MMVU: TOWARDS MULTI-DISCIPLINE MULTI-FACETED VIDEO UNDERSTANDING EVALUATION

Anonymous authors
Paper under double-blind review



Figure 1: MMVU covers seven broad disciplines and 69 subdisciplines, focusing on the evaluation of multi-faceted reasoning beyond perception (e.g., explanation, counterfactual thinking, future prediction, domain expertise). On the right are four video samples from the Science, Tech & Engineering, Embodied Tasks, and Game disciplines.

ABSTRACT

Multimodal Language Language Models (MLLMs) demonstrate the emerging abilities of "world models"—interpreting and reasoning about complex real-world dynamics. To assess these abilities, we posit videos are the ideal medium, as they encapsulate rich representations of real-world dynamics and causalities. To this end, we introduce MMVU, a new benchmark for multi-discipline, multi-faceted multimodal video understanding. MMVU distinguishes itself from previous video understanding benchmarks with two unique advantages: (1) **multi-discipline**, covering various disciplines that often require domain expertise for comprehensive understanding; (2) **multi-faceted reasoning**, including explanation, counterfactual thinking, future prediction, etc. MMVU consists of a human-annotated dataset to evaluate MLLMs with questions about the whole videos and a synthetic dataset to analyze MLLMs within a single modality of perception. Together, MMVU encompasses 1,910 videos across seven broad disciplines and 69 subdisciplines, complete with 6,627 question-answer pairs and associated captions. The evaluation includes 4 proprietary and 11 open-source MLLMs, which struggle on MMVU (e.g., GPT-4o performs the best with only 62.5% accuracy), showing large room for improvement. Further ablation studies reveal other interesting findings such as models' different skill sets from humans. We hope MMVU can serve as an essential step towards world model evaluation in videos.

1 INTRODUCTION

Foundation models, such as Large Language Models (LLMs) (OpenAI, 2023c; Touvron et al., 2023a; Jiang et al., 2023; Anil et al., 2023) and Multimodal LLMs (MLLMs) (Team et al., 2023; Lin et al., 2023a; Li et al., 2023c; Maaz et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2023), have demonstrated remarkable abilities in text and image domains, igniting debates about their potential pathways to Artificial General Intelligence (AGI). This raises a critical question: how well do these models understand the dynamics of the real world? Are they equipped with an inherent World Model (LeCun, 2022; Chen et al., 2024; Ha & Schmidhuber, 2018; Xiang et al., 2024) that can understand and reason about the underlying principles and causalities of the dynamic, multimodal world?

Videos, with their rich, dynamic portrayal of the real world, are ideally suited for evaluating the "world modeling" capabilities of MLLMs. Existing video understanding benchmarks (Li et al., 2023d; Ning et al., 2023b; Pătrăucean et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023d), however, fall short in two key perspectives for such evaluations. First, as LeCun et al. (LeCun, 2022) discussed, the world model should be able to *(1) estimate missing information about the state of the world not provided by perception, and (2) predict plausible future states of the world*. Evaluation of such capabilities requires **multi-faceted reasoning** beyond perception level, including explaining the video dynamics, counterfactual thinking of alternative consequences, and predicting future activities within videos. Moreover, the **multi-discipline** nature of the multimodal world necessitates a grasp of diverse fundamental principles—ranging from physics and chemistry to engineering and business. Hence, domain expertise across a variety of disciplines is imperative for a thorough evaluation of a model's world understanding towards AGI (Morris et al., 2023; Yue et al., 2023).

Therefore, we introduce MMVU, a multi-discipline multi-faceted multimodal video understanding benchmark to comprehensively evaluate MLLMs' abilities in reasoning and interpreting real-world dynamics [1]. MMVU encompasses a wide range of disciplines and presents multi-faceted reasoning challenges that demand a combination of visual, auditory, and temporal understanding. It consists of 1,910 videos that span seven common disciplines, including *Art & Sports*, *Business*, *Science*, *Health & Medicine*, *Embodied Tasks*, *Tech & Engineering*, and *Games*, and 69 subdisciplines (see Figure 1) such as Robotics, Chemistry, Trading, and Agriculture, thereby fulfilling the objective of breadth in discipline coverage. The dataset includes a total of 1,559 question-answer pairs and video captions annotated and reviewed by humans. Meanwhile, for multi-faceted reasoning, MMVU mainly contains seven kinds of questions focusing on *explanation* (explaining the phenomenon in videos), *counterfactual thinking* (answering what-if questions), *future prediction* (predicting future events), *domain expertise* (answering domain-specific inquiries), *temporal understanding* (reasoning about temporal information), and etc. Four video examples with these questions from different disciplines are depicted in Figure 1. To serve as a comprehensive benchmark, MMVU comprises two datasets: a human-annotated dataset for evaluating MLLMs on the whole video and a synthetic dataset designed to analyze MLLMs' perception within single visual or audio modalities. We evaluate 15 MLLMs that can handle videos or image sequences on MMVU, including both open-source (e.g., Video-LLaVA-7B (Lin et al., 2023a)) and proprietary models (GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2024) and Gemini (Team et al., 2023)).

We summarized the contributions and key findings as follows:

- We introduce MMVU, a new benchmark designed to rigorously evaluate the capabilities of Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) in world modeling through the realm of video understanding. MMVU spans a broad spectrum of disciplines, featuring a rich array of question types for multi-faceted reasoning.
- In addition to the human-annotated dataset, we develop an automatic data collection pipeline, streamlining video content selection and question-answer generation, and construct a well-controlled synthetic dataset to analyze MLLMs within single visual or audio modalities.

[1] Note that the term "world model" in MMVU is broadened from its traditional use in reinforcement learning to a more generalized sense. MMVU is not a sufficient testbed for world model evaluation, but we believe overcoming the unique challenges presented in MMVU is essential and necessary towards comprehensive world modeling.

Table 1: Comparison between MMVU and previous benchmarks for real-world video understanding on a variety of criteria. Multi-faceted include Explanation (`Explain.`), Counterfactual Thinking (`Counter.`), Future Prediction (`Future.`) and Domain Expertise (`Domain.`) MMVU is the first multi-discipline and multitask video understanding benchmark that covers wider reasoning questions, and also included first-party data annotations.

Benchmarks	**Multi-Discipline**	**Multi-Task**	**Multi-Faceted Reasoning**				**First-Party Annotation**
			`Explain.`	`Counter.`	`Future.`	`Domain.`	
MovieQA (Tapaswi et al., 2016)			✓				✓
TVQA (Lei et al., 2018)			✓				✓
ActivityNet-QA (Yu et al., 2019b)							✓
MSVD-QA (Xu et al., 2017) (Xu et al., 2016)							✓
MSRVTT-QA (Xu et al., 2016)							✓
Sports-QA (Li et al., 2024)				✓		✓	✓
VaTeX (Wang et al., 2019)		✓					✓
VALUE (Li et al., 2021)		✓					
Video-Bench (Ning et al., 2023a)		✓			✓	✓	
MVBench (Li et al., 2023d)		✓		✓	✓		
Perception Test (Pătrăucean et al., 2023)		✓	✓	✓	✓		
VideoMME (Fu et al., 2024)					✓	✓	✓
MMBench-Video (Fang et al., 2024)				✓	✓	✓	✓
TempCompass (Liu et al., 2024c)		✓			✓	✓	✓
ViLMA (Kesen et al., 2023)		✓			✓	✓	✓
VITATECS (Li et al., 2023e)				✓	✓	✓	✓
NExT-QA (Xiao et al., 2021)		✓	✓		✓		✓
CVRR (Khattak et al., 2024)			✓		✓		✓
Causal-VidQA (Li et al., 2022)			✓	✓	✓		✓
MMVU (Ours)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

- We observe that existing MLLMs still face substantial challenges posed by MMVU. Even the best performer, GPT-4o, can only achieve a 62.54% overall accuracy, and four MLLMs particularly trained on videos perform worse than random chance.
- Although there is stll a clear gap between open-source and proprietary models, the open-source model Video-LLaVA-7B achieves the best on Embodied Tasks. It outperforms GPT-4V and Gemini Pro on Embodied Tasks by a large margin and performs similarly on Art & Sports, where spatiotemporal dynamics play a more crucial role in video understanding. This is further validated with its leading results on Temporal Understanding question type.
- In our study comparing MLLMs with average humans (non-experts), we notice some correlation between question difficulties as perceived by humans and MLLMs. However, MLLMs present different skill sets than humans in that they can answer reasonable amount of difficult questions that humans completely fail but also struggle at easy questions that humans excel at. This indicates different perception, cognition, and reasoning abilities between MLLMs and humans.

2 Related Work

2.1 Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs)

Emerging MLLMs Recent advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs) (OpenAI, 2023a; Google, 2023; Touvron et al., 2023a; Chiang et al., 2023; Touvron et al., 2023b; Bai et al., 2023a) have paved the way for several multimodal counterparts in the vision-and-language domain (Dai et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023b;a; Li et al., 2023a; Zhu et al., 2023b; Zheng et al., 2023; Bai et al., 2023b), and recently released GPT-4V (OpenAI, 2023b), followed by Gemini Vision family (Team et al., 2023). As LLMs have been applied to world modeling and simulation (Wang et al., 2024a), MLLMs now extend their capabilities beyond text and image inputs. Pretrained on large-scale, diverse datasets, these models are equipped with commonsense, domain-specific knowledge, and broad generalizability.

VideoChat (Li et al., 2023c) leverages the QFormer (Li et al., 2023b) to map visual representations to LLM (Chiang et al., 2023), and performs a multi-stage training pipeline. Otter (Li et al., 2023a) proposes to conduct instruction finetuning based on Openflamingo (Awadalla et al., 2023). PandaGPT (Su et al., 2023) employs the ImageBind (Han et al., 2023) as the backbone and finetunes it. The mPLUG-Owl (Ye et al., 2023) introduces an abstractor module to perform visual and language alignment. VideoLLaMA (Zhang et al., 2023a) introduces a frame embedding layer and

also leverages ImageBind to inject temporal and audio information into the LLM backend. Chat-UniVi (Jin et al., 2023) uses clustering to do feature fusion. LWM (Liu et al., 2024b) collects a large video and language dataset from public books and video datasets and trains a world model that is capable of processing more than millions of tokens.

These MLLMs demonstrate emerging abilities in multi-disciplinary world knowledge and excel at multi-faceted reasoning tasks, such as inverse dynamic prediction—predicting intermediate steps between previous and next states, a crucial auxiliary task for next-state prediction (Devlin, 2018; Lu et al., 2019; Paster et al., 2020) in real-world scenarios. In response to the emerging capabilities of MLLMs, we propose MMVU to evaluate their ability to understand real-world dynamics, underlying principles, and causalities, with the ultimate goal of achieving world modeling.

Benchmarking MLLMs To evaluate MLLMs, there is a flourishing of analysis (Liu et al., 2024a; Zhang et al., 2023b; Jiang et al., 2022; Lu et al., 2024; Fan et al., 2024; Cui et al., 2023; Guan et al., 2024; Yu et al., 2023; Fu et al., 2023a) and the establishment of innovative benchmarks such as VisIB-Bench (Bitton et al., 2023) which evaluates models with real-world instruction-following ability given image inputs, MMMU (Yue et al., 2023) designed to access models on college-level image-question pairs that span among different disciplines, and VIM (Lu et al., 2023) which challenges the model's visual instruction following capability.

However, these recent analyses and benchmarks only cover the image input. Recently, video benchmarks such as Perception Test (Pătrăucean et al., 2023) is proposed to focus on perception and skills like memory and abstraction. However, it uses scenarios with a few objects manipulated by a person, which limits the variety of contexts. In contrast, MMWorld operates in an open-domain scenario with diverse scenes; MVBench (Li et al., 2023d), TempCompass (Liu et al., 2024c) centers on temporal understanding, while MMVU not only includes temporal reasoning but also evaluates other multi-faceted reasoning abilities such as counterfactual thinking and domain-specific expertise; EgoSchema Mangalam et al. (2023) focuses on natural human activity and behavior, but it does not cover the broad range of disciplines that MMWorld does. MLLMs that can perfectly solve MMWorld would unlock the ability to perform multifaceted, multidisciplinary reasoning and the potential to serve as a world model.

2.2 Video Understanding Benchmarks

Previous video benchmarks, as shown in Table 1, focus on video understanding tasks, including activity-focused on web videos (Yu et al., 2019a), description-based question answering (Zeng et al., 2017), video completion (Fu et al., 2023b), and video infilling (Himakunthala et al., 2023). Recently, Video-Bench (Ning et al., 2023b) introduces a benchmark by collecting videos and annotations from multiple existing datasets. Mementos (Wang et al., 2024b) builds a benchmark for MLLM reasoning for input image sequences. STAR (Wu et al., 2021) builds a benchmark for situated reasoning in real-world videos. CLEVER (Yi et al., 2020) builds a benchmark containing videos focusing on objects with simple visual appearance. None of these benchmarks match the multi-discipline coverage that MMWorld provides. MMWorld, in contrast, presents a new benchmark designed to encompass interdisciplinary coverage, task diversity, and multifaceted reasoning capabilities—including future prediction, counterfactual thinking, and more—underpinned by original human annotations and integrated domain knowledge.

3 The MMVU Benchmark

The MMVU benchmark is built on three key design principles: multi-discipline coverage, multi-faceted reasoning, and temporal reasoning. It spans various disciplines that require domain expertise and incorporates diverse reasoning skills such as explanation, counterfactual thinking, and future prediction. The benchmark consists of two parts: a human-annotated dataset and a synthetic dataset. **The human-annotated dataset serves as the main testbed to evaluate MLLMs from multiple perspectives.** The synthetic dataset is divided into two subsets, each designed to assess MLLMs' perception behavior based on visual and audio inputs, respectively.

3.1 MANUAL DATA COLLECTION

We collect videos from YouTube with the Creative Licence in seven disciplines: Art & Sports (18.5%), Business (12.0%), Science (20.4%), Health & Medicine (12.0%), Embodied Tasks (12.0%), Tech & Engineering (12.9%), and Game (12.2%). For Art & Sports, 29 videos are collected from the SportsQA dataset (Li et al., 2024). And for Embodied Tasks, 24 videos are sourced from IKEA Assembly (Ben-Shabat et al., 2021), RT-1 (Brohan et al., 2022), and Ego4D (Grauman et al., 2022) datasets to increase video diversity.

Our manual benchmark collection takes two stages. In the first stage, we conduct a detailed examination of each of the seven primary disciplines to identify a comprehensive range of subdisciplines for inclusion in our benchmark. Our selection of videos is driven by three key principles:

1. The **first principle**, **multi-discipline** coverage, emphasizes the requirement for domain knowledge—selecting videos that inherently demand an understanding of specialized content across various disciplines; 2. The **second principle**, **multi-faceted** annotation, involves collecting videos that enable the creation of question-answer pairs from multiple perspectives to evaluate world model properties comprehensively; 3. The **third principle**, **temporal information**, prioritizes the inclusion of videos that provide meaningful content over time, as understanding temporal information is crucial for grasping world dynamics. This allows models to engage in temporal reasoning and answering questions in MMWorld requires implicit temporal reasoning, e.g., the model needs to understand temporal information to explain "why does the robot need to do the step shown in the video". We also design a "temporal understanding" question type to explicitly test models' ability to reason about temporal information (more examples can be found in Section F in the Appendix).

During the second stage, our team began the task of annotating questions, answers, and options. All annotators were asked to carefully watch the collected videos and create questions with corresponding answers and options, ensuring that understanding the video content and applying temporal reasoning were necessary to determine the correct answers. We also ensured that the clarity, correctness, and grammatical accuracy of the questions and answers were verified using GPT-4o, and that the questions could not be correctly answered without video input. We craft questions that primarily test seven aspects of multimodal video understanding also from the perspective of **multi-faceted reasoning**: 1) Explanation: Questions ask the model to elucidate the underlying logic or purpose within the video; 2) Counterfactual Thinking: Tests the model's ability to hypothesize and consider alternative outcomes; 3) Future Prediction: Aims to predict future events based on the current scenario, challenging the model's foresight; 4) Domain Expertise: Evaluates the model's depth of knowledge in specific fields, such as how to assemble a coffee table; 5) Temporal Understanding: Assesses the model's capability to reason about temporal sequences and dynamics; 6) Attribution Understanding: These questions focus on identifying cause-and-effect relationships within the video, including tasks like counting; 7) Procedure Understanding: Tests the model's ability to comprehend and explain procedural tasks shown in the video. The detailed distribution and examples are shown in Figure 2. For quality control, we ensure each annotation is cross-checked by at least two professional researchers to ensure accuracy and prevent annotation errors.

3.2 AUTOMATED DATA COLLECTION

Understanding real-world dynamics requires models to process both audio and visual modalities. To evaluate MLLMs' perception abilities in these modalities, we designed an automated data collection pipeline. This pipeline collects targeted videos and generates QA pairs based on either audio or visual information, ensuring the model's capabilities are assessed independently for each modality. By using information from a single modality to generate QA pairs, our pipeline ensures that the synthetic data remains unbiased regarding input modality.

The synthetic data generation pipeline is illustrated in Figure 3. We employ a systematic approach to gather videos with Creative Commons licenses from YouTube and the extensive YouTube-8M dataset (Abu-El-Haija et al., 2016). This method ensures a diverse and comprehensive collection of video data, which is important for the robust evaluation of multimodal video understanding models.

Video Collection and Processing We start with the video *Query Generator*. We start with the same seven disciplines as the manually collected dataset. For each discipline, a set of subdisciplines is defined to encapsulate a wide spectrum of topics, ensuring a diverse and comprehensive dataset. Once



Figure 2: The questions in MMVU are designed to evaluate seven primary understanding and reasoning abilities of models. Each question is annotated with all relevant categories. The figure showcases one example question for each reasoning category, based on its main category.



Figure 3: Schematic diagram of the synthetic data generation pipeline in MMVU. It starts with generating subdiscipline-specific queries, followed by video retrieval from YouTube-8M (Abu-El-Haija et al., 2016) and YouTube. Keyframes are extracted for visual-based QA generation, and videos are transcribed using an ASR module for audio-based QA generation.

the queries are generated, the *Video Mapping and Filtering* step is initiated. We perform mapping of videos to YouTube-8M and online videos, constrained by a strict time limit of two minutes per query, keeping only the most pertinent videos that satisfy the predefined criteria. Simultaneously, the works in conjunction with the video transcripts to extract key terms and concepts. This iterative process refines the search parameters and enhances the semantic richness of the dataset by identifying and encoding the salient themes present in the videos. The *Video Summarization* module utilizes Query-focused video summarization techniques based on Katna[2] and UniVTG (Lin et al., 2023b). This module selects ten representative frames from each video, distilling the essence of the content while preserving the narrative context. This summarization facilitates efficient storage and quicker processing times, which are crucial for large-scale analysis.

QA Generation The final stage in our pipeline is the *QA / Caption Generation* module, where we leverage the capabilities of GPT-4V to generate accurate and contextually relevant questions and answers, as well as captions, based on the video frames and transcripts. This step not only provides rich annotations for each video but also equips the dataset with a multimodal dimension that supports various downstream tasks such as video QA, captioning, and more.

Quality of the Synthetic Dataset Human evaluators were engaged to ascertain the reasonableness of automatically generated questions and answers, ensuring that the synthetic dataset maintains a high standard of quality and relevance. The findings from this human evaluation phase are detailed in Section D of the Appendix, offering insights into the dataset's efficacy and the realism of its constructed queries and responses.

[2] https://github.com/keplerlab/katna

Table 2: Key Statistics of the MMVU Benchmark. The main subset is the human-annotated subset. Synthetic Subset I contains generated QA pairs focused exclusively on the audio content, while Synthetic Subset II contains QA pairs focused exclusively on the visual content of the video.

Statistics	**Main Subset**	**Synthetic I**	**Synthetic II**
#Discipline/#Subdiscipline	7/61	7/51	7/54
#Videos	417	746	747
#QA pairs	1,559	2,969	2,099
Avg Video Lengths (s)	102.3	103.4	115.8
Avg #Questions per Video	4.05	3.98	2.81
Avg #Options	3.90	4.00	4.00
Avg Question Length	11.39	15.12	17.56
Avg Option Length	7.27	6.01	5.19
Avg Answer Length	6.42	6.71	5.67
Avg Caption Length	27.00	71.87	82.33
# Unique Words in Questions	1,913	2,528	2,279
# Unique Words in Answers	2,292	2,981	2,657

Finally, the statistics of automated curated data, which is used for the ablation study, are shown in Table 2. The taxonomy of our dataset is shown in Figure 1. We note that only a portion of the subdisciplines are shown due to space concerns. Please refer to the Appendix for full information.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Settings

In our study, we compare MLLM's performance on the MMVU benchmark, including GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2024), GPT-4V (OpenAI, 2023b), Gemini Pro (Team et al., 2023), Claude-3.5-Sonnet Anthropic (2024), Video-Chat (Li et al., 2023c), Video-ChatGPT (Maaz et al., 2024), Video-LLaMA (Zhang et al., 2023a), Video-LLaVA (Lin et al., 2023a), ChatUnivi (Jin et al., 2023), mPLUG-Owl (Ye et al., 2023), Otter (Li et al., 2023a), ImageBind-LLM (Han et al., 2023), PandaGPT (Su et al., 2023), LWM (Liu et al., 2024b), and X-Instruct-BLIP (Panagopoulou et al., 2023). For proprietary model, we adhere to the default settings provided by their official APIs. They both take ten image frames extracted from the video content as the input. The Gemini Pro is set to process visual input and configured with safety settings to filter a range of harmful content. The configuration thresholds are set to 'BLOCK_NONE'. For PandaGPT, we set 'top_p' to 0.7 and 'temperature' to 0.5. For VideoChat, we set 'max_frames' to 100. For X-Instruct-BLIP, the model is implemented using four image frames. We use GPT-4-32K as the judge for judging whether the model answer is correct when it can not mapped to the option letter using the rule-based method. For others, we all use the default setting. All inferences are run on a NVIDIA A6000 workstation. The detailed implementation is given in the Appendix.

4.2 Evaluation Strategy

Our dataset contains multiple-choice questions and captions corresponding to each video, supporting tasks such as video question answering and video captioning. In our evaluation setup, we focus on video question answering by measuring a model's accuracy in selecting the correct answer from the provided options. This method is straightforward to quantify and provides objective assessment. However, one challenge is reliably mapping the model's predictions to one of the predefined choices.

To address this, we employ two mapping strategies. We employ two mapping strategies. The first method employs automated scripts to parse the models' predictions and compare the parsed results with the ground truth, similar to the approach used in (Yue et al., 2023); The second method involves models freely generating answers, which are then evaluated by GPT-4. Given the question, correct answer, and model's prediction, GPT-4 returns a True or False judgment. This approach is based on recent works in model evaluation (Maaz et al., 2024; Hsu et al., 2023; Hackl et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023c).

Table 3: MLLM accuracy across diverse disciplines (averaging over three runs). GPT-4V and Gemini Pro lead at most disciplines and achieve the best overall accuracy. The best open-source model Video-LLaVA-7B outperforms them on Embodied Tasks and perform similarly on Art & Sports. All data are annotated by humans.

Model	Art& Sports	Business	Science	Health& Medicine	Embodied Tasks	Tech& Engineering	Game	Average
Random Choice	25.03	25.09	26.44	25.00	26.48	30.92	25.23	26.31
Proprietary MLLMs								
GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2024)	47.87 ±1.47	**91.14** ±0.87	**73.78** ±2.88	**83.33** ±1.47	62.94 ±3.47	**75.53** ±2.61	**80.32** ±2.05	**62.54** ±0.79
Claude-3.5-Sonnet (Anthropic, 2024)	**54.58** ±0.45	63.87 ±0.40	59.85 ±1.28	54.51 ±1.28	30.99 ±0.40	58.87 ±0.61	59.44 ±0.68	54.54 ±0.29
GPT-4V (OpenAI, 2023b)	36.17 ±0.58	81.59 ±1.74	66.52 ±1.86	73.61 ±0.49	55.48 ±2.70	61.35 ±1.00	73.49 ±1.97	52.30 ±0.49
Gemini Pro (Team et al., 2023)	37.12 ±2.68	76.69 ±2.16	62.81 ±1.83	76.74 ±1.30	43.59 ±0.33	69.86 ±2.01	66.27 ±2.60	51.02 ±1.35
Open-source MLLMs								
Video-LLaVA-7B (Lin et al., 2023a)	35.91 ±0.96	51.28 ±0.87	56.30 ±0.76	32.64 ±0.49	**63.17** ±1.44	58.16 ±1.00	49.00 ±3.16	44.60 ±0.58
Video-Chat-7B (Li et al., 2023c)	39.53 ±0.06	51.05 ±0.00	30.81 ±0.21	46.18 ±0.49	40.56 ±0.57	39.36 ±0.00	44.98 ±0.57	40.11 ±0.06
ChatUnivi-7B (Jin et al., 2023)	24.47 ±0.49	60.84 ±1.51	52.00 ±0.73	61.11 ±1.96	46.15 ±2.06	56.74 ±1.33	52.61 ±2.84	39.47 ±0.42
mPLUG-Owl-7B (Ye et al., 2023)	29.16 ±1.62	64.10 ±1.84	47.41 ±3.29	60.07 ±1.30	23.78 ±3.47	41.84 ±5.09	62.25 ±3.16	38.94 ±1.52
Video-ChatGPT-7B (Maaz et al., 2024)	26.84 ±0.69	39.16 ±3.02	36.45 ±1.31	53.12 ±0.00	36.60 ±3.25	41.49 ±1.74	36.55 ±2.27	33.27 ±0.97
PandaGPT-7B (Su et al., 2023)	25.33 ±0.54	42.66 ±3.02	39.41 ±2.67	38.54 ±3.07	35.43 ±0.87	41.84 ±2.79	40.16 ±4.65	32.48 ±0.45
ImageBind-LLM-7B (Han et al., 2023)	24.82 ±0.16	42.66 ±0.99	32.15 ±1.11	30.21 ±1.47	46.85 ±1.14	41.49 ±1.50	41.37 ±0.57	31.75 ±0.14
X-Instruct-BLIP-7B (Panagopoulou et al., 2023)	21.08 ±0.27	15.85 ±0.87	22.52 ±1.11	28.47 ±0.49	18.41 ±1.44	22.34 ±0.87	26.10 ±0.57	21.36 ±0.18
LWM-1M-JAX (Liu et al., 2024b)	12.04 ±0.53	17.48 ±0.57	15.41 ±0.91	20.49 ±0.98	25.87 ±1.98	21.99 ±2.19	11.65 ±3.01	15.39 ±0.32
Otter-7B (Li et al., 2023a)	17.12 ±1.17	18.65 ±0.87	9.33 ±0.36	6.94 ±0.98	13.29 ±1.51	15.96 ±1.74	15.26 ±0.57	14.99 ±0.77
Video-LLaMA-2-13B (Zhang et al., 2023a)	6.15 ±0.44	21.21 ±0.66	22.22 ±1.45	31.25 ±1.70	15.38 ±1.14	19.15 ±1.74	24.90 ±5.93	14.03 ±0.29

Table 4: Results of different MLLMs on multi-faceted reasoning. All data are annotated by humans.

Model	Explanation	Counterfactual Thinking	Future Prediction	Domain Expertise	Attribution Understanding	Temporal Understanding
Proprietary MLLMs						
GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2024)	**56.68** ±0.72	**75.88** ±1.47	**82.48** ±0.69	**69.05** ±0.49	**65.10** ±1.15	**40.90** ±2.42
GPT-4V (OpenAI, 2023b)	44.90 ±0.07	64.90 ±0.58	78.59 ±1.55	61.07 ±0.17	59.61 ±0.85	27.17 ±1.00
Claude-3.5-Sonnet (Anthropic, 2024)	51.94 ±0.23	62.75 ±0.16	71.78 ±0.40	66.79 ±0.45	40.00 ±0.55	25.77 ±0.46
Gemini Pro (Team et al., 2023)	48.58 ±1.07	65.49 ±0.42	65.45 ±1.05	53.87 ±1.31	43.92 ±1.40	24.65 ±1.00
Open-source MLLMs						
Video-LLaVA (Lin et al., 2023a)	42.46 ±0.61	42.55 ±0.85	64.96 ±0.69	47.86 ±0.58	36.86 ±1.95	34.45 ±1.19
Video-Chat-7B (Li et al., 2023c)	41.66 ±0.06	43.73 ±0.32	45.74 ±0.20	40.95 ±0.10	30.59 ±0.00	25.77 ±0.23
Video-ChatGPT-7B (Maaz et al., 2024)	32.13 ±0.38	39.02 ±1.12	47.45 ±2.09	33.69 ±1.08	21.18 ±2.00	23.53 ±0.76
ImageBind-LLM-7B (Han et al., 2023)	29.51 ±0.27	26.86 ±0.58	50.61 ±0.20	33.93 ±0.17	34.90 ±1.40	19.89 ±0.91
PandaGPT-7B (Su et al., 2023)	29.55 ±0.41	37.45 ±1.80	46.47 ±1.05	33.93 ±0.45	26.27 ±2.24	28.01 ±0.82
ChatUnivi-7B (Jin et al., 2023)	33.91 ±0.31	48.82 ±0.48	61.80 ±0.53	45.95 ±0.68	33.33 ±0.64	22.97 ±0.91
Video-LLaMA-2-13B (Zhang et al., 2023a)	10.55 ±0.29	23.92 ±0.97	25.30 ±1.11	16.31 ±1.03	8.63 ±0.85	6.16 ±1.00
X-Instruct-BLIP-7B (Panagopoulou et al., 2023)	23.05 ±0.24	15.29 ±0.28	27.25 ±0.53	21.07 ±0.51	24.31 ±0.64	11.20 ±0.82
LWM-1M-JAX (Liu et al., 2024b)	11.62 ±0.39	18.82 ±0.55	30.66 ±0.34	17.98 ±0.26	21.57 ±0.85	7.00 ±0.46
Otter-7B (Li et al., 2023a)	16.91 ±0.54	10.98 ±0.42	15.82 ±0.20	13.10 ±0.68	17.65 ±0.00	9.52 ±1.00
mPLUG-Owl-7B (Ye et al., 2023)	35.20 ±1.17	49.61 ±1.31	55.47 ±1.58	47.74 ±1.07	24.71 ±2.00	20.17 ±0.69

We validated the second GPT-4-based evaluation approach with human evaluators, showing an error rate of only 4.76% across 189 examples, demonstrating its reliability as an evaluator. Detailed results for human evaluation and both evaluation strategies are provided in Appendix. All results presented in the main paper are based on the second evaluation approach.

4.3 Main Evaluation Results on Human-Annotated Data

We show in Table 3 the main evaluation results of different MLLMs. Among these, GPT-4o emerges as the top performer, followed by Claude-3.5-Sonnet. Video-LLaVA also demonstrates strong results, primarily due to the extensive training data which consists of 558K LAION-CCSBU image-text pairs and 702K video-text pairs from WebVid (Bain et al., 2021). Its superior performance may also be attributed to the adoption of CLIP ViT-L/14 trained in LanguageBind (Lin et al., 2023a) as its vision model and the inclusion of a large volume of image-video-text pairings within the training data. On the other hand, models like Otter and LWM perform poorly across most disciplines, possibly due to their weaker backbone and architecture used. Otter uses the LLaMA-7B language encoder and a CLIP ViT-L/14 vision encoder, both of which are frozen, with only the Perceiver resampler (Awadalla et al., 2023) module fine-tuned, which may lead to the lower performance. Additionally, four MLLMs perform even worse than random, highlighting the challenging nature of MMVU.



(a) Accuracy of MLLMs at difficulty levels for average humans.

(b) GPT-4V results by disciplines at different difficulty levels for average humans.

Figure 4: Model performance at different difficulty levels for average humans. Average human difficulty levels are defined by 3 turkers' performance per question: Easy (3/3 correct answers), medium (2/3 correct), hard (1/3 correct), and expert (0/3 correct).

Study on Multi-faceted Reasoning Table 4 illustrates the multi-faceted reasoning performance of each MLLM. GPT-4o emerges as the strongest model across all facets. Notably, in temporal understanding, the open-sourced Video-LLaVA outperforms all other models except GPT-4o, likely due to its extensive training on high temporal resolution video data, enhancing its spatio-temporal reasoning abilities. This is further reflected in its high scores on Embodied Tasks (the best) and Art & Sports, both of which involve dense spatio-temporal information, as shown in Table 3.

Study on MLLM Performance at Different Difficulty Levels for Average Humans

Figure 4a indicate some correlation between the difficulty levels as perceived by humans and the performance of MLLMs. The difficulty levels are defined based on the **average human performance**. MLLMs generally follow a trend where accuracy decreases as the difficulty level increases, which aligns with human performance patterns. However, the correlation is not perfect, suggesting that while models and humans share some common ground in understanding question difficulty, there are also notable differences in their capabilities. The data reveals that MLLMs exhibit different skill sets compared to humans. As highlighted in Figure 4b, models like GPT-4V can correctly answer expert-level questions that humans often get wrong, particularly in disciplines such as Business and Health & Medicine, where humans often struggle, yet they sometimes falter on easier questions, likely due to the lack of contextual understanding. Notably, discrepancies in disciplines like Art & Sports and Tech & Engineering highlight areas where MLLMs' performance does not align with human results, suggesting different perception, cognition, and reasoning abilities in handling abstract concepts. These differences suggest that MLLMs can complement human capabilities, offering potential for enhanced task performance by combining the data-driven insights of models with human intuition and contextual knowledge.

Error Analysis To gain deeper insights into the limitations of current open-sourced MLLMs and provide guidance for developing next-generation models, we prompted the models to explain their reasoning, particularly when errors occurred. We grouped and identified common error patterns into seven distinct categories. We conducted a comparative test by posing the error-inducing questions for GPT-4V to other MLLMs, as GPT-4V was used as a representative model due to its strong performance and its ability to highlight errors common across MLLMs.

Our analysis revealed that Video-LLaVA exhibited the lowest error frequencies among open-source MLLMs Its superior performance, particularly in reducing Visual Perception Errors (PE), Hallucination Errors (HE), and Reasoning Errors (RE), can also be linked to its use of the CLIP ViT-L/14 model in LanguageBind (Zhu et al., 2023a). In contrast, mPLUG-Owl showed higher rates of Visual Perception Errors, possibly due to its reliance on weaker video embedder architectures. Furthermore, VideoChat outperformed Video-LLaMA due to its GMHRA (Li et al., 2023c) module for temporal aggregation, demonstrating the importance of effective temporal aggregation in reducing errors. Common trends across all models included frequent hallucination errors and a lack of domain-specific knowledge, highlighting the need for accurate, noise-free training data and suggesting that techniques like Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) (Ouyang et al., 2022) could help mitigate these issues. While current MLLMs demonstrate strong multi-disciplinary



Figure 5: The frequency of different error types across various MLLMs. For each error type, 100 examples were evaluated. Error types are abbreviated as follows: QUE (Question Understanding Error), AUE (Audio Understanding Error), VPE (Visual Perception Error), HE (Hallucination Error), RE (Reasoning Error), LDK (Lack of Domain Knowledge), and RA (Reject to Answer).

Table 5: Performance on Synthetic Subset I (Audio) and II (Visual). Synthetic Subset I contains QAs based solely on the audio content, while Synthetic Subset II focuses exclusively on the visual content of the video. We evaluated four MLLMs processing both audio and visual inputs along with Gemini Pro (for the audio setting, only providing the question).

Model	Art&Sports		Business		Science		Health&Medicine		Embodied Tasks		Tech&Engineering		Game		Average	
	Audio	Visual	Audio	Visual	Audio	Visual	Audio	Visual	Audio	Visual	Audio	Visual	Audio	Visual	Audio	Visual
Random Choice	31.59	30.14	31.18	26.58	36.98	32.89	38.74	32.64	32.81	31.25	27.23	32.60	32.01	30.78	32.44	30.91
Video-Chat (Li et al., 2023c)	**33.98**	32.48	**46.47**	41.46	**41.86**	39.15	**45.95**	36.81	32.81	46.88	**37.48**	35.91	**32.98**	46.70	**38.82**	39.07
ChatUnivi (Jin et al., 2023)	30.03	43.22	30.19	52.85	38.75	54.59	34.76	50.69	20.14	40.63	24.17	46.41	29.98	45.44	31.82	48.44
Video-LLaMA (Zhang et al., 2023a)	30.15	30.23	36.18	33.17	31.33	31.34	30.90	32.78	**33.13**	30.05	31.18	30.55	20.49	27.20	29.08	30.47
Otter (Li et al., 2023a)	14.22	16.82	16.77	14.24	16.12	17.00	19.82	13.19	10.94	12.50	15.63	12.43	6.65	10.44	12.83	13.41
Gemini Pro (Team et al., 2023)	20.88	**61.38**	29.43	**77.35**	30.62	**74.26**	30.14	**81.53**	22.57	**70.31**	18.83	**66.22**	29.96	**65.01**	24.45	**69.97**

world knowledge, they could benefit from enhanced domain-specific expertise, potentially through retrieval-based methods. Detailed qualitative examples and further analysis are provided in the Appendix.

4.4 Study on Modality of Perception on Synthetic Data

We conducted ablation studies to evaluate how well MLLMs can perceive the world when limited to a single modality (audio or visual) using the synthetic dataset of MMVU. In these experiments, we isolated scenarios where only one modality—either audio or visual—was available. Table 5 presents the results, which assess the models' ability to interpret spoken language, background noises, and other audio elements without visual context, as well as their visual perception without any audio input. For the visual perception test, Gemini Pro performed the best, demonstrating its strong ability to process visual information. Interestingly, Video-Chat exhibited better audio perception than ChatUnivi, despite its poorer visual perception. This may be attributed to its use of the Whisper (Radford et al., 2022) speech recognition model. It also explains that in Table 3, Video-Chat outperforms ChatUnivi in the Art & Sports discipline, which requires a greater understanding of music, voice, and background audio. However, in other disciplines such as Science and Health & Medicine, Video-Chat's performance is significantly worse.

5 Conclusion

Our MMVU Benchmark represents a significant step forward in the quest for advanced multi-modal language models capable of understanding complex video content. By presenting a diverse array of videos across seven disciplines, accompanied by questions that challenge models to demonstrate explanation, counterfactual thinking, future prediction, and domain expertise, we have created a rigorous testing ground for the next generation of AI. While using LLMs for data generation can introduce hallucination issues, these challenges are manageable and are commonly addressed (Wang et al., 2024c; Shen et al., 2023). Another potential risk is the misuse of MLLMs for surveillance or privacy invasion. The ability of models to understand video content and perform reasoning could be exploited to monitor individuals without their consent, leading to serious ethical and legal concerns regarding privacy.

Ethics Statement In line with the ICLR Code of Ethics, we acknowledge our responsibility to adhere to ethical principles throughout the entirety of our research. Our work does not involve human subjects, and the datasets we used are available in the submitted supplementary material and do not raise any concerns regarding privacy or security issues. The evaluation of models in this paper focuses on publicly available multimodal larger language models, and no sensitive or personally identifiable information was involved in this process. While our work benchmarks existing multimodal large language models via multi-discipline, multi-faceted world model evaluation, we recognize the potential risks of unintended bias and fairness issues in these models, which may have inherited biases from their training data. We encourage future research to address these concerns in the development of more inclusive and fair models. There are no conflicts of interest or sponsorship influencing this research, and our work fully complies with legal and ethical standards.

Reproducibility Statement To ensure the reproducibility of our work, we provide extensive details on our methodology, datasets, and evaluation setup in the main paper and the Appendix. The datasets used are available in the supplementary material, and their collection and annotation steps are described in Section 3 of the paper. We also provide detailed descriptions of the experimental setup, including hyperparameters, model architectures, in the main paper and Appendix. All evaluation protocols and metrics are explained to facilitate replication of our results.

REFERENCES

Sami Abu-El-Haija, Nisarg Kothari, Joonseok Lee, Paul Natsev, George Toderici, Balakrishnan Varadarajan, and Sudheendra Vijayanarasimhan. Youtube-8m: A large-scale video classification benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.08675*, 2016.

Rohan Anil, Andrew M. Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, Eric Chu, Jonathan H. Clark, Laurent El Shafey, Yanping Huang, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Gaurav Mishra, Erica Moreira, Mark Omernick, Kevin Robinson, Sebastian Ruder, Yi Tay, Kefan Xiao, Yuanzhong Xu, Yujing Zhang, Gustavo Hernandez Abrego, Junwhan Ahn, Jacob Austin, Paul Barham, Jan Botha, James Bradbury, Siddhartha Brahma, Kevin Brooks, Michele Catasta, Yong Cheng, Colin Cherry, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Clément Crepy, Shachi Dave, Mostafa Dehghani, Sunipa Dev, Jacob Devlin, Mark Díaz, Nan Du, Ethan Dyer, Vlad Feinberg, Fangxiaoyu Feng, Vlad Fienber, Markus Freitag, Xavier Garcia, Sebastian Gehrmann, Lucas Gonzalez, Guy Gur-Ari, Steven Hand, Hadi Hashemi, Le Hou, Joshua Howland, Andrea Hu, Jeffrey Hui, Jeremy Hurwitz, Michael Isard, Abe Ittycheriah, Matthew Jagielski, Wenhao Jia, Kathleen Kenealy, Maxim Krikun, Sneha Kudugunta, Chang Lan, Katherine Lee, Benjamin Lee, Eric Li, Music Li, Wei Li, YaGuang Li, Jian Li, Hyeontaek Lim, Hanzhao Lin, Zhongtao Liu, Frederick Liu, Marcello Maggioni, Aroma Mahendru, Joshua Maynez, Vedant Misra, Maysam Moussalem, Zachary Nado, John Nham, Eric Ni, Andrew Nystrom, Alicia Parrish, Marie Pellat, Martin Polacek, Alex Polozov, Reiner Pope, Siyuan Qiao, Emily Reif, Bryan Richter, Parker Riley, Alex Castro Ros, Aurko Roy, Brennan Saeta, Rajkumar Samuel, Renee Shelby, Ambrose Slone, Daniel Smilkov, David R. So, Daniel Sohn, Simon Tokumine, Dasha Valter, Vijay Vasudevan, Kiran Vodrahalli, Xuezhi Wang, Pidong Wang, Zirui Wang, Tao Wang, John Wieting, Yuhuai Wu, Kelvin Xu, Yunhan Xu, Linting Xue, Pengcheng Yin, Jiahui Yu, Qiao Zhang, Steven Zheng, Ce Zheng, Weikang Zhou, Denny Zhou, Slav Petrov, and Yonghui Wu. Palm 2 technical report, 2023.

Anthropic. Introducing the next generation of Claude. `https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-family`, 2024. Accessed: 2024-07-29.

Anas Awadalla, Irena Gao, Josh Gardner, Jack Hessel, Yusuf Hanafy, Wanrong Zhu, Kalyani Marathe, Yonatan Bitton, Samir Gadre, Shiori Sagawa, et al. Openflamingo: An open-source framework for training large autoregressive vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01390*, 2023.

Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-vl: A frontier large vision-language model with versatile abilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12966*, 2023a.

Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-vl: A versatile vision-language model for understanding, localization, text reading, and beyond, 2023b.

Max Bain, Arsha Nagrani, Gül Varol, and Andrew Zisserman. Frozen in time: A joint video and image encoder for end-to-end retrieval. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021.

Yizhak Ben-Shabat, Xin Yu, Fatemeh Saleh, Dylan Campbell, Cristian Rodriguez-Opazo, Hongdong Li, and Stephen Gould. The ikea asm dataset: Understanding people assembling furniture through actions, objects and pose. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pp. 847–859, 2021.

Yonatan Bitton, Hritik Bansal, Jack Hessel, Rulin Shao, Wanrong Zhu, Anas Awadalla, Josh Gardner, Rohan Taori, and Ludwig Schimdt. Visit-bench: A benchmark for vision-language instruction following inspired by real-world use. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06595*, 2023.

Anthony Brohan, Noah Brown, Justice Carbajal, Yevgen Chebotar, Joseph Dabis, Chelsea Finn, Keerthana Gopalakrishnan, Karol Hausman, Alex Herzog, Jasmine Hsu, et al. Rt-1: Robotics transformer for real-world control at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.06817*, 2022.

Jun Chen, Deyao Zhu, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, Zechun Liu, Pengchuan Zhang, Raghuraman Krishnamoorthi, Vikas Chandra, Yunyang Xiong, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigpt-v2: large language model as a unified interface for vision-language multi-task learning, 2023.

William Chen, Oier Mees, Aviral Kumar, and Sergey Levine. Vision-language models provide promptable representations for reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02651*, 2024.

Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality, March 2023. URL `https://lmsys.org/blog/2023-03-30-vicuna/`.

Chenhang Cui, Yiyang Zhou, Xinyu Yang, Shirley Wu, Linjun Zhang, James Zou, and Huaxiu Yao. Holistic analysis of hallucination in gpt-4v (ision): Bias and interference challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03287*, 2023.

Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale Fung, and Steven Hoi. Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06500*, 2023.

Jacob Devlin. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.

Yue Fan, Jing Gu, Kaiwen Zhou, Qianqi Yan, Shan Jiang, Ching-Chen Kuo, Xinze Guan, and Xin Eric Wang. Muffin or chihuahua? challenging large vision-language models with multipanel vqa, 2024.

Xinyu Fang, Kangrui Mao, Haodong Duan, Xiangyu Zhao, Yining Li, Dahua Lin, and Kai Chen. Mmbench-video: A long-form multi-shot benchmark for holistic video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.14515*, 2024.

Chaoyou Fu, Peixian Chen, Yunhang Shen, Yulei Qin, Mengdan Zhang, Xu Lin, Jinrui Yang, Xiawu Zheng, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Yunsheng Wu, and Rongrong Ji. Mme: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13394*, 2023a.

Chaoyou Fu, Yuhan Dai, Yongdong Luo, Lei Li, Shuhuai Ren, Renrui Zhang, Zihan Wang, Chenyu Zhou, Yunhang Shen, Mengdan Zhang, et al. Video-mme: The first-ever comprehensive evaluation benchmark of multi-modal llms in video analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.21075*, 2024.

Tsu-Jui Fu, Licheng Yu, Ning Zhang, Cheng-Yang Fu, Jong-Chyi Su, William Yang Wang, and Sean Bell. Tell Me What Happened: Unifying Text-guided Video Completion via Multimodal Masked Video Generation. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2023b.

Google. Bard - chat based ai tool from google, powered by palm 2. *https://bard.google.com/?hl=en*, 2023.

Kristen Grauman, Andrew Westbury, Eugene Byrne, Zachary Chavis, Antonino Furnari, Rohit Girdhar, Jackson Hamburger, Hao Jiang, Miao Liu, Xingyu Liu, et al. Ego4d: Around the world in 3,000 hours of egocentric video. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 18995–19012, 2022.

Tianrui Guan, Fuxiao Liu, Xiyang Wu, Ruiqi Xian, Zongxia Li, Xiaoyu Liu, Xijun Wang, Lichang Chen, Furong Huang, Yaser Yacoob, Dinesh Manocha, and Tianyi Zhou. Hallusionbench: An advanced diagnostic suite for entangled language hallucination & visual illusion in large vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024.

David Ha and Jürgen Schmidhuber. World models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.10122*, 2018.

Veronika Hackl, Alexandra Elena Müller, Michael Granitzer, and Maximilian Sailer. Is gpt-4 a reliable rater? evaluating consistency in gpt-4 text ratings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02575*, 2023.

Jiaming Han, Renrui Zhang, Wenqi Shao, Peng Gao, Peng Xu, Han Xiao, Kaipeng Zhang, Chris Liu, Song Wen, Ziyu Guo, et al. Imagebind-llm: Multi-modality instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03905*, 2023.

Vaishnavi Himakunthala, Andy Ouyang, Daniel Rose, Ryan He, Alex Mei, Yujie Lu, Chinmay Sonar, Michael Saxon, and William Yang Wang. Let's think frame by frame with vip: A video infilling and prediction dataset for evaluating video chain-of-thought, 2023.

Ting-Yao Hsu, Chieh-Yang Huang, Ryan Rossi, Sungchul Kim, C Lee Giles, and Ting-Hao K Huang. Gpt-4 as an effective zero-shot evaluator for scientific figure captions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15405*, 2023.

Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, Lélio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timothée Lacroix, and William El Sayed. Mistral 7b, 2023.

Kenan Jiang, Xuehai He, Ruize Xu, and Xin Eric Wang. Comclip: Training-free compositional image and text matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.13854*, 2022.

Peng Jin, Ryuichi Takanobu, Caiwan Zhang, Xiaochun Cao, and Li Yuan. Chat-univi: Unified visual representation empowers large language models with image and video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08046*, 2023.

Ilker Kesen, Andrea Pedrotti, Mustafa Dogan, Michele Cafagna, Emre Can Acikgoz, Letitia Parcalabescu, Iacer Calixto, Anette Frank, Albert Gatt, Aykut Erdem, et al. Vilma: A zero-shot benchmark for linguistic and temporal grounding in video-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07022*, 2023.

Muhammad Uzair Khattak, Muhammad Ferjad Naeem, Jameel Hassan, Muzammal Naseer, Federico Tombari, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Salman Khan. Complex video reasoning and robustness evaluation suite for video-lmms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.03690*, 2024.

Yann LeCun. A path towards autonomous machine intelligence version 0.9. 2, 2022-06-27. *Open Review*, 62(1), 2022.

Jie Lei, Licheng Yu, Mohit Bansal, and Tamara L Berg. Tvqa: Localized, compositional video question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.01696*, 2018.

Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Liangyu Chen, Jinghao Wang, Jingkang Yang, and Ziwei Liu. Otter: A multi-modal model with in-context instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03726*, 2023a.

Haopeng Li, Andong Deng, Qiuhong Ke, Jun Liu, Hossein Rahmani, Yulan Guo, Bernt Schiele, and Chen Chen. Sports-qa: A large-scale video question answering benchmark for complex and professional sports. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01505*, 2024.

Jiangtong Li, Li Niu, and Liqing Zhang. From representation to reasoning: Towards both evidence and commonsense reasoning for video question-answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2022.

Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12597*, 2023b.

KunChang Li, Yinan He, Yi Wang, Yizhuo Li, Wenhai Wang, Ping Luo, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Videochat: Chat-centric video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06355*, 2023c.

Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yinan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Ping Luo, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Mvbench: A comprehensive multi-modal video understanding benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2311.17005*, 2023d.

Linjie Li, Jie Lei, Zhe Gan, Licheng Yu, Yen-Chun Chen, Rohit Pillai, Yu Cheng, Luowei Zhou, Xin Eric Wang, William Yang Wang, et al. Value: A multi-task benchmark for video-and-language understanding evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.04632*, 2021.

Shicheng Li, Lei Li, Shuhuai Ren, Yuanxin Liu, Yi Liu, Rundong Gao, Xu Sun, and Lu Hou. Vitatecs: A diagnostic dataset for temporal concept understanding of video-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17404*, 2023e.

Bin Lin, Bin Zhu, Yang Ye, Munan Ning, Peng Jin, and Li Yuan. Video-llava: Learning united visual representation by alignment before projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10122*, 2023a.

Kevin Qinghong Lin, Pengchuan Zhang, Joya Chen, Shraman Pramanick, Difei Gao, Alex Jinpeng Wang, Rui Yan, and Mike Zheng Shou. Univtg: Towards unified video-language temporal grounding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 2794–2804, 2023b.

Fuxiao Liu, Kevin Lin, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Yaser Yacoob, and Lijuan Wang. Mitigating hallucination in large multi-modal models via robust instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024a.

Hao Liu, Wilson Yan, Matei Zaharia, and Pieter Abbeel. World model on million-length video and language with ringattention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08268*, 2024b.

Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03744*, 2023a.

Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08485*, 2023b.

Yang Liu, Dan Iter, Yichong Xu, Shuohang Wang, Ruochen Xu, and Chenguang Zhu. Gpteval: Nlg evaluation using gpt-4 with better human alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16634*, 2023c.

Yuanxin Liu, Shicheng Li, Yi Liu, Yuxiang Wang, Shuhuai Ren, Lei Li, Sishuo Chen, Xu Sun, and Lu Hou. Tempcompass: Do video llms really understand videos? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.00476*, 2024c.

Jiasen Lu, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Stefan Lee. Vilbert: Pretraining task-agnostic visiolinguistic representations for vision-and-language tasks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.

Yujie Lu, Xiujun Li, William Yang Wang, and Yejin Choi. Vim: Probing multimodal large language models for visual embedded instruction following, 2023.

Yujie Lu, Dongfu Jiang, Wenhu Chen, William Wang, Yejin Choi, and Yuchen Lin. Wildvision arena: Benchmarking multimodal llms in the wild, February 2024. URL https://huggingface.co/spaces/WildVision/vision-arena/.

Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Rasheed, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Video-chatgpt: Towards detailed video understanding via large vision and language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2024)*, 2024.

Karttikeya Mangalam, Raiymbek Akshulakov, and Jitendra Malik. Egoschema: A diagnostic benchmark for very long-form video language understanding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:46212–46244, 2023.

Meredith Ringel Morris, Jascha Sohl-dickstein, Noah Fiedel, Tris Warkentin, Allan Dafoe, Aleksandra Faust, Clement Farabet, and Shane Legg. Levels of agi: Operationalizing progress on the path to agi. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.02462*, 2023.

Munan Ning, Bin Zhu, Yujia Xie, Bin Lin, Jiaxi Cui, Lu Yuan, Dongdong Chen, and Li Yuan. Video-bench: A comprehensive benchmark and toolkit for evaluating video-based large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16103*, 2023a.

Munan Ning, Bin Zhu, Yujia Xie, Bin Lin, Jiaxi Cui, Lu Yuan, Dongdong Chen, and Li Yuan. Video-bench: A comprehensive benchmark and toolkit for evaluating video-based large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16103*, 2023b.

OpenAI. Gpt-4: Technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023a.

OpenAI. Gpt-4v(ision) system card. *https://openai.com/research/gpt-4v-system-card*, 2023b.

OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023c.

OpenAI. Hello gpt-4o. https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/, 2024. Accessed: 2024-07-29.

Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35: 27730–27744, 2022.

Artemis Panagopoulou, Le Xue, Ning Yu, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Shafiq Joty, Ran Xu, Silvio Savarese, Caiming Xiong, and Juan Carlos Niebles. X-instructblip: A framework for aligning x-modal instruction-aware representations to llms and emergent cross-modal reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.18799*, 2023.

Keiran Paster, Sheila A McIlraith, and Jimmy Ba. Planning from pixels using inverse dynamics models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.02419*, 2020.

Viorica Pătrăucean, Lucas Smaira, Ankush Gupta, Adrià Recasens Continente, Larisa Markeeva, Dylan Banarse, Skanda Koppula, Joseph Heyward, Mateusz Malinowski, Yi Yang, Carl Doersch, Tatiana Matejovicova, Yury Sulsky, Antoine Miech, Alex Frechette, Hanna Klimczak, Raphael Koster, Junlin Zhang, Stephanie Winkler, Yusuf Aytar, Simon Osindero, Dima Damen, Andrew Zisserman, and João Carreira. Perception test: A diagnostic benchmark for multimodal video models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=HYEGXFnPoq.

Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Tao Xu, Greg Brockman, C. McLeavey, and I. Sutskever. Robust speech recognition via large-scale weak supervision. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2022. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2212.04356.

Xinyue Shen, Zeyuan Chen, Michael Backes, Yun Shen, and Yang Zhang. "do anything now": Characterizing and evaluating in-the-wild jailbreak prompts on large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2308.03825*, 2023.

Yixuan Su, Tian Lan, Huayang Li, Jialu Xu, Yan Wang, and Deng Cai. Pandagpt: One model to instruction-follow them all. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16355*, 2023.

Makarand Tapaswi, Yukun Zhu, Rainer Stiefelhagen, Antonio Torralba, Raquel Urtasun, and Sanja Fidler. Movieqa: Understanding stories in movies through question-answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 4631–4640, 2016.

Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.

Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023a.

Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023b.

Ruoyao Wang, Graham Todd, Ziang Xiao, Xingdi Yuan, Marc-Alexandre Côté, Peter Clark, and Peter Jansen. Can language models serve as text-based world simulators? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.06485*, 2024a.

Xin Wang, Jiawei Wu, Junkun Chen, Lei Li, Yuan-Fang Wang, and William Yang Wang. Vatex: A large-scale, high-quality multilingual dataset for video-and-language research. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 4581–4591, 2019.

Xiyao Wang, Yuhang Zhou, Xiaoyu Liu, Hongjin Lu, Yuancheng Xu, Feihong He, Jaehong Yoon, Taixi Lu, Gedas Bertasius, Mohit Bansal, et al. Mementos: A comprehensive benchmark for multimodal large language model reasoning over image sequences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10529*, 2024b.

Yuxia Wang, Haonan Li, Xudong Han, Preslav Nakov, and Timothy Baldwin. Do-not-answer: Evaluating safeguards in LLMs. In Yvette Graham and Matthew Purver (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2024*, pp. 896–911, St. Julian's, Malta, March 2024c. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-eacl.61.

Bo Wu, Shoubin Yu, Zhenfang Chen, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Chuang Gan. Star: A benchmark for situated reasoning in real-world videos. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*, 2021.

Jiannan Xiang, Guangyi Liu, Yi Gu, Qiyue Gao, Yuting Ning, Yuheng Zha, Zeyu Feng, Tianhua Tao, Shibo Hao, Yemin Shi, Zhengzhong Liu, Eric P. Xing, and Zhiting Hu. Pandora: Towards general world model with natural language actions and video states. 2024.

Junbin Xiao, Xindi Shang, Angela Yao, and Tat-Seng Chua. Next-qa: Next phase of question-answering to explaining temporal actions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 9777–9786, 2021.

Dejing Xu, Zhou Zhao, Jun Xiao, Fei Wu, Hanwang Zhang, Xiangnan He, and Yueting Zhuang. Video question answering via gradually refined attention over appearance and motion. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, pp. 1645–1653, 2017.

Jun Xu, Tao Mei, Ting Yao, and Yong Rui. Msr-vtt: A large video description dataset for bridging video and language. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), June 2016. URL https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/msr-vtt-a-large-video-description-dataset-for-bridging-video-and-language/.

Qinghao Ye, Haiyang Xu, Guohai Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Yiyang Zhou, Junyang Wang, Anwen Hu, Pengcheng Shi, Yaya Shi, et al. mplug-owl: Modularization empowers large language models with multimodality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14178*, 2023.

Kexin Yi, Chuang Gan, Yunzhu Li, Pushmeet Kohli, Jiajun Wu, Antonio Torralba, and Joshua B. Tenenbaum. CLEVRER: collision events for video representation and reasoning. In *ICLR*, 2020.

Weihao Yu, Zhengyuan Yang, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Kevin Lin, Zicheng Liu, Xinchao Wang, and Lijuan Wang. Mm-vet: Evaluating large multimodal models for integrated capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02490*, 2023.

Zhou Yu, Dejing Xu, Jun Yu, Ting Yu, Zhou Zhao, Yueting Zhuang, and Dacheng Tao. Activitynet-qa: A dataset for understanding complex web videos via question answering. In *AAAI*, pp. 9127–9134, 2019a.

Zhou Yu, Dejing Xu, Jun Yu, Ting Yu, Zhou Zhao, Yueting Zhuang, and Dacheng Tao. Activitynet-qa: A dataset for understanding complex web videos via question answering. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pp. 9127–9134, 2019b.

Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoqi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, et al. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16502*, 2023.

Kuo-Hao Zeng, Tseng-Hung Chen, Ching-Yao Chuang, Yuan-Hong Liao, Juan Carlos Niebles, and Min Sun. Leveraging video descriptions to learn video question answering. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 31(1), Feb. 2017. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v31i1.11238. URL `https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/11238`.

Hang Zhang, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. Video-llama: An instruction-tuned audio-visual language model for video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02858*, 2023a.

Xinlu Zhang, Yujie Lu, Weizhi Wang, An Yan, Jun Yan, Lianke Qin, Heng Wang, Xifeng Yan, William Yang Wang, and Linda Ruth Petzold. Gpt-4v(ision) as a generalist evaluator for vision-language tasks, 2023b.

Kaizhi Zheng, Xuehai He, and Xin Eric Wang. Minigpt-5: Interleaved vision-and-language generation via generative vokens. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02239*, 2023.

Bin Zhu, Bin Lin, Munan Ning, Yang Yan, Jiaxi Cui, HongFa Wang, Yatian Pang, Wenhao Jiang, Junwu Zhang, Zongwei Li, et al. Languagebind: Extending video-language pretraining to n-modality by language-based semantic alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01852*, 2023a.

Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigpt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592*, 2023b.

A Overview of the Appendix

This Appendix is organized as follows:

- Section B contains additional experimental results;
- Section C contains the implementation details;
- Section D contains the settings and results from human evaluations;
- Section E contains the error analysis;
- Section F contains the data examples from MMVU;
- Section G contains additional data statistics of MMVU;

B Additional Results

B.1 Results Across Different Seed for Each Model

In Table 6, we show detailed results using three different seeds for each evaluated models.

Table 6: Detailed results (%) of model performance, measured as accuracy percentages across diverse disciplines for three runs. The random choice baseline involves shuffling candidate answers for each video question before consistently selecting answer 'a'. GPT-4V and Gemini Pro utilize 10 image frames extracted from the video content.

Model	Art& Sports	Business	Science	Health& Medicine	Embodied Tasks	Tech& Engineering	Game	Average
GPT-4o-seed 1 (OpenAI, 2024)	47.10	92.31	75.11	81.25	65.03	72.34	78.31	62.22
GPT-4o-seed 2 (OpenAI, 2024)	46.58	90.91	69.78	84.38	65.73	75.53	83.13	61.77
GPT-4o-seed 3 (OpenAI, 2024)	49.94	90.21	76.44	84.38	58.04	78.72	79.52	63.63
Claude-3.5-seed 1 (Anthropic, 2024)	54.32	64.34	59.11	53.12	30.77	59.57	59.04	54.27
Claude-3.5-seed 2 (Anthropic, 2024)	54.32	63.64	61.33	54.17	30.77	58.51	59.04	54.52
Claude-3.5-seed 3 (Anthropic, 2024)	55.10	63.64	59.11	56.25	31.47	58.51	60.24	54.84
GPT-4V-seed 1 (OpenAI, 2023b)	36.90	79.72	64.00	73.96	51.75	60.64	71.08	51.64
GPT-4V-seed 2 (OpenAI, 2023b)	35.48	83.92	68.44	73.96	58.04	60.64	75.90	52.79
GPT-4V-seed 3 (OpenAI, 2023b)	36.13	81.12	67.11	72.92	56.64	62.77	73.49	52.47
Gemini Pro-seed 1 (Team et al., 2023)	40.90	79.72	60.44	78.12	43.36	71.28	65.06	52.92
Gemini Pro-seed 2 (Team et al., 2023)	35.10	75.52	63.11	75.00	44.06	71.28	69.88	50.16
Gemini Pro-seed 3 (Team et al., 2023)	35.35	74.83	64.89	77.08	43.36	67.02	63.86	49.97
Video-LLaVA-seed 1 (Lin et al., 2023a)	34.58	51.05	57.33	32.29	61.54	57.45	50.60	43.94
Video-LLaVA-seed 2 (Lin et al., 2023a)	36.77	52.45	56.00	32.29	65.03	57.45	51.81	45.35
Video-LLaVA-seed 3 (Lin et al., 2023a)	36.39	50.35	55.56	33.33	62.94	59.57	44.58	44.52
Video-Chat-seed 1 (Li et al., 2023c)	39.48	51.05	30.67	46.88	39.86	39.36	44.58	40.03
Video-Chat-seed 2 (Li et al., 2023c)	39.48	51.05	30.67	45.83	41.26	39.36	45.78	40.15
Video-Chat-seed 3 (Li et al., 2023c)	39.61	51.05	31.11	45.83	40.56	39.36	44.58	40.15
mPLUG-Owl-seed 1 (Ye et al., 2023)	31.35	65.73	45.78	61.46	28.67	48.94	65.06	41.05
mPLUG-Owl-seed 2 (Ye et al., 2023)	28.65	65.03	44.44	58.33	21.68	37.23	57.83	37.52
mPLUG-Owl-seed 3 (Ye et al., 2023)	27.48	61.54	52.00	60.42	20.98	39.36	63.86	38.23
ChatUnivi-seed 1 (Jin et al., 2023)	24.13	60.14	52.00	62.50	48.95	56.38	56.63	39.77
ChatUnivi-seed 2 (Jin et al., 2023)	25.16	62.94	51.11	62.50	44.06	58.51	50.60	39.77
ChatUnivi-seed 3 (Jin et al., 2023)	24.13	59.44	52.89	58.33	45.45	55.32	50.60	38.87
Video-ChatGPT-seed 1 (Maaz et al., 2024)	26.71	34.97	34.67	53.12	37.76	41.49	34.94	32.59
Video-ChatGPT-seed 2 (Li et al., 2023c)	27.74	41.96	36.89	53.12	39.86	43.62	39.76	34.64
Video-ChatGPT-seed 3 (Li et al., 2023c)	27.74	41.96	36.89	53.12	39.86	43.62	39.76	34.64
PandaGPT-seed 1 (Su et al., 2023)	26.06	44.06	38.22	41.67	35.66	39.36	42.17	32.97
PandaGPT-seed 2 (Su et al., 2023)	24.77	45.45	36.89	34.38	34.27	40.43	44.58	31.88
PandaGPT-seed 3 (Su et al., 2023)	25.16	38.46	43.11	39.58	36.36	45.74	33.73	32.58
ImageBind-LLM-seed 1 (Han et al., 2023)	24.77	41.96	30.67	31.25	46.85	43.62	40.96	31.62
ImageBind-LLM-seed 2 (Han et al., 2023)	25.03	41.96	32.44	31.25	45.45	40.43	40.96	31.69
ImageBind-LLM-seed 3 (Han et al., 2023)	24.65	44.06	33.33	28.12	48.25	40.43	42.17	31.94
X-Instruct-BLIP-seed 1 (Panagopoulou et al., 2023)	21.42	14.69	22.22	29.17	16.78	21.28	26.51	21.23
X-Instruct-BLIP-seed 2 (Panagopoulou et al., 2023)	20.77	16.78	24.00	28.12	20.28	22.34	25.30	21.62
X-Instruct-BLIP-seed 3 (Panagopoulou et al., 2023)	21.03	16.08	21.33	28.12	18.18	23.40	26.51	21.23
LWM-seed 1 (Liu et al., 2024b)	11.35	18.18	16.44	19.79	24.48	24.47	10.84	15.20
LWM-seed 2 (Liu et al., 2024b)	12.13	17.48	15.56	19.79	24.48	22.34	8.43	15.14
LWM-seed 3 (Liu et al., 2024b)	12.65	16.78	14.22	21.88	28.67	19.15	15.66	15.84
Otter-seed 1 (Li et al., 2023a)	18.45	19.58	8.89	8.33	14.69	15.96	14.46	15.84
Otter-seed 2 (Li et al., 2023a)	17.29	17.48	9.33	6.25	13.99	18.09	15.66	15.14
Otter-seed 3 (Li et al., 2023a)	15.61	18.88	9.78	6.25	11.19	13.83	15.66	13.98
Video-LLaMA-seed 1 (Zhang et al., 2023a)	5.55	21.68	24.00	29.17	15.38	21.28	18.07	13.66
Video-LLaMA-seed 2 (Zhang et al., 2023a)	6.58	20.28	20.44	31.25	13.99	17.02	32.53	14.05
Video-LLaMA-seed 3 (Zhang et al., 2023a)	6.32	21.68	22.22	33.33	16.78	19.15	24.10	14.37

Table 7: Performance (%) of different set of turkers

Model	Art& Sports	Business	Science	Health& Medicine	Embodied Tasks	Tech& Engineering	Game&	Average
Turker Set 1	25.224	39.860	32.444	40.625	51.049	50.000	40.964	33.227
Turker Set 2	30.452	46.154	35.556	42.708	53.846	51.064	46.988	37.652
Turker Set 3	26.710	41.958	36.889	46.875	53.147	42.553	38.554	34.830

Table 8: Performance (%) of different MLLMs across different disciplines.

Model	Art& Sports	Business	Science	Health& Medicine	Embodied Tasks	Tech& Engineering	Average
Video-Chat (Open-ended) (Li et al., 2023c)	27.484	9.091	18.137	10.417	29.371	19.149	22.887
Video-Chat (Li et al., 2023c)	39.355	48.951	31.863	45.833	39.161	38.298	39.588
Video-LLaMA (Open-ended) (Zhang et al., 2023a)	5.419	27.972	24.020	31.250	11.816	15.957	16.096
Video-LLaMA (Zhang et al., 2023a)	27.355	31.469	31.373	48.958	16.084	28.723	28.729
ChatUnivi (Open-ended) (Jin et al., 2023)	21.161	61.538	42.157	61.458	30.070	37.234	32.646
ChatUnivi (Jin et al., 2023)	12.387	58.042	50.000	60.417	30.070	43.617	29.072
Otter (Open-ended) (Li et al., 2023a)	37.677	32.867	37.255	32.292	22.378	27.660	34.639
Otter (Li et al., 2023a)	17.677	16.783	12.255	5.208	17.483	15.957	15.876
ImageBind-LLM (Open-ended) (Han et al., 2023)	3.355	3.497	14.706	10.417	21.678	18.085	8.179
ImageBind-LLM (Han et al., 2023)	23.742	34.965	51.471	33.333	48.951	56.383	33.952
PandaGPT (Open-ended) (Su et al., 2023)	22.581	16.084	24.020	21.875	19.580	21.277	21.718
PandaGPT (Su et al., 2023)	27.613	44.056	39.706	25.000	40.559	21.277	31.615
LWM (Open-ended) (Liu et al., 2024b)	16.000	20.979	14.706	16.667	19.580	20.213	16.976
LWM (Liu et al., 2024b)	16.387	18.182	18.137	19.792	22.378	21.277	17.938
X-Instruct-BLIP (Open-ended) (Panagopoulou et al., 2023)	3.613	11.888	14.706	25.000	17.483	13.830	9.416
X-Instruct-BLIP (Panagopoulou et al., 2023)	19.355	13.287	22.549	29.167	18.881	14.894	19.519

B.2 Results from Amazon Turkers

Table 7 presents the evaluation results from three sets of Amazon Turkers across various disciplines. The results indicate that there is slightly variability in performance across different human evaluators.

B.3 Results for the Two Different Evaluation Strategies

In Table 8, we give additional evaluation results for different MLLMs evaluated in this paper. For closed-source models, the evaluation pipeline is the one used in the main paper, which involves utilizing GPT-4V as a judger. The process consists of presenting GPT-4V with the question, a corresponding answer generated by the baseline model, and the set of possible options. GPT-4V then assesses whether the model-generated answer is accurate within the given context; Another is open-ended generation where we employ a two-step methodology. We first prompt each model to do open-ended generation. Subsequently, we prompt the model to align its generative response with one of the predefined options: 'a', 'b', 'c', or 'd'.

B.4 Additional Evaluation Results Using Open-sourced Evaluator as the Evaluator

In addition to GPT-4V, we also experimented with using the open-sourced Video-LLaVA model as an evaluator. The average accuracy of various models evaluated with this method is shown in Table 10. The rankings are consistent with those obtained using GPT-4V in the main paper, highlighting the versatility of our benchmark, which supports multiple evaluator options beyond GPT-4V.

B.5 Additional Temporal Reasoning Experiments

To better understand the impact of temporal coherence on reasoning tasks of different models, we conducted two experiments focused on temporal reasoning. These experiments were designed to analyze model performance under varying temporal constraints, including reduced video frames and shuffled video frames.

- **Reduced Video Frames**: Videos were processed by reducing the number of frames to 1/5 of the original. This setting evaluates the models' ability to reason with limited temporal information.

Table 9: Performance (%) of MLLMs on temporal reasoning tasks under different conditions.

Model	Original Videos	Shuffled Videos	Reduced Video Frames
GPT-4o (OpenAI, 2024)	40.90	35.11	32.19
GPT-4V (OpenAI, 2023b)	27.17	22.04	22.33
Claude-3.5-Sonnet (Anthropic, 2024)	25.77	21.58	19.45
Gemini Pro (Team et al., 2023)	24.65	20.19	18.97
Video-LLaVA (Lin et al., 2023a)	34.45	18.47	28.50
Video-Chat-7B (Li et al., 2023c)	25.77	21.50	20.19
Video-ChatGPT-7B (Maaz et al., 2024)	23.53	21.62	20.17
ImageBind-LLM-7B (Han et al., 2023)	19.89	16.19	14.98
PandaGPT-7B (Su et al., 2023)	28.01	24.35	22.57
ChatUnivi-7B (Jin et al., 2023)	22.97	19.41	17.14
Video-LLaMA-2-13B (Zhang et al., 2023a)	6.16	5.02	4.58
X-Instruct-BLIP-7B (Panagopoulou et al., 2023)	11.20	9.88	8.95
LWM-1M-JAX (Liu et al., 2024b)	7.00	5.75	5.56
Otter-7B (Li et al., 2023a)	9.52	3.25	7.93
mPLUG-Owl-7B (Ye et al., 2023)	20.17	18.19	16.59

Table 10: Performance of different models across evaluations using Video-LLaVA as the evaluator.

Model	Accuracy (%)
Video-Chat-7B (Li et al., 2023c)	41.96
ChatUnivi-7B (Jin et al., 2023)	39.81
mPLUG-Owl-7B (Ye et al., 2023)	38.01
PandaGPT-7B (Su et al., 2023)	31.66
ImageBind-LLM-7B (Han et al., 2023)	31.65
X-Instruct-BLIP-7B (Panagopoulou et al., 2023)	22.02
LWM-1M-JAX (Liu et al., 2024b)	16.81
Otter-7B (Li et al., 2023a)	12.08
Video-LLaMA-2-13B (Zhang et al., 2023a)	10.84

- **Shuffled Video Frames**: Videos were processed by shuffling their frames. This setting tests the models' ability to reason when the temporal order of the frames is disrupted.

The results of these experiments are summarized in Table 9. From Table 9, there is a significant performance drop when videos are either reduced in frame count or shuffled. These findings highlight the sensitivity of models to temporal coherence and emphasize the necessity of maintaining sufficient temporal information for accurate reasoning. Notably, proprietary models such as GPT-4o and GPT-4V demonstrate better resilience under these settings compared to most open-source models.

C Implementation Details

We use the optimum number of video frames and report the performance in the main paper. The numbers of the sampled frames are 10 for GPT-4V/o and Gemini Pro, 8 for Video-LLaVA, 32 for ChatUniVi. For closed-source models, for both Gemini Pro and GPT-4V, we use the default settings provided by their official APIs. We use Katna [3] to extract key video frames as input to these two models. The Gemini Pro is set to process visual input and configured with safety settings to filter a range of harmful content. The configuration thresholds are set to 'BLOCK_NONE'. For PandaGPT, we set 'top_p' to 0.7, and 'temperature' to 0.5. For VideoChat, we set 'max_frames' to 100. For LWM, we use the LWM-Chat-1M variant. For X-Instruct-BLIP, the model is implemented using four image frames. For Otter, we use the video variant. We use GPT-4-32K as the judge for judging whether the model answer is correct when it can not mapped to the option letter using the rule-based method. The prompt provided to GPT-4-32K is structured as follows: "`I will present a response from a question-answering model alongside several answer options. Your task is to evaluate the response and determine which of the following options it most closely aligns`

[3] https://github.com/keplerlab/katna



Figure 6: The interface of using Amazon Mechanical Turk to do human evaluation.

Table 11: Category-wise and overall error rates

Category	Incorrect/Total	Error Rate (%)
Sports & Arts	5/62	8.06
Health & Medicine	2/7	28.57
Science	1/52	1.92
Robotics	0/12	0.00
Business	0/10	0.00
Tech & Engineering	1/46	2.17
Overall	**9/189**	**4.76**

```
with, denoting the most similar option by its corresponding letter
(a, b, c, or d).".
```

Query Generation in Synthetic Data Generation Pipeline For the discipline of **Science**, queries are generated for subdisciplines such as Geography, Chemistry, Wildlife Restoration, Mycology, Nature, Physics, Weather, Zoology, Math, Botany, Biology, and Geology. In the **Tech & Engineering** discipline, our queries span across Electronics, Animal Behavior, Mechanical Engineering, Energy & Power, Architecture, Agriculture, Nature, Physics, Robotics, Woodworking, and Gardening. The **Sports & Arts** discipline encompasses a broad range of cultural and physical activities, including Music, Drawing and Painting, Football, Volleyball, Aerobic Gymnastics, Basketball, Instrument, Baking, Dance, Woodworking, Graffiti, Anatomy, and additional Music-related topics. **Embodied Tasks** are represented through queries for Assembly, Ego-motion, and Single Object Manipulation, focusing on the interaction between agents and their physical environment. The **Health & Medicine** discipline is segmented into Pharmacy, Public Health, Clinical Medicine, and Basic Medical Science, reflecting the multifaceted nature of healthcare and medical studies. The **Business** discipline is stratified into fundamental areas such as accounting, finance, management, marketing, and economics, each representing key facets of the commercial and economic world. Lastly, the **Game** discipline consists of Role Playing Game, First Person Shooting game, Racing Game, Adventure Game, Real-Time Strategy Game, Tower Defense game, and Fighting Game.

Each generated query retrieves relevant video content, which is then filtered and processed to align with the specific needs of our research objectives. Videos that meet our criteria in terms of content, length, and quality are downloaded and incorporated into our dataset, forming the basis for subsequent analysis and model training.



Figure 7: Human evaluation interface for GPT judger.

D HUMAN EVALUATION

D.1 QUALITY OF DATA

We hired Amazon Mechanical Turk to do human evaluation on the data with the results shown in Table 7. Workers were required to have completed more than 1000 Human Intelligence Tasks (HITs) and have an HIT approval rate greater than 95% to qualify for our tasks. We show in Figure 6 the human evaluation interface on the generated data. Each worker was compensated 0.20 for completing an assignment. This amount was determined based on the estimated time and effort required to complete each task. We set the number of unique workers per task to 3 to collect diverse perspectives while avoiding redundancy. Workers were given 1 hour to complete each assignment. This time frame was chosen to enable thoughtful responses from workers.

We also hired students from campus to do human evaluation on subset of the data. The results are shown in Table 12. The performance of the human evaluators did not surpass that of GPT-4V and Gemini-Pro. This outcome underscores the challenging nature of the dataset, which often necessitates specialized domain knowledge that our evaluators—primarily non-experts—found demanding.



Figure 8: Examples from MMVU in the Embodied Tasks discipline.



Figure 9: Examples from MMVU in the Tech & Engineering discipline.

These results highlight the complexity of the questions and the potential necessity for discipline-specific understanding to achieve high accuracy

D.2 Quality of Using GPT as the Judger

For a comprehensive assessment of GPT-4V's accuracy when using it as the judger, we devised a human evaluation protocol also resort to Amazon Mechanical Turk, as visualized in Figure 7. The evaluators present a series of statements derived from the video, and GPT-4V is tasked with selecting the most accurate answer from a set of multiple-choice questions. Through this interface, human evaluators can efficiently gauge GPT-4V's performance across different types of questions—when using it as the judger.

The results obtained from this human evaluation process are shown in Table 11, across 189 examples, there are only 9 incorrect ones with the error rate of 4.76%, validating the effectiveness of using GPT-4V as the judger.



Figure 10: Examples from MMVU in the Science discipline.



Figure 11: Examples from MMVU in the Business discipline.

E Error Analysis

In this section, we delve into the analysis of errors from evaluated MLLMs. We summarized error types as follows:

Question Understanding Error (QUE): Models misinterpret the question's intent, such as misunderstanding how a pendulum's period would change if a condition in the scenario is altered.

Audio Understanding Error (AUE): Models fail to interpret audio cues correctly, shown by their failure to recognize blue and red lines on a stock chart.

Visual Perception Error (VPE): There is a misinterpretation of visual content, leading to incorrect assumptions about the visual data presented in the video.

Hallucinations (HE): Models generate content or details that are not present in the actual data, essentially 'hallucinating' information.



Figure 12: Examples from MMVU in the Arts & Sports discipline.



Figure 13: Examples from MMVU of explicit temporal understanding and implicit temporal understanding (e.g., in explanation).

Reasoning Error (RE): Models demonstrate a lack of logical reasoning, leading to incorrect conclusions based on the given data.

Lack of Domain Knowledge (LDK): Models show an inability to answer questions that require specific domain expertise, indicating a gap in their knowledge.

Reject to Answer (RA): An example of this error was observed when the model was asked to select an answer regarding the outcome of an experiment involving liquid nitrogen. Instead of choosing an option, the model provided an unrelated response concerning a light bulb, indicating either a misunderstanding or a cautious approach due to the potential for the question to be interpreted as pertaining to a sensitive topic, which can trigger content filters focused on safety and compliance policies.

We show in Figure 15, 16, 17, 18 some error cases of *Question Understanding Error*, *Audio Understanding Error*, *Visual Perception Error*, *Hallucinations*, *Reasoning Error*, *Lack of Domain Knowledge*, and *Reject to Answer* respectively from MLLMs evaluated on MMVU.

Table 12: Comparison of Human Evaluation on subset of 75 videos.

Model	Art& Sports	Business	Science	Health& Medicine	Embodied Tasks	Tech& Engineering	Average
Human Evaluation	31.183	59.782	42.103	48.858	56.429	50.134	43.758
GPT-4V (OpenAI, 2023b)	30.399	89.203	68.731	80.059	38.432	69.108	48.793
Gemini-Pro (Team et al., 2023)	28.745	80.909	69.425	80.023	50.987	80.479	48.083

F DATA EXAMPLES

F.1 MAIN SUSET

We show in Figure 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 some additional examples from main subset of MMVU.

F.2 SYNTHETIC I AND SYNTHETIC II

We present in Figure 14 additional examples from Synthetic I and Synthetic II of MMVU. The examples correspond to various disciplines: Business, Health & Medicine, Science, and Gaming, respectively. For each discipline, the first example showcases an audio-only generated QA from Synthetic I, while the second example represents a visual-only generated QA from Synthetic II. These examples highlight the multi-disciplinary reasoning capabilities evaluated in our benchmark, even for the synthetic dataset.

G ADDITIONAL DATA STATISTICS

For human annotated dataset, the length of each video was capped at approximately two minutes. The statistical distribution of the disciplines within the dataset for this part is as follows:

- *Sports & Arts*: The subset that consists of 77 videos, showcasing a vibrant collection that covers a wide range of topics from athletic endeavors to various forms of artistic expression.
- *Science*: A subset of 75 videos, which delves into the empirical world of scientific inquiry, spanning a multitude of specializations from fundamental physics to advanced biological studies.
- *Tech & Engineering*: Encompassing 54 videos, this segment captures the cutting-edge advancements and foundational concepts that drive innovation and infrastructure in the modern world.
- *Embodied Tasks*: With 50 videos, the dataset provides a focused insight into the dynamic field of Embodied Tasks, highlighting the intersection of AI, mechanics, and automation.
- *Health & Medicine*: This essential discipline is well-represented with 50 videos, offering perspectives on medical breakthroughs, healthcare practices, and life sciences.
- *Business*: This discipline includes 50 videos, reflecting on the multifaceted nature of commerce, from economics to management sciences.
- *Game*: This discipline includes 51 videos, reflecting various aspects of gaming.

Altogether, the MMVU Benchmark's diversity is visually encapsulated in Figure 19, which delineates the distribution of videos across 61 subdisciplines. The horizontal bar chart provides a quantified representation of the dataset's range, reflecting the careful curation process that has gone into ensuring breadth across various knowledge areas.

MMWorld also has additional annotations such as "Requires Audio", "Requires Video", and "Question Only". The world we live in is rich with both audio and visual information, and effective world modeling requires an understanding of how these modalities interact and convey meaning.

To achieve this, we annotated additional attributes such as ”Requires Audio”, ”Requires Video”, and ”Question Only” during data collection. These annotations help determine whether correctly answering a question necessitates audio information, visual cues from the video, or can be addressed based solely on the question itself. By doing so, we ensure that our benchmark tests the full spectrum of multimodal comprehension, reflecting the complex, sensory-rich environment in which real-world understanding takes place. The statistics of these annotations are shown in Figure 20.



Figure 14: Examples from Synthetic Subset I and Synthetic Subset II of MMVU.



Lack of Domain Knowledge

Q: How many eggs can a frog lay at once?

A: I'm sorry, but the images provided are of mushrooms in a forest setting, which do not provide any information about the egg-laying habits of frogs.



Reasoning Error

Q: How do the pulleys move when the hands are off the pulley system?

A: When the hands are removed from the pulley system, as shown in the series of images, there is no force being applied to any of the pulleys to cause movement. Therefore, all four pulleys remain static.

Figure 15: Error pattern of lack of domain knowledge and reasoning error. In the first case, the model does not give the correct answer because of lacking the domain knowledge. In the second case, the model makes the wrong reasoning.

Question Understanding Error

Q: What would happen to the pendulum period if the professor sit up straight on the ball instead?

A: The pendulum period would not afford it.



Visual Perception Error, Hallucinations

Q: What would happen if the man skipped the step shown in the video?

A: If the man skipped the step of rolling the blue tube on the floor to uncover the red box, he would likely have encountered difficulty in accessing the contents of the box. This step is important because it helps the man to create a flat surface to work with the red box, ensuring that the box is visible and accessible.

Figure 16: Error pattern of question understanding, visual perceptron error, and hallucinations. In the first case, the model does not understand the question correctly where the model fails to accurately discern the query regarding the pendulum's period. In the second scenario, the model erroneously identifies objects within the visual input, leading to the hallucination of non-existent elements, such as a red box.

Reject to Answer

Q: What if we replace the boiling water with iced water?
The question will trigger the content filter and there will be no answer



Audio Understanding Error

Q: What does the blue and red lines in the stock chart represents?
A: The blue and red lines in the stock chart represent the support and resistance levels, respectively. The support level is where the stock price tends to stop falling, while the resistance level is where the stock price tends to stop rising. In the video, the blue line indicates a level of support, while the red line indicates a level of resistance.

Figure 17: Error pattern of reject to answer and audio understanding error. In the first case, the model will reject to answer because of the dangerous action showing in the video. In the second case, the model does not understand the audio correctly as the answer to the question is given in the audio of the video.



Visual Perception Error

Q: How many capacitors are there in the final circuit?
A: There are several capacitors in the final circuit. We can see at least 14 of them in the video.

Visual Perception Error, Lack of Domain Knowledge

Q: What could be the three gases in order?
A: I'm unable to provide assistance as the request requires information to be extracted from images/videos which is beyond my current capabilities.

Figure 18: Error pattern due to visual perception inaccuracies and insufficient domain knowledge. The first case demonstrates a visual perception error where the model incorrectly identifies the number of capacitors present. The second case showcases a compound error where the model not only fails to discern the colors indicative of different gases but also lacks the domain knowledge necessary to infer their identity correctly.



Figure 19: The number of videos per subdiscipline in MMVU. Each horizontal bar indicates the quantity of videos corresponding to a subdiscipline, showcasing the dataset's diversity and coverage across various domains of knowledge. Synthetic Subset I is collected with audio-only data and Synthetic Subset II is collected with visual-only data.



Figure 20: The distribution statistics of questions in the MMVU benchmark by annotations.