MG-LLAVA: TOWARDS MULTI-GRANULARITY VI-SUAL INSTRUCTION TUNING

Anonymous authors

004

010 011

012

013

014

015

016

017

018

019

021

025

026

Paper under double-blind review

ABSTRACT

Multi-modal large language models (MLLMs) have made significant strides in various visual understanding tasks. However, the majority of these models are constrained to process low-resolution images, which limits their effectiveness in perception tasks that necessitate detailed visual information. In our study, we present MG-LLaVA, an innovative MLLM that enhances the model's visual processing capabilities by incorporating a multi-granularity vision flow, which includes low-resolution, high-resolution, and object-centric features. We propose the integration of an additional high-resolution visual encoder to capture fine-grained details, which are then fused with base visual features through a Conv-Gate fusion network. To further refine the model's object recognition abilities, we incorporate object-level features derived from bounding boxes identified by offline detectors. Being trained solely on publicly available multimodal data through instruction tuning, MG-LLaVA demonstrates exceptional perception skills. We instantiate MG-LLaVA with a wide variety of language encoders, ranging from 3.8B to 34B, to evaluate the model's performance comprehensively. Extensive evaluations across multiple benchmarks demonstrate that MG-LLaVA outperforms existing MLLMs of comparable parameter sizes, showcasing its remarkable efficacy.

028 029 1 INTRODUCTION

Recent works on Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) (Zhu et al., 2023; Ye et al., 2023; Liu 031 et al., 2024b; Zhang et al., 2023b; Wei et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2023) have achieved rapid development in vision language understanding, visual reasoning, visual interaction, and localization. Most MLLMs 033 adopt pre-trained Large Language Models (LLMs) as the base architecture to process concatenated 034 visual and language embeddings. As one representative work, LLaVA (Liu et al., 2024b) adopts low-resolution (224², 336², etc.) images as inputs and aligns visual embeddings with the text modality 036 via an MLP projector and then performs instruction tuning. The architecture of LLaVA has been 037 widely adopted by subsequent works (Xu et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024c; Maaz et al., 2023; Lin et al., 038 2023a), and has been applied to various vision tasks, including detection, segmentation, and video understanding.

040 Real-world images exhibit a wide range of resolutions, scales, and aspect ratios, posing significant 041 challenges for MLLMs with low-resolution inputs in robustly processing them. To tackle this problem, 042 recent works (Liu et al., 2024a; Lin et al., 2023b; Li et al., 2024c; Zong et al., 2024; Luo et al., 2024; 043 Xu et al., 2024; Dong et al., 2024) have proposed various strategies to augment the capabilities of 044 visual encoders in MLLMs, including training on diverse datasets, utilizing high-resolution image inputs, and employing dynamic aspect ratios. Most of these approaches involve the integration of additional visual tokens through various techniques. Despite these advancements, two critical issues 046 persist: (1) Although object-level features are crucial in nearly all visual understanding tasks, they 047 are currently absent in existing vision encoders; (2) None of the existing MLLMs have integrated 048 multi-granularity features, a classic concept in computer vision, into their frameworks. However, as a human vision system, multi-granularity inputs are common in various cases since even on the same object, the scale variance problems pose challenges (Ren et al., 2015; Ghiasi et al., 2019) in the 051 current perception system. 052

Motivated by the aforementioned analysis, we introduce MG-LLaVA, a novel MLLM designed to effectively process multi-granularity visual inputs, including object-level, origin images, and

061

067

068 069



Figure 1: MG-LLaVA demonstrates notable performance across various vision-language tasks, particularly on tasks involving object recognition.

high-resolution inputs. Our framework builds upon LLaVA (Liu et al., 2024b) and is specifically 071 tailored to incorporate and manage multi-granularity inputs. For object-level inputs, we employ a pre-trained open-vocabulary detector to identify object bounding boxes and execute region features 073 to acquire region visual tokens. In particular, we explore two methods for object feature integration: 074 explicit integration via box feature fusion and implicit integration via object proposal feature. We find 075 that the former works well and it can even scale up with more data. In contrast to close-set detectors, 076 open-vocabulary detectors offer enhanced generalizability and robustness across diverse scenes. To 077 handle fine-grained visual inputs, we utilize a convolution-based backbone Schuhmann et al. (2022) to 078 extract richer visual features. Subsequently, we propose a straightforward yet effective fusion strategy 079 to integrate these inputs into the original visual tokens in LLaVA. Specifically, we initially merge the fine-grained visual tokens with the original visual tokens using a simple Conv-Gate convolution. Then, we append the object-level tokens to the fused tokens. Fig. 2 illustrate the difference between 081 MG-LLaVA and existing MLLMs. Experimental results quantitatively validate the efficacy of the 082 design of MG-LLaVA. 083

084 We perform extensive experiments with MG-LLaVA integrated with various language encoders, 085 ranging from 3.8B to 34B, to substantiate the effectiveness of MG-LLaVA. Our evaluation encompasses 13 popular multimodal benchmarks for both image and video. Additionally, we present a comprehensive set of ablation studies that illustrate the impact of different components in MG-087 LLaVA. Benefiting from multi-granularity visual features, MG-LLaVA demonstrates a significantly 880 enhanced capability in perception and visual comprehension, outperforming established counterparts 089 and notably surpassing GPT-4V (OpenAI, 2023) and GeminiPro-V (Team et al., 2023) on various 090 multimodal benchmarks, including MMBench (Liu et al., 2023c) and SEEDBench (Li et al., 2023a). 091

The contribution of this work can be summarized as follows: 092

• We introduce MG-LLaVA, an advanced multi-modal model adept at processing visual inputs of 094 multiple granularities, including object-level features, original-resolution images, and high-resolution 095 data. This advancement significantly enhances the capabilities of MLLMs in visual perception and 096 understanding.

• We propose the Multi-Granularity Vision Flow, a straightforward yet effective module designed to 098 integrate features across various granularities, thereby significantly improving the performance of our 099 model. The effectiveness of our approach is substantiated through empirical experiments.

100 • By employing a range of language models scaling from 3.8B to 34B, our model exhibits clear 101 scalability and a marked proficiency in visual comprehension, outperforming established counterparts and notably surpassing GPT-4V and GeminiPro-V on MMBench and SEEDBench. 102

- 103 104
- 2 **RELATED WORK**
- 105 106
- Large Language Models. In recent years, private large language models (LLMs) like GPT-4 (Ope-107 nAI, 2023) and Llama (Touvron et al., 2023) have gained remarkable performance. Concurrently,



 Figure 2: Comparing Different MLLM Paradigms. MG-LLaVA effectively perceives multigranularity visual inputs that include object-level, low, and high-resolution inputs, thereby achieving advanced multi-modal understanding.

a multitude of open-source research (Chiang et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2023; Bai et al., 2023; Team, 2023) has embarked on the exploration of LLMs. LLM shows strong performance in various NLP tasks. However, pure LLMs cannot handle image and video inputs. Our work focuses on designing new multimodal large language models, which jointly take visual and language tokens as inputs. In this work, we engaged a range of LLMs (Chiang et al., 2023; Abdin et al., 2024; AI@Meta, 2024; Young et al., 2024) scaling from 3.8B to 34B. The observed performance across these models has proved the effectiveness of our design.

129 Multimodal Large Language Models. Multi-modal Large Language Models (MLLMs) (Zhu 130 et al., 2023; Ye et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2023c; Dai et al., 2024; Bai et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023a; 131 Li et al., 2023c; Lin et al., 2023a; Zhang et al., 2024; Huang et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2024) have recently showcased the potential to endow LLMs with visual conversational abilities. Among these 132 models, LLaVA (Liu et al., 2023a) typically built a simple architecture that utilizes a vision-language 133 cross-modal adapter to bridge the gap between vision and language tokens. Some research (Li 134 et al., 2023d; Zhang et al., 2023c; Liu et al., 2024a) tried to increase performance by utilizing 135 high-resolution inputs. LLaVA-UHD (Xu et al., 2024) cost-effectively increased input resolution by 136 dividing high-resolution images into smaller slices. Subsequently, LLaVA-HR (Luo et al., 2024) and 137 Mini-Gemini (Li et al., 2024c), endeavor to incorporate an additional visual encoder to enhance high-138 resolution details without increasing the count of visual tokens. However, these works consistently 139 overlook the impact of fine-grained object-level features, which compromises their potential for 140 enhanced perception. In comparison, MG-LLaVA explores the potential of multi-granularity input by 141 simultaneously leveraging high-resolution inputs, low-resolution inputs, and object-level inputs. By 142 flexibly integrating visual tokens of multiple granularity, MG-LLaVA achieves superior performance on several benchmarks with a marginal increase in cost. 143

144 Multi-Granularity Modeling in Vision. Inputs of multiple granularity have been incorporated into 145 various downstream vision tasks. In object detection and segmentation, the efficacy of multi-level 146 features has been well-established in detecting objects of different scales (Zhao et al., 2019a; Qian 147 et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2023b; Wan et al., 2019; Li et al., 2024b; Yuan et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2023). For panoptic segmentation, some methods (de Geus et al., 2019; Kirillov et al., 2019; Li et al., 2019; 148 Xu et al., 2022; Ramanathan et al., 2023; Qi et al., 2024) applied a multi-granularity network to 149 train instance, semantic, and part segmentation in parallel, and some studies (Michieli et al., 2020; 150 Zhao et al., 2019b; de Geus et al., 2021; Li et al., 2022; 2024a) have indicated that training on 151 various levels of abstraction can improve the performance of the segmentation network. For example, 152 SAM (Kirillov et al., 2023) presents a multi-granularity mask prediction method for handling various 153 level masks, such as things, background stuff, and parts. Motivated by the above works, we aim to 154 capture input from various levels of perception into MLLM. In particular, we construct our model 155 by developing multiple visual branches for different granularity, thereby augmenting its perceptual 156 capabilities.

157 158

3 Method

159 160

161 In this work, we propose MG-LLaVA, effectively harnesses both the high-resolution and object-level features for improving MLLMs. The architecture of MG-LLaVA is illustrated in Fig. 3a. The model



Figure 3: The illustration of MG-LLaVA. *Top left*: The overall framework of MG-LLaVA, which includes the Multi-Granularity Vision Flow module and a LLM. *Right*: Illustration of Multi-Granularity Vision Flow, which aims to extract multiple visual features and integrate disparate features to ensure seamless interaction. *Bottom left*: Structure of Conv-Gate Fusion module.

192

193

183

comprises two key components: (1) Multi-Granularity Vision Flow framework for extracting visual
 features with different resolutions and granularities while effectively integrating disparate features
 to ensure seamless interaction. (2) A large language model dedicated to generating coherent and
 contextually relevant responses.

3.1 PRELIMINARY

As one of the most extensively adopted multi-modal LLM architectures, LLaVA consists of a vision encoder f_V , an MLP projector f_p , and a language model f_L . Given a visual input V and a textual input T, LLaVA computes the vision and language embeddings as per Eq. (1), where f_T represents the input embedding layer of f_L . The resulting embeddings, \mathbf{E}_T and \mathbf{E}_V , are then concatenated into a single token sequence, serving as the input to the LLM. LLaVA utilizes Eq. (2) to calculate the probability of the target answer \mathbf{X}_A , where θ represents the trainable parameters and L is the length of \mathbf{X}_A . The model is trained on visual instruction tuning data to maximize $p(\mathbf{X}_A | V, T)$.

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{T}} = f_{\mathrm{T}}(T), \mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{V}} = f_{p}(f_{\mathrm{V}}(V))$$
(1)

202 203

204 205

206 207

201

$$p\left(\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{A}} \mid V, T\right) = \prod_{i=1}^{L} p_{\theta}\left(\mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{A}}^{[i]} \mid Concat(\mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{V}}, \mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{T}}^{[1:i-1]}), \mathbf{X}_{\mathrm{A}}^{[i-1]}\right)$$
(2)

208 Despite the promising results, LLaVA still restrains itself in processing images at a low resolution 209 (224², 336², etc.), This significantly hinders the model's ability, particularly in recognizing small 210 objects. Scaling to high resolution without adapting the vision encoder directly would dramatically 211 increase the number of visual tokens, rendering the approach ineffective. Furthermore, the visual input 212 can also be complex and contain numerous objects within an image or video, which poses challenges 213 for MLLMs in identifying some critical objects. Empirically, incorporating object-level features can significantly enhance the model's perceptual abilities. Therefore, we introduce MG-LLaVA, 214 which effectively harnesses both the high-resolution and object-level features for the improvement of 215 MLLMs.



Figure 4: Comparison of explicit and implicit integration of object-level features.

3.2 MULTI-GRANULARITY VISION FLOW

228 Hybrid Vision Encoders As depicted in Fig. 3b, MG-LLaVA initially processes images at two 229 different resolutions: low-resolution V_L and high-resolution V_H . In the low-resolution branch, we follow the LLaVA-1.5 (Liu et al., 2023a) to utilize a CLIP-pretrained ViT (Radford et al., 2021) denoted as f_V^L to derive low-resolution features $\mathbf{E}_L \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times C}$. The ViT feature \mathbf{E}_L benefits from 230 231 an expanded receptive field, capturing a more comprehensive view of global information. In the 232 high-resolution branch, we employ a CLIP-pretrained ConvNeXt (Schuhmann et al., 2022) denoted 233 by f_V^H to obtain high-resolution features $\mathbf{E}_H \in \mathbb{R}^{h \times w \times C}$. f_V^H effectively extracts detailed features 234 from high-resolution images, offering detailed local insights. f_V^L and f_V^H downsample the input 235 resolution with strides of 14 and 32, respectively. We therefore adjust V_L and V_H to ensure that the 236 number of tokens in \mathbf{E}_{L} and \mathbf{E}_{H} remains the same $(N = h \times w)$. 237

238 **Conv-Gate Fusion** Combining both low and high-resolution features as inputs results in a doubling 239 of the visual tokens to be processed, which is computationally ineffective. Moreover, the distinct 240 architectures of ViT and ConvNeXt lead to a discrepancy between E_L and E_H , requiring a careful 241 fusion process. Inspired from (Luo et al., 2024), we implement a lightweight Conv-Gate fusion 242 network that facilitates feature aggregation while maintaining a single resolution's token count, as 243 shown in Fig. 3c. We first employ 1D convolutions to align the channel widths of heterogeneous 244 features and subsequently use a gating layer to modulate the semantic information across low and 245 high resolutions, as described in Eq. (3). The fusion module is applied to the output of both vision encoders, resulting in only a marginal increase in computational cost. 246

247 248

249

223

224 225 226

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{F}} = \mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{L}} + G(Conv(\mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{L}}), Conv(\mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{H}})) \times \mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{H}}$$
(3)

Integration of Object-level Features We investigate the integration of object-level features through
 both explicit and implicit methodologies.

252 (1) Explicit integration. We first employ an offline detector to delineate the bounding boxes of 253 objects within the image. Given the set of k object bounding boxes derived from the image, denoted 254 as $B = \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k\}$, we employ the Region of Interest (RoI) Align to extract object-level 255 features from the vision features of the high-resolution encoder f_V^H . Specifically, we upsample and 256 concatenate features from different convolutional stages to a scale of 1/4 the input size, resulting in a multi-scale feature representation $f_V^{H'}$, which provides a fine-grained perspective. The object-level 257 258 features are then aligned from $f_V^{H'}$. To maintain computational efficiency, we apply average pooling to each object feature and subsequently concatenate them into a sequence $\mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{B}}^{Ex} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times C}$, as detailed 259 260 in Eq. (4). The progress is illustrated in Fig. 4a.

261 262

263

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{B}}^{Ex} = Concat(Avg(RoIAlign(f_V^{H'}, B))) \tag{4}$$

264 (2) Implicit integration. We propose the implicit integration of object-level features by incorporating 265 proposal information. Owl-ViT-v2 (Minderer et al., 2024) is a robust detector that utilizes its visual 266 encoder to generate proposals of the objects within the input image. Given an image *I*, the output of 267 Owl-encoder f_O is represented as $P_O \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times D}$, where *L* denotes the number of proposals and *D* 268 denotes the dimension of the output. Each proposal can be interpreted as a potential object within the 269 image, encompassing information regarding its position and category. Given the substantial number 269 of proposals(in the thousands), we utilize a resampler module (Alayrac et al., 2022), denoted as *S*, to extract the information from the output proposals, represented as $\mathbf{E}_{\mathrm{B}}^{Im} \in \mathbb{R}^{L' \times D}$. The number of output queries L' generated by the resampler is significantly fewer than the output proposals Lproduced by the Owl-encoder. The entire progress is depicted in Fig. 4b, as described in Eq. (5).

 $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{B}}^{Im} = S(f_O(I)) \tag{5}$

In our experiments, we found that the performance of explicit integration significantly surpasses that of the implicit method. Consequently, we have selected explicit integration as our final approach. Detailed comparison results are presented in Sec. 4.3.

After the aggregation and extraction of object-level features, $\mathbf{E}_{\rm F}$ and $\mathbf{E}_{\rm B}^*$ are processed individually by two separate projectors (p_F and p_B) to align with the text embeddings $\mathbf{E}_{\rm T}$. The aligned features are then concatenated as input for LLM. We try multiple strategies to merge object-level features into visual embeddings and find the concatenation operation yields the most beneficial results. The experiments are discussed in Sec. 4.3. During training, we optimize Eq. (6) on the visual instruction tuning data to enhance the multi-modal comprehension capabilities of MG-LLaVA. We execute the aforementioned operations for video training to each frame and then concatenate the results into an extended sequence.

290 291 292

293

274

275 276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

 $p(\mathbf{X}_{A} \mid V_{L}, V_{H}, B, T) = \prod_{i=1}^{L} p_{\theta} \left(\mathbf{X}_{A}^{[i]} \mid Concat(p_{F}(\mathbf{E}_{F}), p_{B}(\mathbf{E}_{B}^{*}), \mathbf{E}_{T}^{[1:i-1]}), \mathbf{X}_{A}^{[i-1]} \right)$ (6)

3.3 MODEL TRAINING AND INFERENCE

Recently, a variety of powerful tagging models and open-vocabulary detectors have emerged, demon-294 strating remarkable efficacy. By using one specific tagging model to output labels, which are then 295 used by the detector to generate bounding boxes, we can effectively avoid the generation of numerous 296 irrelevant boxes, contrasting with the direct use of class-agnostic detectors. The details of the infer-297 ence pipeline are illustrated in Appx. D. For the acquisition of object bounding boxes, we employ the 298 well-pretrained RAM (Zhang et al., 2023e) as the tagging model and OWL-ViT v2 (Minderer et al., 299 2024) as the detector. The generated bounding boxes are filtered by NMS and then fed to models 300 for training and inference. It is important to note that while the RAM model aids in generating tags, 301 these tags serve solely as inputs for the open-vocabulary detector to determine the bounding boxes 302 and are not integrated into the training phase. For video inference, we detect bounding boxes for each 303 frame and concatenate the object queries with the corresponding frame's visual sequence.

Following LLaVA-1.5 (Liu et al., 2023a), we conduct a two-stage training process. During the pretraining stage, we freeze all visual encoders and the LLM and only train the fusion module, visual projector, and box projector. This aims to refine the fusion module's capability to aggregate features of low and high resolutions and to enhance the projector's alignment of visual features with the text embeddings. During instruction tuning, we freeze the visual encoders to maintain the integrity of high-quality image feature extraction and fine-tune the remaining components to enhance multi-modality comprehension.

311

³¹² 4 EXPERIMENTS

3143154.1 IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

DetailedModel Settings. In this work, all experiments are conducted based on Xtuner (Contributors, 2023). Specially, we choose CLIP pre-trained ViT-Large-14-336 (Radford et al., 2021) as a low-resolution visual encoder and the LAION pre-trained ConvNext-Large-320 (Schuhmann et al., 2022)
for high-resolution vision encoder. For the generation of bounding boxes, we have selected RAM-Plus (Zhang et al., 2023e) as the tagging model and OWL-ViTv2-large-patch14-ensemble (Minderer et al., 2024) as the open-vocabulary detector.

- 322
- **Datasets.** During the image-based training stage, our dataset comprises 558K image-caption pairs from LAION-CCSBU (Sharma et al., 2018) and 708k image-caption pairs from ALLaVA-4V-Caption

Table 1: Comparison with leading methods on several popular visual benchmarks that concentrate on perception. **Params.** denotes the total number of parameters within the model. **Res.** refers to the resolution of the input image, which is assumed to be square by default unless otherwise indicated. The notation '()' signifies the presence of both low-resolution and high-resolution inputs, with the number inside the parentheses specifying the higher resolution.

Method	LLM	Param.	Data	Res.	$\mathbf{M}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{B}^D$	$\mathbf{M}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{B}^T$	$SEED^{I}$	MMStar
		Private M	1 odels					
GPT-4V (OpenAI, 2023)	-	-	-	-	75.1	77.0	72.3	49.7
GeminiProVision (Team et al., 2023)	-	-	-	-	75.2	73.6	70.7	38.6
Qwen-VL-Plus (Bai et al., 2023)	-	-	-	-	66.2	67.0	65.7	39.7
	(Open-sourc	e Models					
BLIP-2 (Li et al., 2023b)	Vicuna-13B	14.2B	129M	224	-	-	46.4	-
InstructBLIP (Dai et al., 2024)	Vicuna-7B	8.2B	130M	224	-	36	53.4	-
Shikra (Chen et al., 2023a)	Vicuna-13B	7.3B	6M	224	58.8	60.2	-	-
IDEFICS-80B (Laurençon et al., 2024)	LLaMA-65B	-	-	224	-	54.6	-	-
Qwen-VL (Bai et al., 2023)	Qwen-7B	9.6B	1.4B	448	38.2	32.2	56.3	-
Qwen-VL-Chat (Bai et al., 2023)	Qwen-7B	9.6B	-	448	60.6	61.8	58.2	37.5
LLaVA-1.5 (Liu et al., 2023a)	Vicuna-7B	7.2B	1.2M	336	65.2	66.5	66.1	30.3
LLaVA-1.5 (Liu et al., 2023a)	Vicuna-13B	13.4B	1.2M	336	69.2	69.2	68.2	32.8
LLaVA-HR (Luo et al., 2024)	Vicuna-7B	7.4B	1.2M	448 (1024)	-	-	64.5	-
SPHINX (Lin et al., 2023b)	Vicuna-7B	10B	1.0B	224	66.9	-	69.1	-
SPHINX-1k (Lin et al., 2023b)	Vicuna-7B	10B	1.0B	448	67.1	-	71.6	-
MiniCPM-V2 (Hu et al., 2024)	MiniCPM-2.4B	2.8B	-	448	69.6	69.1	67.1	39.1
MOVA (Zong et al., 2024)	Vicuna-7/B	10B	16.6M	576	70.4	-	-	-
LLaVA-UHD Xu et al. (2024)	Vicuna-13B	13.4B	1.2M	672×1008	68.0	-	-	-
LLaVA-HR (Luo et al., 2024)	Vicuna-7B	7.4B	1.2M	1024		-	64.2	27.6
Mini-Gemini (Li et al., 2024c)	vicuna-/B	/.4B	2./M	330 (708)	69.3	08.2	08.9	37.0
		Our Me	odels					
MG-LLaVA	Phi3-3.8B	4.2B	2.5M	336 (768)	74.2	74.4	70.3	41.3
MG-LLaVA	Vicuna-7B	7.4B	2.5M	336 (768)	72.1	71.9	69.4	35.1
MG-LLaVA	LLaMA3-8B	8.4B	2.5M	336 (768)	76.5	76.6	71.5	36.9
MG-LLaVA	Vicuna-13B	13.6B	2.5M	336 (768)	72.2	73.5	70.8	34.1
MG-LLaVA	Yi1.5-34B	34.4B	2.5M	336 (768)	80.1	79.1	73.7	47.9

dataset (Chen et al., 2024a), culminating in a total of 1.2M image-caption pairs for pretraining. The 352 datasets employed for instruction-tuning encompass 665K mixture dataset from LLaVA-Instruct (Liu 353 et al., 2023a), 692k instructions from ALLaVA-4V-Instruction dataset (Chen et al., 2024a), and 354 an additional 25k instructions derived from a combination of ShareGPT4V (Chen et al., 2023b), 355 DocVQA (Tito et al., 2021), DVQA (Kafle et al., 2018) and AI2D (Kembhavi et al., 2016), with 356 a total number of more than 1.3M image-text conversations. The superior quality of this dataset 357 contributes to a swift enhancement in performance. For video training, following Video-LLaVA (Lin 358 et al., 2023a), we combine 558K image-text pairs and 703k video-text pairs for video pertaining. 359 For instruction-finetuning, we utilize a 665k image-text instruction dataset from LLaVA and a 100k 360 video-text instruction dataset from Video-ChatGPT (Maaz et al., 2023).

362 **Training Details.** We fix all seeds across the training procedures for fairness, where we adopt the XTuner codebase (Contributors, 2023). We established the low-resolution parameter at 336 and the 363 high-resolution parameter at 768. For video training, we uniformly extract 8 frames from each video. 364 During the pretraining stage, we employ a batch size of 32 per device and an aggregate batch size 365 of 256. In the instruction-tuning phase, we reduce the batch size to 16 per device and an overall 366 batch size of 128. The initial learning rate is set to 1e-3 for the pretraining stage and 2e-5 for the 367 instruction-tuning stage. The number of bounding boxes per image is limited to 100 during training. 368 The entire training process takes approximately 23 hours when using the Vicuna7B (Chiang et al., 369 2023) model using 8×A100 GPUs. For our most extensive model, the Yi1.5-34B (Young et al., 2024), 370 we utilize 32×A100 GPUs and finalize the optimization process in roughly three days by employing 371 the DeepSpeed Zero3 strategy.

373 4.2 MAIN RESULTS374

351

361

372

Perception Benchmarks. In Tab. 1, we compare our MG-LLaVA with previous leading approaches
 across several settings on Multi-Modal benchmarks, which mainly concentrate on perception capabil ity, including MMBench-Dev and MMBench-Test (Liu et al., 2023c), SEEDBench-Image (Li et al., 2023a), and MMStar (Chen et al., 2024b). MMBench is dedicated to advancing the understanding

	1			C				-			
Method	LLM	Param.	Res.	$\mathbf{V}\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{A}^T$	DocVQA	\mathbf{SQA}^{I}	AI2D	VQAv2	MMVet	LLaVA-w	MMVP
				Priv	ate Models						
GPT-4V	-	-	-	78.0	42.3	82.1	-	-	67.7	-	38.7
GeminiProVision	-	-	-	74.6	-	81.4	-	-	64.3	-	40.7
Qwen-VL-Plus	-	-	-	78.9	82.2	73.4	-	-	61.1	-	-
				Open-	source Mode	ls					
BLIP-2	Vicuna-13B	14.2B	224	42.5	-	61.0	-	41.0	22.4	38.1	-
InstructBLIP	Vicuna-7B	8.2B	224	50.1	10.9	60.5	40.6	-	26.2	60.9	-
Shikra	Vicuna-13B	7.3B	224	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IDEFICS-80B	LLaMA-65B	-	224	30.9			54.8	60	-	-	-
Qwen-VL	Qwen-7B	9.6B	448	63.8	62.1	67.1	57.7	78.8	-	-	-
Qwen-VL-Chat	Qwen-/B	9.6B	448	61.5	57.1	68.2	63	78.2	-	-	4
LLaVA-1.5	Vicuna-/B	12 AD	330	58.2	21.5	00.8	33.3	/8.5	31.1 26.1	05.4	27.4
CLUAVA-1.5	Vicuna-15B	15.4D 10P	224	51.6	24.1	/1.0	01.1	80.0 79.1	26.0	72.5	-
SPHINA SPHINY 11/	Vicuna 7B	10B	224	58.8	-	60.1	-	80.2	36.6	73.3	-
LI aVA-UHD	Vicuna-13B	13 4B	672×1008	67.7	-	72.0		81.7	50.0	74.5	
LLaVA-HR	Vicuna-7B	7 4B	1024	67.1	-	65.1	-	81.9	31.2	-	-
Mini-Gemini	Vicuna-7B	7.4B	336(768)	65.2	-	-	-	-	40.8	-	35.3
				Oi	ur Models						
MG-LLaVA	Phi3-3.8B	4.2B	336(768)	66.4	49.1	74.5	74	80.1	47.3	75.4	50.0
MG-LLaVA	Vicuna-7B	7.4B	336(768)	67.3	47.9	70.8	69.3	80.2	41.0	75.5	47.3
MG-LLaVA	LLaMA3-8B	8.2B	336(768)	68.1	49.0	76.3	75.6	80.7	46.9	75.5	37.3
MG-LLaVA	Vicuna-13B	13.6B	336(768)	69.6	52.1	74.7	73.4	81.2	46.7	82.0	40.7
MG-LLaVA	Yi1.5-34B	34.4B	336(768)	70.0	56.1	77.0	81.1	82.0	48.4	80.5	50.0

Table 2: Comparison with leading methods on popular VQA visual benchmarks.

378

399

of multi-modal perception and cognition, and SEEDBench provides a comprehensive and objective 400 evaluation of MLLM. MMStar further ensures each selected sample exhibits visual dependency. MG-401 LLaVA exhibits a significantly enhanced perceptual capability compared to a wide range of MLLMs. 402 Our MG-LLaVA equipped with phi3-3.8B (Abdin et al., 2024) show superior performance than 403 MiniCPM V2 (Hu et al., 2024) of +4.6%/5.3% on MMBench Dev/Test, and +3.2% on SEEDBench. 404 Utilizing Vicuna-7B (Chiang et al., 2023), MG-LLaVA outperforms all models with vicuna-7B 405 and even 13B on MMBench and SEEDBench, surpassing LLaVA-1.5-7B by an average of 5.1% 406 across four benchmarks. Moreover, with Yi1.5-34B (Young et al., 2024), MG-LLaVA consistently 407 outperforms GPT-4V on MMBench and SEEDBench. Concurrently, it maintains equivalent efficacy to GPT-4V on MMStar. Incorporating multi-granularity visual inputs, MG-LLaVA develops its 408 capability of capturing details within the image. More cases are exhibited in Appx. B. 409

410 Visual Question Answering Benchmarks. In this section, we analyze MLLM's capability of visual 411 conversation. The benchmarks can be divided into two groups: (1)Benchmarks require understanding 412 the text within images to provide answers, including TextVQA(VQA^T) (Singh et al., 2019) and DocVQA (Mathew et al., 2021). We report the accuracy of both validation sets. (2)General visual 413 question answering benchmarks such as VQA-V2 (Antol et al., 2015), ScienceQA-Image(SQA^I) (Lu 414 et al., 2022), AI2D (Kembhavi et al., 2016), MMVet (Yu et al., 2023), LLaVA-W (Liu et al., 2023a), 415 and MMVP(Tong et al., 2024). The evaluation results on VQA benchmarks are shown in Tab. 2. 416 MG-LLaVA also demonstrates considerable proficiency on VQA benchmarks. When equipped with 417 Vicuna-7B and 7.4B parameters, MG-LLaVA surpasses both SPHINX-1k (Lin et al., 2023b), which 418 has 10B parameters, and Mini-Gemini with 7.4B parameters on these benchmarks, despite utilizing 419 even less data. Operating under identical parameter conditions, MG-LLaVA-Vicuna13B, with low-420 resolution input of 336 and high-resolution of 768, outperforms LLaVA-UHD (Xu et al., 2024), which 421 incorporates an input resolution of 672×1008 on VQA^T, SQA^I, and AI2D. Additionally, MG-LLaVA 422 demonstrates significant improvement on the MMVP benchmark, which is particularly challenging for MLLMs. MG-LLaVA-Vicuna-7B achieves an accuracy of 47.3, surpassing Mini-Gemini's score 423 of +12% and even exceeding that of GPT-4V. MG-LLaVA exhibits its potential for expansion when 424 integrated with larger LLM. With Yi1.5-34B (Young et al., 2024), MG-LLaVA surpasses the majority 425 of established baselines across a wide array of VQA benchmarks. 426

Video Question Answering Benchmarks. To demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach, we
 have expanded our model to encompass video comprehension. We evaluate our models on MSVD and
 MSRVTT, and results are shown in Tab. 3. MG-LLaVA outperforms Video-LLaVA (Lin et al., 2023a)
 on both benchmarks, which further proves the efficiency of MG-LLaVA. In video understanding,
 MG-LLaVA demonstrates proficiency in identifying the critical object in the video. More illustrative instances are depicted in Appx. B.

Method	LLM	MSVD-QA	MSRVTT-QA
FrozenBiLM (Yang et al., 2022)	-	32.2	16.8
VideoChat (Li et al., 2023c)	Vicuna-7B	56.3	45.0
LLaMA-Adapter (Zhang et al., 2023d)	-	54.9	43.8
Video-LLaMA (Zhang et al., 2023a)	Vicuna-7B	51.6	29.6
Video-ChatGPT (Maaz et al., 2023)	Vicuna-7B	64.9	49.3
Video-LLaVA (Lin et al., 2023a)	Vicuna-7B	70.7	59.2
MG-LLaVA	Vicuna-7B	71.5	59.8

Table 3: Comparison with other methods on Video-QA benchmarks.

Table 4: Ablation results on MMBench-DEV, TextVQA, and GQA. **Params.** denotes the number of model parameters, while **Inf. Speed** represents the speed of inference. We execute our baseline based on the LLaVA model on the Xtuner codebase with Vicuna-7B and Phi3-3.8B.

	Object-level	Conv-Gate		Vicuna-7B					Phi3-3.8B					
	Features	Fusion	#TFLOPS	Params.	Inf. Speed	MMB ^D	VQA ^T	GQA	#TFLOPS	Params.	Inf. Speed	MMB ^D	VQA ^T	GQA
_	×	×	5.76	7.2B	8.89 tokens/s	69.5	60.5	59.3	3.3	4.0B	35.00 tokens/s	70.7	58.1	58.3
	~	×	6.20	7.4B	8.71 tokens/s	70.6(+1.1)	61.0(+0.5)	60.3(+1.0)	3.72	4.2B	34.54 tokens/s	73.0(+2.3)	59.0(+0.9)	59.1(+0.8)
_	\checkmark	√	6.21	7.4B	8.46 tokens/s	72.1(+2.6)	67.3(+7.8)	61.3(+2.0)	3.73	4.2B	34.04 tokens/s	74.2(+3.5)	66.4(+8.3)	60.4(+2.1)

Table 5: Comparison with different Table 6: Results of explicit and implicit integration of
MLLM designs.MLLM designs.

Method	LLM	$\mathbf{M}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{B}^D$	MMStar	$\mathbf{V}\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{A}^T$	GQA	Method	LLM	$\mathbf{M}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{B}^D$	MMStar	$\mathbf{V}\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{A}^T$	GQA
LLaVA-HR Mini-Gemini MG-LLaVA	Phi3-3.8B Phi3-3.8B Phi3-3.8B	72.2 73.2 74.2	38.4 39.5 41.3	65.9 66.4 66.4	59.7 59.7 60.4	Implicit Integration Explicit Integration	Vicuna-7B Vicuna-7B	70.8 72.1	34.7 35.1	66.8 67.3	61.3 61.3

4.3 ABLATION EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we conduct comprehensive ablation studies of our model. The ablation experiments are based on Xtuner codebase (Contributors, 2023), with a fixed seed protocol to ensure the stability and comparability of the experimental conditions.

Effect of Each Component. We first conduct ablation studies on object-level features and the Conv-Gate fusion module across multiple datasets of different purpose, including MMBench-DEV (Liu et al., 2023c), TextVQA (Singh et al., 2019), and GQA (Hudson & Manning, 2019). To validate the effectiveness of our method on different scales of LLM, the baseline is built on Vicuna-7B and Phi3-3.8B using the Xtuner codebase. The training data and seed are consistently set to ensure fairness. The results are shown in Tab. 4.

It is clear that the model achieves significant gains with the integration of object-level features and the Conv-Gate Fusion module. When adding object-level features, the performance of MMBench-Dev, GQA increases 1.1%, 1.0% separately with Vicuna-7B and 2.3%, 0.8% with Phi3. After utilizing the fusion network, the performance on these two benchmarks further increases by 2.6%, 2.0% with Vicuna-7B and 3.5%, 2.1% with Phi3. For the TextVQA benchmark, the incorporation of object-level features does not markedly enhance performance due to the suboptimal detection of textual content within images by the detector. Nevertheless, the integration of high-resolution features mitigates this limitation, culminating in an accuracy increment of 7.8% on Vicuna-7B and 8.3% on Phi3-3.8B. The integration of both modules incurs a marginal increase in computational expense and parameter count, yet it enhances the efficacy of models across various scales. We further enumerate additional comparative outcomes across various subsets of MMBench-Dev, the comparative results are shown in Appx. A.

Comparison with Other MLLM Design. To demonstrate the efficiency of our framework, we reconstruct two fusion-based MLLM, Mini-Gemini (Li et al., 2024c) and LLaVA-HR (Luo et al., 2024) on Xtuner codebase and conduct a comparative analysis of these two multi-input methods against MG-LLaVA. We conduct the experiments on Phi3-3.8B. Specifically, we integrate the fusion module of LLaVA-HR into the 12th layer of the visual encoder. To ensure a fair comparison, the input resolutions are standardized. The results, detailed in Tab. 5, indicate that our multi-granularity vision flow outperforms complex fusion-based models across multiple downstream tasks.

Table 7: Comparison of different fusion modules, methods of merging object-level features, and tagging models.

(a) Fusion modules. (b) Methods of merging object-level features. (c) Tagging models. $\mathbf{M}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{B}^D$ Method MMStar Method MMB^D MMStar Method MMB^D MMStar Baseline 69.2 34.1 30.5 Baseline 68.2 32.5 Baseline 68.2 32.5 w/ Resampler w/ Channel Concat 55.6 w/ F-to-B Cross Attention 65.7 33.3 32.6 32.9 34.5 w/ COCO80 68.9 68.3 32.9 w/ B-to-F Cross Attention 67.7 34.4 w/ Patch Info Mining w/ Conv-Gate Fusion 68.3 **69.8** w/ RAM tags 69.2 34.5 69.8 w/ Concat 34.5

492 493

488

489 490

491

494 495 496

497

498

499

500

Fusion Network Design. We also explore a diverse design of fusion modules and perform ablation studies on various components: (1)*Channel Concat.* We simply concat the low and high-resolution features in the channel dimension. (2) *Patch Info Mining.* We replace the gated-fusion model with Patch Info Mining in (Li et al., 2024c). (3) *Resampler.* We substitute the gated-fusion model with a resampler in (Alayrac et al., 2022). The results are shown in Tab. 7a. We find our Conv-Gated fusion module performs better through these methods, which confirms its efficiency.

501 502 Method of Merging Object-level Features.

(1) We first compare the performance of explicit integration and implicit integration. The results are
 presented in Tab. 6. It can be observed from the table that the explicit method demonstrates superior
 performance compared to the implicit method across various benchmarks.

506 (2) Based on the explicit integration method, we further explore various methods for incorporating 507 object-level features: (1)F-to-B Cross-Attention. We add a cross-attention block to enhance the fusion 508 features by integrating object-level features after the fusion module, the enhanced fusion features are 509 then fed into LLM. (2)B-to-F Cross-Attention. Following the fusion module, another cross-attention block is employed to enhance the object-level features by integrating fusion features. The fusion 510 features and enhanced object-level features are then concatenated as input for LLM. The frameworks 511 of both are depicted in Appx. C, and the results are reported in Tab. 7b. Our observations indicate that 512 cross-attention does not enhance the integration of object-level features into visual representations. 513 Conversely, concatenating object-level features with visual tokens and deferring the decision-making 514 to the LLM yields more favorable outcomes. 515

Tagging Model. We investigate the impact of the tagging model within the bounding box generation pipeline. We compare our method with assigning fixed tags based on the 80 categories from the COCO (Lin et al., 2014) dataset to open-vocabulary detectors for producing bounding boxes. The comparative results are presented in Tab. 7c. Given that the COCO dataset's 80 categories do not comprehensively cover real-world objects, the generated bounding boxes fail to encompass all objects within an image. This limitation consequently diminishes the impact of object-level features.

522

5 DISCUSSIONS

523 524

Conclusions. In this work, we propose MG-LLaVA, an expansive multi-modal model adept at 525 processing visual inputs of multiple granularities, encompassing object-level features, original images, 526 and high-resolution data. To effectively amalgamate features of varying granularities, we propose 527 the Multi-Granularity Vision Flow module, thereby equipping the LLM with the ability to discern 528 multi-modal interactions from a consolidated visual framework. Utilizing a range of LLMs extending 529 from 3.8B to 34B parameters, our model exhibits pronounced scalability and remarkable performance 530 in visual understanding, outperforming established models and significantly outperforming GPT-531 4V and GeminiPro Vision on benchmarks such as MMBench and SEEDBench. The validity of 532 our methodology is substantiated through rigorous empirical studies. MG-LLaVA establishes a 533 foundational baseline for future explorations into more sophisticated techniques of integrating inputs 534 of multiple granularities.

Broader Impacts. As a robust multi-modal language model, MG-LLaVA exhibits considerable
 prowess in visual perception and comprehension, offering an innovative methodology to refine
 MLLMs further. However, MG-LLaVA's potential societal implications merit attention, as it may
 facilitate the creation of multimodal applications, including those with possible adverse effects.

540 Reproducibility Statement

We have included all of our code in the supplementary materials, encompassing training, evaluation, and inference. Additionally, we provide our training script and seed to ensure the reproducibility of our method.

References

546

567

568

569

573

582

583

584

- 547 Marah Abdin, Sam Ade Jacobs, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jyoti Aneja, Ahmed Awadallah, Hany 548 Awadalla, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Harkirat Behl, Alon Benhaim, Misha 549 Bilenko, Johan Bjorck, Sébastien Bubeck, Martin Cai, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Weizhu 550 Chen, Vishrav Chaudhary, Parul Chopra, Allie Del Giorno, Gustavo de Rosa, Matthew Dixon, 551 Ronen Eldan, Dan Iter, Amit Garg, Abhishek Goswami, Suriya Gunasekar, Emman Haider, 552 Junheng Hao, Russell J. Hewett, Jamie Huynh, Mojan Javaheripi, Xin Jin, Piero Kauffmann, Nikos 553 Karampatziakis, Dongwoo Kim, Mahoud Khademi, Lev Kurilenko, James R. Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Chen Liang, Weishung Liu, Eric Lin, Zeqi Lin, Piyush Madan, Arindam Mitra, Hardik 554 Modi, Anh Nguven, Brandon Norick, Barun Patra, Daniel Perez-Becker, Thomas Portet, Reid 555 Pryzant, Heyang Qin, Marko Radmilac, Corby Rosset, Sambudha Roy, Olatunji Ruwase, Olli 556 Saarikivi, Amin Saied, Adil Salim, Michael Santacroce, Shital Shah, Ning Shang, Hiteshi Sharma, Xia Song, Masahiro Tanaka, Xin Wang, Rachel Ward, Guanhua Wang, Philipp Witte, Michael 558 Wyatt, Can Xu, Jiahang Xu, Sonali Yadav, Fan Yang, Ziyi Yang, Donghan Yu, Chengruidong 559 Zhang, Cyril Zhang, Jianwen Zhang, Li Lyna Zhang, Yi Zhang, Yue Zhang, Yunan Zhang, and 560 Xiren Zhou. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone, 2024. 561
- AI@Meta. Llama 3 model card. 2024. URL https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3/
 blob/main/MODEL_CARD.md.
- Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel
 Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. Flamingo: a visual language
 model for few-shot learning. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
 - Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jiasen Lu, Margaret Mitchell, Dhruv Batra, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. Vqa: Visual question answering. In *ICCV*, 2015.
- 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*, 2023.
- Guiming Hardy Chen, Shunian Chen, Ruifei Zhang, Junying Chen, Xiangbo Wu, Zhiyi Zhang,
 Zhihong Chen, Jianquan Li, Xiang Wan, and Benyou Wang. Allava: Harnessing gpt4v-synthesized data for a lite vision-language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11684*, 2024a.
- Keqin Chen, Zhao Zhang, Weili Zeng, Richong Zhang, Feng Zhu, and Rui Zhao. Shikra: Unleashing
 multimodal llm's referential dialogue magic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15195*, 2023a.
- Lin Chen, Jisong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Conghui He, Jiaqi Wang, Feng Zhao, and Dahua Lin. Sharegpt4v: Improving large multi-modal models with better captions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12793*, 2023b.
 - Lin Chen, Jinsong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Zehui Chen, Haodong Duan, Jiaqi Wang, Yu Qiao, Dahua Lin, et al. Are we on the right way for evaluating large vision-language models? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.20330*, 2024b.
- Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Zhong Muyan, Qinglong
 Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning
 for generic visual-linguistic tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14238*, 2023c.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E Gonzalez, et al. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality. *See https://vicuna. lmsys. org (accessed 14 April 2023)*, 2023.
- 593 XTuner Contributors. Xtuner: A toolkit for efficiently fine-tuning llm. https://github.com/ InternLM/xtuner, 2023.

594 Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, 595 Boyang Li, Pascale N Fung, and Steven Hoi. Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language 596 models with instruction tuning. In NeurIPS, 2024. 597 Daan de Geus, Panagiotis Meletis, and Gijs Dubbelman. Single network panoptic segmentation for 598 street scene understanding. In IV, 2019. 600 Daan de Geus, Panagiotis Meletis, Chenyang Lu, Xiaoxiao Wen, and Gijs Dubbelman. Part-aware 601 panoptic segmentation. In CVPR, 2021. 602 Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Yuhang Cao, Bin Wang, Linke Ouyang, Songyang Zhang, 603 Haodong Duan, Wenwei Zhang, Yining Li, et al. Internlm-xcomposer2-4khd: A pioneering 604 large vision-language model handling resolutions from 336 pixels to 4k hd. arXiv preprint 605 arXiv:2404.06512, 2024. 606 607 Golnaz Ghiasi, Tsung-Yi Lin, and Quoc V Le. Nas-fpn: Learning scalable feature pyramid architec-608 ture for object detection. In CVPR, 2019. 609 Shengding Hu, Yuge Tu, Xu Han, Chaoqun He, Ganqu Cui, Xiang Long, Zhi Zheng, Yewei Fang, 610 Yuxiang Huang, Weilin Zhao, et al. Minicpm: Unveiling the potential of small language models 611 with scalable training strategies. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06395, 2024. 612 613 Kuan-Chih Huang, Xiangtai Li, Lu Qi, Shuicheng Yan, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. Reason3d: Searching and reasoning 3d segmentation via large language model. arXiv, 2024. 614 615 Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning. Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning 616 and compositional question answering. In CVPR, 2019. 617 618 Kushal Kafle, Brian Price, Scott Cohen, and Christopher Kanan. Dvqa: Understanding data visualiza-619 tions via question answering. In CVPR, 2018. 620 Aniruddha Kembhavi, Mike Salvato, Eric Kolve, Minjoon Seo, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ali Farhadi. 621 A diagram is worth a dozen images. In ECCV. Springer, 2016. 622 623 Alexander Kirillov, Ross Girshick, Kaiming He, and Piotr Dollár. Panoptic feature pyramid networks. 624 In CVPR, 2019. 625 Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete 626 Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, et al. Segment anything. In ICCV, 627 2023. 628 629 Hugo Laurençon, Lucile Saulnier, Léo Tronchon, Stas Bekman, Amanpreet Singh, Anton Lozhkov, Thomas Wang, Siddharth Karamcheti, Alexander Rush, Douwe Kiela, et al. Obelics: An open 630 web-scale filtered dataset of interleaved image-text documents. In NeurIPS, 2024. 631 632 Bohao Li, Rui Wang, Guangzhi Wang, Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, and Ying Shan. Seed-bench: Bench-633 marking multimodal llms with generative comprehension. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16125, 634 2023a. 635 Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image 636 pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In ICML. PMLR, 2023b. 637 638 KunChang Li, Yinan He, Yi Wang, Yizhuo Li, Wenhai Wang, Ping Luo, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and 639 Yu Qiao. Videochat: Chat-centric video understanding. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06355, 2023c. 640 Xiangtai Li, Shilin Xu, Yibo Yang, Guangliang Cheng, Yunhai Tong, and Dacheng Tao. Panoptic-641 partformer: Learning a unified model for panoptic part segmentation. In ECCV, 2022. 642 643 Xiangtai Li, Shilin Xu, Yibo Yang, Haobo Yuan, Guangliang Cheng, Yunhai Tong, Zhouchen Lin, 644 Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Dacheng Tao. Panopticpartformer++: A unified and decoupled view for 645 panoptic part segmentation. PAMI, 2024a. 646 Xiangtai Li, Haobo Yuan, Wei Li, Henghui Ding, Size Wu, Wenwei Zhang, Yining Li, Kai Chen, and 647 Chen Change Loy. Omg-seg: Is one model good enough for all segmentation? In CVPR, 2024b.

658

659

661

662

668

648	Yanwei Li, Xinze Chen, Zheng Zhu, Lingxi Xie, Guan Huang, Dalong Du, and Xingang Wang.
649	Attention-guided unified network for panoptic segmentation. In <i>CVPR</i> , 2019.
650	Same and the second sec

- Yanwei Li, Yuechen Zhang, Chengyao Wang, Zhisheng Zhong, Yixin Chen, Ruihang Chu, Shaoteng Liu, and Jiaya Jia. Mini-gemini: Mining the potential of multi-modality vision language models.
 arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.18814, 2024c.
- ⁶⁵⁴ Zhang Li, Biao Yang, Qiang Liu, Zhiyin Ma, Shuo Zhang, Jingxu Yang, Yabo Sun, Yuliang Liu, and
 ⁶⁵⁵ Xiang Bai. Monkey: Image resolution and text label are important things for large multi-modal
 ⁶⁵⁶ models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.06607*, 2023d.
 - Bin Lin, Bin Zhu, Yang Ye, Munan Ning, Peng Jin, and Li Yuan. Video-Ilava: Learning united visual representation by alignment before projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10122*, 2023a.
 - Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *ECCV*, 2014.
- Ziyi Lin, Chris Liu, Renrui Zhang, Peng Gao, Longtian Qiu, Han Xiao, Han Qiu, Chen Lin, Wenqi
 Shao, Keqin Chen, et al. Sphinx: The joint mixing of weights, tasks, and visual embeddings for
 multi-modal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07575*, 2023b.
- 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, Yuheng Li, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Sheng Shen, and Yong Jae Lee.
 Llava-next: Improved reasoning, ocr, and world knowledge, 2024a.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. In *NeurIPS*, 2024b.
- Shilong Liu, Zhaoyang Zeng, Tianhe Ren, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Jie Yang, Chunyuan Li, Jianwei
 Yang, Hang Su, Jun Zhu, et al. Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for
 open-set object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05499*, 2023b.
- Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhang, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi
 Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, et al. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06281*, 2023c.
- Pan Lu, Swaroop Mishra, Tanglin Xia, Liang Qiu, Kai-Wei Chang, Song-Chun Zhu, Oyvind Tafjord, Peter Clark, and Ashwin Kalyan. Learn to explain: Multimodal reasoning via thought chains for science question answering. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- Gen Luo, Yiyi Zhou, Yuxin Zhang, Xiawu Zheng, Xiaoshuai Sun, and Rongrong Ji. Feast your
 eyes: Mixture-of-resolution adaptation for multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03003*, 2024.
- Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Rasheed, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Video-chatgpt: Towards detailed video understanding via large vision and language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05424*, 2023.
- Minesh Mathew, Dimosthenis Karatzas, and CV Jawahar. Docvqa: A dataset for vqa on document images. In *WACV*, 2021.
- ⁶⁹³ Umberto Michieli, Edoardo Borsato, Luca Rossi, and Pietro Zanuttigh. Gmnet: Graph matching
 ⁶⁹⁴ network for large scale part semantic segmentation in the wild. In *ECCV*, 2020.
- Matthias Minderer, Alexey Gritsenko, and Neil Houlsby. Scaling open-vocabulary object detection. In *NeurIPS*, 2024.
- ⁶⁹⁸ R OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. arxiv 2303.08774. *View in Article*, 2(5), 2023.
- Lu Qi, Yi-Wen Chen, Lehan Yang, Tiancheng Shen, Xiangtai Li, Weidong Guo, Yu Xu, and Ming Hsuan Yang. Generalizable entity grounding via assistance of large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02555*, 2024.

702 703 704	Rui Qian, Yuxi Li, Huabin Liu, John See, Shuangrui Ding, Xian Liu, Dian Li, and Weiyao Lin. Enhancing self-supervised video representation learning via multi-level feature optimization. In <i>ICCV</i> , 2021.
705 706 707 708	Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In <i>ICML</i> , 2021.
709 710 711	Vignesh Ramanathan, Anmol Kalia, Vladan Petrovic, Yi Wen, Baixue Zheng, Baishan Guo, Rui Wang, Aaron Marquez, Rama Kovvuri, Abhishek Kadian, et al. Paco: Parts and attributes of common objects. In <i>CVPR</i> , 2023.
712 713 714	Shaoqing Ren, Kaiming He, Ross Girshick, and Jian Sun. Faster r-cnn: Towards real-time object detection with region proposal networks. In <i>NeurIPS</i> , 2015.
715 716 717	Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, et al. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. In <i>NeurIPS</i> , 2022.
718 719 720 721	Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, Sebastian Goodman, and Radu Soricut. Conceptual captions: A cleaned, hypernymed, image alt-text dataset for automatic image captioning. In <i>Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)</i> , 2018.
722 723	Amanpreet Singh, Vivek Natarajan, Meet Shah, Yu Jiang, Xinlei Chen, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Marcus Rohrbach. Towards vqa models that can read. In <i>CVPR</i> , 2019.
724 725 726 727	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. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805</i> , 2023.
728 729	InternLM Team. InternIm: A multilingual language model with progressively enhanced capabilities, 2023.
730 731 732	Rubèn Tito, Dimosthenis Karatzas, and Ernest Valveny. Document collection visual question answering. In <i>ICDAR</i> , 2021.
733 734 735	Shengbang Tong, Zhuang Liu, Yuexiang Zhai, Yi Ma, Yann LeCun, and Saining Xie. Eyes wide shut? exploring the visual shortcomings of multimodal llms. In <i>CVPR</i> , 2024.
736 737 738	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. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971</i> , 2023.
739 740 741	Bo Wan, Desen Zhou, Yongfei Liu, Rongjie Li, and Xuming He. Pose-aware multi-level feature network for human object interaction detection. In <i>ICCV</i> , 2019.
742 743	Fei Wei, Xinyu Zhang, Ailing Zhang, Bo Zhang, and Xiangxiang Chu. Lenna: Language enhanced reasoning detection assistant. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02433</i> , 2023.
744 745 746 747	Shengqiong Wu, Hao Fei, Xiangtai Li, Jiayi Ji, Hanwang Zhang, Tat-Seng Chua, and Shuicheng Yan. Towards semantic equivalence of tokenization in multimodal llm. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.05127</i> , 2024.
748 749	Jinjin Xu, Liwu Xu, Yuzhe Yang, Xiang Li, Yanchun Xie, Yi-Jie Huang, and Yaqian Li. u-llava: Unifying multi-modal tasks via large language model. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05348</i> , 2023.
750 751 752 753	Ruyi Xu, Yuan Yao, Zonghao Guo, Junbo Cui, Zanlin Ni, Chunjiang Ge, Tat-Seng Chua, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, and Gao Huang. Llava-uhd: an lmm perceiving any aspect ratio and high-resolution images. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.11703</i> , 2024.
754 755	Shilin Xu, Xiangtai Li, Jingbo Wang, Guangliang Cheng, Yunhai Tong, and Dacheng Tao. Fashion- former: A simple, effective and unified baseline for human fashion segmentation and recognition. <i>ECCV</i> , 2022.

756 757 758 759	Aiyuan Yang, Bin Xiao, Bingning Wang, Borong Zhang, Ce Bian, Chao Yin, Chenxu Lv, Da Pan, Dian Wang, Dong Yan, et al. Baichuan 2: Open large-scale language models. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10305</i> , 2023.
760 761	Antoine Yang, Antoine Miech, Josef Sivic, Ivan Laptev, and Cordelia Schmid. Zero-shot video question answering via frozen bidirectional language models. In <i>NeurIPS</i> , 2022.
762 763 764	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. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14178</i> , 2023.
765 766 767 768	Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, Heng Li, Jiangcheng Zhu, Jianqun Chen, Jing Chang, et al. Yi: Open foundation models by 01. ai. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04652</i> , 2024.
769 770 771	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. <i>arXiv</i> preprint arXiv:2308.02490, 2023.
772 773 774	Haobo Yuan, Xiangtai Li, Chong Zhou, Yining Li, Kai Chen, and Chen Change Loy. Open-vocabulary sam: Segment and recognize twenty-thousand classes interactively. <i>ECCV</i> , 2024.
775 776	Hang Zhang, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. Video-llama: An instruction-tuned audio-visual language model for video understanding. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02858</i> , 2023a.
777 778 779 780	Hao Zhang, Hongyang Li, Feng Li, Tianhe Ren, Xueyan Zou, Shilong Liu, Shijia Huang, Jianfeng Gao, Lei Zhang, Chunyuan Li, et al. Llava-grounding: Grounded visual chat with large multimodal models. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02949</i> , 2023b.
781 782 783 784	Pan Zhang, Xiaoyi Dong Bin Wang, Yuhang Cao, Chao Xu, Linke Ouyang, Zhiyuan Zhao, Shuan- grui Ding, Songyang Zhang, Haodong Duan, Hang Yan, et al. Internlm-xcomposer: A vision- language large model for advanced text-image comprehension and composition. <i>arXiv preprint</i> <i>arXiv:2309.15112</i> , 2023c.
785 786 787	Renrui Zhang, Jiaming Han, Chris Liu, Peng Gao, Aojun Zhou, Xiangfei Hu, Shilin Yan, Pan Lu, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Qiao. Llama-adapter: Efficient fine-tuning of language models with zero-init attention. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16199</i> , 2023d.
788 789 790 791	Tao Zhang, Xiangtai Li, Hao Fei, Haobo Yuan, Shengqiong Wu, Shunping Ji, Change Loy Chen, and Shuicheng Yan. Omg-llava: Bridging image-level, object-level, pixel-level reasoning and understanding. <i>arXiv preprint</i> , 2024.
792 793 794	Youcai Zhang, Xinyu Huang, Jinyu Ma, Zhaoyang Li, Zhaochuan Luo, Yanchun Xie, Yuzhuo Qin, Tong Luo, Yaqian Li, Shilong Liu, et al. Recognize anything: A strong image tagging model. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03514</i> , 2023e.
795 796 797	Qijie Zhao, Tao Sheng, Yongtao Wang, Zhi Tang, Ying Chen, Ling Cai, and Haibin Ling. M2det: A single-shot object detector based on multi-level feature pyramid network. In <i>AAAI</i> , 2019a.
798 799	Yifan Zhao, Jia Li, Yu Zhang, and Yonghong Tian. Multi-class part parsing with joint boundary- semantic awareness. In <i>ICCV</i> , 2019b.
800 801 802	Chong Zhou, Xiangtai Li, Chen Change Loy, and Bo Dai. Edgesam: Prompt-in-the-loop distillation for on-device deployment of sam. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.06660</i> , 2023.
803 804 805	Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigpt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592</i> , 2023.
806 807 808 809	Zhuofan Zong, Bingqi Ma, Dazhong Shen, Guanglu Song, Hao Shao, Dongzhi Jiang, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Liu. Mova: Adapting mixture of vision experts to multimodal context. <i>arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13046</i> , 2024.

A APPENDIX / DETAILED RESULTS ON SUBSETS

In this section, we compare the influence of object-level features on several subsets of MMBench-Dev and Seed-bench, as shown in Fig. 5. It can be observed that the integration of object-level features significantly enhances the model's capability in multiple aspects of perception including Attribute Reasoning, Fine-grained Perception, Physical Relation Perception, Visual Reasoning, *etc.*



Figure 5: Ablation study on several subsets of MMBench-DEV-EN and Seed-bench. Fine-grained Perception(I) denotes *Fine-grained Perception(instance-level)*, Property Reasoning(P) means *Property Reasoning Perception* and SIT Understanding denotes *Structuralized Image-Text Understanding*.

B APPENDIX / ADDITIONAL SHOWCASES

In this section, we present additional instances to substantiate the capability of MG-LLaVA. As presented in Fig. 6 and Fig. 7, MG-LLaVA is proficient in addressing queries that necessitate meticulous attention to specifics and in capturing fine-grained details within image or video. These further instances reinforce the superior performance of our MG-LLaVA in visual comprehension.

C APPENDIX / METHOD OF MERGING OBJECT-LEVEL FEATURES

The illustration of *F-to-B Cross-Attention* and *B-to-F Cross-Attention* is depicted in Fig. 8.

D APPENDIX / INFERENCE PIPELINE

The inference pipeline of MG-LLaVA is displayed in Fig. 9. The tagging model first processes the input image to provide tags within the image, which are subsequently utilized as the text input of the detector to derive bounding boxes corresponding to the tagged obejcts within the image.

E APPENDIX / COMPARISON OF TAGGING MODELS

Table 8: Ablation results on MMBench-DEV Liu et al. (2023c), SEEDBench Li et al. (2023a) and TextVQA Singh et al. (2019). We execute our experiments based on the LLaVA model with Vicuna-7B and Phi3-3.8B.

Mathad	Imagaa	Number of Boxes							
Method	images	0	1-10	12-20	21-30	30-50	<u>ئ</u> 50		
COCO 80 + OWL-ViT v2	389722	71118	245952	44059	28593	0	0		
RAM + OWL-ViT v2	389722	43654	184706	91245	34648	22827	1264		

864	
865	
866	
867	
868	
869	
870	
871	
970	
873	
075	
074	
070	
870	
877	
878	
879	
880	
881	
882	
883	Ouestion: What did the bird of prev attack ?
884	
885	Video-LLaVA:
886	The bird of prey attacked a small bird in the video.
887	WG-LLaVA:
888	The bird of prey attacked a rabbit, which was hiding in the grass. The rabbit was
889	startled and ran away.
890	
891	
892	
893	
894	Question: Where did the man play his guitar to a women in?
895	
896	Video-LLavA:
897	The man prayed ms gunar to a woman in a plane, as seen in the video.
898	🕌 MG-LLaVA:
899	The man played his guitar to a woman in the airport. He played a song for her and
900	sang along.
001	
002	Figure 6: More cases of video understanding.
002	
903	
904	
905	
906	
907	
908	
909	
910	
911	
912	
913	
914	
915	
916	
917	



