

MANTIS: Interleaved Multi-Image Instruction Tuning

Dongfu Jiang[✉], Xuan He[◇], Huaye Zeng[✉], Cong Wei[✉], Max Ku[✉], Qian Liu[♡], Wenhua Chen[✉]
 University of Waterloo[✉], Tsinghua University[◇], Sea AI Lab[♡]
 dongfu.jiang@uwaterloo.ca, wenhuchen@uwaterloo.ca




Figure 1: Mantis can accept interleaved text-image to perform different tasks like coherence, comparison, logical reasoning, and temporal understanding, etc. Mantis achieves the state-of-the-art performance on the 5 multi-image benchmarks, and preserves abilities for single-image tasks.

Abstract

The recent years have witnessed a great array of large multimodal models (LMMs) to effectively solve single-image vision language tasks. However, their abilities to solve multi-image visual language tasks is yet to be improved. The existing multi-image LMMs (e.g. OpenFlamingo, Emu, Idefics, etc) mostly gain their multi-image ability through pre-training on hundreds of millions of noisy interleaved image-text data from web, which is neither efficient nor effective. In this paper, we aim at building strong multi-image LMMs via instruction tuning with academic-level resources. Therefore, we meticulously construct MANTIS-INSTRUCT containing 721K instances from 14 multi-image datasets. We design MANTIS-INSTRUCT to cover different multi-image skills like co-reference, reasoning, comparing, temporal understanding. We combine MANTIS-INSTRUCT with several single-image visual-language datasets to train our model MANTIS to handle any interleaved image-text inputs. We evaluate the trained MANTIS on five multi-image benchmarks and eight single-image benchmarks. Though only requiring academic-level resources (i.e. 36 hours on 16xA100-40G), MANTIS-8B can achieve state-of-the-art performance on all the multi-image benchmarks and beats the existing best multi-image LMM Idefics2-8B (pre-trained on 140M interleaved image-text data) by an average of 9 absolute points. We observe that MANTIS performs equivalently well on the held-in and held-out evaluation benchmarks, which demonstrates its generalization ability. Remarkably, MANTIS only lags behind GPT-4V by an average of 2 absolute points across the five benchmarks. We further evaluate MANTIS on single-image benchmarks and demonstrate that MANTIS can maintain a strong single-image performance on par with CogVLM and Emu2. Our results are particularly encouraging as it shows that low-cost instruction tuning is indeed much more effective than intensive pre-training in terms of building multi-image LMMs. We will release all of our code and data for reproducibility.

1 Introduction

Large Multimodal Models (LMMs) have advanced significantly in recent years. Both closed-source models like GPT-4V [1], Gemini [2], Reka [3], MM1 [4] and open-source models like LLaVA [5, 6], LLaVA-NeXT [7], BLIP [8], CogVLM [9], Idefics [10] have shown strong visual-language understanding and generation capabilities in single-image tasks like VQA [11], TextVQA [12], GQA [13], etc. Despite the significant interest in improving LMMs’ performance on single-image vision-language tasks, relatively less work attempts to improve LMMs’ capability to solve multi-image vision-language tasks. To the best of our knowledge, only a few open-source models (e.g. Idefics [10], OpenFlamingo [14], Emu2 [15]) are optimized to support multi-image inputs.

We argue that multi-image visual ability is also a crucial ability in real-world applications. Specifically, we categorize the ability into four skills including (1) **Co-reference**: understanding the references like “second image” in the natural language expression and grounding it on the referred image to generate a response. (2) **Reasoning**: capturing the information across multiple images and reasoning over these multiple pieces to derive the response. (3) **Comparison**: capturing the nuances and commonalities between several images. (4) **Temporal understanding**: observing multiple frames of a video or a scene to understand the temporal information like actions, behaviors, interactions, etc. These are the major four skills we want the LMMs to encompass.

The existing multi-image LMMs like Idefics [10], OpenFlamingo [14], Emu2 [15], MM1 [4] heavily rely on pre-training on a massive amount of interleaved image-text documents like MMC4 [16], Obelics [10] crawled from the web. For example, MMC4 contains 500 million examples, while Obelics contains 140 million examples. Such a pre-training procedure would require a massive amount of computation. Recent works like Mementos [17], BLINK [18], MVBench [19] reveal that they are actually incompetent in handling multi-image inputs despite being extensively pre-trained. We conjecture it’s due to the high volume of noise present in the crawled image-text documents.

In this paper, we attempt to build LMMs with academic-level resources to support interleaved multi-image inputs. Instead of pre-training LMMs with massive amounts of data, we resort to instruction tuning on publicly available academic vision-language datasets. Similar to LLaVA [7], we start from a pre-trained language model like LLaMA-3 [20] or Fuyu [21] and a vision transformer encoder from CLIP [22] or SigLIP [23]. We use the same multimodal projector as LLaVA to map the vision embeddings to the text embeddings space to simply concatenate them with the text embeddings. We also define a text-image interleaving format: “...(image {i}: <B0I>image embeddings</E0I>)...”, where <B0I> and </E0I> are the image delimiters.

We create an instruction-tuning dataset MANTIS-INSTRUCT to train our model. MANTIS-INSTRUCT has a total of 721K instances, consisting of 14 subsets to cover all the multi-image skills. Among the 14 subsets, 10 subsets are from the existing datasets. For example, NLVR2 [24], IconQA [25], etc are used to cover ‘reasoning’ skill; DreamSim [26], Birds-to-Words [27], etc are used to cover ‘comparing’ skill; NExT-QA [28], STAR [29], etc are used to cover ‘temporal’ skill. We additionally curate four new datasets LLaVA-665k-multi, LRV-multi to cover ‘coref’ skill and Contrast-Caption, Multi-VQA to broaden ‘reasoning’ skill. The detail of all the datasets is included in Table 1. All the subsets are unified in a standardized format, where images and texts are fully interleaved across multi-turn conversations and can be put into any order depending on the task. We train MANTIS by combining MANTIS-INSTRUCT with another 268K single-image vision-language data to balance the multi-image and single-image abilities.

To evaluate the multi-image skills, we adopt four existing benchmarks NLVR2 [24], QBench [30], BLINK [18], MVBench [19] to cover ‘reasoning’, ‘compare’ and ‘temporal’ skills. We manually create a new challenging dataset Mantis-Eval to cover ‘coref’ and ‘reasoning’ skills. We include 12 competitive baselines including single-image LMMs like LLaVA-Next [7], Qwen-VL [31] and multi-image LMMs like Idefics1/2, OpenFlamingo, and Emu2. For single-image LMMs, we merge multiple images horizontally as a single-image input.

By training on 16 x A100-40G for 36 hours, MANTIS achieves the state-of-the-art performance on 5 multi-image tasks, excelling on all the multi-image skills. MANTIS is able to outperform the strongest baseline Idefics2 [10] by an average of 9 absolute points. On the held-out evaluation set Mantis-Eval, MANTIS beats all the other baselines by at least 9.5 points. These results are encouraging because we show that the low-cost instruction tuning on 721K high-quality data can lead to a much better generalization performance than other LMMs (Emu2, Idefics, etc) intensively pre-trained on 140M-

500M noisy web data. Mantis also preserves decent performance of single-image tasks and is on par with CogVLM [9] and Emu2 [15]. We also present insights on the architecture selection and inference approaches based on the results in section 3. We believe MANTIS-INSTRUCT can serve as an essential baseline for future studies on multi-image LLMs due to its efficiency. We will release all the code, data, and models to help the community reproduce our results.

2 MANTIS: Interleaved Multi-Image Instruction Tuning

2.1 Method

Model Architecture: LMM architectures are roughly divided into two classes: decoder-only LMM and encoder-decoder LMM. The most popular ones are Fuyu [21] and LLaVA [32]. We modified these two model structure to enable support for interleaved multi-image input. For Fuyu, we preserve the super-resolution feature containing the maximum image size to be 720P. For LLaVA architecture, we also modify the codes to support multi-image inputs.

Image Context Length: How many images can a multi-image supported model accept? This is actually limited by both the LLM backbone’s max token length and the number of image tokens the vision encoder generated. For Fuyu, since we limit the image size to 720P, each image consumes at most $1920 \times 1080 / 30^2 = 1024$ image tokens. For the LLaVA architecture, each image consumes a fixed $(336/14)^2 = 576$ image tokens. For Llama3 with maximum window size of 8K, we can feed at most 8 and 14 images respectively. This is fairly enough for all the experiments in this paper.

Text-Image Interleaving Format: A proper text-image interleaving format can make an LLM easier to acquire multi-image understanding and reasoning ability. We contend that a good text-image interleaving format should: (1) mark boundaries between images clearly, and (2) denote the serial number of images. Following this principle, we designed our interleaving format as follows: "(image {i}): <BOI><image><EOI>)", where <BOI> is the begin of image token and <EOI> is the end of image token. <image> is the placeholder for image patches. This format add clear separators between images, and gives LMM serial information of the image through "image {i}". In practice, we set <BOI> and <EOI> to be <Image> and </Image> respectively.

Multi-Image Skills: Training data decides the skills and knowledge that we expect the model to learn. As mentioned in section 1, 4 crucial multi-image skills, co-reference, reasoning, comparison, and temporal understanding are considered. We also deliberately curate our MANTIS-INSTRUCT to cover all these skills. For example, we reformat LLaVA-665k to LLaVA-665k-multi for co-reference skills, and VIST for temporal understanding. Details are stated in the following subsection.

2.2 MANTIS-INSTRUCT: A large scale multiple image question answering dataset

We construct MANTIS-INSTRUCT from multiple publicly available datasets. Detailed statistics are shown in Table 1. We use a similar dataset format with LLaVA’s, where each data item contains multiple images and multiple turns of QA pairs are gathered. We report the number of examples, the number of images per item, the average conversation turns, and the average length. We describe the task type of each dataset and the processing techniques used in the followings:

LLaVA-665k-multi: Besides the above-mentioned multi-image reasoning tasks, we also manually reformat the LLaVA-655k dataset from LLaVA-1.5 into a "synthetic" multi-image dataset. We randomly merge 2 to 4 original data items of a single image into a multi-image data item. Then add proper image denotation like "For the second image, ..." for each question. Then we shuffle all the conversation pairs to form the final merge items. It’s a "synthetic" multi-image dataset because answering each question in the conversation does not require reasoning across images. However, due to the quality and diversity of the LLaVA-665k data, we contend that it’s helpful for avoiding forgetting via replaying and increasing instruction-following ability.

Co-Instruct [33]: Co-Instruct is a dataset curated to compare the quality of 2-4 images in the format of open-ended answer or multi-choice QA format. It’s similar to the tasks in the Qbench [30].

NLVR2 [24]: NLVR2 is a natural language reasoning dataset grounded in images. The task is to determine whether an statement is true or false given the visual contents of 2 images. NLVR2 covers many linguistic phenomena, such as cardinality, existential quantifiers, universal quantifiers, etc.

Subsets	Skill	# Instance	# Avg-I	# Max-I	# Turns	Length ^T	Length ^{T+I}
Multi-Image Reasoning Datasets							
LLaVA-665k-multi [♣]	Coref	313K	2.0	4	21.4	558	1710
LRV-multi [♣]	Coref	8K	3.5	9	83.4	2234	4251
NLVR2	Reason	86K	2.0	2	2.0	105	1257
IconQA	Reason	64K	2.4	6	2.0	71	1454
Contrast-Caption [♣]	Reason	36K	3.8	8	7.6	871	3067
ImageCoDe	Reason	17K	2.4	6	1.0	126	5886
Multi-VQA [♣]	Reason	5K	4.0	6	11.0	1102	3417
Coinstruct	Compare	151K	2.7	4	7.5	314	1620
Dreamsim	Compare	16K	3.0	3	2.0	103	1831
Spot-the-Diff	Compare	8K	2.0	2	4.0	121	1273
Birds-to-Words	Compare	3K	2.0	2	2.0	101	1253
VIST	Temporal	7K	20.3	50	9.7	530	12238
NExT-QA	Temporal	4K	8.0	8	17.6	572	5180
STAR	Temporal	3K	8.0	8	30.2	961	5569
Total	-	721K	4.7	50	14.4	555	3584
Single-Image Reasoning Datasets							
DVQA	Doc	200K	1.0	1	40.0	304	880
DocVQA	Doc	39K	1.0	1	2.0	62	638
ChartQA	Chart	28K	1.0	1	2.0	66	642
Total	-	268K	1.0	1	14.7	144	720

Table 1: The statistics of MANTIS-INSTRUCT. We list the number of examples, average images per example, maximum image per example, average turns, average text token lengths, and average text+image token lengths. [♣] means the new subsets we constructed in this paper. Here we use Llava’s tokenizer and assume each image occupies 576 image tokens, which is the number of tokens for each image. Here "Avg Length^T" denotes the average number of tokens for the text part, while "Avg Length^{T&I}" means the average number of tokens of text and images in total.

Dreamsim [26]: DreamSim proposes a dataset to train a model to judge image similarity. We reuse their datasets, and the task is to judge which candidate image is more similar to a reference image.

ImageCoDe [34]: ImageCoDe is multimodal challenge called image retrieval from contextual descriptions, where a multimodal model is required to retrieve/select the correct image from a set of 10 minimally contrastive images. For each image, 9 similar images are retrieved from Open Images Dataset V6 [35] using CLIP encodings.

Contrast-Caption: Inspired by the paradigm of contrastive learning, we reformat existing image captioning tasks into a multi-image version, where 2 tasks are defined. Given multiple images, the first task we defined is to judge which image matches the provided caption, and the second task is to generate a caption for a denoted image. We randomly select 2 to 8 images along with their captions to form a single item, then apply the template of the 2 tasks defined. We used the images and captions provided by ShareGPT-4V [36] and LAION GPT-4V captions from LVIS [37].

Spot-the-diff [25]: This is a dataset which requires the model to generate the difference description given 2 images. We use the processed version from MIMIC-IT [38].

LRV-multi [39]: This is a single-image dataset used to mitigate hallucinations of LMMs. We process it similarly to LLaVA-665k-multi to get a "synthetic" multi-image dataset.

Birds-to-Words [27]: The task of this dataset is to generate different descriptions and give 2 images of different birds. We directly take the training split for training. Besides, we prompt GPT-3.5-turbo to generate a possible question given the reference answer, so we can get a diverse question pool.

Multi-VQA: This dataset contains multi-image reasoning QA pairs, where each question is generated by GPT-4 based on the captions of the images. Each question is required to involve at least two images. Images and captions are sampled from ShareGPT-4V [36]. Prompt template is in Table 5.

Video QA: We also include some video question answering datasets, including NExTQA [28], STAR [29], and visual-story-telling [32]. nextqa and star are the processed version from Flipped-VQA [40]. The visual-story-telling are the processed version from MIMIC-IT [38].

Single-image-VQA: Instead of focusing only on multi-image tasks, we claim that it’s necessary to




Birds-to-words	NLVR2	Contrastive Captioning
<p>Q: What are the differences in coloring and physical features between <image> and <image> in the bird images?</p>  <p>Answer: animal1 has a white belly and animal2 has a yellow and white belly . animal1 has a longer thinner body than animal2 .</p>	<p>Q: Answer the following multiple-choice question: Here is a statement describing 2 images: There are exactly two animals in the image on the left. Is it true or false? <image></p>  <p>Options: (A) False (B) True</p> <p>Answer: B</p>	<p>Q: Here are 3 images <image> <image> <image>, which image shows the following content: (caption of image 2)</p>  <p>Options: (A) Image 1 (B) Image 2 (C) Image 3</p> <p>Answer: B</p>

Figure 2: Illustrations of MANTIS-INSTRUCT datasets.

also include some single-image VQA dataset to avoid catastrophic forgetting on single-image tasks. We included some of the single image data from LLaVA-665k as well as DocVQA [41], DVQA [42], and ChartQA [43] to enhance its ability on diagrams and OCR. In practice, since the size of DVQA is too large, we only use 30k output 200k of it for the training.

2.3 Training Details

We have trained multiple versions of our models with different dataset-mixing strategies and different backbones. We mainly build three models. MANTIS-8B-CLIP and MANTIS-8B-SigLIP are based on Llama-3-8B-Instruct [20], where CLIP [22] and SigLIP [23] are used as the visual encoder respectively. MANTIS-8B-Fuyu is based on the Adept AI’s Fuyu-8B [21]. Different from the above architecture, there is not visual encoder for the Fuyu model, where each image path is directly mapped to the token embedding space through a linear layer.

For MANTIS-8B-CLIP and MANTIS-8B-SigLIP, we first pre-train the multimodal projector on LLaVA pre-train data, where learning rate is set to 1e-3, batch size is set to 256. After pre-training, we fine-tune the 2 models on the MANTIS-INSTRUCT. For MANTIS-8B-Fuyu, we directly fine-tune Fuyu-8B on MANTIS-INSTRUCT without pre-training.

During the fine-tuning, we train each model on the data for 1 epoch, with a batch size being 128. The maximum context length is set to 8192. The learning rate is set to 1e-5, which is half of the learning rate used in LLaVA-1.5’s instruction-tuning. We set the warmup ratio to be 0.03 and use a cosine learning rate scheduler. We speed up our training and inference with Flash-attention2 [44].

3 Experiments

In this section, we aim to evaluate MANTIS’s ability on both multi-image and single-image vision-language tasks. For multi-image tasks, depending on whether the LMM can handle multiple images, we either concatenate multiple images (‘merge’) horizontally as a single image or feed multiple images as a ‘sequence’ to the model.

3.1 Baselines

For ‘merge’ evaluation, we include BLIP-2-13B [8], InstructBLIP-13B [45], Qwen-VL-Chat [31], LLaVA-1.5-7B [5], LLaVA-1.6-7B [7], Kosmos2 [46], and Fuyu-8B [21]. For ‘sequence’ evaluation, we include OpenFlamingo [14], Emu2-Chat-34B [15], Idefics1 [10], Idefics2 [10], GPT-4V [1]. Additionally, for single-image tasks, we include InstructBLIP-7B-Vicuna [45], Yi-VL-6B [47].

3.2 Evaluation Benchmarks

For multi-image vision-language tasks, we use 2 held-in benchmarks: NLVR2 [24] and Qbench [30]; and 3 held-out benchmarks: Mantis-Eval, BLINK [18], and MVBench [19]. We report detailed statistics of different datasets in Table 2.

NLVR2 [24] evaluates the model’s ability to conduct logical reasoning across the contents of images. It asks the model to compare the contents of the two given images and judge whether a given statement is correct or not. All questions are multiple-choice. We use the test-public split for evaluation

Qbench [30] is a benchmark evaluating whether LMMs can properly judge and compare the quality of a benchmark. Q-bench aims to evaluate the low-level visual abilities of LMMs, such as judging

Benchmarks	Skill	Type	# Instances	# Avg-I	# Max-I	Lenght ^{T+I}
NLVR2	Reason	MCQ	6,967	2.0	2	1,190
Q-Bench	Compare	MCQ	1,000	2.0	2	1,167
Mantis-Eval	Reason & Coref	MCQ & Short	217	2.5	5	1,455
BLINK	Reason	MCQ	1,901	1.9	4	1,129
MVBench	Temporal	MCQ	4,000	8.0	8	46

Table 2: Statistics of the evaluation dataset. NLVR2 and Mantis-Eval are held-in dataset, while the rest are held-out. For MVBench, we extract 8 frames per video for the evaluation.

Models	Size	Format	NLVR2	Q-Bench	Mantis-Eval	BLINK	MVBench	Avg
GPT-4V	-	sequence	88.80	76.52	62.67	51.14	43.50	64.5
Open Source Models								
Random	-	-	48.93	40.20	23.04	38.09	27.30	35.5
Kosmos2	1.6B	merge	49.00	35.10	30.41	37.50	21.62	34.7
LLaVA-1.5	7B	merge	53.88	49.32	31.34	37.13	36.00	41.5
LLaVA-1.6	7B	merge	58.88	54.80	45.62	39.55	40.90	47.9
Qwen-VL-Chat	7B	merge	58.72	45.90	39.17	31.17	42.15	43.4
Fuyu	8B	merge	51.10	49.15	27.19	36.59	30.20	38.8
BLIP-2	13B	merge	59.42	51.20	49.77	39.45	31.40	42.9
InstructBLIP	13B	merge	60.26	44.30	45.62	42.24	32.50	44.9
CogVLM	17B	merge	58.58	53.20	45.16	41.54	37.30	47.1
Idefics2	8B	sequence	86.87	57.00	48.85	45.18	29.68	53.5
OpenFlamingo	9B	sequence	36.41	19.60	12.44	39.18	7.90	23.1
Idefics1	9B	sequence	54.63	30.60	28.11	24.69	26.42	32.9
Emu2-Chat	37B	sequence	58.16	50.05	37.79	36.20	39.72	44.4
Mantis-Fuyu	8B	sequence	72.41	54.10	37.79	39.87	39.12	48.6
Mantis-CLIP	8B	sequence	84.66	66.00	55.76	47.06	48.30	60.3
Mantis-SigLIP	8B	sequence	87.43	69.90	59.45	46.35	50.15	62.6
Δ over SoTA	-	-	+0.56	+12.90	+9.68	+1.88	+8.00	+9.1

Table 3: Evaluation results on multi-image benchmarks. The highest score of open-source models for each tasks is bolded. The highest score of the open-source baseline model is underscored. Δ is the performance gains of MANTIS compared to the best baseline model for each task.

the image quality. All questions are multiple-choice. In our experiments, we evaluate the Qbench2-A2-pair dev set, where a low-level visual question is asked based on multiple image contents.

Mantis-Eval consists of 217 multiple-image reasoning examples that cover different topics, including size perceptions, weight comparisons, etc. This dataset is carefully curated by our annotators, where images are acquired via Google Search, and then come up with a proper question which requires understanding the contents in the two images well to answer. Mantis-Eval contains both multiple-choice and short-answer questions. We report results in the test split.

BLINK [18] is a benchmark on core visual perception abilities, where most of the tasks can be solved by humans “within a blink” (e.g., relative depth estimation, visual correspondence, forensics detection, and multi-view reasoning). Some questions in the benchmark involved multiple images, such as image similarity comparison. We report results in the validation set of the benchmark.

MVBench [19] is a comprehensive multimodal video understanding benchmark covering 20 challenging video tasks. The questions cannot be solved with a single frame, which necessitates understanding an image sequence to solve the questions in the benchmark. We report results in test split.

3.3 Results on Multi-Image Tasks

We report our results on the multi-image task in Table 3. We put the GPT-4V’s results at the top of the table as it’s a closed-source LMM. We put comparison results between MANTIS with other powerful open-source LMMs, along with the insights derived in the following paragraphs.

Model	Size	TextVQA	VQA	MMB	MMMU	OKVQA	SQA	MathVista	Avg
InstructBLIP	7B	33.6	75.2	38.3	30.6	45.2	70.6	24.4	48.9
Yi-VL	6B	44.8	72.5	68.4	39.1	51.3	71.7	29.7	58.0
LLaVA-1.5	7B	58.2	76.6	64.8	35.3	53.4	70.4	25.6	59.8
Qwen-VL-Chat	7B	63.8	78.2	61.8	35.9	56.6	68.2	15.5	60.8
CogVLM	17B	70.4	<u>82.3</u>	65.8	32.1	<u>64.8</u>	65.6	35.0	<u>63.5</u>
Idefics1	9B	39.3	68.8	45.3	32.5	50.4	51.6	21.1	48.0
OpenFlamingo	9B	46.3	58.0	32.4	28.7	51.4	45.7	18.6	43.8
Emu2-Chat	37B	<u>66.6</u>	84.9	63.6	36.3	64.8	65.3	30.7	63.6
Mantis-8B-CLIP	8B	56.4	73.0	66.0	38.1	53.0	<u>73.8</u>	31.7	60.1
Mantis-8B-SigLIP	8B	59.2	74.9	68.7	40.1	55.4	74.9	<u>34.4</u>	62.2

Table 4: Evaluation results of MANTIS on various single-image tasks. The full name of the abbreviations in the table are listed here. TextVQA: TextVQA validation set; VQA: VQA-v2 validation set; MMB: MMBench-English test set; SQA: ScienceQA-Image validation set. The highest score for each task is bolded, while the second highest is underscored.

MANTIS performs well on held-in evaluation Mantis-8B-SigLIP achieves 87.43 and 69.90 on NLVR2 and Q-Bench respectively, marking it the best open-source LMM on these 2 tasks. When compared to Idefics2, which also trains on NLVR2 training set, our result is marginally better. It’s worth noticing that the Mantis-8B-SigLIP is only 1.37 behind GPT-4V on NLVR2. The highest scores on these 2 benchmarks demonstrate that Mantis has gained strong ability in multi-image logical reasoning and low-level vision understanding.

MANTIS generalizes well on held-out evaluation Generalization of held-out multi-image tasks is a more valuable metric. Our evaluation results on the 3 held-out benchmarks, Mantis-Eval, BLINK (val), and MVBench also demonstrate our strong generalization ability. Mantis-8B-SigLIP achieves 59.45, 46.35, and 50.15 respectively on the 3 held-out tasks, surpassing all other open-source baselines. The gain over existing strongest baseline are particularly tremendous on Mantis-Eval and MVBench.

Decoder-only LMM vs encoder-decoder LMM Unlike many other LMMs like Flamingo, LLaVA, and BLIP, Fuyu is a decoder-only LMM without a vision encoder. A big advantage of this practice is that it supports super-resolution, so the image will not be resized to fit the vision encoder. So which architecture is better? To investigate deeper, we also train an additional Mantis-8B-Fuyu as a comparison. Results in Table 3 show that the performance of Mantis-8B-Fuyu is worse than Mantis-8B-CLIP and Mantis-8B-SigLIP where a vision encoder exists, even after fine-tuning on the same set of data. We thus conclude vision encoder should be necessary. This is also consistent with our intuition, where people see more, but think/write/talk less. In short, Encoder-Decoder LMM might be a better choice for LMM architecture.

Vision encoder matters As stated above, the Encoder-Decoder is a superior architecture compared to the decoder-only LMM. Following this, the quality of the vision encoder can also have big effects on the final LMM performance. We include 2 versions of Mantis, which is trained with CLIP [22] and SigLIP [23] respectively. And Mantis-8B-SigLIP can achieve generally better performance than the Mantis-8B-CLIP. This shows that SigLIP is a better vision encoder for LMM development.

‘Merge’ vs ‘Sequence’ input The ‘merge’ evaluation is an important baseline to evaluate the multi-image understanding ability of those LMMs that can accept one image at a time. If the results are good by merging images, then interleaved text/image instruction tuning will seem unnecessary. However, it’s not the truth. LLaVA-v1.6’s dynamic image resolution feature can divide a single image into multiple tiles, processing like multiple images [7]. But it still behaves badly on multi-image tasks, only getting 45.62 and 39.55 on the Mantis-Eval and BLINK benchmark. Though the results are better than LLaVA-v1.5, which does not have the dynamic image resolution feature, it’s still limited by the image resolution and cannot recognize separate images well.

3.4 Results on Single-Image Tasks

We also evaluate Mantis-8B-CLIP and Mantis-8B-SigLIP on various single-image tasks, including TextVQA [48], VQA-v2 [49], MMBench [50], MMMU [51], etc. Results are shown in Table 4. All the evaluations are conducted with the help of LMMs-Eval [52] tool.

Compared to a set of previous famous LMMs, Mantis-8B-SigLIP gets significant improvements on MMBench-English, MMMU, and ScienceQA benchmarks. Solving problems in these tasks requires




Figure 3: Case Study of Mantis. The Mantis model is able to understand multiple images and complete the given task

not only the visual perception ability but also the good reasoning ability of the LLM backbone. Considering that we are using the powerful LLaMA-3 as the backbone LLM, these improvements are thus expected. However, it’s also worth noticing the performance degeneration on some tasks after introducing the multi-image ability. Compared to LLaVA-v1.5-7B, Mantis-8B-CLIP’s performance on TextVQA, VQA-v2 drops 1.8 and 3.6 respectively. However, this decrease is acceptable as a trade-off for enhancing multi-image ability.

3.5 Case Studies

As shown in Figure 3, we present 2 cases where Mantis is doing do compared to LLaVA-1.5, which does not have multi-image ability, along with Emu-2 and GPT-4V, which also have multi-image ability. Mantis can understand multiple images and generate a more accurate answer.

4 Related Works

4.1 Large Multimodal Models

Large Multimodal Models (LMMs) are mostly denoted as large language models that can understand multiple modalities beside the human language. Some works aim to fuse image, audio, video, or more modalities with language [53, 54], while more works mainly focus on better combining vision knowledge with the language [55, 14, 45]. BLIP-2 has curated a large-scale image captioning dataset, bootstrapping a language model along with a vision encoder to be a powerful multimodal model [8]. Following this, LLaVA further proposes a cheaper approach to train a powerful LMM through visual instruction tuning [32]. LLaVA-Next further optimizes single-image performance, with a cost of an increasing number of image tokens per token [7], consuming more than 2k for each image, which is about 4 times of the original LLaVA model. Later LMMs like QwenVL [31], CogVLM [9], Yi-VL [47], etc. all follow a similar architecture of LLaVA. However, real-world visual problems are way more complex and usually require a sequence of images to describe the situation. Although better performance is achieved in the single-image scenario, it’s doubtful whether it’s worth the cost.

4.2 Multi-Image Supported Large Multimodal Models

Previous works have also noticed the importance of multi-image ability. Deepmind’s close-sourced Flamingo [55] focuses on optimizing in-context learning for a sequence of image/text pairs but lacking free-from image-text interleaved training examples. Kosmos2 [46], Fuyu [21] both support text-image interleaved format given the model structure, but they did not optimize in multi-image reasoning, and the released inference codes also do not support multi-image as input. Emu2 [15]

is a generative multimodal model that supports interleaved text-image inputs, as well as generating both images and texts. However, it’s mainly focused on in-context examples like Flamingo and auto-regressive image generation, instead of the 4 skills mentioned in section 1. Another common variant of LMMs that can accept multiple images as input is video understanding models, such as Video-LLaMA [56]. However, as shown in the MVBench benchmark, it is also shown that Video-LLaMA behaves worse than LMMs that can only accept one image as input [19], which raises doubts about its multi-image understanding ability. Different from these works, Mantis aims to optimize the multi-image ability of LMMs guided by the 4 defined skills, co-reference, reasoning, comparison, and temporal understanding, thus equipping the model with better multi-image ability.

4.3 Multi-Image Evaluation

While many benchmarks have been developed for single-image tasks, such as TextVQA [48], VQA-V2 [49], MMBench [50], and so on, the multi-image evaluation did not capture much of the people’s attention until recently. Difference description is the first task which large-scale data and good evaluation benchmarks are developed for, including works like Spot-the-Diff [25], Birds-to-Words [27], etc. They are usually evaluated by n-gram metrics like BLEU, and ROUGE, and only involve two images. The later NLVR2 [24] further includes logical reasoning across 2 images into evaluation, focusing on a higher-level of cognition ability. Q-bench [30] and BLINK [18] are both proposed for low-level multi-image vision tasks, where human easily do but model struggles. Another set of multi-image evaluation comes from video or image sequence evaluation, including Mementos [17], MVBench [19], etc. In this case, model usually need to take more than 2 images for answering.

5 Conclusion

We propose MANTIS, a new large multimodal model family designed to be able to accept interleaved text-image inputs. MANTIS is fine-tuned on our MANTIS-INSTRUCT, a text-image interleaved dataset consisting of 721K examples, covering 4 crucial skills, including co-reference, reasoning, comparison, and temporal understanding, for multi-image tasks. We also propose Mantis-Eval, a high-quality multi-image evaluation benchmark consisting of 217 examples with an average of 2.5 images per example. Comprehensive experiments show that MANTIS models effectively acquire the 4 multi-image skills and achieves state-of-the-art performance on 5 multi-image evaluation benchmarks, and preserve decent single-image reasoning performance. We shared insights about the model architecture and inference approaches based on the experiment results. Extending the image sequence context length and compressing the number of tokens per tokens efficiently are regarded as our future work.

References

- [1] OpenAI Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mo Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Benjamin Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix, Sim’on Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Raphael Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Lukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Ryan Kiros, Matthew Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Lukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kosic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Adeola Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne,

- Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel P. Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David M’ely, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rajeev Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Ouyang Long, Cullen O’Keefe, Jakub W. Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alexandre Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Pondé de Oliveira Pinto, Michael Pokorny, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario D. Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin D. Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas A. Tezak, Madeleine Thompson, Phil Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cer’on Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayvergiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu, Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023.
- [2] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
 - [3] Aitor Ormazabal, Che Zheng, Cyprien de Masson d’Autume, Dani Yogatama, Deyu Fu, Donovan Ong, Eric Chen, Eugénie Lamprecht, Hai Pham, Isaac Ong, et al. Reka core, flash, and edge: A series of powerful multimodal language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.12387*, 2024.
 - [4] Brandon McKinzie, Zhe Gan, Jean-Philippe Fauconnier, Sam Dodge, Bowen Zhang, Philipp Dufter, Dhruvi Shah, Xianzhi Du, Futang Peng, Floris Weers, et al. Mml: Methods, analysis & insights from multimodal llm pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09611*, 2024.
 - [5] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *ArXiv*, abs/2304.08485, 2023.
 - [6] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. *ArXiv*, abs/2310.03744, 2023.
 - [7] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Sheng Shen, and Yong Jae Lee. Llava-next: Improved reasoning, ocr, and world knowledge, January 2024.
 - [8] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven C. H. Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023.
 - [9] Wei Han Wang, Qingsong Lv, Wenmeng Yu, Wenyi Hong, Ji Qi, Yan Wang, Junhui Ji, Zhuoyi Yang, Lei Zhao, Xixuan Song, Jiazheng Xu, Bin Xu, Juanzi Li, Yuxiao Dong, Ming Ding, and Jie Tang. Cogvlm: Visual expert for pretrained language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2311.03079, 2023.
 - [10] 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, 2023.
 - [11] Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jiasen Lu, Margaret Mitchell, Dhruv Batra, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. Vqa: Visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2425–2433, 2015.
 - [12] Amanpreet Singh, Vivek Natarajan, Meet Shah, Yu Jiang, Xinlei Chen, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Marcus Rohrbach. Towards vqa models that can read. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8317–8326, 2019.
 - [13] Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning. Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6700–6709, 2019.

- [14] Anas Awadalla, Irena Gao, Josh Gardner, Jack Hessel, Yusuf Hanafy, Wanrong Zhu, Kalyani Marathe, Yonatan Bitton, Samir Yitzhak Gadre, Shiori Sagawa, Jenia Jitsev, Simon Kornblith, Pang Wei Koh, Gabriel Ilharco, Mitchell Wortsman, and Ludwig Schmidt. Openflamingo: An open-source framework for training large autoregressive vision-language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2308.01390, 2023.
- [15] Quan Sun, Yufeng Cui, Xiaosong Zhang, Fan Zhang, Qiying Yu, Zhengxiong Luo, Yueze Wang, Yongming Rao, Jingjing Liu, Tiejun Huang, and Xinlong Wang. Generative multimodal models are in-context learners. *ArXiv*, abs/2312.13286, 2023.
- [16] Wanrong Zhu, Jack Hessel, Anas Awadalla, Samir Yitzhak Gadre, Jesse Dodge, Alex Fang, Youngjae Yu, Ludwig Schmidt, William Yang Wang, and Yejin Choi. Multimodal c4: An open, billion-scale corpus of images interleaved with text. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [17] Xiyao Wang, Yuhang Zhou, Xiaoyu Liu, Hongjin Lu, Yuancheng Xu, Feihong He, Jaehong Yoon, Taixi Lu, Gedas Bertasius, Mohit Bansal, et al. Mementos: A comprehensive benchmark for multimodal large language model reasoning over image sequences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10529*, 2024.
- [18] Xingyu Fu, Yushi Hu, Bangzheng Li, Yu Feng, Haoyu Wang, Xudong Lin, Dan Roth, Noah A. Smith, Wei-Chiu Ma, and Ranjay Krishna. Blink: Multimodal large language models can see but not perceive, 2024.
- [19] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yanan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Ping Luo, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Mvbench: A comprehensive multi-modal video understanding benchmark. *ArXiv*, abs/2311.17005, 2023.
- [20] AI@Meta. Llama 3 model card, 2024.
- [21] Adept AI. Fuyu-8B: A Multimodal Architecture for AI Agents. <https://www.adept.ai/blog/fuyu-8b>, 2023.
- [22] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [23] Xiaohua Zhai, Basil Mustafa, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. Sigmoid loss for language image pre-training. *2023 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 11941–11952, 2023.
- [24] Alane Suhr, Stephanie Zhou, Iris Zhang, Huajun Bai, and Yoav Artzi. A corpus for reasoning about natural language grounded in photographs. *ArXiv*, abs/1811.00491, 2018.
- [25] Harsh Jhamtani and Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick. Learning to describe differences between pairs of similar images. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 4024–4034, 2018.
- [26] Stephanie Fu, Netanel Tamir, Shobhita Sundaram, Lucy Chai, Richard Zhang, Tali Dekel, and Phillip Isola. Dreamsim: Learning new dimensions of human visual similarity using synthetic data. *ArXiv*, abs/2306.09344, 2023.
- [27] Maxwell Forbes, Christine Kaeser-Chen, Piyush Sharma, and Serge J. Belongie. Neural naturalist: Generating fine-grained image comparisons. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2019.
- [28] Junbin Xiao, Xindi Shang, Angela Yao, and Tat seng Chua. Next-qa: Next phase of question-answering to explaining temporal actions. *2021 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 9772–9781, 2021.
- [29] Bo Wu and Shoubin Yu. Star: A benchmark for situated reasoning in real-world videos. In *NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks*, 2021.
- [30] Haoning Wu, Zicheng Zhang, Erli Zhang, Chaofeng Chen, Liang Liao, Annan Wang, Chunyi Li, Wenxiu Sun, Qiong Yan, Guangtao Zhai, and Weisi Lin. Q-bench: A benchmark for general-purpose foundation models on low-level vision. *ArXiv*, abs/2309.14181, 2023.
- [31] 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*, abs/2308.12966, 2023.

- [32] Ting-Hao K. Huang, Francis Ferraro, Nasrin Mostafazadeh, Ishan Misra, Jacob Devlin, Aishwarya Agrawal, Ross Girshick, Xiaodong He, Pushmeet Kohli, Dhruv Batra, et al. Visual storytelling. In *15th Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL 2016)*, 2016.
- [33] Haoning Wu, Hanwei Zhu, Zicheng Zhang, Erli Zhang, Chaofeng Chen, Liang Liao, Chunyi Li, Annan Wang, Wenxiu Sun, Qiong Yan, Xiaohong Liu, Guangtao Zhai, Shiqi Wang, and Weisi Lin. Towards open-ended visual quality comparison. *ArXiv*, abs/2402.16641, 2024.
- [34] Benno Krojer, Vaibhav Adlakha, Vibhav Vineet, Yash Goyal, E. Ponti, and Siva Reddy. Image retrieval from contextual descriptions. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2022.
- [35] Alina Kuznetsova, Hassan Rom, Neil Gordon Alldrin, Jasper R. R. Uijlings, Ivan Krasin, Jordi Pont-Tuset, Shahab Kamali, Stefan Popov, Matteo Mallocci, Alexander Kolesnikov, Tom Duerig, and Vittorio Ferrari. The open images dataset v4. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 128:1956 – 1981, 2018.
- [36] Lin Chen, Jinsong Li, Xiao wen Dong, Pan Zhang, Conghui He, Jiaqi Wang, Feng Zhao, and Dahua Lin. Sharegpt4v: Improving large multi-modal models with better captions. *ArXiv*, abs/2311.12793, 2023.
- [37] Christoph Schuhmann and Peter Bevan. 220k-gpt4vision-captions-from-lvis. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/laion/220k-GPT4Vision-captions-from-LIVIS>, 2023.
- [38] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Liangyu Chen, Jinghao Wang, Fanyi Pu, Jingkang Yang, C. Li, and Ziwei Liu. Mimic-it: Multi-modal in-context instruction tuning. *ArXiv*, abs/2306.05425, 2023.
- [39] Fuxiao Liu, Kevin Lin, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Yaser Yacoob, and Lijuan Wang. Aligning large multi-modal model with robust instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14565*, 2023.
- [40] Dohwan Ko, Ji Soo Lee, Wooyoung Kang, Byungseok Roh, and Hyunwoo J Kim. Large language models are temporal and causal reasoners for video question answering. In *EMNLP*, 2023.
- [41] Minesh Mathew, Dimosthenis Karatzas, R. Manmatha, and C. V. Jawahar. Docvqa: A dataset for vqa on document images. *2021 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 2199–2208, 2020.
- [42] Kushal Kafle, Scott D. Cohen, Brian L. Price, and Christopher Kanan. Dvqa: Understanding data visualizations via question answering. *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5648–5656, 2018.
- [43] Ahmed Masry, Xuan Long Do, Jia Qing Tan, Shafiq R. Joty, and Enamul Hoque. Chartqa: A benchmark for question answering about charts with visual and logical reasoning. *ArXiv*, abs/2203.10244, 2022.
- [44] Tri Dao. FlashAttention-2: Faster attention with better parallelism and work partitioning. *ArXiv*, 2023.
- [45] Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Albert Li, Pascale Fung, and Steven C. H. Hoi. Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning. *ArXiv*, abs/2305.06500, 2023.
- [46] Zhiliang Peng, Wenhui Wang, Li Dong, Yaru Hao, Shaohan Huang, Shuming Ma, and Furu Wei. Kosmos-2: Grounding multimodal large language models to the world. *ArXiv*, abs/2306.14824, 2023.
- [47] 01. AI, :, Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, Heng Li, Jiangcheng Zhu, Jianqun Chen, Jing Chang, Kaidong Yu, Peng Liu, Qiang Liu, Shawn Yue, Senbin Yang, Shiming Yang, Tao Yu, Wen Xie, Wenhao Huang, Xiaohui Hu, Xiaoyi Ren, Xinyao Niu, Pengcheng Nie, Yuchi Xu, Yudong Liu, Yue Wang, Yuxuan Cai, Zhenyu Gu, Zhiyuan Liu, and Zonghong Dai. Yi: Open foundation models by 01.ai, 2024.
- [48] Amanpreet Singh, Vivek Natarajan, Meet Shah, Yu Jiang, Xinlei Chen, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Marcus Rohrbach. Towards vqa models that can read. *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 8309–8318, 2019.
- [49] Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Making the v in vqa matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in visual question answering. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 127:398 – 414, 2016.
- [50] Yuanzhan 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*, abs/2307.06281, 2023.

- [51] Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoqi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, Cong Wei, Botao Yu, Ruibin Yuan, Renliang Sun, Ming Yin, Boyuan Zheng, Zhenzhu Yang, Yibo Liu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhui Chen. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. *ArXiv*, abs/2311.16502, 2023.
- [52] Bo Li*, Peiyuan Zhang*, Kaicheng Zhang, Fanyi Pu, Xinrun Du, Yuhao Dong, Haotian Liu, Yuanhan Zhang, Ge Zhang, Chunyuan Li, and Ziwei Liu. Lmms-eval: Accelerating the development of large multimodal models, March 2024.
- [53] Shengqiong Wu, Hao Fei, Leigang Qu, Wei Ji, and Tat-Seng Chua. Next-gpt: Any-to-any multimodal llm. *ArXiv*, abs/2309.05519, 2023.
- [54] Jun Zhan, Junqi Dai, Jiasheng Ye, Yunhua Zhou, Dong Zhang, Zhigeng Liu, Xin Zhang, Ruibin Yuan, Ge Zhang, Linyang Li, Hang Yan, Jie Fu, Tao Gui, Tianxiang Sun, Yugang Jiang, and Xipeng Qiu. Anygpt: Unified multimodal llm with discrete sequence modeling. *ArXiv*, abs/2402.12226, 2024.
- [55] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katie Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, Roman Ring, Eliza Rutherford, Serkan Cabi, Tengda Han, Zhitao Gong, Sina Samangooei, Marianne Monteiro, Jacob Menick, Sebastian Borgeaud, Andy Brock, Aida Nematzadeh, Sahand Sharifzadeh, Mikolaj Binkowski, Ricardo Barreira, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew Zisserman, and Karen Simonyan. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2204.14198, 2022.
- [56] Hang Zhang, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. Video-llama: An instruction-tuned audio-visual language model for video understanding. *ArXiv*, abs/2306.02858, 2023.

A Appendix / supplemental material

A.1 Heuristics for data curation

Similar to visual instruction tuning [5], data curation is an important step to ensure good performance. During the curation, we have found some heuristics that can improve the performance. We list them below.

1. **Conflicts between short answers and long answers.** Many datasets we collected are domain-specific, and some of them are classification tasks like NLVR2 [24] and Dream-Sim [26]. For these datasets, we convert them into multiple-choice QA format to avoid conflicts between repeated short-answers and some long answers from other datasets.
2. **Addition of image denotation in the text for each question.** We manually add image denotations like "the first image", "image 2", "the right image", etc. to each question in our dataset to make sure the question involved with multiple images is clear to answer.
3. **Positions of the "<image>" placeholder.** For each item with multiple images, we write some rules to randomly put the image placeholders at the beginning of the first question or the end of the first question. This technique is also used by the curation LLaVA-665k [6].

B Prompt Template

Please generate 10 independent QA pairs. Each question shall involve at least 2 images to answer. Try to cover different ability like reasoning, planning, common sense understanding, etc. Be creative with your questions and ****make sure the answers require integration of information from multiple images****. Use "image i" to refer to the i-th image in your questions.

Output format:

Question: First question?

Answer: The answer to the first question.

Question: Second question?

Answer: The answer to the second question.

...

Table 5: Propmt template used to curate the Synthetic-GPT4 subset.