using the text encoder of the CLIP model's ViT-L/14 based on the input text x . Simultaneously, a random noise ϵ_λ , is initialized with the text description for initialization. The text embeddings and the




Fig. 4: Implementation of visual multi-level prompt enhancement module.

noise are then fed into the U-Net of the diffusion model to generate denoised image latent representations. Finally, the VAE decoder projects the denoised latent representations from the latent space to the pixel space to obtain the reconstructed image. This process can be represented as:

$$v_{t-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha_t}} \cdot \left(v_t - \sqrt{1 - \alpha_t} \cdot \epsilon_\lambda(v_t, t, c) \right) + \sqrt{1 - \alpha_{t-1}} \cdot \epsilon_\lambda(v_t, t, c) \quad (9)$$

where $\epsilon_\lambda(v_t, t, c)$ is the noise predicted by the model, and c represents the text description embedding vector.

D. Dual-Branch Prompt Learning

We aim for the model to capture deeper semantic information from the source language and to leverage visual signals to understand the implicit meanings and contextual nuances within the language—particularly when dealing with ambiguous or underspecified expressions. Compared to mainstream unimodal enhancement approaches, our dual-branch prompting strategy enables more flexible and dynamic adaptation of the textual and visual representation spaces. This allows the model to extract richer linguistic semantics as well as highly relevant visual contextual information. Specifically, we introduce multi-stage prompt blocks at different layers of the visual branch to enhance visual representations. These enhanced visual features are not only fused with the corresponding feature maps as inputs for the subsequent stages, but are also used to guide the generation of textual prompts, thereby further strengthening the deep interaction between the two modalities.

1) *Visual Prompt Generation*: As noted in [44], visual feature representations at different levels contribute significantly to enhancing the generalization ability of the network. To fully exploit semantic information across multiple levels and enrich the feature representation space, we embed the prompt blocks into multiple layers of the CLIP visual encoder.

The structure of the prompt block is illustrated in Fig. 4. In our visual prompt generation module, input features are first grouped along the channel dimension and then processed through two parallel branches. One branch captures global information using a 1×1 convolution, a 5×5 depth-wise convolution, and another 1×1 convolution. The other branch focuses on local spatial patterns, employing a 3×3 convolution, a 4×4 convolution, a fully connected layer, and an additional 3×3 convolution. Finally, the outputs from both branches are fused via concatenation.

First, given the input image features $x \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times L \times D}$ (where B is the batch size, and L and D represent the length and dimension of the image features, respectively), we perform dimensional expansion on x , increasing the number of channels, and then group the channels. The input is split into $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times \frac{C}{2} \times L \times D}$ and $x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times \frac{C}{2} \times L \times D}$. For the global information branch, the input x_1 is first processed through a 1×1 convolutional layer to compress the channel information. It is then followed by a 5×5 depth-wise convolution to enhance spatial modeling capabilities and further extract global contextual information. Finally, another 1×1 convolution is applied to adjust the number of output channels and feature dimensions. This process is shown in Equation (10):

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{x}_1 &= P_{\text{global}} \\ &= P_{\text{Conv}2d_{1 \times 1}}(P_{\text{Conv}2d_{5 \times 5}}(P_{\text{Conv}2d_{1 \times 1}}(x_1)))\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

where $\hat{x}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times C \times L \times D}$, $P_{\text{Conv}2d}$ represents a convolutional layer, and the subscripts denote the size of the convolutional kernel.

For the second branch, the input x_2 is first passes through a 3×3 convolution layer and a 4×4 convolution layer to capture the detailed information of the image and further extract local features. After undergoing a nonlinear transformation, these features are flattened into a two-dimensional vector. We utilize a fully connected layer, which is sensitive to the features, to integrate the characteristics, thereby enhancing the interrelationships among features for higher-level feature learning. Finally, the output of the fully connected layer is reshaped and then optimized through a 3×3 convolution layer to improve the representation of local features. This process is shown in Equation (11):

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{x}_2 &= P_{\text{local}} \\ &= P_{\text{Conv}2d_{3 \times 3}}(\text{Linear}(P_{\text{Conv}2d_{4 \times 4}}(P_{\text{Conv}2d_{3 \times 3}}(x_2))))\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

Additionally, a ReLU activation function is applied after each convolutional layer to enhance the network's ability to express non-linear features. This helps the model learn more complex and abstract features while ensuring the non-negativity of the feature mappings.

Finally, x_1 and \hat{x}_1 are connected via residual connections, and a linear layer maps them to the same space as \hat{x}_2 . The results are concatenated along the channel dimension to generate the complete visual prompt V_p :

$$\begin{aligned}V_p &= VPG(x) \\ &= \text{Concat}(\text{Linear}(P_{\text{global}}(x_1) + x_1), P_{\text{local}}(x_2))\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$

The Visual Prompt Generation (VPG) module extracts both global and local information through parallel branches, effectively leveraging holistic semantics and fine-grained details of the image to enhance the expressiveness of visual representations.

2) *Language Prompt Learning*: At this stage, our goal is to guide the model in learning language context prompts through visual prompt embeddings. For the given source sentence $T = (t_1, \dots, t_i)$, each token t_i is first passed through the embedding layer and positional encoding to be converted into a word vector $E_{t_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_w}$, where d_w represents the

dimensionality of the embeddings. The text embeddings of the entire sentence are represented as $X = (E_{t_1}, \dots, E_{t_i})$. Subsequently, the encoded text embeddings are input into the Text Prompt module. At the same time, the visual prompt V_p , containing rich visual information, is projected into the same feature space as the text embeddings. Using a cross-modal attention mechanism, the projected visual prompt \tilde{V}_p is aligned with the text embeddings X . We treat \tilde{V}_p as both key and value, querying from the text embeddings. By computing the similarity between the query Q_x and the key K_v through an inner product, and normalizing it via the Softmax function, we obtain the attention weights:

$$\alpha = \text{Softmax}\left(\frac{X \cdot W_Q \cdot (\tilde{V}_p \cdot W_K)^\top}{\sqrt{d}}\right)\quad (13)$$

where α represents the attention weights between each word in the text embeddings and the visual prompt. W_Q , W_K and W_V are the learned weight matrices, and d is the embedding dimension. Finally, the attention weights α are used to compute a weighted sum of the values V_v from the visual prompt, resulting in the fused representation. This process can be expressed as:

$$X_p = \alpha \cdot V_v\quad (14)$$

Where $V_v = \tilde{V}_p \cdot W_V$, and X_p is the final text prompt prefix embedding. The guidance of visual prompts establishes a strong connection between visual and textual information to enhance the cross-modal understanding of the model.

3) *Visual Language Prompt Integration*: We believe that a multimodal prompting approach must be adopted in multimodal tasks, which involves simultaneously adjusting the visual and language branches to achieve the integrity of contextual optimization. A simple method is to combine the visual and language prompts, where the visual prompt V_p and the language prompt X_p are adjusted independently. We refer to this design as ‘independent prompting’. Although this method satisfies the requirements for prompt completeness, it lacks collaboration between the visual and language prompts.

To address this, in the MMT task, we propose a dual-branch prompting method to promote deep integration of visual and textual information, helping the model capture more granular semantic relationships. To ensure the coordination between the two branches, the visual prompt V_p is projected into the language branch using the mapping function $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$. The mapping function is implemented as a linear layer, mapping the d_v dimensional input to d_l , acting as a bridge between the two branches:

$$\tilde{V}_p = \mathcal{F}(V_p) = W_{\text{proj}} V_p + b_{\text{proj}}\quad (15)$$

Where W_{proj} is the weight matrix of the linear layer, b_{proj} is the bias term, and $V_p \in \mathbb{R}^{d_v}$, $\tilde{V}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{d_l}$. Here, d_v and d_l represent the dimensions of the features in the visual prompt and language branch, respectively. Unlike independent prompting, V_p provides explicit conditional guidance for X_p , thus promoting a richer and tighter interaction between the two modalities.

E. Consistency Training

We jointly train the MMT model using reconstructed images and authentic images. Specifically, we alleviate the distribution shift between training and inference by incorporating reconstructed images in the training process. Technically, we utilize the image d generated by the Stable Diffusion model, associated with the input text x . The CLIP image encoder is then employed to encode either the reconstructed image d or the authentic image a into visual embeddings. For the reconstructed and authentic image paths, we independently generate reconstructed and authentic visual prompts, V_p^d and V_p^a , respectively, using VPG, and then connect the visual prompts with the visual embeddings through residual connections. Subsequently, we introduce a feedforward network (FFN) to adjust the dimension of the visually embedded prompts to match the dimension of the word embeddings.

$$F^d = FFN(V^d \oplus V_p^d) \quad (16)$$

$$F^a = FFN(V^a \oplus V_p^a) \quad (17)$$

Where $F^d \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d}$ and $F^a \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times d}$ represent the visual representations of the reconstructed and authentic images, respectively, d is the dimension of the word embeddings, and \oplus denotes tensor concatenation operation. Next, F^d and F^a are fed into the Multimodal Transformer along with the text prompt embedding \hat{X} to perform the MMT task.

$$Z^d = F^d + \alpha \mathcal{F}(V_p^d) W_v^d \oplus X \quad (18)$$

$$Z^a = F^a + \alpha \mathcal{F}(V_p^a) W_v^a \oplus X \quad (19)$$

Where $\hat{X} = \alpha \mathcal{F}(V_p) W_V \oplus X$. We represent the target sentence as $y = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$ and formulate the translation training loss function as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{sdf} = - \sum_{j=1}^M \log p(y_j | y_{<j}, x, d) \quad (20)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{aut} = - \sum_{j=1}^M \log p(y_j | y_{<j}, x, a) \quad (21)$$

To enhance the model's internal consistency in handling reconstructed and authentic images and to improve the consistency of predicted probability distributions using the reconstructed image path with dual-branch prompting, we introduce a prediction consistency loss to measure the difference in the performance of visual prompts between the two paths. Denoting the target translation probability distributions obtained using reconstructed and authentic images as y^d and y^a , respectively, the Kullback-Leibler divergence loss is defined as the measure of the discrepancy between y^d and y^a :

$$\mathcal{L}_{kl} = \sum_i^M f_{\theta}(y_j | y_{<j}, x, d) \log \frac{f_{\theta}(y_j | y_{<j}, x, d)}{f_{\theta}(y_j | y_{<j}, x, a)} \quad (22)$$

Finally, the total loss related to the training process is as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{total} = \mu(\mathcal{L}_{sdf} + \mathcal{L}_{aut}) + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{kl} \quad (23)$$




Fig. 5: Our inference process uses only the source sentence and the reconstructed image as input.

where μ and λ are hyperparameters that balance the contributions of \mathcal{L}_{sdf} , \mathcal{L}_{aut} and \mathcal{L}_{kl} . During the training process, the objective is to minimize the total loss \mathcal{L}_{total} .

F. Language Translation

We use the source language sentence and the reconstructed image as inputs for the inference process. By integrating the embedding of the source text, the visual representation of the reconstructed image, and the prompts from both branches, we obtain the multimodal representation Z^d . As shown in Fig. 5, this multimodal representation not only captures the contextual information of the source sentence but also incorporates global and local spatial features extracted from the reconstructed image. Subsequently, Z^d is fed into the Multimodal Transformer Encoder for further feature extraction and semantic modeling. The encoded representation is then passed to the Transformer decoder, which, based on the contextual information and multimodal input, progressively predicts the target language translation. Specifically, the Transformer decoder utilizes a self-attention mechanism to dynamically attend to the already generated target language tokens during the prediction process, while integrating the multimodal input to capture hierarchical semantic dependencies. In this manner, the decoder iteratively processes the input to generate the target translation y^d . This approach eliminates the reliance of traditional MMT systems on paired authentic images during inference.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

In this section, we first introduce the experimental datasets, experimental setup, and baseline models. Secondly, to verify the effectiveness of the proposed model and analyze the ability of the dual-branch prompting method to capture the underlying semantics between textual and visual representations, we conducted a series of tests on both the baseline and the proposed models. The experimental results validate the effectiveness of the method. Finally, all our translation experiments were conducted on the Multi30K English \rightarrow German (En-De) and English \rightarrow French (En-Fr) dataset.

A. Dataset

Experiments were conducted on the widely used MMT benchmark dataset, Multi30K [45]. This dataset is a mul-

lingual extension of the Flickr30K dataset [46], comprising images, corresponding English descriptions, and human-translated texts in German (De), French (Fr), and Czech (Cs). The training set consists of 29,000 text-image pairs, while the validation set contains 1,014 text-image pairs.

MMT models were evaluated using the following three test sets:

- **Test2016** [45]: Comprising 1,000 text-image pairs from the original Multi30K dataset.
- **Test2017** [47]: Consisting of 1,000 text-image pairs sourced from WMT2017, characterized by more complex source sentence structures.
- **MSCOCO** [47]: Including 461 text-image pairs. Notably, MSCOCO serves as an out-of-domain dataset, comprising instances with ambiguous verbs and non-domain-specific content, which typically presents a more significant challenge for MMT models.

Following the methodology of Wu et al. [48], we employed joint Byte Pair Encoding BPE [49] for subword segmentation. By performing 10,000 merge operations on the source and target languages, we generated shared vocabularies of 9,712 and 9,544 tokens for the English-German (En-De) and English-French (En-Fr) tasks, respectively.

B. Model Setting

1) *Implementation details.*: Due to the relatively small scale of the Multi30K dataset, previous studies have shown that smaller models perform better on this dataset [48]. Therefore, we used Transformer-Tiny as the base configuration for our experiments. Our translation model consists of a 4-layer encoder and a 4-layer decoder, with each encoder and decoder layer having a hidden size of 128, an intermediate size of 256 for the feed-forward network, and 4 attention heads in the multi-head self-attention mechanism. Our implementation is based on the Fairseq library¹ [50], and we used stable-diffusion-v1-4² from the Huggingface library³ to generate reconstructed images. We used the default parameters, setting the denoising steps and guidance scale to 50 and 7.5, respectively, with the random seed for the generator set to 47, and a batch size of 8. For both reconstructed and authentic images, we used a pre-trained ViT-B/32 CLIP⁴ model for initial feature extraction. During training, we employed the Adam optimizer [51] to facilitate optimization, with parameters β_1 and β_2 set to 0.9 and 0.98, respectively. The learning rate was set to $1e-5$, with 2000 warm-up steps. The dropout rate was set to 0.3, and label smoothing was set to 0.1. The training was conducted on four A40 GPUs, with each training batch containing 2048 tokens, and the update frequency set to 4. During inference, we selected the reconstructed image most relevant to the text semantics for the MMT task and used a beam search strategy with a beam size of 5 to generate the target sentences.

2) *Evaluation Metrics.*: To ensure a fair comparison with previous work, we evaluated the final 10 checkpoints by averaging their performance to obtain a stable result. We selected the 4-gram BLEU [52] metric as an indicator to evaluate the translation performance. BLEU is a standard metric used to evaluate translation models, which balances considerations of adequacy and fluency by measuring the similarity between the generated and reference translations through n-gram matching. By default, 4-gram BLEU is used. The formula for calculating the BLEU score is as follows:

$$BLEU = BP \cdot \exp \left(\sum_{n=1}^N w_n \cdot \log P_n \right) \quad (24)$$

where BP is the brevity penalty, n represents the number of consecutive words (n-gram), w_n represents the weight of the n-gram, which is usually set equally such that $w_n = \frac{1}{N}$. P_n represents the precision of the n-gram. The BP calculation formula is expressed as follows:

$$BP = \begin{cases} 1 & lc > lr \\ \exp \left(1 - \frac{lr}{lc} \right) & lc \leq lr \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

where lc represents the length of the generated translation, and lr represents the length of the reference translation. We reported the BLEU scores for the checkpoints using the validation set results.

C. Baselines

To verify the effectiveness of the proposed model, we compared it with baseline methods from the state-of-the-art Multimodal Machine Translation tasks. The baseline methods are categorized into three types: Text-Only Transformer, Image-free systems, and Image-dependent systems. The Text-Only Transformer is implemented with the Transformer-Tiny configuration, using only text as input. The Image-free systems use only text during inference, while the Image-dependent systems use both text and images during inference.

1) Text-Only Transformer:

- **Transformer-Tiny**(Vaswani et al. 2017) [4] implements a lightweight self-attention-based Transformer architecture that uses only textual input for translation..

2) Image-free Methods:

- **UVR-NMT**(Zhang et al. 2020) [17] introduces a universal visual representation to replace authentic images and mitigate the scarcity of bilingual multimodal data in MMT.
- **ImagiT**(Long et al. 2021) [53] proposes a generative translation method based on imagination, which constructs consistent visual representations from the source text without authentic images.
- **IKD-MMT**(Peng et al. 2022) [16] adopts an inverted knowledge distillation approach to transfer multimodal knowledge from vision to the MMT model using only source text.
- **RMMT**(Wu et al. 2021) [54] incorporates a retrieval-based strategy that enhances translation by retrieving relevant visual information associated with the source sentence.

¹<https://github.com/facebookresearch/fairseq>

²<https://huggingface.co/CompVis/stable-diffusion-v1-4>

³<https://huggingface.co/>

⁴<https://github.com/openai/CLIP>

TABLE I: The BLEU scores for English-German and English-French translation tasks on the Multi30K test sets. Here we let * represent ensembled models. "(A)" indicates the use of authentic images during the inference stage, while "(R)" represents the use of reconstructed images. Bold values indicate the highest BLEU scores, and averages are rounded to two decimal places. Some of the results are taken from the work of Li et al. [6]

Method	English-German			English-French			Average
	Test2016	Test2017	MSCOCO	Test2016	Test2017	MSCOCO	
Text-Only Transformer							
Transformer-Tiny	40.69	34.26	30.52	62.84	54.35	44.81	44.58
Image-free Methods							
UVR-MMT	36.90	28.60	-	58.30	48.70	-	-
ImagiT	38.50	32.10	28.70	59.70	52.40	45.30	42.78
IKD-MMT	41.28	33.83	30.17	62.53	54.84	-	-
RMMT*	41.40	32.90	30.00	62.10	54.40	44.50	44.22
VALHALLA*	42.70	35.10	30.70	63.10	56.00	46.50	45.68
Image-dependent Methods							
Doubly-ATT	42.45	33.95	29.63	61.99	53.72	45.16	44.32
DCCN	39.70	31.00	26.70	61.20	54.30	45.40	43.05
Gumbel-Attention	39.20	31.40	26.90	-	-	-	-
Gated Fusion*	41.96	33.59	29.04	61.69	54.85	44.86	44.33
Selective Attention	41.84	34.32	30.22	62.24	54.52	44.82	44.66
Noise-robust	42.56	35.09	31.09	63.24	55.48	46.34	45.63
VALHALLA	42.60	35.10	30.70	63.10	56.00	46.40	45.65
MMT-VQA	42.55	34.58	30.96	62.24	54.89	45.75	45.16
D ² P-MMT(A)	42.72	35.24	30.93	63.04	55.13	45.44	45.42
D ² P-MMT(R)	43.12	35.54	31.01	63.70	56.62	46.23	46.04

3) Image-dependent Methods:

- **Doubly-ATT**(Calixtio et al. 2017) [32] proposes a dual-attention-based MMT framework that jointly encodes source text and visual features via two separate attention streams.
- **DCCN**(Lin et al. 2020) [9] introduces a dynamic context-guided capsule network, which integrates visual and textual information through dynamic routing and context-aware fusion.
- **Gumbel-Attention**(Liu et al. 2022) [55] utilizes a Gumbel-attention mechanism to generate image-aware text features, reducing interference from irrelevant visual regions.
- **Gated Fusion**(Wu et al. 2021) [54] designs a gated fusion module that regulates the degree of modality fusion with a gating matrix, enhancing interpretability and interaction control.
- **Selective Attention**(Li et al. 2022a) [6] proposes a selective attention mechanism that emphasizes stronger visual semantics to guide translation.
- **Noise-robust**(Ye et al. 2022) [56] constructs a relation-aware attention module using cross-modal interaction masks to suppress noisy visual signals and enhance model robustness.
- **VALHALLA**(Li et al. 2022b) [13] employs a visual hallucination module to generate pseudo-visual features from text, enabling multimodal training without paired images.
- **MMT-VQA**(Zou et al. 2023) [57] incorporates Visual Question Answering (VQA) to inject question-answer

supervision into the MMT process, improving visual reasoning through explicit probing.

V. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

As shown in Table I, we report the BLEU scores for each model on the two language pairs in the Multi30K dataset.

A. Main Results

First, our model significantly outperforms the text-only baseline across all test sets, emphasizing the effectiveness of the visual modality in conventional text-only NMT. With Transformer-Tiny as the backbone, D²P-MMT achieves average BLEU scores of 36.56 on the English-German task and 55.52 on the English-French task, resulting in improvements of approximately **1.4** and **1.52** BLEU points over the Text-Only Transformer baseline, respectively.

Furthermore, D²P-MMT outperforms both VALHALLA*, which generates visual representations from pure text input, and VALHALLA, which uses authentic visual annotations, in both the English-German and English-French tasks. Compared to MMT-VQA [57], which enhances the modeling of image-text relationships through visual question answering, our model achieves improvements of **+0.57**, **+0.96**, **+0.05**, **+1.46**, **+1.73**, and **+0.48** BLEU points across six sub-datasets. Similar performance trends can also be observed when comparing D²P-MMT with other representative approaches, further validating the effectiveness of our framework. These gains are attributed to the proposed dual-branch prompting strategy, which enables joint learning from both authentic and reconstructed images. This strategy effectively captures multi-level visual

TABLE II: Number of parameters and BLEU scores of different MMT models on English-German task.

Model	#Params	English-German			Average
		Test2016	Test2017	MSCOCO	
Text-Only Transformer					
Transformer-Tiny	2.60M	40.69	34.26	30.52	35.16
Transformer-Small	36.5M	39.68	32.99	28.50	33.72
Transformer-Base	49.1M	38.33	31.36	27.54	32.41
Our proposed method					
D ² P-MMT(A)-Tiny	4.35M	42.72	35.24	30.93	36.30
D ² P-MMT(A)-Small	36.85M	42.18	34.13	31.49	35.93
D ² P-MMT(A)-Base	49.25M	41.78	34.49	30.37	35.55
D ² P-MMT(R)-Tiny	4.35M	43.12	35.54	31.01	36.56
D ² P-MMT(R)-Small	36.85M	42.06	34.38	31.78	36.07
D ² P-MMT(R)-Base	49.25M	41.82	34.45	30.51	35.59

features and contextual semantic cues while mitigating adverse cross-modal interference. Notably, while the translation performance using reconstructed images (R) is comparable to that using authentic images (A), the reconstructed-image-based results consistently outperform those based on authentic images. This demonstrates that the reconstructed visual representation excludes visual noise and is semantically superior to the authentic image, further validating the effectiveness of our framework.

Lastly, it is encouraging to note that our method significantly outperforms all baseline systems in both Image-free and Image-dependent settings, achieving state-of-the-art performance on the test sets of the two translation tasks while freeing the inference process from reliance on authentic images. Overall, our model demonstrates a stronger ability to understand complex images and texts, achieving more robust and accurate translation predictions.

B. Model Analysis

In this section, we aim to provide a deeper analysis of the effectiveness of D²P-MMT. All results are performed on the Multi30K English-German task.

1) *Apply Our Method to Other Model Architecture*: To validate the generalization ability of the model, we conducted experiments using other architectures, maintaining the same model settings and hyperparameters as in our experiments with the Multimodal Transformer. Furthermore, prior research often overlooks discussions on model complexity, which is a notable factor given the small scale of the MMT training datasets. As emphasized in [48], the Transformer-Base and Transformer-Small architectures tend to overfit when applied to smaller datasets. In contrast, the smaller parameter count of the Transformer-Tiny demonstrates higher robustness and efficiency on such datasets. The experimental results are shown in Table II. D²P-MMT demonstrates a more appropriate number of parameters, reducing the risk of overfitting. Although the parameter count is higher compared to the pure text Transformer-Tiny, our model exhibits exceptional performance. This indicates that balancing the number of parameters and model capacity is crucial for Transformer-based systems, especially in MMT.

TABLE III: BLEU scores of our method and other regularization methods.

Model	English-German			Average
	Test2016	Test2017	MSCOCO	
Noise	41.86	35.72	30.77	36.12
D ² P-MMT(R)	43.12	35.54	31.01	36.56

TABLE IV: Ablation study over different components of our model on the English-German translation task. All results use BLEU scores.

Model	English-German			Average
	Test2016	Test2017	MSCOCO	
D ² P-MMT(R)	43.12	35.54	31.01	36.56
D ² P-MMT(A)	42.72	35.24	30.93	36.30
w/o \mathcal{L}_{kl}	41.83	33.94	29.59	35.12
w/o VPG_{global}	42.80	36.14	30.30	36.41
w/o VPG_{local}	42.29	34.76	30.63	35.89
w/o $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$	42.63	35.93	30.12	36.23
w/o VPG	42.57	35.08	30.88	36.18
w/o prompt	42.36	35.20	31.60	36.39

2) *Comparison with non-corresponding visual representation methods*: We follow the non-corresponding visual context settings from previous research and employ adversarial methods to evaluate the sensitivity of the reconstructed visual context [58]. We use noise vectors [18] as visual representations to compare the changes in BLEU performance between our method and the **Noise** method. As shown in Table III, D²P-MMT achieves an average score improvement of 0.44 across the three test sets in the English-German translation task, highlighting the importance of using reconstructed images as visual context after removing visual redundancy, as well as our effective utilization of more accurate visual and semantic information.

3) *Impact of Dual-branch prompting*: The Multi30k dataset consists of two modalities: text and images. To evaluate the impact of our dual-branch prompting method on both modalities, we visualize the unimodal features from a baseline configuration and our proposed method using t-SNE [59], as illustrated in Fig. 6. We observe that after projection, the baseline features for both text and visuals display a diffuse distribution with poor separability. In contrast, the features enhanced by our dual-branch prompting demonstrate markedly improved discriminability in the feature space. This enhancement is especially evident in the visual modality, where clusters become more distinct and intra-cluster compactness is significantly improved. This indicates that our dual-branch prompting strategy not only aids the model’s understanding of the global semantic context but also enhances its capacity to capture fine-grained local details.

C. Ablation Study

To comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed D²P-MMT model in leveraging reconstructed visual information and enhancing the interaction between text and visual modalities to improve MMT performance, we analyze the ablation experiments by focusing on four questions: (1)




Fig. 6: t-SNE visualization of unimodal feature representations for 1,000 samples from the Multi30K dataset. The top row shows features from a baseline configuration, while the bottom row displays the representations enhanced by our method.

Absence of \mathcal{L}_{kl} Loss. (2) Effect of visual prompt generation strategy on performance. (3) Coupling function. (4) Effectiveness of Dual-branch prompting. The results and analyses are presented in Table IV.

1) *Absence of \mathcal{L}_{kl} Loss*: In this variant, we deliberately excluded the distributional alignment loss (\mathcal{L}_{kl}) during the training phase. The aim is to gain insight into the impact of consistency in the predicted probability distributions based on two types of images under prompt guidance. Surprisingly, as presented in Table IV, the removal of the \mathcal{L}_{kl} loss leads to a significant drop in performance. This finding underscores the critical role of \mathcal{L}_{kl} loss in facilitating the consistency of predicted distributions between the reconstructed image path and the authentic image path. This loss ensures that the target sentences generated from the reconstructed images, guided by the dual-branch prompts, remain consistent with the translation context generated from the authentic images.

In addition, we replaced the distribution alignment loss with JS divergence loss, EMD loss [60], and Cosine embedding loss. All hyperparameters were kept the same as in the experiments using KL divergence loss. As shown in Table V, the decline in BLEU scores indicates the effectiveness of the KL divergence loss function in mitigating the discrepancies between the visual prompts from the reconstructed image path and those from the authentic image path. This further demonstrates that distributional alignment loss plays a critical role in reducing semantic and representational gaps between modalities.

TABLE V: BLEU scores of our method and other loss strategies.

Model	English-German			Average
	Test2016	Test2017	MSCOCO	
JS	41.67	34.84	30.74	35.75
EMD	40.99	33.94	31.61	35.51
Cosine	40.98	34.37	29.45	34.93
Ours(R)	43.12	35.54	31.01	36.56

TABLE VI: Results of different coupling strategies on the Multi30K English-German test set.



Model	English-German			Average
	Test2016	Test2017	MSCOCO	
Conv1d	42.12	34.74	30.33	35.73
Ours(R)	43.12	35.54	31.01	36.56

2) *Effect of visual prompt generation module on performance*: In our VPG Block, the design of grouped processing and parallel branches enhances the model’s ability to capture both global and local information. To evaluate the impact of different strategies on translation performance, we individually removed the global information processing branch and the local information processing branch, conducting separate tests for each variant. As shown in Table IV, using only one branch (i.e., w/o VPG_{global} or w/o VPG_{local}) results in a decline in translation performance. This indicates that the combined processing of global and local information is crucial for the MMT task. Specifically, when handling multimodal tasks, the model is able to comprehensively capture both the details and the overall scene present in the image.

3) *Coupling function*: As discussed in Section III-D3, D^2P -MMT employs the coupling function $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ to explicitly constrain text prompts within the visual prompts $V_p(V_p \rightarrow X_p)$. Here, we analyze an alternative design choice by using a one-dimensional convolution to replace the coupling function. As shown in Table VI, our method is a superior choice. Although one-dimensional convolution has the advantages of extracting local features and increasing the receptive field when processing sequence data, our design is able to capture complex feature relationships in a higher-dimensional space, thereby improving the expressiveness of the model, which can also be attributed to the lower information loss in this design.

4) *Effectiveness of Dual-branch prompting*: As shown in Table IV, we evaluated the dual-branch prompting method. First, we removed the coupling function from visual prompts to language prompts and directly embedded the visual prompts into the language branch. The “w/o $\mathcal{F}(\cdot)$ ” section in the table indicates that the absence of the coupling function’s projection significantly reduced the model’s performance, highlighting the crucial role of the coupling function in cross-modal information integration. Furthermore, we conducted experiments using an independent prompting method [61]. When visual prompts were not used (w/o VPG), the performance of D^2P -MMT decreased by 0.55, 0.46, and 0.13 on the three test sets of Multi30K, respectively. When the dual-branch prompting was removed (w/o *prompt*), the average drop was 0.17 on the

TABLE VII: Two translation cases of three systems on the English-German task. The red and blue highlight error and correct translations respectively.

	SRC: a cement truck pours fresh cement on the road. REF: ein zementlaster gießt frischen zement auf die straße . Text-Only: arbeiter arbeiten an einer straße . MMT-VQA: ein zementlaster gießt frische zement auf den boden . D ² P-MMT: ein zementlaster gießt frischen zement auf die straße .
	SRC: a man talks on the phone with his feet up . REF: ein mann telefoniert mit hochgelegten füßen . Text-Only: ein mann sitzt auf einer bank und telefoniert . MMT-VQA: ein mann telefoniert mit den füßen . D ² P-MMT: ein mann telefoniert mit hochgelegten füßen .

English-German task. This indicates that dual-branch prompting facilitates deep interaction between the two modalities, effectively integrating text and visual features, enriching the model’s understanding of contextual awareness, and enhancing translation performance.

D. Case Study

We present two translation examples generated by different systems as shown in Table VII. In the first example, the first system fails to capture the essence of the image and simply translates it as “arbeiter arbeiten an einer Straße.” (“Workers are working on a road”); the second system translates the phrase “auf die Straße” (“on the street”) as “auf den Boden” (“on the ground”), leading to a semantic deviation. In contrast, our proposed model accurately translates the phrases “frischen” (fresh) and “auf die Straße” (“on the street”). In the second example, the MMT system ignores the word “up” in the German context and fails to convey the state of the foot accurately. In contrast, our system correctly translates “hochgelegten” in German, effectively capturing the concept of “raised foot”. By introducing reconstructed visual information, our model effectively captures local details in the images, enhances the system’s ability to resolve translation ambiguities, and further verifies the improved translation performance achieved by utilizing the reconstructed image with dual-branch prompt enhancement.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we attribute the system’s low sensitivity to visual information to the redundancy present in authentic image content and insufficient cross-modal interaction. To address this issue, we propose a diffusion-based dual-branch prompting framework for Multimodal Machine Translation (D²P-MMT) to reduce the reliance on authentic paired images during the inference stage of multimodal machine translation tasks. Specifically, we utilize a Stable Diffusion model to generate reconstructed images from source sentences to filter out irrelevant visual noise. Through the dual-branch prompt method, we extract multi-level visual prompts to guide textual prompts, thereby enhancing the interaction between the textual and visual modalities. Finally, the target translation is generated by integrating the source sentence with the reconstructed image. We conduct extensive experiments on the Multi30K English-German and English-French datasets and observe significant improvements across multiple subsets.

Despite the strong performance of our model, we identify several limitations: (1) The sentences in the Multi30K dataset primarily consist of common and simple vocabulary, which may constrain the model’s generalization ability. We plan to incorporate datasets with more diverse and rare vocabulary for training. (2) Future work will explore more advanced cross-modal learning strategies and the integration of richer contextual cues to further strengthen the model’s comprehension of textual and visual modalities. (3) Developing more efficient visual models will be a focus of future work to further improve the performance of multimodal systems.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Jha, H. Y. Patil, S. K. Jindal, and S. M. Islam, “Multilingual indian language neural machine translation system using mt5 transformer,” in *2023 2nd International Conference on Paradigm Shifts in Communications Embedded Systems, Machine Learning and Signal Processing (PCEMS)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–5.
- [2] W. Li, Z. Cao, J. Feng, J. Zhou, and J. Lu, “Label2label: A language modeling framework for multi-attribute learning,” in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2022, pp. 562–579.
- [3] S. R. Laskar, P. Pakray, and S. Bandyopadhyay, “Neural machine translation for low resource assamese-english,” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computing and Communication Systems: I3CS 2020, NEHU, Shillong, India*. Springer, 2021, pp. 35–44.
- [4] A. Vaswani, “Attention is all you need,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- [5] L. Specia, S. Frank, K. Sima’An, and D. Elliott, “A shared task on multi-modal machine translation and crosslingual image description,” in *First Conference on Machine Translation*. Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL), 2016, pp. 543–553.
- [6] B. Li, C. Lv, Z. Zhou, T. Zhou, T. Xiao, A. Ma, and J. Zhu, “On vision features in multimodal machine translation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.09173*, 2022.
- [7] H. Fei, Q. Liu, M. Zhang, M. Zhang, and T.-S. Chua, “Scene graph as pivoting: Inference-time image-free unsupervised multimodal machine translation with visual scene hallucination,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12256*, 2023.
- [8] P. Liu, H. Cao, and T. Zhao, “Gumbel-attention for multi-modal machine translation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.08862*, 2021.
- [9] H. Lin, F. Meng, J. Su, Y. Yin, Z. Yang, Y. Ge, J. Zhou, and J. Luo, “Dynamic context-guided capsule network for multimodal machine translation,” in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM international conference on multimedia*, 2020, pp. 1320–1329.
- [10] Z. Li, Y. Hong, Y. Pan, J. Tang, J. Yao, and G. Zhou, “Feature-level incongruence reduction for multimodal translation,” in *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Advances in Language and Vision Research*, 2021, pp. 1–10.
- [11] M. Futeral, C. Schmid, I. Laptev, B. Sagot, and R. Bawden, “Tackling ambiguity with images: Improved multimodal machine translation and contrastive evaluation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10140*, 2022.
- [12] Y. Zhao, M. Komachi, T. Kajiwara, and C. Chu, “Word-region alignment-guided multimodal neural machine translation,” *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, vol. 30, pp. 244–259, 2021.
- [13] Y. Li, R. Panda, Y. Kim, C.-F. R. Chen, R. S. Feris, D. Cox, and N. Vasconcelos, “Valhalla: Visual hallucination for machine translation,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 5216–5226.
- [14] Q. Long, M. Wang, and L. Li, “Generative imagination elevates machine translation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.09654*, 2020.
- [15] Q. Fang and Y. Feng, “Neural machine translation with phrase-level universal visual representations,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.10299*, 2022.
- [16] R. Peng, Y. Zeng, and J. Zhao, “Distill the image to nowhere: Inversion knowledge distillation for multimodal machine translation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.04468*, 2022.
- [17] Z. Zhang, K. Chen, R. Wang, M. Utiyama, E. Sumita, Z. Li, and H. Zhao, “Neural machine translation with universal visual representation,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [18] J. Zhang, J. Song, L. Gao, N. Sebe, and H. T. Shen, “Reliable few-shot learning under dual noises,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2025.

- [19] N. Bhadwal, P. Agrawal, and V. Madaan, "A machine translation system from hindi to sanskrit language using rule based approach," *Scalable Computing: Practice and Experience*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 543–554, 2020.
- [20] R. Rajan, R. Sivan, R. Ravindran, and K. Soman, "Rule based machine translation from english to malayalam," in *2009 International Conference on Advances in Computing, Control, and Telecommunication Technologies*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 439–441.
- [21] M. Singh, R. Kumar, and I. Chana, "Corpus based machine translation system with deep neural network for sanskrit to hindi translation," *Procedia Computer Science*, vol. 167, pp. 2534–2544, 2020.
- [22] M. M. Rahman, M. F. Kabir, and M. N. Huda, "A corpus based n-gram hybrid approach of bengali to english machine translation," in *2018 21st International Conference of Computer and Information Technology (ICCIT)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–6.
- [23] S. R. Laskar, A. Dutta, P. Pakray, and S. Bandyopadhyay, "Neural machine translation: English to hindi," in *2019 IEEE conference on information and communication technology*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–6.
- [24] W. Xu, X. Niu, and M. Carpuat, "Dual reconstruction: a unifying objective for semi-supervised neural machine translation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03412*, 2020.
- [25] Z. Li, R. Wang, K. Chen, M. Utiyama, E. Sumita, Z. Zhang, and H. Zhao, "Explicit sentence compression for neural machine translation," in *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2019.
- [26] S. Yao and X. Wan, "Multimodal transformer for multimodal machine translation," in *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, D. Jurafsky, J. Chai, N. Schluter, and J. Tetreault, Eds. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, jul 2020, pp. 4346–4350.
- [27] D. Elliott and Á. Kádár, "Imagination improves multimodal translation," in *Proceedings of the Eighth International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, G. Kondrak and T. Watanabe, Eds. Taipei, Taiwan: Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing, Nov. 2017, pp. 130–141.
- [28] H. Fei, Q. Liu, M. Zhang, M. Zhang, and T.-S. Chua, "Scene graph as pivoting: Inference-time image-free unsupervised multimodal machine translation with visual scene hallucination," 2023.
- [29] T. Nishihara, A. Tamura, T. Ninomiya, Y. Omote, and H. Nakayama, "Supervised visual attention for multimodal neural machine translation," in *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, D. Scott, N. Bel, and C. Zong, Eds. Barcelona, Spain (Online): International Committee on Computational Linguistics, Dec. 2020, pp. 4304–4314.
- [30] L. Li, T. Tayir, Y. Han, X. Tao, and J. D. Velásquez, "Multimodality information fusion for automated machine translation," *Inf. Fusion*, vol. 91, no. C, p. 352–363, mar 2023.
- [31] J. Helcl, J. Libovický, and D. Variš, "CUNI system for the WMT18 multimodal translation task," in *Proceedings of the Third Conference on Machine Translation: Shared Task Papers*, O. Bojar, R. Chatterjee, C. Federmann, M. Fishel, Y. Graham, B. Haddow, M. Huck, A. J. Yepes, P. Koehn, C. Monz, M. Negri, A. Névél, M. Neves, M. Post, L. Specia, M. Turchi, and K. Verspoor, Eds. Belgium, Brussels: Association for Computational Linguistics, oct 2018, pp. 616–623.
- [32] I. Calixto, Q. Liu, and N. Campbell, "Doubly-attentive decoder for multimodal neural machine translation," in *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, R. Barzilay and M.-Y. Kan, Eds. Vancouver, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, jul 2017, pp. 1913–1924.
- [33] I. Calixto and Q. Liu, "Incorporating global visual features into attention-based neural machine translation," in *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, M. Palmer, R. Hwa, and S. Riedel, Eds. Copenhagen, Denmark: Association for Computational Linguistics, Sep. 2017, pp. 992–1003.
- [34] J. Ive, P. Madhyastha, and L. Specia, "Distilling translations with visual awareness," in *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, A. Korhonen, D. Traum, and L. Márquez, Eds. Florence, Italy: Association for Computational Linguistics, jul 2019, pp. 6525–6538.
- [35] D. Wang and D. Xiong, "Efficient object-level visual context modeling for multimodal machine translation: Masking irrelevant objects helps grounding," 2020.
- [36] Y. Yin, F. Meng, J. Su, C. Zhou, Z. Yang, J. Zhou, and J. Luo, "A novel graph-based multi-modal fusion encoder for neural machine translation," in *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, D. Jurafsky, J. Chai, N. Schluter, and J. Tetreault, Eds. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, jul 2020, pp. 3025–3035.
- [37] H. Lin, F. Meng, J. Su, Y. Yin, Z. Yang, Y. Ge, J. Zhou, and J. Luo, "Dynamic context-guided capsule network for multimodal machine translation," in *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, ser. MM '20. ACM, Oct. 2020.
- [38] J. Sato, H. Caseli, and L. Specia, "Choosing what to mask: More informed masking for multimodal machine translation," in *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 4: Student Research Workshop)*, V. Padmakumar, G. Vallejo, and Y. Fu, Eds. Toronto, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics, jul 2023, pp. 244–253.
- [39] B. Bowen, V. Vijayan, S. Grigsby, T. Anderson, and J. Gwinnup, "Detecting concrete visual tokens for multimodal machine translation," 2024.
- [40] R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, D. Lorenz, P. Esser, and B. Ommer, "High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models," 2022.
- [41] X. Ma, Y. Wang, G. Jia, X. Chen, Z. Liu, Y.-F. Li, C. Chen, and Y. Qiao, "Latte: Latent diffusion transformer for video generation," 2024.
- [42] Y. Takagi and S. Nishimoto, "High-resolution image reconstruction with latent diffusion models from human brain activity," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 14453–14463.
- [43] R. Rombach, A. Blattmann, and B. Ommer, "Text-guided synthesis of artistic images with retrieval-augmented diffusion models," 2022.
- [44] A. Islam, C.-F. R. Chen, R. Panda, L. Karlinsky, R. Radke, and R. Feris, "A broad study on the transferability of visual representations with contrastive learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 8845–8855.
- [45] D. Elliott, S. Frank, K. Sima'an, and L. Specia, "Multi30k: Multilingual english-german image descriptions," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.00459*, 2016.
- [46] P. Young, A. Lai, M. Hodosh, and J. Hockenmaier, "From image descriptions to visual denotations: New similarity metrics for semantic inference over event descriptions," *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, vol. 2, pp. 67–78, 2014.
- [47] D. Elliott, S. Frank, L. Barrault, F. Bougares, and L. Specia, "Findings of the second shared task on multimodal machine translation and multilingual image description," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.07177*, 2017.
- [48] Z. Wu, L. Kong, W. Bi, X. Li, and B. Kao, "Good for misconceived reasons: An empirical revisiting on the need for visual context in multimodal machine translation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2105.14462*, 2021.
- [49] R. Sennrich, "Neural machine translation of rare words with subword units," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.07909*, 2015.
- [50] M. Ott, "fairseq: A fast, extensible toolkit for sequence modeling," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.01038*, 2019.
- [51] D. P. Kingma, "Adam: A method for stochastic optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- [52] K. Papineni, S. Roukos, T. Ward, and W.-J. Zhu, "Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation," in *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2002, pp. 311–318.
- [53] Q. Long, M. Wang, and L. Li, "Generative imagination elevates machine translation," 2021.
- [54] Z. Wu, L. Kong, W. Bi, X. Li, and B. Kao, "Good for misconceived reasons: An empirical revisiting on the need for visual context in multimodal machine translation," in *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, C. Zong, F. Xia, W. Li, and R. Navigli, Eds. Online: Association for Computational Linguistics, Aug. 2021, pp. 6153–6166.
- [55] P. Liu, H. Cao, and T. Zhao, "Gumbel-attention for multi-modal machine translation," 2022.
- [56] J. Ye, J. Guo, Y. Xiang, K. Tan, and Z. Yu, "Noise-robust cross-modal interactive learning with text2image mask for multi-modal neural machine translation," in *International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 2022, pp. 5098–5108.
- [57] Y. Zuo, B. Li, C. Lv, T. Zheng, T. Xiao, and J. Zhu, "Incorporating probing signals into multimodal machine translation via visual question-answering pairs," *openalex*, 2023.
- [58] O. Caglayan, P. Madhyastha, L. Specia, and L. Barrault, "Probing the need for visual context in multimodal machine translation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.08678*, 2019.
- [59] L. Van der Maaten and G. Hinton, "Visualizing data using t-sne," *Journal of machine learning research*, vol. 9, no. 11, 2008.
- [60] Y. Rubner, C. Tomasi, and L. J. Guibas, "The earth mover's distance as a metric for image retrieval," *International journal of computer vision*, vol. 40, pp. 99–121, 2000.

- [61] J. Zhang, S. Wu, L. Gao, H. T. Shen, and J. Song, “Dept: Decoupled prompt tuning,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 12 924–12 933.