000 001 002 003 DOES SPATIAL COGNITION EMERGE IN FRONTIER MODELS?

Anonymous authors

023

Paper under double-blind review

ABSTRACT

Not yet. We present SPACE, a benchmark that systematically evaluates spatial cognition in frontier models. Our benchmark builds on decades of research in cognitive science. It evaluates large-scale mapping abilities that are brought to bear when an organism traverses physical environments, smaller-scale reasoning about object shapes and layouts, and cognitive infrastructure such as spatial attention and memory. For many tasks, we instantiate parallel presentations via text and images, allowing us to benchmark both large language models and large multimodal models. Results suggest that contemporary frontier models fall short of the spatial intelligence of animals, performing near chance level on a number of classic tests of animal cognition.

022 1 INTRODUCTION

024 025 026 027 028 029 030 031 Frontier models have achieved impressive performance in mathematics, coding, general knowledge, and commonsense reasoning [\(Hendrycks et al., 2021a](#page-12-0)[;b;](#page-12-1) [Chen et al., 2021;](#page-11-0) [Sakaguchi et al., 2021;](#page-15-0) [Yue et al., 2024\)](#page-16-0). This remarkable progress has inspired characterizations of frontier models as possessing the intelligence of a smart high schooler and predictions of the imminent arrival of superintelligence [\(Aschenbrenner, 2024\)](#page-10-0). These characterizations are often underpinned by the premise that competence (or even mastery) in some aspects of cognition is symptomatic of broad cognitive competence. This is not self-evident. To quote Brooks's first law of artificial intelligence, "When an AI system performs a task, human observers immediately estimate its general competence in areas that seem related. Usually that estimate is wildly overinflated." [\(Brooks, 2024\)](#page-10-1).

032 033 034 035 036 037 038 039 040 041 042 Our work focuses on spatial cognition, a foundational form of intelligence that is present in a broad spectrum of animals including humans [\(Marshall & Fink, 2001;](#page-13-0) [Waller & Nadel, 2013;](#page-16-1) [Mallot,](#page-13-1) [2024\)](#page-13-1). Spatial cognition refers to the ability of animals to perceive and interact with their surroundings, build mental representations of objects and environments, and draw upon these representations to support navigation and manipulation. Decades of research in animal cognition have characterized the spatial cognition of rats, bats, dogs, chimpanzees, wolves, and humans [\(Tolman, 1948;](#page-15-1) [Menzel, 1973;](#page-14-0) [Peters, 1974;](#page-14-1) [Gillner & Mallot, 1998;](#page-12-2) [Marshall & Fink, 2001;](#page-13-0) [Tommasi et al., 2012;](#page-15-2) [Geva-Sagiv et al., 2015\)](#page-12-3). Human infants already possess rudimentary spatial cognition, which subsequently improves along developmental schedules that have been characterized [\(Blades & Spencer,](#page-10-2) [1994;](#page-10-2) [Newcombe, 2000;](#page-14-2) [Vasilyeva & Lourenco, 2012\)](#page-16-2). Spatial cognition is known to underpin more advanced cognitive abilities [\(Kozhevnikov et al., 2007;](#page-13-2) [Newcombe, 2010;](#page-14-3) [Young et al., 2018\)](#page-16-3).

043 044 045 046 047 048 049 050 The emergence of spatial cognition has been linked to embodiment [\(Smith & Gasser, 2005;](#page-15-3) [Jansen](#page-12-4) [& Heil, 2010;](#page-12-4) Frick & Möhring, 2016), without which the development of spatial cognition may be impaired [\(Foreman et al., 1990;](#page-11-2) [Anderson et al., 2013\)](#page-10-3). However, frontier models are typically trained in a disembodied manner on corpora of text, images, and video. Does spatial cognition emerge in disembodied frontier models? To study this question systematically, we develop SPACE, a benchmark that builds on decades of research in cognitive science. Our benchmark comprises two broad classes of tasks, covering large-scale and small-scale spatial cognition [\(Hegarty et al., 2006;](#page-12-5) [Meneghetti et al., 2022;](#page-14-4) [Newcombe, 2024\)](#page-14-5). The tasks are schematically illustrated in Figure [1.](#page-1-0)

051 052 053 Large-scale spatial cognition has to do with a model's ability to understand its surroundings. In large-scale spatial cognition tasks, the model is familiarized with an environment and is then asked to estimate distances and directions to landmarks, sketch a map of the environment, retrace a known route, or identify a shortcut to the goal. Small-scale spatial cognition has to do with a model's ability

078 Figure 1: **SPACE:** Spatial Perception And Cognition Evaluation. We design a suite of spatial cognition tasks based on the cognitive science literature. These are broadly classified into large-scale and small-scale spatial cognition. Large-scale tasks require understanding space at the level of environments, while small-scale tasks require understanding space at the level of objects or object arrangements. We develop multimodal as well as purely textual presentations, which support evaluation of both large language models (LLMs) and visionlanguage models (VLMs).

081 082 083 to perceive, imagine, and mentally transform objects in two or three dimensions. Together, largescale and small-scale tasks evaluate core cognitive abilities such as spatial perception, visualization, selective attention, and visuospatial memory.

084 085 086 087 088 089 090 091 092 We design text-based and image-based presentations to evaluate both language-only and visionlanguage models (LLMs and VLMs, respectively). Our results indicate that contemporary frontier models have not yet reached competency – let alone mastery – in spatial cognition. On key largescale spatial cognition tasks, frontier multimodal models perform near chance level, even when presented with an allocentric (map) view of the environment. The strongest models exhibit much better performance on some small-scale tasks, especially with purely textual presentations via character arrays, but perform near chance on image-based tasks such as mental rotation (Vandenberg $\&$ [Kuse, 1978\)](#page-16-4), perspective taking [\(Kozhevnikov & Hegarty, 2001\)](#page-12-6), maze completion [\(Lacroix et al.,](#page-13-3) [2021\)](#page-13-3), or the classic Minnesota Paper Form Board Test [\(Likert & Quasha, 1941;](#page-13-4) [1969\)](#page-13-5).

093 094

075 076 077

079 080

2 RELATED WORK

095 096

097 098 099 100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 Spatial cognition. Spatial cognition is a branch of cognitive science that seeks to understand how humans and animals perceive, interpret, represent, and interact with objects and environments [\(Mar](#page-13-0)[shall & Fink, 2001;](#page-13-0) [Landau, 2002;](#page-13-6) [Waller & Nadel, 2013;](#page-16-1) [Mallot, 2024;](#page-13-1) [Newcombe, 2024\)](#page-14-5). This involves the perception of object sizes, shapes, and scales, as well as the relationships between objects and landmarks in the environment (including location, distance, direction, and orientation). Spatial cognition is broadly divided into two categories: large-scale and small-scale [\(Hegarty et al.,](#page-12-5) [2006;](#page-12-5) [Jansen, 2009;](#page-12-7) [Meneghetti et al., 2022;](#page-14-4) [Newcombe, 2024\)](#page-14-5). *Large-scale spatial cognition* refers to the ability to build spatial representations of environments and use them effectively for navigation and spatial reasoning. Large-scale spatial cognition tasks typically involve egocentric spatial transformations, where the viewer's perspective changes with respect to the environment while the spatial relationships between parts of the environment remain constant [\(Wang et al., 2014\)](#page-16-5). *Smallscale spatial cognition* refers to the ability to perceive, imagine, and mentally transform objects or shapes in 2D or 3D. This is typically evaluated using paper and pencil tasks that require allocentric

108 109 110 111 spatial transformations of objects and shapes [\(Wang et al., 2014\)](#page-16-5). While large-scale spatial cognition has been demonstrated in a wide range of animals [\(Tolman, 1948;](#page-15-1) [Menzel, 1973;](#page-14-0) [Peters, 1974;](#page-14-1) [O'Keefe & Nadel, 1978;](#page-14-6) [Gillner & Mallot, 1998;](#page-12-2) [Richardson et al., 1999;](#page-15-4) [Geva-Sagiv et al., 2015;](#page-12-3) [Toledo et al., 2020\)](#page-15-5), the study of small-scale spatial cognition is specific to humans.

112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 Spatial reasoning in large language models. PlanBench [\(Valmeekam et al., 2024\)](#page-16-6) and CogEval [\(Momennejad et al., 2023\)](#page-14-7) evaluate LLMs on text-based planning tasks such as navigation, delivery logistics and block stacking to evaluate cognitive mapping and planning. [Yamada et al.](#page-16-7) [\(2024\)](#page-16-7) evaluates spatial reasoning in LLMs by performing map traversals of different types of graphs and evaluate the model's self-localization ability. EWOK [\(Ivanova et al., 2024\)](#page-12-8) studies spatial plausibility reasoning in LLMs (i.e., given some context text, does a target text sound plausible?). Unlike these benchmarks, SPACE evaluates a broader umbrella of cognitive abilities and implements multimodal presentations of classic animal cognition experiments.

120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 Benchmarks for large multimodal models. The recent successes of multimodal models [\(OpenAI,](#page-14-8) [2024;](#page-14-8) [Li et al., 2024a;](#page-13-7) [Reid et al., 2024\)](#page-15-6) have been facilitated by large-scale training on text and multimodal corpora [\(Rana, 2010;](#page-15-7) [Together Computer, 2023;](#page-15-8) [Chen et al., 2023;](#page-11-3) Laurencon et al., [2023;](#page-13-8) [Gadre et al., 2023\)](#page-12-9), followed by tuning on human preferences [\(Liu et al., 2023a;](#page-13-9) [Awadalla](#page-10-4) [et al., 2024;](#page-10-4) [Ouyang et al., 2022;](#page-14-9) [Rafailov et al., 2023\)](#page-15-9). The remarkable advances in the capabilities of these models inspired a variety of benchmarks that evaluate their performance. Early multimodal benchmarks consisted of single-task datasets such as visual question answering [\(Antol et al., 2015;](#page-10-5) [Goyal et al., 2019;](#page-12-10) [Marino et al., 2019\)](#page-13-10) and image captioning [\(Chen et al., 2015\)](#page-11-4). However, due to the limited scope of early datasets and concerns regarding potential test-data leakage, newer benchmarks use diverse collections of tasks [\(Fu et al., 2023;](#page-11-5) [Yu et al., 2024;](#page-16-8) [Liu et al., 2023b;](#page-13-11) [Yue et al., 2024;](#page-16-0) [Lu](#page-13-12) [et al., 2024;](#page-13-12) [Ying et al., 2024\)](#page-16-9). While these datasets primarily focus on image understanding, newer datasets that emphasize spatiotemporal reasoning have been proposed for video [\(Li et al., 2024b;](#page-13-13) [Fu](#page-12-11) [et al., 2024a;](#page-12-11) [Majumdar et al., 2024\)](#page-13-14).

133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 Recent studies highlight a number of shortcomings of frontier multimodal models [\(Moskvichev](#page-14-10) [et al., 2023;](#page-14-10) [Tong et al., 2024;](#page-15-10) [Chen et al., 2024a;](#page-10-6) [Fu et al., 2024b\)](#page-12-12). One such shortcoming is that models may not perceive the image in detail, often missing fine-grained details or ignoring the image entirely [\(Chen et al., 2024b;](#page-11-6) [Guan et al., 2024;](#page-12-13) [Tong et al., 2024\)](#page-15-10). HallusionBench proposes a new dataset of image pairs, where tiny edits are made from one image to another that change the answer to the question [\(Guan et al., 2024\)](#page-12-13). MMVP identifies issues with CLIP-based pretraining of visual encoders, which make current models blind to certain visual patterns, and proposes a benchmark of CLIP-blind image pairs where the same question has opposite answers [\(Tong et al., 2024\)](#page-15-10). MMStar shows that many questions in multimodal benchmarks can be answered correctly without the image and proposes a new split of existing benchmarks that addresses this issue [\(Chen et al., 2024b\)](#page-11-6).

142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 Another shortcoming of existing models is their lack of spatial perception and reasoning [\(Chen et al.,](#page-10-6) [2024a;](#page-10-6) [Cheng et al., 2024\)](#page-11-7). SpatialVLM proposes a VQA dataset that requires answering questions about relative spatial arrangements and metric relationships [\(Chen et al., 2024a\)](#page-10-6). SpatialRGPT further includes region-level understanding [\(Cheng et al., 2024\)](#page-11-7). 'Perception test' aims to overcome shortcomings of standard video datasets by creating a diagnostic dataset where participants record videos while following complex scripts depicting interesting events [\(Patraucean et al., 2023\)](#page-14-11). It evaluates fundamental perceptual skills (memory, abstraction, intuitive physics, and semantics) and various types of reasoning.

150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 Another line of work considers skill acquisition (the ability to learn a skill and apply it to new scenarios). Prior work has studied this using visual analogical reasoning [\(Chollet, 2019;](#page-11-8) [Moskvichev](#page-14-10) [et al., 2023;](#page-14-10) [Yiu et al., 2024\)](#page-16-10). The ARC dataset contains samples consisting of a few examples of abstract grids and their transformations and one or more test inputs [\(Chollet, 2019\)](#page-11-8). The objective is to understand the transformation performed using the examples and apply it to test inputs. The transformations have been further organized into specific concepts with varying degrees of difficulty in the ConceptARC dataset [\(Moskvichev et al., 2023\)](#page-14-10). Inspired by ARC and developmental psychology, the KiVA dataset studies visual analogies in the context of visually realistic 3D shapes with concepts like transformations in color, size, rotations, reflections, and counting [\(Yiu et al., 2024\)](#page-16-10).

- **159**
- **160**
- **161**

162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 Ego image BEV image BEV text Ego image BEV image BEV text **171 172** 1,0,0,1,1 1,1,1,0,0 1,1,1,1,1 1,1,1,1,1 1,1,*****,1,1 **173** \blacksquare 1,**B**,*****,1,1 **K**,1,1,0,0 **174** 1,0,0,1,**E** 0,0,0,0,0 1,1,1,1,1 **175 176** BEV image legend BEV text legend **177** Obstacles Navigable space Current position Landmark **0** = Obstacles **1** = Navigable space ***** = Current position **A-Z** = Landmarks

178 179 180 181 182 183 184 Figure 2: Large-scale spatial cognition. We design ten environment layouts based on experimental protocols in cognitive science. The top row shows bird's-eye view (BEV) renderings of these environments. To evaluate large-scale spatial cognition in frontier models, we implement three observation spaces: egocentric image, BEV image, and BEV text (see bottom row). Ego image shows a first-person view within the environment. BEV **image** shows an allocentric bird's-eye view of the $2.5m \times 2.5m$ region centered on the current position. **BEV** text shows a depiction of the allocentric bird's-eye view using text characters. We use the ego image and BEV image presentations to evaluate multimodal models. Large language models are evaluated using the BEV text presentation.

185 186 187

3 SPACE: A BENCHMARK FOR SPATIAL PERCEPTION AND COGNITION EVALUATION

We develop a benchmark for evaluating the spatial cognition of frontier models. The benchmark comprises large-scale and small-scale tasks and is designed for compatibility with both text-only and multimodal models.

192 193 194

3.1 LARGE-SCALE SPATIAL COGNITION

195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 In large-scale spatial cognition tasks, we evaluate the ability of models to build spatial representations of their surrounding environment, and whether they can use these representations to reason about and navigate in the environment. There are two stages to these tasks. First, we familiar-ize the model with an environment by showing a video walkthrough.^{[1](#page-3-0)} The model must build a mental representation of the environment that captures the locations of start, goal and landmark locations, and their spatial relationships. After the model is familiarized with the environment, we evaluate the model's spatial representation using five tasks derived from the cognitive science literature [\(Meneghetti et al., 2022\)](#page-14-4). See Figure [1\(](#page-1-0)top) and Figure [2](#page-3-1) for an overview.

- **1. Direction estimation.** The goal is to determine the directions to other landmarks from a given landmark. The participant is asked to pretend that they are facing a landmark A, and then asked to estimate the direction (in degrees) to another landmark B. These are also known as pointing trials in the cognitive science literature [\(Allen et al., 1996;](#page-10-7) [Hegarty et al., 2006;](#page-12-5) [Pazzaglia & Taylor,](#page-14-12) [2007;](#page-14-12) [Weisberg et al., 2014;](#page-16-11) [Meneghetti et al., 2016\)](#page-13-15). We formulate this as a multiple-choice QA task with four options for the direction (only one correct option).
- **209 210 211 212 213 214** 2. Distance estimation. The goal is to determine the straight-line distances from one landmark to all other landmarks [\(Allen et al., 1996;](#page-10-7) [Hegarty et al., 2006\)](#page-12-5). The participant is asked to pretend that they are facing a landmark A, and then asked to estimate the Euclidean distance to all the other landmarks. We pose this as a multiple-choice QA with four options for the list of distances to each landmark. Since current models are not good at estimating metric measurements [\(Chen](#page-10-6)

²¹⁵ ¹[For text-only models, the 'video walkthrough' is a sequence of bird's-eye view \(BEV\) observations pre](#page-10-6)[sented as arrays of letters, see Figure 2 for examples.](#page-10-6)

[et al., 2024a;](#page-10-6) [Cheng et al., 2024\)](#page-11-7), we generate incorrect options such that the ratios of distances between landmarks are not preserved, making it easier to identify the correct option.

- 3. Map sketching. The goal is to draw a map of the environment that contains the start, goal and landmark positions [\(Allen et al., 1996;](#page-10-7) [Hegarty et al., 2006;](#page-12-5) [Pazzaglia & Taylor, 2007;](#page-14-12) [Weisberg](#page-16-11) [et al., 2014;](#page-16-11) [Meneghetti et al., 2016;](#page-13-15) [2021\)](#page-14-13). We again formulate this as multiple-choice QA with four options for the map sketches. The correct option preserves the true spatial relationships between the different map elements, while the incorrect options skew the spatial relationships randomly.
- 4. Route retracing. The goal is to retrace the route shown in the video from the start to the goal [\(Allen et al., 1996;](#page-10-7) [Pazzaglia & Taylor, 2007;](#page-14-12) [Meneghetti et al., 2016;](#page-13-15) [2021\)](#page-14-13). This task evaluates the model's ability to remember landmarks seen in the route and the actions required along the route to reach the goal. We formulate this as an interactive task where the model receives the current observation, decides which action to take, and receives updated observations based on the actions taken. We measure performance using the SPL metric (success weighted by path length), which penalizes the model for taking unnecessary detours [\(Anderson et al., 2018\)](#page-10-8). (The route shown in the demonstration, which the model is asked to retrace, is always the shortest path from the start to the goal.)
- **233 234 235 236 237 238 239** 5. Novel shortcut discovery. The goal is to discover a novel shortcut (i.e., a route never observed before) from the start to the goal after observing a video walkthrough that takes detours to reach the goal [\(Tolman, 1948;](#page-15-1) [Allen et al., 1996;](#page-10-7) [Pazzaglia & Taylor, 2007;](#page-14-12) [Meneghetti et al., 2016;](#page-13-15) [2021\)](#page-14-13). The ability to take novel shortcuts in familiar environments is a key indicator of cognitive mapping ability [\(Tolman, 1948\)](#page-15-1). When designing environments and walkthrough paths, we ensured that a novel shortcut exists that the model can exploit. Similar to route retracing, we treat this as an interactive navigation task and measure performance using the SPL metric.
	- 3.1.1 IMPLEMENTATION

240 241

257 258 259

242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 3D environment generation. We create ten environment layouts based on prior work in cognitive science and artificial intelligence [\(Tolman, 1948;](#page-15-1) [Gillner & Mallot, 1998;](#page-12-2) [Richardson et al., 1999;](#page-15-4) [Banino et al., 2018;](#page-10-9) [Bouchekioua et al., 2021\)](#page-10-10). Figure [2](#page-3-1) shows bird's-eye view (BEV) images of each layout. We populate each environment with visual landmarks in the form of paintings hanging on the walls, where the painting frames are 3D meshes and the paintings are images from ImageNet [\(Deng et al., 2009\)](#page-11-9). To create a 3D environment for a given layout, we first randomly sample textures for walls, floors, and ceilings from a database of textures to create the base 3D mesh. Next, we randomly assign ImageNet images and 3D frame meshes to predefined landmark locations in the environment. We create the 3D environment using the Trimesh library and export it in glTF format [\(Dawson-Haggerty et al., 2019\)](#page-11-10). We simulate the environment using the Habitat simulator [\(Savva et al., 2019\)](#page-15-11). We create 3 environments per layout, for a total of 30 environments in our benchmark.

254 255 256 Observation spaces. We create multiple observation spaces to support evaluating both text-only and vision+text models. These are egocentric images, bird's-eye view (BEV) images, and bird's-eye view (BEV) text presentations.

- Ego image. The environment is captured using a forward-facing perspective camera placed at the model's location in the environment. This is similar to the setup of an animal navigating through an immersive environment.
- **260 261 262 263** • BEV image. This is a bird's-eye view image of a $2.5 \text{m} \times 2.5 \text{m}$ area in the environment surrounding the model's location. This is akin to a human using a map to navigate. The current location is always at the center of the BEV image. We use a Pacman-like coloring scheme highlighting the obstacles, navigable space, current postion, and landmarks.
- **264 265 266 267** • BEV text. This is a presentation of the BEV image in the form of an array of text characters. Specifically, we encode the image into a text array. We carefully select the encoding to ensure compatibility with text tokenizers of popular models and ensure that each element of the array is encoded by the tokenizers of all evaluated models as a distinct token.
- **268 269** See Figure [2](#page-3-1) (bottom) for examples of these presentations. The first two observation spaces are used for models that support visual inputs, while the last observation space is used for text-only models. See the appendix for additional illustrations of these tasks and dataset statistics.

Figure 3: **Small-scale spatial cognition.** We show an example from each small-scale spatial cognition task. All tests with the exception of the water level come with both multimodal and purely textural presentations (for evaluating VLMs and LLMs, respectively). These tasks evaluate cognitive abilities such as spatial visualization, orientation, perception, selective spatial attention and visuospatial working memory. Bolding of characters in this figure is for illustration purposes only.

3.2 SMALL-SCALE SPATIAL COGNITION

293 In small-scale spatial cognition tasks, we evaluate the models' ability to perceive, imagine, and mentally transform objects or shapes in two and three dimensions. We build on the body of work on visuospatial abilities, which are evaluated in humans via paper-and-pencil tasks [\(Allen et al.,](#page-10-7) [1996;](#page-10-7) [Weisberg et al., 2014;](#page-16-11) [Meneghetti et al., 2022\)](#page-14-4). These abilities may be used to explain individual differences between participants in large-scale spatial cognition [\(Meneghetti et al., 2022\)](#page-14-4). We define ten small-scale tasks to evaluate abilities such as spatial perception, spatial visualization, spatial orientation, mental rotation, selective attention, and visuospatial working memory. See Figure [1\(](#page-1-0)bottom) and Figure [3](#page-5-0) for an overview.

- **300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310** 6. Mental rotation test (MRT). This was introduced by Vandenberg $\&$ Kuse [\(1978\)](#page-16-4) as a test of spatial visualization, i.e., the ability to mentally manipulate 2D or 3D stimuli. The original MRT contained 20 items, where each item consisted of a criterion figure, two correct alternatives, and two distractors [\(Vandenberg & Kuse, 1978\)](#page-16-4). The criterion figure is a perspective rendering of a 3D criterion shape from [Shepard & Metzler](#page-15-12) [\(1971\)](#page-15-12). The correct alternatives are rotated versions of the criterion shape, where the rotation is applied in the 2D image space on the criterion figure, or along the vertical axis in 3D for the criterion shape. The distractors are rotated mirror-images of the criterion shape or renderings of other criterion shapes. The goal was to identify the two correct alternatives from the four choices. We implement a version of MRT with one correct choice and three distractors, and incorporate rotations along multiple axes [\(Peters et al., 1995\)](#page-14-14). Since the 3D implementation of MRT can only be evaluated with images, our text-only version of MRT uses a 2D implementation, akin to the card rotations test [\(French et al., 1963\)](#page-11-11).
- **311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320** 7. Perspective taking test (PTT). This was introduced by [Kozhevnikov & Hegarty](#page-12-6) [\(2001\)](#page-12-6) as a test of spatial orientation, i.e., the ability to imagine being in a different position in space and seeing the surroundings from the new perspective. An arrangement of objects is shown on a piece of paper. A test participant is asked to take the perspective of standing next to an object (say, object A) facing another (say, object B), and is required to point to a third object (say, object C). This task has been used extensively in subsequent literature [\(Hegarty & Waller, 2004;](#page-12-14) [Weisberg et al.,](#page-16-11) [2014;](#page-16-11) [Meneghetti et al., 2022\)](#page-14-4). To implement it, we randomly sample N icons of objects like cars, carrots, chairs, and grapes and place them at random locations in an image (with no overlap between objects). We then randomly sample three of the N objects as A, B , and C . We treat this as multiple-choice QA with four options (only one of them correct).
- **321 322 323** 8. Water level test (WLT). This was introduced by [Piaget et al.](#page-15-13) [\(1957\)](#page-15-13) as a test of visuospatial perception. Originally, the test was designed to evaluate children's knowledge about the horizontal nature of the surface of water in a sealed bottle regardless of its orientation. Children were presented with bottles partially filled with colored water and asked to imagine the position of

324 325 326 327 the water if it were tilted. Children had to gesture, draw, or use cardboard cutouts to answer the question [\(Piaget et al., 1957;](#page-15-13) [Foltz, 1978;](#page-11-12) [Wittig & Allen, 1984\)](#page-16-12). Performance on the water-level test was found to be related to performance on spatial ability tests [\(Foltz, 1978;](#page-11-12) [Wittig & Allen,](#page-16-12) [1984\)](#page-16-12). We implement this test in the form of multiple-choice QA [\(Wittig & Allen, 1984\)](#page-16-12).

- **328 329 330 331 332 333** 9. Minnesota Paper Form Board test (MPFB). This is a test of spatial visualization, i.e., the ability to perform multi-step manipulations of complex spatial information [\(Meneghetti et al.,](#page-14-4) [2022\)](#page-14-4). Specifically, a participant is provided with pieces of a figure and is asked to identify how the pieces fit together [\(Likert & Quasha, 1941;](#page-13-4) [1969\)](#page-13-5). We programmatically segment a square into five pieces, and rotate the pieces randomly to generate the final segments. We generate alternate segmentations of a square as negative choices for a multiple-choice QA presentation.
- **334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341** 10. Judgement of Line Orientation test (JLO). This was introduced by [Benton](#page-10-11) [\(1994\)](#page-10-11) as a measure of visuospatial perception. The original implementation contained 30 samples presented in a flipbook style, where two lines are shown at the top of each page. The goal is to determine the angles between the two lines by comparing them to an array of reference lines (i.e., pick two reference lines that have same angle between them as the lines at the top). There have been multiple variations of JLO with subsets of the 30 questions for faster evaluation [\(Spencer et al., 2013\)](#page-15-14). We recreate the JLO test suite by randomly sampling pairs of lines on a 2D plane with an angle between 0 to 180 degrees (in multiples of 18 degrees) and formulate it as multiple-choice QA.
- **342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352** 11. Selective attention task (SAtt). This is designed to evaluate selective spatial attention, i.e., the ability to selectively attend to a particular region of space while ignoring others (Serences $\&$ [Kastner, 2014;](#page-15-15) [Pahor et al., 2022\)](#page-14-15). In particular, we use the widely used cancellation task, where the goal is to search for and mark out target stimuli embedded amidst distractors [\(Della Sala et al.,](#page-11-13) [1992;](#page-11-13) [Brickenkamp & Zillmer, 1998;](#page-10-12) [Dalmaijer et al., 2015;](#page-11-14) [Lacroix et al., 2021;](#page-13-3) [Pahor et al.,](#page-14-15) [2022;](#page-14-15) [Kalina & Walgrave, 2004\)](#page-12-15). The stimuli may be characters [\(Brickenkamp & Zillmer, 1998;](#page-10-12) [Dalmaijer et al., 2015;](#page-11-14) [Pahor et al., 2022;](#page-14-15) [Della Sala et al., 1992;](#page-11-13) [Kalina & Walgrave, 2004\)](#page-12-15), pictures [\(Lacroix et al., 2021;](#page-13-3) [Pahor et al., 2022\)](#page-14-15), or icons [\(Lacroix et al., 2021\)](#page-13-3). We design the task as multiple-choice QA with pictures as the stimuli for visual evaluation and characters as stimuli for textual evaluation. The target stimuli and distractors are arranged on a grid. The answer must be selected from one out of four options. The correct option lists the (row, column) pairs that localize the target stimuli in the grid.
- **353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362** 12. Maze completion task (MCT). This task was designed to evaluate spatial orientation, planning, and executive functioning [\(Lacroix et al., 2021\)](#page-13-3). It was used as a neuropsychological test to assess executive function disorders in children (Marquet-Doléac et al., 2010). We programmatically create mazes using Mazelib [\(Stilley, 2014\)](#page-15-16) and visually render them using a Pacman-like color scheme (similar to BEV images in Figure [2\)](#page-3-1). We treat this as an interactive task, where the model is provided with the maze rendering and is prompted to sequentially select an up/down/left/right action to reach the goal. Upon reaching the goal, the model must select a stop action to successfully complete the task. If the model does not reach the goal within 250 actions, the task is considered a failure. We measure the success rate, i.e., the percentage of mazes where the model reaches the goal within the allotted time.
- **363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376** 13. Corsi block-tapping task (CBTT). This is designed to assess visuospatial working memory and attention in healthy participants and patients with known or suspected brain damage [\(Corsi, 1972;](#page-11-15) [Claessen et al., 2015\)](#page-11-16). An examiner demonstrates a sequence of block-tapping movements on a board containing fixed blocks placed in pseudo-random positions. Participants are required to reproduce the same sequence (forward condition) or the inverted sequence (backward condition) of block-tapping movements to succeed. We evaluate frontier models on the forward condition since prior work has not found significant differences between task performance in the forward and backward conditions [\(Claessen et al., 2015\)](#page-11-16). Specifically, we create a digital Corsi board with N blue-colored blocks that are randomly placed on the board with no overlap (N varies from 5 to 8). We randomly sample a sequence of K taps, where $K \in [4, N]$, where each block is tapped at most once. The taps are digitally rendered on the blocks by changing their color from blue to yellow when tapped, yielding an sequence of K images. After the K images are presented, we provide a rendering of the board with integer IDs assigned to each block and ask the model to reproduce the sequence of taps using these IDs. We treat this as multiple-choice QA and provide four choices of tap sequences, only one of which is correct.
- **377** 14. Spatial addition task (SAdd). This was introduced in the fourth edition of the Wechsler Memory Scale, a suite of neuropsychological tests to evaluate memory function in individuals aged 16 to

378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 90 [\(Wechsler, 2009\)](#page-16-13). SAdd evaluates visuospatial storage and manipulation in working memory. A test participant is shown a grid with blue and red dots for five seconds. The participant is asked to remember the location of the blue dots and ignore the red dots. The participant is then shown another such grid. The objective is to add the two grids together by following certain rules. If a grid location has a blue dot in exactly one of grids, the result should be blue. If a grid location has blue dots on both grids, the result should be white. We programmatically generate grid pairs with sizes sampled from $\{3, 5, 7, 9\}$ and pseudo-randomly populate them with blue and red dots. We formulate the task as multiple-choice QA, presenting four grids as possible answers, exactly one of which is correct.

387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 15. Cambridge spatial working memory test (CSWM). This was designed to evaluate spatial working memory in human subjects [\(Sahakian et al., 1988\)](#page-15-17). Multiple colored boxes are shown on a screen. A yellow 'treasure' is initially hidden in one of the boxes. The participant must select boxes one at a time to open them and search for the treasure. Once the treasure is found, another treasure is placed in one of the remaining boxes. The intention is for the participant to locate all the yellow treasures via a process of elimination. We programmatically generate instances of this task by randomly sampling $N \in \{3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$ blue boxes, assigning them to random locations (without overlap), and placing the treasures in each box in random order. The model must proceed interactively. At each step, the game screen is presented to the model with random integers assigned to each box. $²$ $²$ $²$ The model selects a box to check for the hidden treasure, and is</sup> presented with an updated game screen. If the treasure was found in the previously selected box, the box becomes yellow. The treasures found so far are also displayed alongside the game screen to indicate progress. The objective is to find all the treasures before a time limit T (determined based on N). The model passes the test if it finds all the treasures.

401 402 403 404 405 406 As with large-scale spatial cognition, we also implement purely textual presentations of these tasks to support evaluation of large language models (LLMs). Figure [3](#page-5-0) illustrates both the multimodal and the purely textual presentations. The key idea in instantiating the textual presentations is to encode all spatial information via 2D character arrays. We did not identify a natural such encoding for the Water Level Test (WLT) and did not include a text-only presentation for it for this reason. See the appendix for additional illustrations of these tasks.

4 EXPERIMENTS

408 409

407

400

410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 Baselines. We evaluate a number of LLMs and VLMs. Using text-only presentations, we evaluate GPT-4v and GPT-4o [\(OpenAI, 2023;](#page-14-16) [2024\)](#page-14-8), Claude 3.5 Sonnet [\(Anthropic, 2024\)](#page-10-13), the Llama3 family [\(Dubey et al., 2024\)](#page-11-17), Mistral models such as Mixtral 8x7B, Mixtral 8x22B, and Mistral 123B [\(Jiang et al., 2024;](#page-12-16) [Mistral AI team, 2024a\)](#page-14-17), and two Yi 1.5 models [\(Young et al., 2024\)](#page-16-14). Using multimodal presentations, we evaluate GPT-4v and GPT-4o [\(OpenAI, 2023;](#page-14-16) [2024\)](#page-14-8), Claude 3.5 Sonnet [\(Anthropic, 2024\)](#page-10-13), LlaVA-NeXT-Interleave [\(Li et al., 2024a\)](#page-13-7), Pixtral [\(Mistral AI team,](#page-14-18) [2024b\)](#page-14-18), and Phi-3.5-vision [\(Abdin et al., 2024\)](#page-10-14). We also list the results of a chance baseline that selects an answer at random. For multiple-choice QA tasks, chance is at 25%. For interactive tasks, the chance baseline samples an action at random in each step. We further include human performance for reference for the multiple-choice QA tasks (see the appendix for details).

419 420 421 422 423 424 425 Implementation details. We use the vLLM inference engine for evaluating the open-source models [\(Kwon et al., 2023\)](#page-13-17). Since LlaVa-Next-Interleave is not supported by vLLM, it is evaluated via HuggingFace [\(Wolf et al., 2019\)](#page-16-15). For multiple-choice QA, we randomize the placement of the correct answer among the four choices. By performing multiple trials, we can compute means and standard deviations for each model on each task. (See the appendix for details.) For each task, we implement a prompt that provides a detailed description of the task and the expected response format. The prompts are reproduced in the appendix.

426 427 428 429 430 Large-scale spatial cognition results. The results are shown in Table [1,](#page-8-0) grouped by presentation modality (ego image, BEV image, BEV text). For image-based presentations, we evaluate GPT-4v and GPT-4o because they support video understanding (via a succession of images). For BEV text, we evaluate both open and closed LLMs. We also list the performance of the chance baseline for calibration, as well as human performance (see the appendix for details). In the text-only

⁴³¹

²The boxes' integer IDs are randomized in each step, forcing the model to remember their locations.

Table 1: Large-scale spatial cognition results. The three tables show results for different observation spaces. Results below 50% of human performance are gray. Methods are sorted based on their overall performance.

460 461 462 463 464 465 modality, GPT-4o attains the highest average performance. Mistral 123B is the highest-performing open model. All evaluated models struggle with large-scale spatial cognition, falling significantly below human performance on direction estimation, distance estimation, and map sketching, and less than 30% SPL on route retracing and novel shortcuts, even with allocentric presentation. With egocentric multimodal presentation (the closest counterpart to classic experimental protocols in animal cognition), the models are near chance level on all tasks.

466 467 468 Human performance ranges from 80% to 100% accuracy on image-based presentations of the multiple-choice QA tasks. Since perceiving large sequences of text arrays is non-trivial for humans, the performance drops to $65\% - 80\%$ for the text presentations.

469 470 471 472 473 Small-scale spatial cognition results. The results are shown in Table [2.](#page-9-0) With multimodal presentations, we benchmark GPT-4o, GPT-4v, Claude 3.5 Sonnet, and a number of open multimodal models. With purely textual presentations, we benchmark both open and closed models. We also list the performance of the chance baseline for calibration, as well as human performance (see the appendix for details).

⁴⁷⁴ 475 476 477 478 479 480 Performance of some model classes (e.g., GPT-4o, GPT-4v, Claude) on purely textual presentations is considerably higher than on multimodal presentations. The best-performing models, Claude and GPT-4o, achieve 43.8% and 40.1% average accuracies in the multimodal regime and 64.5% and 65.2% average accuracies with purely textual presentations. (Chance is $<$ 25%.) We attribute this in part to the simplified nature of the text-only implementations of the tasks (e.g., the text-only presentation of mental rotation uses only 2D shapes and constrained 2D rotations) and in part to the relative developmental maturity of large language models (LLMs) versus multimodal models.

⁴⁸¹ 482 483 484 485 On tasks that evaluate visuospatial working memory (specifically SAtt, CBTT, SAdd, and CSWM), the strongest LLMs perform well. On selective attention (SAtt), GPT-4o, Claude, Mistral 123B, and GPT-4v all achieve over 95% accuracy, matching or outperforming the human performance on this task. On the other hand, models perform poorly on maze completion (MCT), in both presentation modalities. (Note that the models operate with full visibility, as illustrated in Figure [3.](#page-5-0)) With multimodal presentation, all evaluated models are near chance on perspective taking (PTT) and the

Table 2: Small-scale spatial cognition results. The two tables show results for multimodal and text-only presentations, respectively. Results below 50% of human performance are gray, results above 90% of human performance are bold. Methods are sorted based on their average performance. (Some multimodal models ran out of memory on MCT and CSWM tasks; their accuracy is taken to be 0 for calculating the average.)

506 507

503 504 505

493 494

508 509 510 Minnesota paper form board test (MPFB). On mental rotation (MRT), the best models are near chance with multimodal presentation, which uses 3D shapes, and only marginally better with purely textual presentation, which uses 2D arrays and constrained rotations.

511 512 513 514 Humans perform well, achieving over 80% accuracy on the majority of the multiple-choice QA tasks with both text-only and multimodal presentations. Humans perform better on the textual presentations of tasks like MRT, MPFB and JLO than their vision counterparts due to the simplified nature of the text-only implementations.

515 516

5 DISCUSSION

517 518

519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 We presented SPACE, a benchmark for spatial cognition in frontier models. Our evaluation of contemporary models brings up intriguing questions and opportunities for further investigation. First, our results underscore that frontier models exhibit a fundamentally different form of intelligence from what has been observed (and studied) in humans and animals. No biological intelligence we have encountered has exhibited such advanced skill in some aspects of higher cognition [\(Trinh](#page-16-16) [et al., 2024\)](#page-16-16) while failing so profoundly in basic spatial cognition. This is particularly intriguing because in biological intelligence, spatial cognition is considered a prerequisite for higher cognition, and breakdowns in spatial cognition are diagnostic of higher-level disorders [\(Cappa, 2008;](#page-10-15) [Possin,](#page-15-18) [2010;](#page-15-18) [Verghese et al., 2017;](#page-16-17) [Cammisuli et al., 2024\)](#page-10-16). From a scientific standpoint, the constellation of traits exhibited by frontier models is fascinating and may inspire a new cognitive science [\(Simon,](#page-15-19) [2019\)](#page-15-19). As a precautionary stance, we can refrain from drawing analogies based on experience with biological cognition. (E.g., "a model won the Mathematics Olympiad therefore it possesses a comparable cognitive repertoire to a human Olympiad winner and could be expected to have comparable skill in other domains".)

532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 Could deficiencies in spatial cognition be causally linked to some of the puzzling breakdowns exhibited by contemporary frontier models in higher-level tasks? What is the roadmap for bringing spatial cognition in frontier models up to the level of animal cognition (and perhaps beyond)? Is this a prerequisite for attaining some of the more far-reaching aspirations of contemporary artificial intelligence research? Does embodiment play a role, as it has in prior forms of intelligence [\(Smith](#page-15-3) [& Gasser, 2005;](#page-15-3) [Savva et al., 2019\)](#page-15-11)? Or will artificial cognition continue to develop along a fundamentally different ontogenetic path? We expect further advances to increase the robustness and generality of frontier models, and to continue to broaden our understanding of the nature of intelligence.

540 541 REFERENCES

547

554

567

570

- **542 543 544** Marah I Abdin, Sam Ade Jacobs, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jyoti Aneja, Ahmed Awadallah, Hany Awadalla, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Harkirat S. Behl, et al. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone. *arXiv:2404.14219*, 2024.
- **545 546** Gary L Allen, Kathleen C Kirasic, Shannon H Dobson, Richard G Long, and Sharon Beck. Predicting environmental learning from spatial abilities: An indirect route. *Intelligence*, 22(3), 1996.
- **548 549 550** David I Anderson, Joseph J Campos, David C Witherington, Audun Dahl, Monica Rivera, Minxuan He, Ichiro Uchiyama, and Marianne Barbu-Roth. The role of locomotion in psychological development. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4, 2013.
- **551 552 553** Peter Anderson, Angel X. Chang, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Alexey Dosovitskiy, Saurabh Gupta, Vladlen Koltun, Jana Kosecka, Jitendra Malik, Roozbeh Mottaghi, Manolis Savva, and Amir R. Zamir. On evaluation of embodied navigation agents. *arXiv:1807.06757*, 2018.
- **555 556** Anthropic. Introducing claude 3.5 sonnet, 2024. [https://www.anthropic.com/news/](https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-5-sonnet) [claude-3-5-sonnet](https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-5-sonnet).
- **557 558** Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jiasen Lu, Margaret Mitchell, Dhruv Batra, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. VQA: Visual question answering. In *ICCV*, 2015.
	- Leopold Aschenbrenner. Situational awareness: The decade ahead, 2024. [https:](https://situational-awareness.ai/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/situationalawareness.pdf) [//situational-awareness.ai/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/](https://situational-awareness.ai/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/situationalawareness.pdf) [situationalawareness.pdf](https://situational-awareness.ai/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/situationalawareness.pdf).
- **563 564 565 566** Anas Awadalla, Le Xue, Oscar Lo, Manli Shu, Hannah Lee, Etash Kumar Guha, Matt Jordan, Sheng Shen, Mohamed Awadalla, Silvio Savarese, Caiming Xiong, Ran Xu, Yejin Choi, and Ludwig Schmidt. MINT-1T: Scaling open-source multimodal data by 10x: A multimodal dataset with one trillion tokens. *arXiv:2406.11271*, 2024.
- **568 569** Andrea Banino, Caswell Barry, Benigno Uria, Charles Blundell, Timothy Lillicrap, Piotr Mirowski, Alexander Pritzel, Martin J Chadwick, Thomas Degris, Joseph Modayil, et al. Vector-based navigation using grid-like representations in artificial agents. *Nature*, 557(7705), 2018.
- **571 572** Arthur Lester Benton. *Contributions to neuropsychological assessment: A clinical manual*. Oxford University Press, USA, 1994.
- **573 574** Mark Blades and Christopher Spencer. The development of children's ability to use spatial representations. *Advances in child development and behavior*, 25, 1994.
	- Youcef Bouchekioua, Aaron P Blaisdell, Yutaka Kosaki, Iku Tsutsui-Kimura, Paul Craddock, Masaru Mimura, and Shigeru Watanabe. Spatial inference without a cognitive map: the role of higher-order path integration. *Biological Reviews*, 96(1), 2021.
	- R Brickenkamp and E Zillmer. Test d2: concentration-endurance test. *Gottingen Ger. CJ Hogrefe*, 1998.

- **585 586 587 588 589** Davide Maria Cammisuli, Gloria Marchesi, Virginia Bellocchio, Edoardo Nicolo Aiello, Barbara ` Poletti, Federico Verde, Vincenzo Silani, Nicola Ticozzi, Stefano Zago, Teresa Difonzo, et al. Behavioral disorders of spatial cognition in patients with mild cognitive impairment due to alzheimer's disease (the bdsc-mci project): Ecological validity of the corsi learning suvra-span test. *Journal of Personalized Medicine*, 14(5), 2024.
- **590 591** SF Cappa. *Cognitive neurology: a clinical textbook*. Oxford University Press, 2008.
- **592 593** Boyuan Chen, Zhuo Xu, Sean Kirmani, Brian Ichter, Danny Driess, Pete Florence, Dorsa Sadigh, Leonidas J. Guibas, and Fei Xia. Spatialvlm: Endowing vision-language models with spatial reasoning capabilities. In *CVPR*, 2024a.

619

624

630

- **594 595 596** Lin Chen, Jinsong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Conghui He, Jiaqi Wang, Feng Zhao, and Dahua Lin. Sharegpt4v: Improving large multi-modal models with better captions. *arXiv:2311.12793*, 2023.
- **598 599 600** Lin Chen, Jinsong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Zehui Chen, Haodong Duan, Jiaqi Wang, Yu Qiao, Dahua Lin, and Feng Zhao. Are we on the right way for evaluating large visionlanguage models? *arXiv:2403.20330*, 2024b.
- **601 602 603** Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared ´ Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- **604 605 606 607** Xinlei Chen, Hao Fang, Tsung-Yi Lin, Ramakrishna Vedantam, Saurabh Gupta, Piotr Dollar, ´ and C. Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft COCO captions: Data collection and evaluation server. *arXiv:1504.00325*, 2015.
- **608 609 610** An-Chieh Cheng, Hongxu Yin, Yang Fu, Qiushan Guo, Ruihan Yang, Jan Kautz, Xiaolong Wang, and Sifei Liu. Spatialrgpt: Grounded spatial reasoning in vision language model. *arXiv:2406.01584*, 2024.
- **611 612** François Chollet. On the measure of intelligence. $arXiv:1911.01547, 2019$.
- **613 614 615** Michiel HG Claessen, Ineke JM Van Der Ham, and Martine JE Van Zandvoort. Computerization of the standard corsi block-tapping task affects its underlying cognitive concepts: a pilot study. *Applied Neuropsychology: Adult*, 22(3), 2015.
- **616 617 618** Philip Michael Corsi. *Human memory and the medial temporal region of the brain.* Phd thesis, McGill University, 1972. [https://escholarship.mcgill.ca/concern/theses/](https://escholarship.mcgill.ca/concern/theses/05741s554) [05741s554](https://escholarship.mcgill.ca/concern/theses/05741s554).
- **620 621 622** Edwin S Dalmaijer, Stefan Van der Stigchel, Tanja CW Nijboer, Tim HW Cornelissen, and Masud Husain. Cancellationtools: All-in-one software for administration and analysis of cancellation tasks. *Behavior Research Methods*, 47, 2015.
- **623** Dawson-Haggerty et al. trimesh, 2019. <https://trimesh.org/>.
- **625 626 627** Sergio Della Sala, Marcella Laiacona, Hans Spinnler, and Chiara Ubezio. A cancellation test: its reliability in assessing attentional deficits in alzheimer's disease. *Psychological medicine*, 22(4), 1992.
- **628 629** Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *CVPR*, 2009.
- **631 632 633** Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- **634 635 636 637** Pul Ashby Foltz. Adult performance on piaget's water level task and its relation of spatial orientation and visualization. Master's thesis, University of Richmond, 1978. [https://scholarship.richmond.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?](https://scholarship.richmond.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1424&context=masters-theses) [article=1424&context=masters-theses](https://scholarship.richmond.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1424&context=masters-theses).
	- Nigel Foreman, Denny Foreman, Alison Cummings, and Sandra Owens. Locomotion, active choice, and spatial memory in children. *The Journal of general psychology*, 117(2), 1990.
- **641 642** John W French, Ruth B Ekstrom, and Leighton A Price. Manual for kit of reference tests for cognitive factors (revised 1963). *(No Title)*, 1963.
- **643 644 645** Andrea Frick and Wenke Mohring. A matter of balance: Motor control is related to children's spatial ¨ and proportional reasoning skills. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 2016.
- **646 647** Chaoyou Fu, Peixian Chen, Yunhang Shen, Yulei Qin, Mengdan Zhang, Xu Lin, Zhenyu Qiu, Wei Lin, Jinrui Yang, Xiawu Zheng, Ke Li, Xing Sun, and Rongrong Ji. MME: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for multimodal large language models. *arXiv:2306.13394*, 2023.

701 Maria Kozhevnikov and Mary Hegarty. A dissociation between object manipulation spatial ability and spatial orientation ability. *Memory & Cognition*, 29, 2001.

- **702 703 704** Maria Kozhevnikov, Michael A Motes, and Mary Hegarty. Spatial visualization in physics problem solving. *Cognitive science*, 31(4), 2007.
- **705 706 707** Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention. In *SOSP*, 2023.
- **708 709 710 711** Emilie Lacroix, Stephanie Cornet, Naima Deggouj, and Martin Gareth Edwards. The visuo-spatial ´ abilities diagnosis (vsad) test: Evaluating the potential cognitive difficulties of children with vestibular impairment through a new tablet-based computerized test battery. *Behavior Research Methods*, 53, 2021.
- **712 713** Barbara Landau. Spatial cognition. In *Encyclopedia of the Human Brain*. Elsevier, 2002.
- **714 715 716 717** Hugo Laurençon, Lucile Saulnier, Léo Tronchon, Stas Bekman, Amanpreet Singh, Anton Lozhkov, Thomas Wang, Siddharth Karamcheti, Alexander M. Rush, Douwe Kiela, Matthieu Cord, and Victor Sanh. OBELICS: An open web-scale filtered dataset of interleaved image-text documents. In *NeurIPS*, 2023.
- **718 719 720** Feng Li, Renrui Zhang, Hao Zhang, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Wei Li, Zejun Ma, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-next-interleave: Tackling multi-image, video, and 3d in large multimodal models. *arXiv:2407.07895*, 2024a.
- **721 722 723 724 725** Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yinan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Ping Luo, et al. Mvbench: A comprehensive multi-modal video understanding benchmark. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 22195–22206, 2024b.
- **726 727** Rensis Likert and WH Quasha. *Minnesota Paper Form Board Test*. Psychological Corporation, 1941.
- **728 729** Rensis Likert and William H Quasha. *Revised Minnesota paper form board test*. Psychological Corporation, 1969.
- **731 732** Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. In *NeurIPS*, 2023a.
- **733 734 735** Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhang, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, Kai Chen, and Dahua Lin. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player? *arXiv:2307.06281*, 2023b.
- **736 737 738 739** Pan Lu, Hritik Bansal, Tony Xia, Jiacheng Liu, Chunyuan Li, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Hao Cheng, Kai-Wei Chang, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. Mathvista: Evaluating mathematical reasoning of foundation models in visual contexts. In *ICLR*, 2024.
- **740 741 742** Arjun Majumdar, Anurag Ajay, Xiaohan Zhang, Pranav Putta, Sriram Yenamandra, Mikael Henaff, Sneha Silwal, Paul Mcvay, Oleksandr Maksymets, Sergio Arnaud, et al. Openeqa: Embodied question answering in the era of foundation models. In *CVPR*, 2024.
- **743 744** Hanspeter A Mallot. *From Geometry to Behavior: An Introduction to Spatial Cognition*. MIT Press, 2024.
- **745 746 747** Kenneth Marino, Mohammad Rastegari, Ali Farhadi, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. OK-VQA: A visual question answering benchmark requiring external knowledge. In *CVPR*, 2019.
- **748 749** Jérôme Marquet-Doléac, Régis Soppelsa, and Jean-Michel Albaret. *Laby 5-12: Test des labyrinthes*. Hogrefe, 2010.
- **750 751 752** John C Marshall and Gereon R Fink. Spatial cognition: Where we were and where we are. *Neuroimage*, 14(1), 2001.
- **753 754 755** Chiara Meneghetti, Clara Zancada-Menéndez, Patricia Sampedro-Piquero, Laudino Lopez, Massimiliano Martinelli, Lucia Ronconi, and Barbara Rossi. Mental representations derived from navigation: The role of visuo-spatial abilities and working memory. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 49, 2016.
- **756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808** Chiara Meneghetti, Laura Miola, Enrico Toffalini, Massimiliano Pastore, and Francesca Pazzaglia. Learning from navigation, and tasks assessing its accuracy: The role of visuospatial abilities and wayfinding inclinations. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 75, 2021. Chiara Meneghetti, Laura Miola, Tommaso Feraco, and Veronica Muffato. Individual differences in navigation: An introductory overview. In *Prime Archives in Psychology*. Vide Leaf, 2nd edition, 2022. Emil W Menzel. Chimpanzee spatial memory organization. *Science*, 182(4115), 1973. Mistral AI team. Large enough, 2024a. [https://mistral.ai/news/](https://mistral.ai/news/mistral-large-2407/) [mistral-large-2407/](https://mistral.ai/news/mistral-large-2407/). Mistral AI team. Announcing pixtral 12b, 2024b. [https://mistral.ai/news/](https://mistral.ai/news/pixtral-12b/) [pixtral-12b/](https://mistral.ai/news/pixtral-12b/). Ida Momennejad, Hosein Hasanbeig, Felipe Vieira Frujeri, Hiteshi Sharma, Robert Osazuwa Ness, Nebojsa Jojic, Hamid Palangi, and Jonathan Larson. Evaluating cognitive maps in large language models with cogeval: No emergent planning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 37, 2023. Arsenii Moskvichev, Victor Vikram Odouard, and Melanie Mitchell. The conceptarc benchmark: Evaluating understanding and generalization in the ARC domain. *Trans. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 2023, 2023. Nora S. Newcombe. *Making space: The development of spatial representation and reasoning*. MIT Press, 2000. Nora S. Newcombe. Picture this: Increasing math and science learning by improving spatial thinking. *American Educator*, 34(2), 2010. Nora S. Newcombe. Spatial Cognition. In *Open Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science*. MIT Press, 2024. John O'Keefe and Lynn Nadel. *The hippocampus as a cognitive map*. Oxford University Press, 1978. OpenAI. GPT-4 technical report. *arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023. OpenAI. Hello gpt-4o, 2024. <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>. Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F. Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. Anja Pahor, Randy E Mester, Audrey A Carrillo, Eunice Ghil, Jason F Reimer, Susanne M Jaeggi, and Aaron R Seitz. Ucancellation: A new mobile measure of selective attention and concentration. *Behavior Research Methods*, 54(5), 2022. Viorica Patraucean, Lucas Smaira, Ankush Gupta, Adria Recasens, Larisa Markeeva, Dylan Ba- ` narse, Skanda Koppula, Joseph Heyward, Mateusz Malinowski, Yi Yang, et al. Perception test: A diagnostic benchmark for multimodal video models. In *NeurIPS*, 2023. Francesca Pazzaglia and Holly A Taylor. Perspective, instruction, and cognitive style in spatial representation of a virtual environment. *Spatial Cognition and Computation*, 7(4), 2007. Michael Peters, Bruno Laeng, Kerry Latham, Marla Jackson, Raghad Zaiyouna, and Chris Richardson. A redrawn vandenberg and kuse mental rotations test-different versions and factors that affect performance. *Brain and Cognition*, 28(1), 1995.
- **809** Roger Paul Peters. *Wolf-sign: Scents And Space In A Wide-ranging Predator.* University of Michigan, 1974.

shut? exploring the visual shortcomings of multimodal llms. In *CVPR*, 2024.

918 919 A APPENDIX

920 921 A.1 ECOLOGICAL COMPATIBILITY OF MULTIMODAL INPUTS WITH FRONTIER MODELS

922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 Our results in Section [4](#page-7-1) suggest that state-of-the-art frontier models fail in basic spatial cognition tasks presented in SPACE. These failures could be attributed to the lack of spatial cognition in these models. Alternatively, these failures could be due to models not comprehending the inputs presented to them (i.e., the inputs are not *ecologically compatible* with the models). To rule out this alternate possibility, we design additional tests unrelated to spatial cognition on the same vision / text inputs used in our benchmark. If models succeed on these tests, it would suggest that the inputs are ecologically compatible with them since they can understand and perform tasks using these inputs. In each test, we pose a series of multiple-choice questions evaluating a model's finegrained understanding of the visual inputs (and textual in some cases). Next, we describe the tests we designed.

932 Test 1: Given BEV image / text inputs (see Figure [2\)](#page-3-1), answer the following questions:

- **933** Q1. What is the size of the grid $(H \times W)$?
- **934** $Q2$. What is your current (x, y) location?

935 936 Q3. What are the (x, y) locations of all navigable cells? Include cells containing landmarks and your current position.

- **937** Q4. What are the (x, y) locations of all obstacle cells?
- **938** Q5. What are the landmarks visible in the image / array?
- **939** Q6. What are the locations of the landmarks visible in the image / array?

941 Test 2: Given an ego image (see Figure 2), answer the following questions:

- **942** Q1. What is the name of the landmark visible in the image?
- **943** Q2. Is the landmark \langle name \rangle in the left half of the image?
- **944** Q3. Is the landmark <name> in the right half of the image?
- **945** $Q4$. Is the landmark \langle name \rangle in the central section of the image?
- **946**

940

947 948 Test 3: Given two consecutive ego images from a walkthrough (see Figure 4), answer the following question:

949 950 Q1. What is the action taken to go from image 1 to image 2 (move forward, turn left, turn right, wait/do nothing)?

951 952

954

959 960

953 Test 4: Given a perspective taking test image / text array (see Figures 10 and 11), answer the following questions:

- **955** Q1. How many objects / non-zero locations are present in the image / array?
	- Q2. What objects / non-zero locations are present in the image / array?
- **956 957** Q3. Is <object / location> to the left of <object / location> in the image / array?
- **958** Q4. Is <object / location> to the above <object / location> in the image / array?

Test 5: Given water level test images, answer the following questions:

- **961** Q1. Is there water in the water container?
	- Q2. From image 1 to image 2, is the water container rotated to the left, right or not rotated at all?
- **962 963** Q3. From image 1 to image 2, what is the absolute rotation angle of the water container (in degrees)?

964 965 966 Test 6: Given a selective attention task grid of icons / characters, answer the following questions:

- **967** Q1. How many total objects / characters are present in the image / grid (including repetitions)?
- **968** Q2. What is the size of the grid of objects / characters (width x height)?
- **969** Q3. How many unique objects / characters are present in the grid (ignore repetitions)?
- **970**
- **971** Results discussion: We evaluate GPT-4o and GPT-4v on these tests. The results are shown in Tables [3](#page-18-0) and [4.](#page-18-1) Both models largely understand BEV image and text inputs (test 1). However, they

				Test 1			Test 2			Test 3			
Model	Q1	Q2	Q ₃	Q4	Q5	Q ₆	Avg.	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Avg.	Q1
GPT-40	30.4	78.2	89.4	87.8	100.0	93.6	79.9	100.0	84.0	95.5	83.5	92.6	59.3
$GPT-4v$	55.8	86.2	89.8	91.2	99.8	79.2	83.6	98.0	45.0	36.5	56.5	66.8	48.0
							Text-only evaluation						
				Test 1						Test 2			
Model	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q ₆	Avg.	Q1	Q ₂	Q3	Q4	Avg.	Q1
	100.0	100.0	77.5	85.6	100.0	82.8	90.9	-				-	
GPT-40 $GPT-4v$	100.0	100.0	96.8	91.0	100.0	77.6	94.2						Test 3

Table 3: Measuring ecological compatibility of multimodal inputs with frontier models (part 1)

Multimodal evaluation

						Multimodal evaluation								
			Test 4			Test 5				Test 6				
Model	Q1	Q ₂	Q ₃	Q4	Avg.	Q1	Q ₂	Q3	Avg.	Q1	Q2	Q3	Avg.	
$GPT-40$	99.6	99.6	89.8	87.7	92.4	100.0	73.9	38.7	64.0	83.0	90.5	58.2	77.2	
$GPT-4v$	78.3	87.4	78.4	76.0	79.0	100.0	56.3	32.4	55.4	74.5	88.0	35.8	66.0	
						Text-only evaluation								
	Test 4						Test 5			Test 6				
Model	Q1	Q ₂	Q ₃	Q4	Avg.	Q1	Q2	Q3	Avg.	Q1	Q2	Q3	Avg.	
$GPT-40$	97.6	99.6	99.5	94.2	97.4	۰			۰.	100.0	100.0	99.5	99.8	
$GPT-4v$	96.8	98.1	92.2	76.8	96.8	۰			۰.	99.5	100.0	94.8	98.1	

Table 4: Measuring ecological compatibility of multimodal inputs with frontier models (part 2)

999 1000 1001 1002 1003 1004 1005 1006 1007 fall short in calculating the grid size for BEV images $(Q1)$. GPT-40 understands egocentric images, i.e., recognizes and localizes landmarks in egocentric images (test 2). GPT-4v recognizes landmarks well (Q1), but performs poorly in localization (Q2, Q3 and Q4). Both GPT-4o and GPT-4v perform poorly on action estimation (test 3) and estimation of water container rotations (Q2 and Q3 in test 5). GPT-4o excels in understanding the perspective taking inputs with multimodal and text-only presentations (test 4). GPT-4v also performs well on test 4, but is worse with multimodal inputs when compared to text-only inputs. Finally, both GPT-4o and GPT-4v perform adequately with counting objects (Q1 in test 6) and grid sizes (Q2 in test 6) on selective attention task inputs with multimodal inputs. However, they struggle to calculate the number of unique objects / characters (Q3 in test 6). Both GPT-4o and GPT-4v excel at the text-only presentation of test 6.

1008 1009 1010 1011 1012 1013 1014 1015 1016 1017 1018 Our results indicate that state-of-the-art models can understand multimodal and text-only inputs provided in our benchmark. They perform well in most of the tests, but have very specific shortcomings (e.g., localizing landmarks in ego images for GPT-4v, understanding rotations of water containers and counting unique characters / objects in a grid). Importantly, the average results on each test is much higher than the SPACE task counterparts. For example, even though GPT-4o and GPT-4v understand BEV text inputs nearly perfectly (test 1), they perform poorly in the BEV text versions of the large-scale spatial cognition tasks (see Table [1\)](#page-8-0). Similarly, even though GPT-4o understands the perspective taking inputs nearly perfectly for both text-only and multimodal presentations, it performs poorly on the perspective taking task in SPACE (see Table [2\)](#page-9-0). Therefore, the failure of frontier models on SPACE is most likely due to their lack of spatial cognition, and not because they cannot understand the inputs presented to them.

1019

1020 1021 A.2 SPACE EXAMPLES

1022 1023 We illustrate examples for each task from our proposed SPACE benchmark.

1024 Large-scale spatial cognition

1025

• Egocentric image observations: Figures [4,](#page-21-0) [5](#page-22-0)

1074 1075 1076 1077 1078 1079 on the model creators to correctly process the images. The exact image resolution and aspect ratios are taskdependent and listed in Table [5.](#page-20-0) For egocentric video inputs in the large-scale spatial cognition tasks, the number of frames varies from 61 to 240. Since GPT-4o and GPT-4v APIs did not permit 240+ frames as inputs, we subsample the video frames by a factor of 2 before providing them to the model. For BEV video inputs, the number of frames varies from 13 to 72. We provide them as is to the model.

³BEV text observations are obtained by simply converting the BEV image to text as illustrated in Figure [2.](#page-3-1)

Figure 4: Large-scale spatial cognition with ego image observations

Figure 8: Mental rotation task (MRT) with visual inputs: Given a reference shape, find the choice that shows the same object rotated in 3D.

Figure 12: Water level test (WLT) with vision inputs: Given a water container filled with water, predict the water level in the rotated container.

1452

1456

Figure 13: Minnesota Paper Form Board test (MPFB) with visual inputs: Which one of the four choices shows what it would be like when the puzzle pieces are put together?

1509 1510 1511 Figure 14: Minnesota Paper Form Board test (MPFB) with text inputs: Which one of the four choices shows what it would be like when the array pieces are put together? *The array colors are purely for illustration purposes.*

- **1617**
- **1618**
- **1619**

Figure 19: Corsi block-tapping task (CBTT) with visual inputs: What is the sequence of block taps observed in the image?

Figure 20: Corsi block-tapping task (CBTT) with text inputs: What is the sequence of block taps observed in the arrays? *The array colors are purely for illustration purposes.*

1672

1635 1636

1638

1640

1642

1646 1647

1649

1673 Figure 21: Spatial addition task (SAdd) with visual inputs: What is the sum of the two arrays? Ignore red circles. Blue circles represent 1, white circles represent 2 and empty spaces represent 0.

1674 1675 1676 1677 1678 1679 1680 1681 1682 1683 1684 1685 1686 1687 1688 1689 1690 1691 1692 1693 1694 1695 1696 1697 1698 1699 1700 1701 1702 1703 1704 1705 1706 1707 1708 1709 1710 1711 1712 1713 1714 1715 1716 1717 1718 1719 1720 1721 Array 1 Array 2 Choice 1 Choice 2 Choice 3 Choice 4 $\mathsf{E}% _{1}=\mathsf{E}_{2}$, $\mathsf{E}_{3}=\mathsf{E}_{4}$, $\mathsf{E}_{5}=\mathsf{E}_{6}$, $\mathsf{E}_{7}=\mathsf{E}_{8}$ E,E,E,E,E E,E,E,E,E E, E, B, E, E E,E,E,E,E $\mathsf{E}\,$, $\mathsf{B}\,$, $\mathsf{E}\,$, $\mathsf{E}\,$, $\mathsf{E}\,$ $\mathsf{E}\,$, $\mathsf{B}\,$, $\mathsf{E}\,$, $\mathsf{E}\,$, $\mathsf{E}\,$ E, E, E, E E , R , E , E , E E,E,E,E,E E,W,E,E,E E,B,E,E,E E,E,E,E,E E, E, E, B, E E,E,E,E,E E , B , E , E , E E,E,E,E,E E, E, E, E, E E,E,W,E,E E, E, E, E, B E,W,E,E,E E,E,E,E,B E, E, E, B, E E,E,E,E,E E,E,E,E,E $, \mathbf{W}, \mathsf{E}, \mathsf{E}, \mathsf{E}$ E,B,E,E,E E, E, E, E, E E , E , B , E , E E,E,E,E,E B , F , F E, E, R E,E,E B, E, E E,E,E E , E , R $\pmb{\mathsf{W}}$, E , E E,E,E E,E,E B, E, E E, E, B E,E,E B,E,E E,E,E B, E, E B, E, E E , B , E E,E,E R,E,E,B,E,E,E,E,B $E, E, E, E, E, E, \mathbf{B}, E$, _ , _ , _ , _ , _ , _ , _
, E , **E , B** , E , E , E , E E, E, B, E, E, B, E E,B,E,E,E,E,E,E,E E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E E,E,E,B,E,E,E,E,B E, E, E, E, E E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E E,E,E,B,E,E,E,B,E E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E E , \bf{B} , \bf{B} E, E, E, B, E, E, B E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E $E, E, E, E, \mathbf{R}, E, E, E, E$ E,E,E,E,E,E,B,E,E , B, E E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E $E, E, E, W, E, E, E, B, B$ E, E, E, E, E, E, **B**, E
E, E, E, **B, W**, E, E, E, E \in , W, \in , \in , W, \in , _, _, _, _, _, _, _, _, _
, **B** , E , E , E , E , E , E , E E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E E,E,E,B,E,E,B,E,B E , B , E E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E $E, E, E, W, E, E, E, E, B, E$ E,E,E,E,E,E,E,B,E E,E,E,B,W,B,E,E,E E, E, B, E, W, E, E E,B,E,E,E,E,E,E,E E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E $E, E, E, B, E, E, E, B, B$
E, E, E, E, E, E, E, B, E, E $E, E, E, B,$ **B**, E, E, **W**, E, **B**, E, **B, B**
E, E, E, E, E, E, E, **B**, E E,E,E,E,E,E,E,B,E E,E,E,B,W,E,E,E,E E,E,B,E,W,E,E,W,E $E, B, E, E, E, E, E, E, E$ E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E E,E,E,B,E,E,B,E,E E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E **B**, E, **B**, E, E, E, **B**,
E, **B**, E, E, E, E, **B**, E E, E E,E,E,E,B,E,E,E,E B,E,E,E,B,E,E,B,E E,W,E,B,E,E,E,E,E E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E,E , E , E , **B** , E , E , E , **B**
, **B** , E , E , E , E , E , E , E E,B,E,E,E,E,E,E,E E,E,E,E,B,E,E,B,E Figure 22: Spatial addition task (SAdd) with text inputs: What is the sum of the two arrays? Ignore "R". "E" is 0, "B" is 1 and "W" is 2. *The array colors are purely for illustration purposes.*

1722 1723 1724 Figure 23: Maze completion task (MCT) with visual inputs: We illustrate examples of mazes used for the MCT task. We programmatically generate mazes of different sizes using Mazelib [\(Stilley, 2014\)](#page-15-16). Blue cells are obstacles. Black cells are navigable space. The yellow square represents the current location. The red circle represents the goal location.

- **1725**
- **1726**
- **1727**

1750 1751 1752 Figure 24: Maze completion task (MCT) with text inputs: We illustrate examples of mazes used for the MCT task. We programmatically generate mazes of different sizes using Mazelib [\(Stilley, 2014\)](#page-15-16). 0s are obstacles. 1s are navigable space. A represents the current location. G represents the goal location. *The array colors are purely for illustration purposes.*

1777 1778 1779 1780 1781 Figure 25: Cambridge spatial working memory task (CSWM) with visual inputs: We illustrate two game plays of the CSWM task in the two rows. In each row, we show the initial observation followed by actions taken and the resulting observations. Note how the box identities change after each step. This is intended to force models to remember boxes by their spatial locations instead of their integer identities. As treasures get collected, they are populated in the "Treasures collected" section of the game screen. When a treasure is collected, a new treasure is placed in one of the boxes where the treasure never appeared before.

1816 1817 1818 1819 followed by actions taken and the resulting observations. The boxes in each array are the non-zero elements. Note how the box identities change after each step. This is intended to force models to remember boxes by their spatial locations instead of their integer identities. As treasures get collected, the "Number of treasures collected" gets incremented. When a treasure is collected, a new treasure is placed in one of the boxes where the treasure never appeared before. *The array colors are purely for illustration purposes.*

- **1820**
- **1821**
- **1822 1823**
- **1824**
- **1825**
- **1826**
- **1827**

- **1830**
- **1831**
- **1832**
- **1833**

1834

1886 1887 1888 1889 SPACE task. For large-scale spatial cognition tasks, we have one video per environment. We generate questions and navigation tasks based on these videos. Some small-scale spatial cognition tasks have multiple images for the same question (e.g., MPFB, WLT, SAtt and CBTT), while other tasks have multiple questions for the same image (e.g., PTT, MRT). For interactive tasks like MCT, CSWM, route retracing and novel shortcuts, images are rendered conditioned on the actions taken by the agent.

- **2211 2212**
- **2213**

