

Two Giraffes in a Dirt Field: Using Game Play to Investigate Situation Modelling in Large Multimodal Models

Sherzod Hakimov¹, Yerkezhan Abdullayeva¹, Kushal Koshti¹, Antonia Schmidt¹, Yan Weiser¹, Anne Beyer¹, David Schlangen^{1,2}

¹Computational Linguistics, Department of Linguistics
University of Potsdam, Germany

²German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence (DFKI), Berlin, Germany
firstname.lastname@uni-potsdam.de

Abstract

While the situation has improved for text-only models, it again seems to be the case currently that multimodal (text and image) models develop faster than ways to evaluate them. In this paper, we bring a recently developed evaluation paradigm from text models to multimodal models, namely evaluation through the goal-oriented game (self) play, complementing reference-based and preference-based evaluation. Specifically, we define games that challenge a model’s capability to represent a situation from visual information and align such representations through dialogue. We find that the largest closed models perform rather well on the games that we define, while even the best open-weight models struggle with them. On further analysis, we find that the exceptional deep captioning capabilities of the largest models drive some of the performance. There is still room to grow for both kinds of models, ensuring the continued relevance of the benchmark.

1 Introduction

Large *multimodal* models (LMMs; such as GPT4o,¹ LLaVA (Liu et al., 2023a)) that can handle images as input together with text seem poised to play a significant role in constructing a new, more capable kind of situated interactive agent. What is particularly exciting about them is that they, in contrast to earlier attempts at building such systems, as surveyed recently by Suglia et al. (2024), promise to be *generalist* models that can be adapted to tasks at hand through methods that require few or even no data and training cost. Current methods for evaluating them, however, largely do not address this potential, following mostly the *reference-based evaluation* paradigm and probing for reasoning and recognition capabilities in static contexts.

In this paper, we investigate whether a recent new evaluation paradigm for text-based

¹<https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>




Figure 1: Example dialogue from *MatchIt* game, between players A (turns highlighted in purple) and B (orange), and a programmatic “game master” (grey). The task is to identify whether A and B were given the same image or not, via text interaction only. The game master scaffolds the game by prompting the players and relaying information.

models—*game-agency-based evaluation*—can be transferred to the evaluation of text and image models. Specifically, we selected one of the various frameworks that appeared last year for defining such games, clemgame (Chalamalasetti et al., 2023), and adapted it to evaluate multimodal mod-

els. We defined three dialogue games (on reference, image comparison, and navigation) that focus on the ability to build a model of a situation that is presented as an image and, in two of them, to align it with a partner.

We make the following observations:

- Current LLMs are capable of conducting situated interactions if given enough scaffolding by an agent framework.
- There are significant differences in the degree of this ability, however, between commercial and open models (39 points on our 0–100 scale between the best of each kind), mirroring the situation that text-only models were in previously (Beyer et al., 2024).
- Much of the performance is driven by the excellent *deep captioning* abilities of the largest models; these break down on very detailed abstract images.
- Elementary capabilities for representing spatial configurations (or, more abstractly, graph structures) seem to be present in the larger models.

2 Related Work

Evaluating LLMs Following traditional practice in NLP, the first main paradigm for evaluation LLMs was what can be called *reference-based evaluation*, where a model response to a test item is compared to a known correct response. As a reaction to the rapidly increasing scores of the latest models and the saturation of existing benchmarks (Wang et al., 2019), meta-benchmarks have been set up, such as HELM (Liang et al., 2022) and BIGbench (Srivastava et al., 2022). While this method offers control over the tasks that are tested, a recently highlighted problem is ensuring train/test splits in the era of extremely large (and intransparent) training sets (Magar and Schwartz, 2022). Another popular method for evaluation falls under what could be called the *preference-based evaluation* paradigm. This is represented by Chatbot Arena (Chiang et al., 2024), which lets users present queries to two models in parallel and then ask for preferences. This has the advantage of higher ecological validity as the human/system interaction is being evaluated. However, it comes with the cost of very little control over the tested distribution of tasks. Finally, a newly emerging

paradigm is *game-agency-based evaluation* (Chalamalasetti et al., 2023; Chan et al., 2023; Qiao et al., 2023). In this paradigm, evaluation is framed as measuring the success of LLMs in conducting task-oriented interactions in simple conversational games. This has the advantage that it does not require user interaction (unlike the preference-based paradigm) while still keeping goal orientation and strategy in focus. In this paper, we want to explore this paradigm for the evaluation of LLMs.

Evaluating LMMs The evaluation of the newer field of Large Multimodal Models so far mostly remains within the *reference-base evaluation* paradigm,² with datasets such as *MME* (Fu et al., 2023), *MMBench* (Liu et al., 2023b), *MMMU* (Yue et al., 2023), and *SEED-Bench* v1 (Li et al., 2023b) and v2 (Li et al., 2023a). These include image and text pairs as test instances for various tasks such as question answering, reasoning, answering scientific questions, etc. *VHELM*(visual HELM)³ uses *MMMU* and two other visual question answering datasets (Gurari et al., 2018; Goyal et al., 2017) to extend the HELM framework to test multimodal LLMs. Our aim here is not to replace this kind of evaluation but rather to complement it with a focus on different capabilities, or at least differently challenged capabilities (see below).

Before we describe the general structure of our games, we will briefly also review literature relevant to each of them separately.

Reference Games The use of reference games where one player gets another to identify an item through verbal means, goes back to at least Krauss and Weinheimer (1964) and Lewis (1969) in linguistics and psycholinguistics, and has seen increased use in NLP in recent years as well (Shen et al., 2018; Haber et al., 2019; Sadler et al., 2024). Its attraction lies in the very clear way in which it brings out context dependence (a good referring expression not only *describes* the target object, but also *excludes* distractor objects) and, especially in settings where there are repeated references, partner-effects as well (precedence; (Brennan and Clark, 1996)).

²Although first attempts are underway to establish attempts in the *preference-based evaluation* paradigm as well, with the Multimodality Chatbot Arena <http://vlarena.opengvlab.com>. This however seems to be much less popular so far than its text-based counterpart.

³Accessed in May 2024. <https://crfm.stanford.edu/helm/vhelm/latest/>

Image Comparison The second game that we implement follows a suggestion by Schlangen (2019), who uses it to illustrate the concept of a *Grounded Agreement Game*. The idea here is to go beyond settings like Visual Dialog (Das et al., 2017) or Guesswhat?! (de Vries et al., 2017), which were quite popular in the language and vision field at the time. The criticism in this paper was that these settings while eliciting dialogue in the sense of sequential turns from different speakers, do not provide much purpose to the interaction. Grounded Agreement Games, on the other hand, by letting players share a common goal of reaching mutual understanding, provide a “*joint purpose*, a shared sense of semantic ownership of the interaction” (Schlangen, 2019). Also related, in incorporating visual information and cooperation between participants, is spot-the-difference (Lopes et al., 2018); this corpus, however, has only been used for linguistic analysis.

Navigation and Exploration Following natural language navigation instructions is a well-established task in the intersection of Computer Vision and NLP, and many special purpose models have been built in recent years (Gu et al., 2022). The task described below is related but posed to *generalist models*, and tasks the model only with exploration. More abstractly, what is tested is the ability to explore graph structures. As a task for the assessment of models, something related has been used by Momennejad et al. (2023) in CogEval. Their results suggest that LLMs lack emergent cognitive map comprehension or planning competence, finding that LLMs can navigate simple graphs but struggle with spatial relationships and complex graphs due to looping, missing edges, and longer trajectories. The NLGraph benchmark (Wang et al., 2023) tested LLMs’ ability to perform explicit graph reasoning on eight tasks. The models perform basic graph reasoning on cycle and shortest path tasks but fail on the Hamilton Path, according to the NLGraph benchmark assessment. (Bubeck et al., 2023) demonstrated anecdotally that GPT-4 seems to have extensive spatial reasoning and map navigation abilities. This was criticized by (Liu and Wu, 2023), who showed that responses may become more error-prone when graph density exceeds a certain threshold, potentially causing hallucinations.




Figure 2: Relating the Dialogue Games used here to the construct model from Schlangen (2023b)

3 Dialogue Games as Benchmarking Tool

Construct Validity We follow (Chalamalasetti et al., 2023) in striving for construct validity in our measurements and taking inspiration from the model of (Schlangen, 2023c,a). As can be seen in Figure 2 (modified from Chalamalasetti et al. (2023)), we link the games introduced here to the *situation model* (representing the situation in which the task at hand is to be performed), *multimodal grounding* (linking language and visual information), and, at least in simple forms, to *conversational grounding* and the *agent model*. See the original papers for an explanation of the model and the other components. How the individual games challenge these aspects will be explained below.

Scaffolding Game Play with a GameMaster

We decided to use clemgame/clembench (Chalamalasetti et al., 2023) as the framework to realise the idea of “self-play for evaluation”. The main idea of this framework is that dialogue games are specified through *prompt templates*, which explain the game goals to the players in natural language. The game goals include the task description and specific rules for formatting responses (so that they can be parsed). A programmatic GameMaster then realises the game play through the instantiation of the templates with specific game instances (e.g., in the game from Figure 1, an instance would be defined by a given pair of images), and the turn-by-turn prompting of the *players* (which can be models or human players).

The resulting *episodes* are then scored through game-specific *scoring rules*. For each game, one scoring metric is determined as the *quality metric* (always ranging from 0 (worst) to 100 (best)). An overall score is computed by averaging this metric by game and then over games. Games where a player violates the parsing rules count as not




Figure 3: Examples of images of type *grid* and various subcategories. **Top left:** distinguishing feature is in row, **top right:** pattern can be described as letter “T”, **bottom left:** feature is in column, **bottom right:** grid is initialised randomly

played (until the end); the percentage of games played can serve as a metric for *formatting instruction following ability*, whereas the *quality metric* measures the ability to play the respective game successfully (only for those episodes that were played until the end). We aggregate these two scores to a single number, the *clemscore*, as the quality metric weighted by % played (scaled to the interval $[0, 1]$).

4 Three Multimodal Games

In this section, we describe the three different games that we set up, with a focus on which capabilities exactly they are meant to target. Each game includes both multimodal and textual variant (more details in Appendix).

4.1 Reference: The Reference Game

Game Description Player A is presented with three images, and tasked with getting player B, who may see them in a different order, to identify the first of these. Player B is then presented with the three images, potentially in a different order, together with A’s reference, and is tasked to identify the referent. This is a single-turn game (Figure 1).

Capability Tested The idea is that this game challenges the referring model to go beyond simple descriptions of the image content (which, in the form of caption generation, of course is a standard task that may very well be part of the training of the model) towards *contrastive descriptions* that exclude the distractor images, and ideally also *efficient descriptions* that do so by concentrating on distinguishing features (Gatt and Krahmer, 2018).

Scoring Each episode is scored as 1 if successful (B picks out the intended referent), 0 otherwise.

Instances We created different sets of instances,

with the hypothesis that they might challenge the models differently. First, we created grid-like pixel images (Figure 3), which we varied in terms of ‘compressability’: from simple-to-recognise (for humans) patterns to random placements. We created these stimuli in two different renderings: As character-based ‘images’ (hence suitable for text-only models, to allow for a comparison in performance; filled cells are marked with the character “X”), as well as real images (converted from the text representations).

Second, we selected sets of photographs (or photo-realistic renderings) of scenes or configurations of objects, to contrast handling of more naturalistic scenes with the set of grid-images. We included instances from three datasets: ADE20K (Zhou et al., 2017), DOCCI (Onoe et al., 2024), CLEVR (Johnson et al., 2017). We selected one target and two distractors chosen based on the similarity to the target (based on available meta-data in each dataset; scene category information in ADE20K, the list of concepts in DOCCI, object categories in CLEVR).

Third, we created boards that include *pentomino* puzzle pieces to analyse whether models are capable of handling unusual shapes and crowded scenes. We take code from Sadler et al. (2024) and generate a wide variety of scenes, in sets of images with very small differences. From this, we sample randomly.

4.2 Alignment: The MatchIt Game

Game Description Player A is presented with an image, as is Player B. The two images are either *identical*, or *different*. The task of the players is to find out which is the case. This game is heavily scaffolded by the GameMaster, which prompts the players to produce a description and ask a question of the other player. In the 1q (1 question) version, the question is put to the respective other player, and the answer is relayed, after which the GameMaster asks for a decision. In the 3q version, three rounds of questioning and answering are facilitated; in 5q, five rounds. The *info* version is like 3q, but the players are explicitly informed that they will have three questions.

Capability Tested Our hypothesis is that good gameplay requires reasoning about what distinguishing features could be, the presence or absence of which would allow for making the same/different decision. This can then influence both the initial description that is produced as well as what

questions are asked. In principle, allowing more rounds of mutual questioning should make the task easier.

Scoring Each episode is scored 1 if successful (A and B both make the correct determination), 0 otherwise.

Instances Three difficulties were defined for the multimodal variant of MatchIt: both players get the same image, both players get similar images or completely different images, the hypothesis being that different images are the easiest to recognize, followed by same and similar image pairs. The curation rationale for a similar picture was that both photos could be described with the same (short) sentence, but their difference should be striking enough that one (short) sentence should be enough. Figure 4 illustrates a similar image pair. The images used were taken from the *Visual Genome* dataset (Krishna et al., 2017) and sampled for the category of similar photos in a multi-step process via Jaccard similarity of sets of object annotations and their attributes and cosine similarity of *CLIP* image encoder embeddings (Radford et al., 2021). The detailed process is described in Appendix C. Ten instances of each difficulty (same, similar, different) were part of the final game play, for a total of 30 instances.

The base grids used for the text based ASCII variant of MatchIt consist of the *diagonal*, *letter* and *shape* grids used in the Reference game. Besides pairs of same and different grids, we used two sets of instances with similar grid pairs. One set of instances was created by either mirroring the grids vertically or horizontally or by turning them 90 degrees and another set of instances consisted of grids paired with new grids with edit distance of two, where the symbol was inverted at two random positions of the grid. Figure 4 shows the modifications for similar grid pairs. For each of the difficulties (same, similar with transformed motive, similar with edit distance of two and different grids), 10 instances were part of the final game play, for a total of 40 instances. Finally, we also sampled accordingly from the set of pentomino images described above in Section 4.1.

4.3 Navigation & Exploration: Map Game

Game Description This is a single-player game in which the player explores a network of connected rooms. At any point in the game, the player is in one of the rooms of the network (or *map*). The

Original Grid					Similar Grid (1)				
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
X	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	X
X	X	X	□	□	□	□	X	X	X
X	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	□	X
X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Similar Grid (2)				
X	X	X	X	X
X	□	X	□	□
X	X	X	□	□
X	□	□	□	□
X	□	X	X	X

Figure 4: Example grids for the `matchit_ascii` version of the game



Figure 5: Example of a pair of similar images for the multimodal version of MatchIt.

player can move into adjacent rooms by issuing a navigational command (a cardinal direction). Information about the room is relayed to the player by the GameMaster in various forms (as image or text); information about the directions in which adjacent rooms can be found is always relayed via text.⁴ Within this general setting, we define several subgames: *Go to X (G2X)*, in which the player is tasked to find a room of a specific category and indicate when they think the goal has been achieved. *Explore Exhaustively (EE)*, in which the player is tasked with visiting all rooms of the map and indicate when it thinks the goal has been achieved. In a *question answering* extension of this variant (*EE-qa*), the GameMaster closes the game by asking three questions about the map; in *graph reasoning (EE-gr)*, the player is prompted to represent the already explored graph explicitly. Lastly, instead of presenting the room as a category or image to the player, we give an *image description (EE-id)*.

Capability Tested Unlike in the previous two games, the situation relevant to the game is not observable in one go but rather must be explored actively. To perform well in this family of games, an internal representation of the map must be kept. Moreover, to be efficient, some reasoning over this implicit structure is required to keep track of as yet unexplored rooms.

Scoring Scoring is more complex in this game. We

⁴More specifically, the environment that we use is the MapWorld of Ilinykh et al. (2019a).




Figure 6: Environment for the text-only Map game. The player (denoted with **P**) is currently in the *Nursery* and has the option to move to one of the neighboring rooms (*Bar*, *Closet* or *Bedroom*). The player moves by choosing a cardinal direction.

define a metric for *efficiency*, which measures how many of the performed moves were required (see Appendix for the full definition); *question answering*, which measures the percentage of questions answered correctly (in the variant with questions); and *success*, which is 1 if the player ended the game in a success condition (indicated room found / all rooms explored), and 0 otherwise.

Instances Experiments on the *EE* subgame test the effect of map complexity by changing map size and connectedness. The maps can have 4, 6, or 8 rooms, whereas, in the 6 or 8-room case, we distinguish between maps with and without a cyclic path in them, yielding five experiments in total. We expect larger and more connected maps to be harder to explore. The same five experiments are also repeated for the *EE-id* subgame. For our *EE-gr* subgame, we reuse the three experiments on map sizes from above. The goal is to have comparable results and grasp the influence of explicit graph reasoning. We also conduct three experiments on the *EE-qa* subgame. Here, we vary how often a room category is repeated; we call this the *ambiguity* of the map. The models are tested at three levels of ambiguity: *none*, *slight* and *strong*. We expect it to be harder to answer questions about a more ambiguous map correctly. On the *G2X* subgame, we experiment with distances from start to target, either starting on, close to, or far from the target. The hypothesis is that finding a target room nearby is easier than finding it far away.

Experiments are conducted with 10 instances each.

5 Results

5.1 Overall Results

Models: We benchmarked both open-weight and commercial models. From the commercial models, we decided to evaluate Claude-3-Opus, GPT-4-vision (which refers to the version *1106*), GPT-4o, and Gemini-1.5-Flash.⁵ From the open-weight models, we included the models that support multi-turn dialogue and have been optimised to follow chat templates:⁶ LLaVA (llava-1.5-13B, llava-1.6-34B, llava-1.5-13B) (Liu et al., 2023a) and Idefics (idefics-80B, idefics-9B) (Laurençon et al., 2023). LLaVA models do not support the encoding of multiple images in a single turn and thus the experiments on *Reference Game* (with images) are excluded for these models (since three images are given in a single turn). More details about the models can be found in Appendix A. The benchmark results are given in Table 1.

What first catches the eye is the significant difference in overall score (*clemscore*) between closed-weight / commercial and open-weight models, with the best open model trailing the worst commercial for 16 points and the best commercial one for 39 points. We can compare this to the situation with text-only games, where Beyer et al. (2024) report that the best/best distance was 55.25 points in June 2023, 41.18 five months later (November 2023), and in May 2024 was reduced to 24.94. This nicely reflects the somewhat less mature state of LMMs compared to LLMs.

What is also striking is that *% played*, which measures the ability of the models to follow formatting instructions, is generally high; indicating that the scaffolding offered by the GameMaster was strong, but also perhaps that indeed these models are well tuned. We can also see that, in particular, the performance on the *Reference Game* seems to be a differentiator between models; while the commercial models are all in the same level on *MatchIt*, they differ more there (and to a lesser degree also on the *Map Navigation Games*).

To investigate further, we turn to a more fine-grained analysis via the game variants and instance sets.

⁵We excluded Gemini 1.5 Pro because querying the API backend resulted in many experiments being timed out, and Gemini 1.0 Pro was excluded since it does not support multi-turn dialogue.

⁶https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/en/chat_templating

model	clscr	avg %p	avg ql	mt %p	mt ql	mp %p	mp ql	ref %p	ref ql
gpt-4o-2024-05-13	77.96	94.25	82.72	100.00	88.54	82.74	76.84	100.00	82.79
gpt-4-1106-vision-preview	68.48	99.21	69.02	100.00	84.27	98.15	73.80	99.48	49.00
claude-3-opus-20240229	65.43	99.80	65.56	100.00	82.29	99.41	76.07	100.00	38.31
gemini-1.5-flash-latest	54.91	84.62	64.89	84.90	83.38	68.96	59.96	100.00	51.33
llava-v1.6-34b-hf	38.69	67.56	57.26	96.46	54.29	6.22	80.83	100.00	36.67
llava-v1.6-vicuna-13b-hf	34.14	61.43	55.58	76.67	72.95	7.63	61.56	100.00	32.22
llava-1.5-13b-hf	28.57	67.94	42.06	97.29	46.49	6.52	44.68	100.00	35.00
idefics-80b-instruct	27.53	67.11	41.01	84.72	43.35	16.61	47.34	100.00	32.35
idefics-9b-instruct	17.43	50.61	34.43	100.00	35.73	0.45	36.67	51.39	30.88

Table 1: *clscr* is the “clemscore” (which is the product of *avg %p* ($\ast \frac{1}{100}$), the average percentage of games played to completion, and *ql*, the measure of quality of the completed games). *mt* is MatchIt, *mp* is Map Game, *ref* is Reference Game. Results are first averaged by game (over all variants of the game), then over these averages. Note that for the Llava models, the results on *Reference Game* only include the ASCII-representations (see main text).

5.2 Zooming in on the Games

5.2.1 The Reference Game

See Table 4 (Appendix B) for a detailed breakdown of results by instance set. We review some of our initial hypotheses and discuss to what extent the data has borne them out.

Hypothesis (H): Due to naming difficulties, the task is harder for more abstract images (grids, pentomino pieces) than, for instance, sets with photos of common scenes (ADE20K, DOCCI).

Finding (F): Both GPT models & claude-3 (but not gemini) get much higher scores on ADE, DOCCI, and CLEVR experiments than on grid and pentomino experiments. The pentomino experiment results (bad across the board) show that the task is far from being solved. We speculate that this set might touch the limits of the vision encoder and its ability to distinguish objects (of usual kinds). See Figures 8 and 9 for sample outputs.

H: Random images are more challenging to describe than patterns and objects.

F: Indeed, the results in Table 4 show that most models struggled with random grids for both textual and multimodal variants of the grid game. The same difference can be observed for photo images vs. random collections of pentomino pieces.

H: Given that the base models from which the models were trained are text models, even the resulting models perform better on the text-only renderings (in the grid experiments) than the image renderings.

F: Results are mixed. Some models are better at ASCII representations (Gemini-1.5, GPT-4o), while others are better at multimodal representations (claude-3, GPT-4V). See Figures 10 and 11 for sample outputs.

H: To reach high scores in this game, player A needs to do Referring Expression Generation (REG; Gatt and Krahmer (2018)), as opposed to

captioning.

F: We were initially surprised by the high scores achieved, in particular by the GPT-4s. On inspecting the transcripts, it became clear that the model achieves its high performance in parts through its exceptional ability to produce detailed descriptions (especially for the photo sets), thereby reaching a level of detail where a description of the target itself is enough to single it out (see also Appendix B.4 for an ablation on the (missing) effect of the distractors). This is also evident from the average number of generated tokens, which is 27 for GPT-4V and 20 for GPT-4o, as compared to 14 for Gemini and Claude. We also find little evidence for the use of negations (“the one without cars”), which can be an efficient REG strategy (although claude does produce this occasionally). As mentioned above, performance breaks down for the pentomino dataset. Overall, this suggests that the game, as currently defined, leans more towards evaluating deep captioning (where the other models still have room to grow).

5.2.2 The MatchIt Game

The results breakdown is in Table 6 (Appendix C).

H: Game play improves if the number of available questions is known beforehand (variant *info*) since it gives players some overview of game structure and the opportunity to strategise.

F: Does not hold; no substantial difference between *3q* and *info*; see Table 6, Figure 14.

H: Being able to ask more questions should translate into more accurate results.

F: As seen before, the main score does not differ substantially between different game versions. This indicates that the initial description carries a large load; as discussed above, models with very well-developed capabilities to produce deep descriptions are, hence, at an advantage. This suggests that future work should enforce the idea that the questions

are valued more highly, for example, by imposing length restrictions on the initial description.

H: Pairs of similar images pose the biggest challenge (shown for human players in a similar setting by Sagi et al. (2012)).

F: Figure 15 shows that this bears out for the image-based instances. This is less clear for the text-based instances.

H: Pairs of very different images will be the easiest to recognise (as being different) because the initial description might already make clear the incompatibility.

F: This has not been shown. Through all versions of inputs (grids, photos, and pentomino pictures), the highest scores are achieved in the “same image/grid” case. This further indicates that the followed strategy relies on comparative reasoning to a lesser degree than anticipated.

5.2.3 The Map Navigation Games

As can be seen in Table 1 above, of the three games, performance is lowest on the Map Navigation Games, showing an especially pronounced gap between the commercial and the open-weight models, which are only able to finish a much smaller percentage of games (*% played*). A detailed results breakdown is in Table 17 (Appendix D).

H: A larger map makes exhaustive exploration more difficult. There is a higher chance of missing something if there are more things to discover.

F: Holds true for smaller models. Looking at the results in table 13, a slight downward trend for Gemini-1.5 and Claude-3 is also noticeable. The GPT models, however, appear to be behaving differently, showing better results on larger maps. This is likely due to their thoroughness when it comes to exploration (almost 8 steps on average, compared to less than 5 by Claude-3; see Table 17). The GPTs tend to take more redundant steps after exploring the entire map. The ratio of redundant exploration to useful exploration decreases with larger map sizes, leading to higher scores.

H: A more complex map layout (w/ cycles) is harder to navigate.

F: Table 13 seem to indicate that this holds. While there is only a marginal difference between maps of medium size with and without cycles, the difference becomes more apparent with large maps.

H: In *G2X*, the further away from the starting position the target is, the harder it is to identify it, as more exploration is needed and distractor categories might be encountered.

F: The results in Table 16 show a clear correlation between distance and success. Not a single model could accurately find every target room at a distance of 3 or more.

H: In *EE-qa*, repeated room categories make question answering more difficult, and multiple similar rooms will make it harder to distinguish between the rooms.

F: As Table 15 shows, increasing ambiguity (slight ambiguity to strong ambiguity) leads to decreasing performance in question answering. Besides challenging the representation capabilities more, larger maps also require better exploration, which seems challenging to the models.

H: Being provided with a textual description of the room rather than a name or a picture of the room should help models trained on smaller datasets.

F: Table 13 demonstrates that indeed smaller models like Idefics and Llava achieve higher scores in *EE-id* than text-only and multimodal *EE*. In fact, Idefics-9B and Llava-1.6-34b were able to play only *EE-id*. The larger models, however, performed much better when given additional visual information.

Overall, we take these findings as an indication that the game posed a significant challenge to the models, and that successful completion requires sophisticated representational abilities.

6 Conclusions

We have transferred a recent evaluation paradigm—game-based evaluation—from the text-only domain to the evaluation of multimodal models. We have set up a set of games that challenge, in different ways, mostly a model’s capability to represent (and describe) a *situation*. We have systematically varied the complexity of these situations, as well as how they are given to the model (where we have included, for comparison, purely text-based renderings). We argue that the results on the benchmark are a valid measurement of (aspects of) specific underlying capabilities, which static benchmarks do not address. We observe a large difference in performance between the largest commercial models and the smaller open-weight models, albeit to a smaller degree than other researchers have observed in the early stages of text-only models. The benchmarks indicate that there is room to grow both for the closed and the open models, while there already is a basis for the development of new kinds of situated interactive systems.

Limitations

The first and biggest limitation is that the prompts that define the games are only given in, and hence the results are restricted to, English, even though several of the tested models are listed as being able to process other languages as well. While we have yet to do this, translating the prompts and measuring their impact should be straightforward; we plan to do this in future work.

As discussed in the text above, some of the findings are limited to certain respect by the fact that excellent capabilities of providing image captions open up simpler strategies than what we initially wanted to challenge. While this doesn't impact the significance of the measurements—there is still room to grow, clearly so for the open weight models, but also for the closed one—it should again be straightforward to modify the games so that interactional phenomena (such as valuing efficiency in producing referring expressions in the *Reference Game*, and putting weight on the questioning in the *MatchIt Game*) are further emphasised. Similarly, the amount of scaffolding provided by the GameMaster is quite high (e.g., in the *MatchIt* game, it determines much of the strategy), which limits the amount to which we gain insight into the strategic abilities of the models. But again, reducing it in future versions of the game should be straightforward.

References

- Anne Beyer, Kranti Chalamalasetti, Sherzod Hakimov, Brielen Madureira, Philipp Sadler, and David Schlangen. 2024. [clmbench₂₀₂₄: A challenging, dynamic, complementary, multilingual benchmark and underlying flexible framework for llms as multi-action agents](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2405.20859.
- Susan E. Brennan and Herbert H. Clark. 1996. Conceptual pacts and lexical choice in conversation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 22(6):1482–1493.
- Sébastien Bubeck, Varun Chandrasekaran, Ronen Eldan, Johannes Gehrke, Eric Horvitz, Ece Kamar, Peter Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Scott M. Lundberg, Harsha Nori, Hamid Palangi, Marco Túlio Ribeiro, and Yi Zhang. 2023. [Sparks of artificial general intelligence: Early experiments with GPT-4](#). *CoRR*, abs/2303.12712.
- Kranti Chalamalasetti, Jana Götze, Sherzod Hakimov, Brielen Madureira, Philipp Sadler, and David Schlangen. 2023. [clmbench: Using game play to evaluate chat-optimized language models as conversational agents](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 11174–11219, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chi-Min Chan, Weize Chen, Yusheng Su, Jianxuan Yu, Wei Xue, Shanghang Zhang, Jie Fu, and Zhiyuan Liu. 2023. [Chateval: Towards better llm-based evaluators through multi-agent debate](#). *CoRR*, abs/2308.07201.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. 2023. [Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality](#).
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Lianmin Zheng, Ying Sheng, Anastasios Nikolas Angelopoulos, Tianle Li, Dacheng Li, Hao Zhang, Banghua Zhu, Michael Jordan, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. 2024. [Chatbot arena: An open platform for evaluating llms by human preference](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.04132.
- Abhishek Das, Satwik Kottur, Khushi Gupta, Avi Singh, Deshraj Yadav, José M. F. Moura, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. 2017. [Visual dialog](#). In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2017, Honolulu, HI, USA, July 21-26, 2017*, pages 1080–1089. IEEE Computer Society.
- Harm de Vries, Florian Strub, Sarath Chandar, Olivier Pietquin, Hugo Larochelle, and Aaron C. Courville. 2017. [Guesswhat?! visual object discovery through multi-modal dialogue](#). In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2017, Honolulu, HI, USA, July 21-26, 2017*, pages 4466–4475. IEEE Computer Society.
- 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. 2023. [MME: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for multimodal large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2306.13394.
- Albert Gatt and Emiel Kraemer. 2018. Survey of the State of the Art in Natural Language Generation: Core tasks, applications and evaluation. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 61:65–170.
- Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. 2017. [Making the V in VQA matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in visual question answering](#). In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2017, Honolulu, HI, USA, July 21-26, 2017*, pages 6325–6334. IEEE Computer Society.
- Jing Gu, Eliana Stefani, Qi Wu, Jesse Thomason, and Xin Wang. 2022. [Vision-and-language navigation: A survey of tasks, methods, and future directions](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7606–7623, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Danna Gurari, Qing Li, Abigale J. Stangl, Anhong Guo, Chi Lin, Kristen Grauman, Jiebo Luo, and Jeffrey P. Bigham. 2018. [Vizwiz grand challenge: Answering visual questions from blind people](#). In *2018 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2018, Salt Lake City, UT, USA, June 18-22, 2018*, pages 3608–3617. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE Computer Society.
- Janosch Haber, Tim Baumgärtner, Ece Takmaz, Lieke Gelderloos, Elia Bruni, and Raquel Fernández. 2019. [The PhotoBook dataset: Building common ground through visually-grounded dialogue](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1895–1910, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nikolai Ilinykh, Sina Zarrieß, and David Schlangen. 2019a. [Meet up! a corpus of joint activity dialogues in a visual environment](#). In *Proceedings of the 23rd Workshop on the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dialogue - Full Papers*, London, United Kingdom. SEM-DIAL.
- Nikolai Ilinykh, Sina Zarrieß, and David Schlangen. 2019b. [Tell me more: A dataset of visual scene description sequences](#). In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Natural Language Generation*, pages 152–157, Tokyo, Japan. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Justin Johnson, Bharath Hariharan, Laurens van der Maaten, Li Fei-Fei, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Ross B. Girshick. 2017. [CLEVR: A diagnostic dataset for compositional language and elementary visual reasoning](#). In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2017, Honolulu, HI, USA, July 21-26, 2017*, pages 1988–1997. IEEE Computer Society.
- Robert M. Krauss and Sidney Weinheimer. 1964. Changes in reference phrases as a function of frequency of usage in social interaction: A preliminary study. *Psychonomic Science*, 1:266–278.
- Ranjay Krishna, Yuke Zhu, Oliver Groth, Justin Johnson, Kenji Hata, Joshua Kravitz, Stephanie Chen, Yannis Kalantidis, Li-Jia Li, David A. Shamma, Michael S. Bernstein, and Li Fei-Fei. 2017. [Visual genome: Connecting language and vision using crowdsourced dense image annotations](#). *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, 123(1):32–73.
- 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. 2023. [Obelics: An open web-scale filtered dataset of interleaved image-text documents](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2306.16527.
- David Lewis. 1969. *Convention*. Harvard University Press.
- Bohao Li, Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, Guangzhi Wang, Rui Wang, Ruimao Zhang, and Ying Shan. 2023a. [Seed-bench-2: Benchmarking multimodal large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2311.17092.
- Bohao Li, Rui Wang, Guangzhi Wang, Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, and Ying Shan. 2023b. [Seed-bench: Benchmarking multimodal llms with generative comprehension](#). *CoRR*, abs/2307.16125.
- Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, and *alia*. 2022. [Holistic evaluation of language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2211.09110.
- Chang Liu and Bo Wu. 2023. [Evaluating large language models on graphs: Performance insights and comparative analysis](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.11224.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. 2023a. [Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning](#). *CoRR*, abs/2310.03744.
- 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. 2023b. [Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player?](#) *CoRR*, abs/2307.06281.
- José Lopes, Nils Hemmingsson, and Oliver Åstrand. 2018. [The spot the difference corpus: a multi-modal corpus of spontaneous task oriented spoken interactions](#). In *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation, LREC 2018, Miyazaki, Japan, May 7-12, 2018*. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Inbal Magar and Roy Schwartz. 2022. [Data contamination: From memorization to exploitation](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 157–165, Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ida Momennejad, Hosein Hasanbeig, Felipe Vieira Frujeri, Hiteshi Sharma, Microsoft Research Redmond, sharma Robert Osazuwa, Ness, Nebojsa Jojic, Hamid Palangi, and Jonathan Larson. 2023. [Evaluating cognitive maps in large language models with cogeval: No emergent planning](#). In *Proceedings of NeurIPS 2023*.
- Yasumasa Onoe, Sunayana Rane, Zachary Berger, Yonatan Bitton, Jaemin Cho, Roopal Garg, Alexander Ku, Zarana Parekh, Jordi Pont-Tuset, Garrett Tanzer, Su Wang, and Jason Baldridge. 2024. [Docci: Descriptions of connected and contrasting images](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2404.19753.
- Dan Qiao, Chenfei Wu, Yaobo Liang, Juntao Li, and Nan Duan. 2023. [Gameeval: Evaluating llms on conversational games](#). *CoRR*, abs/2308.10032.
- 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. 2021. [Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision](#). In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2021, 18-24 July 2021, Virtual Event*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR.
- Philipp Sadler, Sherzod Hakimov, and David Schlangen. 2024. [Sharing the cost of success: A game for evaluating and learning collaborative multi-agent instruction giving and following policies](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 14770–14783, Torino, Italia. ELRA and ICCL.
- Eyal Sagi, Dedre Gentner, and Andrew M. Lovett. 2012. [What difference reveals about similarity](#). *Cogn. Sci.*, 36(6):1019–1050.
- David Schlangen. 2019. [Grounded agreement games: Emphasizing conversational grounding in visual dialogue settings](#). *CoRR*, abs/1908.11279.
- David Schlangen. 2023a. [Dialogue games for benchmarking language understanding: Motivation, taxonomy, strategy](#). *CoRR*, abs/2304.07007.
- David Schlangen. 2023b. [On general language understanding](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 8818–8825, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- David Schlangen. 2023c. [What A Situated Language-Using Agent Must be Able to Do: A Top-Down Analysis](#). *CoRR*, abs/2302.08590.
- Judy Hanwen Shen, Matthias Hofer, Bjarke Felbo, and Roger Levy. 2018. [Comparing models of associative meaning: An empirical investigation of reference in simple language games](#). In *Proceedings of the 22nd Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 292–301, Brussels, Belgium. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R. Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, Adrià Garriga-Alonso, Agnieszka Kluska, Aitor Lewkowycz, Akshat Agarwal, Alethea Power, Alex Ray, Alex Warstadt, Alexander W. Kocurek, Ali Safaya, Ali Tazarv, Alice Xiang, Alicia Parrish, Allen Nie, Aman Hussain, Amanda Askell, Amanda Dsouza, Ameet Rahane, Anantharaman S. Iyer, Anders Andreassen, Andrea Santilli, Andreas Stuhlmüller, Andrew M. Dai, Andrew La, Andrew K. Lampinen, Andy Zou, Angela Jiang, Angelica Chen, Anh Vuong, Animesh Gupta, Anna Gottardi, Antonio Norelli, Anu Venkatesh, Arash Gholamidavoodi, Arfa Tabassum, Arul Menezes, Arun Kirubakaran, Asher Mullokandov, Ashish Sabharwal, Austin Herick, Avia Efrat, Aykut Erdem, Ayla Karakas, and et al. 2022. [Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2206.04615.
- Alessandro Suglia, Ioannis Konstas, and Oliver Lemon. 2024. [Visually Grounded Language Learning: a review of language games, datasets, tasks, and models](#). *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 79:173–239.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurélien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023. [Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2302.13971.
- Alex Wang, Yada Pruksachatkun, Nikita Nangia, Amanpreet Singh, Julian Michael, Felix Hill, Omer Levy, and Samuel R. Bowman. 2019. [SuperGLUE: A Stickier Benchmark for General-Purpose Language Understanding Systems](#). In *NeurIPS*, July, pages 1–30.
- Heng Wang, Shangbin Feng, Tianxing He, Zhaoxuan Tan, Xiaochuang Han, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2023. [Can language models solve graph problems in natural language?](#) *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.10037.
- 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. 2024. [Yi: Open foundation models by 01.ai](#). *CoRR*, abs/2403.04652.
- 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 Wenhua Chen. 2023. [MMMU: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert AGI](#). *CoRR*, abs/2311.16502.
- Bolei Zhou, Hang Zhao, Xavier Puig, Sanja Fidler, Adela Barriuso, and Antonio Torralba. 2017. [Scene parsing through ADE20K dataset](#). In *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2017, Honolulu, HI, USA, July 21-26, 2017*, pages 5122–5130. IEEE Computer Society.

A Model Evaluation Details

Model	Base Language Model		Base Image Processor	
	Name	Parameters	Name	Parameters
Idefics-80B	LLaMA (Touvron et al., 2023)	65B	laion/CLIP-ViT	630M
Idefics-9B	LLaMA	7B	laion/CLIP-ViT	630M
Llava-1.5-13B	Vicuna (Chiang et al., 2023)	13B	CLIP-ViT-L-336px	430M
Llava-v1.6-34B	Yi (Young et al., 2024)	13B	LlavaNextImageProcessor	303.5M
Llava-v1.6-vc	Vicuna	34B	LlavaNextImageProcessor	303.5M

Table 2: Internal details for open-weight models

This section provides a detailed view of the models present in our primary results, along with their utilization. As outlined in the main text, four commercial (Claude-3, Gemini-1.5-Flash, Gpt-4o, Gpt-4V-1106) and five open-weight models (Idefics-9B, Idefics-80B, Llava-1.5-13B, Llava-v1.6-34B, Llava-v1.6-vicuna) are included in the primary results. Detailed information about these models can be found in Table 3.

A.1 Image resolution limits

Image resolution in Table 3 defines the maximum scaled-down resolution during image processing. For Claude-3,⁷ though the maximum image resolution is 1568×1568 pixels, it does allow images upto $8k \times 8k$ which are then scaled down to 1568. If any edge of the image exceeds 8k pixels, the model rejects the image. Another constraint specified by Anthropic is the token limit, capped at 1600 tokens per image. Other commercial models only specify the maximum scaled-down resolution without specifying explicit pixel or token constraints. Considering open-weight models, Llava-1.5-13B and Idefics variants specify just one image resolution, and if any image exceeds this, it will be scaled down. In contrast, Llava v1.6 variants provide multiple resolutions and aspect ratios, ensuring images are resized to the closest defined value and preserving their original aspect ratio.

A.2 Compute Details

The commercial models were used by integrating their APIs with the *clmbench* backend,⁸ however the responses were generated in a standard manner directly from their respective servers. For open-weight models, inferencing was conducted on our local A100 cluster, which comprises four Nvidia A100 (80GB) GPUs. The model weights

were distributed evenly on each GPU, and the models used their default precision values. No weights were offloaded to the CPU during inference. The open-weight models considered here are their HuggingFace-compatible versions, loaded via Auto Classes methods to maintain generalizability, which leads to straightforward integration of additional models with minimal changes required⁹.

A.3 Internal Details of Models

The internal details of open-weight models are described in this section. The internal information about the base language model and base image processor is available in Table 2. To train the Idefics models, the authors developed their own dataset - Obelics (Laurençon et al., 2023). This dataset is based on multimodal web documents, so a single sample of this dataset contains multiple images, making these models suitable for multimodal reference game runs. In contrast, the LLaVA models, trained on Visual Question Answering (VQA) tasks involving single image-caption pairs per sample, were excluded from the multimodal reference game runs.

B A Picture Reference Game

B.1 Prompt Templates

The prompt template for both players of the Reference Game is given in Figure 7.

B.2 Overall Results

Table 4 displays the detailed results for the different Reference Game experiments.

B.3 Qualitative Samples

Here, we provide example instances and the respective model responses for the pentomino experiments (Figure 8), the CLEVR and ADE experiments (Figure 9), and the multimodal (Figure 10) and the textual (Figure 11) grid experiments.

B.4 Static Target Image

In order to understand the effect of the distractors on the generated expression, we created another set of instances from the ADE, CLEVR, and DOCCI datasets where the target image is kept the same for all instances, and the distractors are chosen from similar images in the respective datasets. The distractors from the ADE dataset were chosen from the same scene category “bedroom”. For the

⁷<https://docs.anthropic.com/en/docs/vision>

⁸<https://github.com/clp-research/clmbench/tree/main/backends> ⁹https://huggingface.co/docs/transformers/model_doc/auto

Model Name	Parameters	Context length	Image resolution (pixels)	Supports multiple images	Release date	Commercial	Backend	Training data cut-off date
Claude-3	2T	200K	1568x1568	✓	Mar 2024	✓	anthropic	Aug 2023
Gemini-1.5	-	1048K	-	✓	Apr 2024	✓	google	Nov 2023
Gpt-4o	1.76T	128K	768x2000	✓	May 2024	✓	openai	Oct 2023
Gpt-4V-1106	1.76T	128K	768x2000	✓	Nov 2023	✓	openai	Apr 2023
Idefics-80B	80B	2K	224x224	✓	Aug 2023	×	huggingface-multimodal	Feb 2023
Idefics-9B	9B	2K	224x224	✓	Aug 2023	×	huggingface-multimodal	Feb 2023
Llava-1.5-13B	13B	4K	336x336	×	Dec 2023	×	huggingface-multimodal	Sep 2023
Llava-v1.6-34B	34B	4K	672x672 / 336x1344	×	Jan 2024	×	huggingface-multimodal	-
Llava-v1.6-vc	13B	4K	672x672 / 336x1344	×	Jan 2024	×	huggingface-multimodal	-

Table 3: Commercial and open-weight model details: Image resolution - indicates the maximum resolution of the image including any scaling. Supports multiple images - indicates whether the model can process multiple images in a single turn, such as in multimodal reference game. Backend - specifies the underlying script used to access the model for gameplay. Dashes (-) denote information that is not publicly available.

TEMPLATE B.1.1

You are given three images, one is called target and the other two are distractors. Your task is to generate a referring expression that best describes the target image while distinguishing it from the two other distractor images. The first image is <IMAGE_POSITION>, the second image is <IMAGE_POSITION>, and the third image is <IMAGE_POSITION>.

Instruction: Describe the target image. Generate the referring expression starting with the tag "Expression: " for the given target image. Omit any other text.

Target image: <IMAGE_PATH>
 Second image: <IMAGE_PATH>
 Third image: <IMAGE_PATH>

TEMPLATE B.1.2

Expression: \$EXPRESSION\$

TEMPLATE B.1.3

You are given three images. You are also given a referring expression that describes one of the given images. Your task is to select the image that matches the given referring expression. Generate only the number (in text) of the image that matches the given expression by selecting first, second, or third.

TARGET_EXPRESSION

Question: Which image does the expression refer to? Start with the tag "Answer: ", followed by your selection. Omit any other text.

First image: <IMAGE_PATH>
 Second image: <IMAGE_PATH>
 Third image: <IMAGE_PATH>

TEMPLATE B.1.4

Answer: \$ANSWER\$

(a) Prompt template for Player A (Instruction Giver) in the Reference Game.

(b) Prompt template for Player B (Instruction Follower) in the Reference Game

Figure 7: Reference game prompt templates for both players




Figure 8: Sample outputs generated by the models for the pentomino experiments.




Figure 9: Sample outputs generated by the models for the CLEVR and ADE experiments.




Figure 10: Sample outputs generated by the models for multimodal row and random grid experiments




Figure 11: Sample outputs generated by the models for textual row and random grid experiments.

Text-only Reference Game						
Models	Row	Column	Diagonal	Letter	Shape	Random
Idefics-80B	33.3	33.3	33.3	26.7	23.3	36.7
Idefics-9B	33.3	N/A	0.0	N/A	28.6	N/A
Claude-3	23.3	26.7	33.3	36.7	33.3	23.3
Gem-1.5	76.7	76.7	63.3	43.3	60.0	46.7
GPT-4-1106	26.7	33.3	33.3	30.0	33.3	20.0
GPT-4o	96.7	100.0	90.0	70.0	93.3	90.0

Multimodal Reference Game										
	Row	Column	Diagonal	Letter	Shape	Random	ADE	DOCCI	CLEVR	Pentomino
Idefics-80B	36.7	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	36.7
Idefics-9B	30.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3	26.7	25.0	33.3	23.5
Claude-3	63.3	36.7	60.0	46.7	33.3	40.0	50.0	70.0	66.7	30.0
Gem-1.5	56.7	53.3	56.7	30.0	43.3	36.7	40.0	53.3	33.4	30.0
GPT-4-1106	43.3	44.8	66.7	33.3	51.9	40.0	93.3	96.7	90.0	34.5
GPT-4o	56.7	63.3	76.7	63.3	50.0	50.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	31.0

Table 4: Average success scores across experiments for textual and multimodal reference games. Random performance is at 33.3 (as there are three images to choose from). Note: Only the grid experiments are used in the text-only version, as the others are actual images and cannot easily be represented in ASCII format. N/A: not available means that the experiment was not played due to the model not following the formal instructions. The best results for each experiment are highlighted in bold.

DOCCI instances, we used the concept category “dog” to select distractor images from the same category. The instances from the CLEVR dataset were chosen based on the object annotations (large metal green sphere, small rubber blue cube, etc.). The images with the most objects in common with the target were taken as distractors.

The results are given in Table 5. We can observe that both GPT-4 models are not susceptible to the change in instances while being the best performing models for all datasets. Comparing the *Claude-3* results in Table 4 and Table 5, we can observe that the performance drops for DOCCI and ADE instances with static target.

We were initially hoping that we can automatically test for context-sensitivity (and hence, the output really being a referring expression more than a description) by pairing the target image in different distractors and seeing whether the generation changes. However, it turns out that the observed context sensitivity is of the wrong kind, as the generated expression also changes if the target image and the same distractors simply are presented in different orders. Hence, we have no grounds to assume that the generated expressions are more than very detailed descriptions.

C An Agreement Game: MatchIt

C.1 Experimental Setup

Game versions There are four game versions with two parameters changed:

- number of questions each player can ask: one

Model	ADE	DOCCI	CLEVR
Claude-3	30.0	20.0	66.7
Gemini-1.5	23.3	36.7	46.7
GPT-4-1106	100.0	100.0	93.3
GPT-4o	100.0	100.0	90.0
Idefics-80B	33.3	33.3	30.0
Idefics-9B	30.0	38.5	33.3

Table 5: Average success scores across ADE, DOCCI and CLEVR instances where the target image is kept the same for all instances and the set of distractors varies.

(1q), three (3q) or five (5q)

- whether the players are informed about the number of questions they have (info) or not (3q). This was done by adding the sentence “Each of us can ask 3 questions.” to the initial prompt.

Game rules Importantly, each utterance has to start with the right flag such as ‘DESCRIPTION’, ‘QUESTION’, ‘ANSWER’ and ‘DECISION’ or the game will be aborted. Also, explanations for final decisions are not allowed. An example of schematic game play is shown in Figure 1.

C.2 Prompts

All prompt templates used for the game are displayed in Figure 12

C.3 Instances

Three groups of instance types were used for Matchit: photographs, images of pentomino boards and grids of ASCII grids. Those instances were grouped into three (to four) difficulties; both player

TEMPLATE C.2.1

You are participating in a collaborative guessing game. The goal is to find out whether this picture and another picture only I can see, are the same. Please describe your image first. Then, I will provide my description and we can ask each other questions about the images to figure out whether they are the same. \$ INFO_NUM_QS\$. Now start your short image description with "DESCRIPTION:" followed by the description. Do not add anything else.

TEMPLATE C.2.2

DESCRIPTION: \$DESCRIPTION\$

(a) Initial prompt. For matchit_info, \$INFO_NUM_QS\$ was replaced by the sentence "Each of us can ask 3 questions." and deleted for the other versions.

TEMPLATE C.2.5

Start your answer with "ANSWER" and do not add anything else.

TEMPLATE C.2.6

ANSWER: \$ANSWER\$

(c) Eliciting answers from the players.

TEMPLATE C.2.7

Now come to a decision. What do you think: are your picture and the other picture described the same picture? Write "DECISION: same images" if you think they are the same picture or "DECISION: different images" if you think they are different pictures. Do not add anything else.

TEMPLATE C.2.8

DECISION: \$DECISION\$

(d) Eliciting decisions from the players.

TEMPLATE C.2.3

Now ask a question in order to find out new aspects of my image that may be different to your image. Start with "QUESTION:" and do not add anything else.

TEMPLATE C.2.4

QUESTION: \$QUESTION\$

(b) Eliciting questions from the players.

Figure 12: Prompt templates for MatchIt.

get the same image, both players get similar images (two different types for ASCII grids) or completely different images. The process of producing similar and different image pairs is described below. The curation rationale for a similar picture was that both pictures could be described with the same (short) sentence, but their difference should be striking enough that also one (short) sentence should be enough. All images for this multimodal variant are taken from the Visual Genome Dataset (Krishna et al., 2017) which has rich annotations for every object in the image including attributes and relations to other objects. For each sampled image pair, the Jaccard index between all object labels and their respective attributes for each image was calculated. The lowest scoring pairs up to a threshold of 0.05 were chosen as “different” pairs. This ensures that there are no to very little shared semantic contents between the pictures. In order to get similar pairs, the cosine similarity of the image embeddings of the CLIP model (Radford et al., 2021) of image pairs with a Jaccard index above 0.22 was calculated and pairs with a cosine similarity above 0.8 chosen. Both thresholds were chosen considering quality of pairs as well as sufficient numbers of pairs. From those, final pairs were selected manually following the curation rationale mentioned above filtering out instances that were not enough or too similar.

C.4 Results

Note that Gemini-1.0-pro was not benchmarked against this game since this model does not support multi-turn dialogue. Also, for GPT-4 the multimodal game variant was run on GPT-4-1106-vision while the ASCII based variant was run on GPT-4-1106. The clem scores of all game versions are presented in Table 6, average main scores depending on difficulty are presented in Tables 7 and 8.

C.5 Detailed Analysis

Model type There is a big jump in performance from the open source models to commercial models with the GPT models having slightly higher played and main scores than Claude-3 and Gemini-1.5. Possible reasons for this difference are carried out in the following paragraphs.

Modality While the initial photo descriptions are mostly correct, the grid and pentomino board descriptions often are incorrect and/or incomplete. As seen for the reference game, the overall perfor-

matchit_multimodal				
	3q	info	1q	5q
Claude-3	81.7	81.7	80.0	80.0
GPT-4-1106	80.0	86.7	85.0	90.0
GPT-4o	78.3	76.7	81.7	81.7
Gemini-1.5	71.7	65.0	83.3	48.3
Idefics-80B	49.2	47.5	50.8	44.1
Idefics-9B	33.3	33.3	33.3	33.3
Llava-1.5-13B	66.7	56.7	66.7	63.3
Llava-v1.6-34B	66.7	78.3	76.7	61.7
Llava-v1.6-vc	38.3	31.7	68.3	38.3
matchit_ascii				
	3q	info	1q	5q
Claude-3	85.0	90.0	82.5	77.5
GPT-4-1106-prev	72.5	90.0	87.5	82.5
GPT-4o	97.5	100.0	92.5	100.0
Gemini-1.5	75.0	70.0	85.0	65.0
Idefics-80B	30.0	20.5	27.5	27.5
Idefics-9B	37.5	47.5	22.5	45.0
Llava-1.5-13B	26.3	35.0	32.5	21.6
Llava-v1.6-34B	30.0	30.0	37.5	32.5
Llava-v1.6-vc	62.5	70.0	85.0	62.5
Llama-3-70B	20.0	35.0	20.0	15.0

Table 6: Clem score results for MatchIt.

mance with pentomino board instances is worse than with photos, with open models sometimes not even remotely describing a picture of abstract shapes and rather trying to find a concrete meaning where there is none (e.g. describing a pentomino board as people playing soccer, people playing tic-tac-toe or as pixel art of a tree). There are two forms of grid descriptions, either in form of a row-by-row (or by column or borders) description of the placements of X’s and squares or by repeating the string of characters verbatim - a behavior we did not predict and therefore not prohibit. No instance was found where a general motive was described instead of the single parts of the grid. This is interesting since other games using grids have shown that correct grid descriptions can be made. The wording of the prompts was adopted completely from the multimodal variant except for necessary exchanges such as image ↔ grid, so a more tailored prompt introducing the grids as such could have maybe mitigated that. Comparing the main scores of the different modalities, for multimodal game play, larger models have an apparent advan-

matchit_multim. - Photo input			
	0	1	2
Claude-3	100.0	67.5	100.0
GPT-4-1106	87.5	97.5	100.0
GPT-4o	95.0	95.0	100.0
Gemini-1.5	93.3	100.0	96.9
Idefics-80B	91.7	9.4	53.1
Idefics-9B	100.0	0.0	0.0
Llava-1.5-13B	86.9	15.0	80.0
Llava-v1.6-34B	92.5	41.2	100.0
Llava-v1.6-vc	2.5	83.2	100.0

matchit_multim. - Pentomino input			
	0	1	2
Claude-3	90.0	30.0	97.5
GPT-4-1106	55.0	72.5	100.0
GPT-4o	82.5	5.0	100.0
Gemini-1.5	91.7	27.5	100.0
Idefics-80B	76.4	63.2	27.8
Idefics-9B	100.0	0.0	0.0
Llava-1.5-13B	80.0	65.0	55.0
Llava-v1.6-34B	100.0	46.1	79.5
Llava-v1.6-vc	34.7	87.5	100.0

Table 7: Mean main score for each model, grouped by difficulty level. 0: same image/pentomino board, 1: similar image/pentomino board, 2: different image/pentomino board

tage over their smaller counterparts that disappears when no visual input is given. Open language models that only take text as input (especially Mixtral models) perform better than large open multimodal models on the matchit_ascii variant. The high main scores from LLaVA-v1.6-vc can be explained by the fact that a majority of decisions of this model have been “different grid” whereas LLaVA-34B and Idefics-80B mostly decided for “same grid”. Since 75% of the instances for matchit_ascii are different grids, this skews the main score quite a bit. In general, the mean main scores have to be taken with a grain of salt, table 9 shows the confusion matrices for each model and weighted F1-scores including the results of two programmatic mock models which always decide either same image/grid or different image/grid and score quite high as a result of the imbalanced distribution of diffi-

matchit_ascii - Grid input				
	0	1_1	1_2	2
Claude-3	87.5	67.5	82.5	97.5
GPT-4o	92.5	100.0	97.5	100.0
GPT-4-1106-prev	75.0	80.0	77.5	100.0
Gemini-1.5	82.7	67.3	76.9	89.7
Idefics-80B	97.5	12.3	2.8	0.0
Idefics-9B	45.0	30.0	42.5	35.0
Llava-1.5-13B	59.2	16.1	15.6	27.5
Llava-v1.6-34B	100.0	7.5	0.0	22.5
llava-v1.6-vc	32.5	100.0	100.0	100.0

Llama-3-70B	91.2	8.3	15.6	32.5
Mixtral-8x22B	83.9	74.2	52.2	81.1
Mixtral-8x7B	49.5	70.4	52.5	68.8
Openchat_3.5	20.0	60.0	75.0	75.0

Table 8: Mean main score for each model, grouped by difficulty level. 0: same grid, 1_1: similar grid (motive transformation), 1_2: similar grid (edit distance of two), 2: different grid




Figure 13: Plot of % Played against Main Score for each model for each game modality

culties.

Game versions The different game versions present an approximation to testing the efficiency of the model’s game play. If the performance for only one vs. five question(s) that can be asked does not differ, one could argue that the quality in game play, i.e. in questions and answers does not contribute to the game play at all, rather the quality of the first description and that all dialogue after that is not meaningful for the game play. The info version was added in order to give the players more overview over the overall game structure and give a possibility to pursue a strategy and improve the goal oriented dialogue by e.g. enabling planning

model	matchit_multimodal		matchit_ascii	
	Conf. matrix	F1	Conf. matrix	F1
Mock_same	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 160 \\ 0 & 80 \end{bmatrix}$	0.17	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 240 \\ 0 & 80 \end{bmatrix}$	0.1
Mock_different	$\begin{bmatrix} 160 & 0 \\ 80 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	0.53	$\begin{bmatrix} 240 & 0 \\ 80 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	0.64
GPT-4o	$\begin{bmatrix} 244 & 76 \\ 11 & 149 \end{bmatrix}$	0.82	$\begin{bmatrix} 239 & 1 \\ 3 & 77 \end{bmatrix}$	0.99
GPT-4-1106(-prev)	$\begin{bmatrix} 297 & 23 \\ 41 & 119 \end{bmatrix}$	0.86	$\begin{bmatrix} 214 & 26 \\ 19 & 61 \end{bmatrix}$	0.86
Claude-3	$\begin{bmatrix} 251 & 69 \\ 6 & 154 \end{bmatrix}$	0.85	$\begin{bmatrix} 213 & 27 \\ 8 & 72 \end{bmatrix}$	0.89
Gemini-1.5	$\begin{bmatrix} 211 & 33 \\ 6 & 118 \end{bmatrix}$	0.9	$\begin{bmatrix} 191 & 39 \\ 11 & 57 \end{bmatrix}$	0.84
Llava-v1.6-vc	$\begin{bmatrix} 188 & 12 \\ 92 & 36 \end{bmatrix}$	0.64	$\begin{bmatrix} 200 & 0 \\ 48 & 24 \end{bmatrix}$	0.79
Llava-1.5-13B	$\begin{bmatrix} 198 & 122 \\ 16 & 142 \end{bmatrix}$	0.72	$\begin{bmatrix} 73 & 157 \\ 25 & 49 \end{bmatrix}$	0.42
Llava-v1.6-34B	$\begin{bmatrix} 207 & 79 \\ 6 & 154 \end{bmatrix}$	0.81	$\begin{bmatrix} 40 & 200 \\ 0 & 80 \end{bmatrix}$	0.33
Idefics-9B	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 320 \\ 0 & 160 \end{bmatrix}$	0.17	$\begin{bmatrix} 106 & 134 \\ 35 & 45 \end{bmatrix}$	0.5
Idefics-80B	$\begin{bmatrix} 120 & 158 \\ 15 & 127 \end{bmatrix}$	0.59	$\begin{bmatrix} 14 & 166 \\ 1 & 75 \end{bmatrix}$	0.24
Llama-3-70B			$\begin{bmatrix} 33 & 87 \\ 4 & 50 \end{bmatrix}$	0.45
Openchat_3.5			$\begin{bmatrix} 190 & 50 \\ 57 & 23 \end{bmatrix}$	0.66
Mixtral-8x7B			$\begin{bmatrix} 116 & 36 \\ 21 & 27 \end{bmatrix}$	0.73
Mixtral-8x22B			$\begin{bmatrix} 142 & 52 \\ 9 & 53 \end{bmatrix}$	0.78

Table 9: Confusion matrices and weighted F1-scores for *all* decisions that were made during all games. Rows represent true labels, columns the predictions. Left column/upper row represent decision for different image or grid. For reference, results for programmatic players that always either decide “same image” or “different images” are included.

the level of detail of the descriptions questions. Figure 14 shows that here is no significant difference between the means of the different game versions. A higher number of dialogue turns does not improve nor change the performance for worse, thus suggesting that either one question is enough for most models to somehow determine whether an input is shared or not or rather that the actual dialogue is not goal oriented enough to provide the players with relevant (or even correct) information for a decision.

Instance difficulties In contrast to the game versions, there are significant differences between levels of difficulty. Similar images (for both modalities) get classified wrong most times, showing that the level of detail of the asked questions is not high enough to determine that there are differences in the images. The two types of similarity of the grid inputs do not seem to differ regarding the perfor-




Figure 14: Mean Main Scores for each of the game versions.




Figure 15: Mean Main Scores for each of the instance difficulties for the multimodal MatchIt version

mance although the kinds of similarities between grids are quite distinct.

General game play Following are a few observations about the general game play based on a sample of played instances for each model and difficulty level. A large difference between smaller open models and larger as well as commercial modes are the types of questions asked. The dialogue of the latter contains more open questions that even includes some details about the player’s own image and leaves the other player room to elaborate whereas smaller models usually produced simple yes/no questions. Similar to that, some answers of the larger and commercial models are not simply a yes/no answer but explanations and comparisons to the known information. This is observable in the contrast between Table 10 and






Figure 16: Mean Main Scores for the instance difficulties of ASCII version of MatchIt

Table 11, displaying actual game play of the same instance by a commercial and an open model.

#	A	Game Master	B
1			
	[A(GM)] <INITIAL PROMPT>		
2	[A(GM)] DESCRIPTION: The image shows a brown and white horse grazing on a grassy hill with mountains and a partly cloudy sky in the background.		
			
3	[GM(B)] <INITIAL PROMPT>		
4	[GM(B)] DESCRIPTION: The image shows a brown and white horse grazing on a grassy hill with mountains and a partly cloudy sky in the background.		
5	[GM(B)] QUESTION: Are there any other animals or objects visible in the foreground or background of the image besides the horse?		

6	[A(GM)] ANSWER: No, the horse appears to be the only animal or significant object visible in the foreground or background of the image.		
7	[A(GM)] QUESTION: Are there any trees, bushes or other vegetation visible in your image besides the grass the horse is grazing on?		
8		[GM(B)] ANSWER: Yes, there are some trees or bushes visible on the hills in the background of the image.	
9		[GM(B)] QUESTION: What color is the horse's mane and tail in your image?	
10	[A(GM)] ANSWER: The horse's mane and tail are white in the image.		
11	[A(GM)] QUESTION: Can you see any fences, paths, or man-made structures in your image?		
12		[GM(B)] ANSWER: No, I do not see any fences, paths, or man-made structures in the image. It appears to be a natural landscape.	
13		[GM(B)] QUESTION: Is the horse wearing any tack, such as a halter or bridle, in your image?	
14	[A(GM)] ANSWER: No, the horse does not appear to be wearing any tack such as a halter or bridle in the image.		
15	[A(GM)] QUESTION: Are there any notable rock formations, cliffs, or boulders visible in the landscape of your image?		
16		[GM(B)] ANSWER: No, there are no notable rock formations, cliffs, or boulders visible in the landscape of the image. The hills appear to be smooth and grassy.	
17		[GM(B)] <DECISION PROMPT>	
18		[GM(B)] DECISION: same image	
19		[GM(GM)] success	
20		[A(GM)] <DECISION PROMPT>	
21	[A(GM)] DECISION: same image		
22		[GM(GM)] success	

Table 10: Transcript of an episode with same images, played by Claude-3.

#	A	Game Master	B
1	[A(GM)] <INITIAL PROMPT>		
2	[A(GM)] DESCRIPTION: A lone horse in a grassy field with mountains in the background.		
3	[GM(B)] <INITIAL PROMPT>		
4		[GM(B)] DESCRIPTION: A lone horse in a grassy field with mountains in the background.	
5		[GM(B)] QUESTION: Is there a person in your image?	

6	[A]GM] ANSWER: No
7	[A]GM] QUESTION: Is there a person in your image?
8	[GM]B] ANSWER: No
9	[GM]B] QUESTION: Is the sky clear in your image?
10	[A]GM] ANSWER: No
11	[A]GM] QUESTION: Is the sky clear in your image?
12	[GM]B] ANSWER: No
13	[GM]B] QUESTION: Is the horse facing the camera in your image?
14	[A]GM] ANSWER: No
15	[A]GM] QUESTION: Is the horse facing the camera in your image?
16	[GM]B] ANSWER: No
17	[GM]B] <DECISION PROMPT>
18	[GM]B] DECISION: different images
19	[GM]GM] loss
20	[A]GM] <DECISION PROMPT>
21	[A]GM] DECISION: different images
22	[GM]GM] loss

Table 11: Transcript of a MatchIt episode with same images, played by Llava-1.6-vc. The images described are the same as in Table 10

The inquired content of questions for photos is often about the existence of objects in the other player’s pictures and if a description is approximately correct, similar behavior can be observed with pentomino boards. The questions about ASCII grids focus mostly on rows and columns than on whole motives. Multimodal models in particular ask about features of the grid that are not represented (such as shape, size or color of the characters). A frequent flaw in asked questions is asking about information that was already given, for example in the description and therefore not advance the exchange of information. In general, while the photograph descriptions are overall correct, the answers to questions about the image are not always correct. Sometimes hallucinations occur, especially when a question is asked about the other image the respective player has no visual information about. This happens more frequently for pentomino board and grid instances than for photo instances, as latter are overall better understood by the models. Another source of wrong answers is the lack of distinction between the own and the other image, shown when a question was posed about a player’s own image or objects in the own image in comparison to the other. This leads to wrong answers and hallucinations with open models.

D A Map Navigation Game

D.1 Experimental Setup

The experiments evaluate the influence of several key parameters of the map, thereby providing a comprehensive range for experimental evaluation:

- **Size:** The size of the map varies across three distinct categories: Small, Medium, and Large, encompassing 4, 6, and 8 rooms respectively.
- **Cycle:** The Cycle parameter determines whether or not the map has a closed loop.
- **Ambiguity:** The Ambiguity parameter determines whether room labels are repeated on the map, making navigating through the game’s spaces more confusing.

D.1.1 Instances

All game instances contain a graph and a starting node. The multimodal variant also provides one image per node taken from the ADE20K dataset (Zhou et al., 2017). Each experiment comes with 10 unique instances.

EE. Experiments for this game version focus on how the graph structure effects the players exploratory abilities. There are five experiments in total, three covering the size of the graph (Small, Medium, Large) and two exploring the effect of graph complexity (Medium & Cycle, Large & Cycle).

EE-id. The experiments are exactly the same as for *Multimodal EE* but instead of a room category or image of the room, a description of the currently visited room in textual form is given to the player. The descriptions of images are taken from the IDS-ADE dataset (Ilinykh et al., 2019b).

EE-qa. Three experiments are conducted in the QA Version based on varying levels of ambiguity. Room categories are never repeated (No Ambiguity), some rooms categories may be repeated (Limited Ambiguity) or most room categories are repeated multiple times (Strong Ambiguity).

In each instance the questions are targeted towards the two most common room categories and one room category that is not present.

G2X. Three experiments are conducted based on the distance of the goal room from the start room: zero (0), close (1 - 2), and far (3 - 4) distances.

EE-gr. The three size-focused experiments (Small, Medium, Large) are also performed for this game version

In total this makes 5 subgames, 19 experiments and 190 instances in total. Since the EE-id game cannot be played in a multimodal fashion, only 4 experiments and 140 instances are conducted in both modalities.

D.2 Analysis

The results are presented in Table 12.

Text-only Map World game					
	G2X	EE	EE-gr	EE-qa	EE-id
GPT-4o	96.7	66.8	63.9	52.9	71.7
GPT-4v-1106	96.7	73.6	67.5	66.1	69.8
Claude-3	100.0	83.8	76.7	68.4	73.0
Gemini-1.5	53.3	42.3	/	30.4	61.7
Idefics-9B	/	/	/	/	1.5
Idefics-80B	/	3.5		4.8	6.1
Llava-1.5-13B	16.7	4.9	/	1.3	11.3
Llava-v1.6-13B	3.3	/	/	/	8.2
Llava-v1.6-34B	26.7	/	/	/	11.1
Llama-3-70B	96.7	65.4	53.5	61.6	60.9

Multimodal Map World game					
	G2X	EE	EE-gr	EE-qa	EE-id
GPT-4o	90.0	38.26	68.45	30.43	-
GPT-4v-1106	76.67	73.74	69.53	57.5	-
Claude-3	53.33	75.79	82.29	66.97	-
Gemini-1.5	30.0	60.05	29.27	48.94	-
Idefics-9B	/	/	/	/	-
Idefics-80B	16.66	6.56	40.68	0.0	-
Llava-1.5-13b	0.0	/	/	/	-
Llava-v1.6-13b	16.67	5.65	2.52	1.25	-
Llava-v1.6-34b	3.33	/	/	/	-

Table 12: Clemscores per Model for each Subgame of the Map World game

D.2.1 Map Complexity

The results gotten from Claude-3 playing the EE game most closely reflect what we hypothesized. Larger maps are more difficult to explore than smaller maps and a map of the same size is more confusing if a cyclic path is present (see Table 13). Claude-3 however, is the exception out of all the models we tested on this task. The GPT-4o model exhibits the exact opposite behavior in terms of size for both text-only and multimodal EE games, and Gpt-4v-1106 demonstrates this trend only for multimodal EE. The smaller the map to explore is, the worse they are performing. This is not due to them exploring smaller graphs less, but due to them making redundant moves. The number of redundant moves stays mostly the same, even when map sizes change. A larger map requires the player to make more steps in general, so the ratio of useful

Text-only EE					
	Sml	Med	Lrg	Med+cyt	Lrg+cyt
Gpt-4o	73.8	70.3	79.3	73.0	76.0
Gpt-4v-1106	74.8	71.8	58.6	83.4	79.5
Claude-3	89.6	89.6	74.8	87.6	77.6
Gemini-1.5	70.4	64.8	53.3	74.3	67.9
Idefics-9B	/	/	/	/	/
Idefics-80B	/	/	55.6	70.6	50.0
Llv-1.5-13b	/	50.0	/	43.3	64.5
Llv-v1.6-13b	/	/	/	/	/
Llv-v1.6-34b	/	/	/	/	/
Llama-3-70b	67.3	67.3	63.1	72.1	63.5

Image Description EE					
	Sml	Med	Lrg	Med+cyt	Lrg+cyt
Gpt-4o	77.5	74.2	62.3	80.6	79.3
Gpt-4v-1106	73.3	68.5	57.2	81.1	69.2
Claude-3	88.1	75.2	62.7	74.3	70.8
Gemini-1.5	73.8	62.0	47.6	70.2	54.7
Idefics-9b	/	40.0	/	/	33.3
Idefics-80b	60.0	60.0	/	61.1	/
Llama-3-70b	71.0	61.1	47.7	69.3	55.6
Llv-1.5-13b	68.2	/	0.0	55.6	41.1
Llv-v1.6-13b	58.3	40.0	22.2	40.0	36.7
Llv-v1.6-34b	63.1	40.0	27.3	32.9	33.3

Multimodal EE					
	Sml	Med	Lrg	Med+cyt	Lrg+cyt
Gpt-4o	66.68	75.4	84.4	67.95	79.7
Gpt-4v-1106	73.79	74.8	76.47	68.87	74.78
Claude-3	79.65	78.94	76.79	75.93	67.65
Gemini-1.5	61.43	63.09	56.58	73.22	45.92
Idefics-9B	/	/	/	/	/
Idefics-80B	0.0	68.97	33.33	0.0	48.03
Llava-1.5-13b	/	/	/	/	/
Llava-v1.6-13b	85.71	43.33	/	66.67	/
Llava-v1.6-34b	/	/	/	/	/

Table 13: Averages over Quality scores of all tested models on the EE game per experiment conducted in text-only and multimodal.

moves a Gpt model makes increases. This leads to a better *efficiency* score, which directly impacts the *Quality* score.

The hypothesis that adding cyclic paths to a map makes fully exploring it harder is almost fully reflected by the results for the multimodal game. In the purely text-based versions, the opposite seems to be true. Adding a cyclic path to a map makes it more connected and theoretically allows for more efficient exploration. On the other hand it increases the number of edges and thus connections between rooms to keep track of. Why this adjustment seems beneficial in text games and detrimental in multimodal ones is unclear to us at the moment.

D.2.2 Effect of Graph Reasoning

The results shown in Table 14 provide a detailed comparison of model performance with and without graph reasoning for multimodal and text-only Map World games. For the multimodal Map World game, incorporating graph reasoning (EE-gr) con-

	Multimodal EE	Multimodal EE-gr	Text-only EE	Text-only EE-gr
Gpt-4o	73.81	76.06	74.47	66.01
Gpt-4v-1106	75.02	77.25	68.39	67.46
Claude-3	78.46	85.12	84.62	76.69
Gemini-1.5	60.37	62.72	62.86	/
Idefics-9B	/	/	/	/
Idefics-80B	27.13	81.36	55.56	/
Llava-1.5-13b	/	/	50.0	/
Llava-1.6-13b	53.93	75.63	/	/
Llava-1.6-34b	/	/	/	/
Llama-3-70b			65.91	55.54

Table 14: Quality scores for the three shared experiments in *EE* and *EE-gr* per model

sistently improves the scores for all models: Gpt and Gemini models gain about 2 quality points, and Claude-3 gains almost 7.

In contrast, for the text-only version of the game, graph reasoning seems to have an adverse effect. Along with score drops of GPT models and Claude-3, Gemini-1.5 had no played games when the model also had additional task of graph reasoning, meanwhile in multimodal EE-gr exhibit notable improvements. This pattern suggests that while graph reasoning is beneficial for enhancing the performance of multimodal models, it deteriorates the performance of text-only models

Claude-3 often chooses to stop exploring before reaching a significant number of rooms. Having an explicit representation of the map might help to navigate back to rooms with unexplored paths. Table 17 also shows that Claude-3 produces the closest representations to the actual map which might also be a reason why it profits the most from graph reasoning out of all the commercial models.

D.2.3 Question Answering

	Map Ambiguity			
	text-only		multimodal	
	% Played	QA	% Played	QA
none	44.0	36.33	43.0	54.26
limited	47.0	23.33	46.94	46.38
strong	47.0	21.0	45.92	40.0

Table 15: *QA*: Question Answering score (percentage of correctly answered questions) for each of the three experiments for the *EE-qa* game, averaged over all tested models

All experiments on the *EE-qa* subgame or performed on maps with 8 rooms on them. The *Ambiguity* parameter now defines how often rooms of the same category are present on each map. We are performing three experiments with increasing

amounts of *Ambiguity*. We can quantify the amount of *Ambiguity* as a tuple (X, Y) . This can be read as: *X room categories are repeated Y times*.

None. In this experiment, each room is of a unique category that is not repeated again in the same map. The *Ambiguity* is $(1, 1)$.

Limited. Here, we have some repetition. The *Ambiguity* can be either $(1, 2)$ or $(2, 2)$.

Strong. More room categories are repeated more often. *Ambiguity* in this experiment can be one of: $(1, 3)$, $(2, 3)$ or $(3, 2)$.

Results for this subgame are shown in Table 15. In both modalities we notice a clear downward trend with an increase in map *Ambiguity*. Not only is it more difficult to remember every *unique* room of a certain category, you also have to find each room of that category to get the question right. the scores presented in Table 15 are not directly influenced by the players exploration but a player that did explore thoroughly likely more prepared to answer any given question.

The fraction of correctly answered questions is a lot lower in the text-only variant of the game (consistently around 20 *Question Answering* points). We suspect, this is caused by the fact that players in the text-only variant are only presented with the label of a room (it’s category) while players in the multimodal game get an actual instance of this label (an image of a room of that category). This could help players in the multimodal games to better differentiate rooms with the same label while also better recognizing rooms that have been visited before (whenever the given image perfectly fits a generated description of a previous turn).

D.2.4 Distance

	Distance from Target in G2X			
	text-only		multimodal	
	% Played	Success	% Played	Success
0 (on)	54.0	100.0	54.0	79.63
1-2 (close)	52.0	100.0	55.0	54.55
3-4 (far)	42.0	85.71	58.0	34.48

Table 16: *% Played* and *Success* (finding the correct room) scores per experiment for the *G2X* subgame, averaged over all tested models.

Table 16 shows the effect of distance from start to target room on the players ability to finish the game (*%Played*) and the quality of the produced result (*Success*). The results show that the *%Played* score is only slightly effected by the distance to the target and there is no effect noticeable when

only considering the multimodal game. The *Success*, however, seems to be directly correlated to the distance to the target.

In text-only, the category of the currently visited room is given to the player and they only need to make sure that it matches target category. In the multimodal game, the player is presented of an image of the currently visited room and needs to identify whether it is a room of the target category. This makes the task clearly more complex in a multimodal setting, resulting in the difference in *Success*.

D.2.5 Error Analysis




Figure 17: Common causes of errors and poor results in the Map World Game.

There are a multitude of reasons why some models fail to play the Map World games as perform worse than others. We are going to look at some of the most common reasons, examples can be seen in Figure 17.

Understanding the concept of exploration on a graph and preferring to visit unexplored rooms over ones that have been visited before is seemingly easy for larger models like the commercial models we tested. Smaller models like Llava-1.5-13b and Llava-1.5-13b often just go back and forth between two rooms until they run out of turns. Open models on the larger end, like Llava-1.6-34b or Idefics-80b manage to break out of this loop easier but are not completely rid of it.

Another common theme for smaller models is stopping their exploration very early on (after one

move or sometimes right away). This problem extends to commercial models too. Especially Claude-3 and Gemini-1.5 tend to stop exploration halfway through a map. The example in Figure 17 is taken from an instance of Claude-3 playing the *EE* game and stopping after only seeing four out of the eight total rooms.

Since we do not parse the responses at all (except for removing leading and trailing white spaces and newlines), a single stray character can lead to a game being aborted due to invalid response syntax. Llava-1.6-34b struggled the most with this. It often put a wrapper around the response it gave (json"<response>"). While the actual response might have been useful, this syntax is being classified as invalid. Commercial models do not have an issue with following the given response structure.

Lastly, since the models don't know that there is a turn limit they simply keep on exploring the graph. This mostly effects GPT-4o and is what causes it to have a relatively low *% played* score compared to the other commercial models.

D.3 Additional Scores

	Text-only Map World game			
	efficiency	exploration	graph_similarity	steps
Gpt-4o	60.8	75.9	67.5	8.2
Gpt-4v-1106	65.1	73.4	57.7	6.7
Claude-3	70.5	78.1	74.6	6.4
Gemini-1.5	56.7	47.5	0.0	4.3
Llava-1.5-13b	58.4	50.4	0.0	13.2
Llava-1.6-13b	47.0	47.1	0.0	18.6
Llava-1.6-34b	46.5	44.8	0.0	16.7
Idefics-9B	19.0	29.2	0.0	7.4
Idefics-80B	10.7	25.1	0.0	3.0
Llama-3-70b	57.1	67.5	31.7	7.5
	Multimodal Map World game			
Gpt-4o	71.98	77.91	45.62	7.68
Gpt-4v-1106	64.7	61.62	38.43	7.94
Claude-3	86.53	56.30	50.08	4.72
Gemini-1.5	69.49	41.16	8.74	5.02
Llava-1.5-13b	/	/	/	/
Llava-1.6-13b	100.0	46.46	0.08	6.33
Llava-1.6-34b	/	/	/	/
Idefics-9B	/	/	/	/
Idefics-80B	0	37.16	0.05	3.09

Table 17: Scores recorded during text-only and multimodal Map World games. *efficiency* is explained in D.5.1; *exploration* is the ratio of visited rooms on a map; *graph_similarity* is explained in D.5.2; *steps* is the number of moves a model decides to make before choosing to stop exploring

D.4 Modality

- G2X is far better in text only. Correctly categorizing a room is hard (and some room categories

have similar images ... Hotel Room & Bedroom for example) while in text-only you just need to match labels given to you.

- While explicit graph reasoning is helping models in the multimodal variant to achieve better results, it worsens quality scores in the text-only case. This might be due to the models needing to switch from basic response patterns (GO: <direction>) to a more complex json-like format ("action": "GO: <direction>", "graph": "nodes": [], "edges":) in textual games. In multimodal games, the json-like format was already used in subgames without explicit graph reasoning since players needed to generate an image description in addition to an action.
- Increasing a maps connectivity, seems to be beneficial in a text-only setting and harmful in multimodal games. We are unsure on why there is a difference across modalities in this case. More info can be found in Section D.2.1.

D.5 Metrics

D.5.1 Efficiency Metric

The algorithm 1 describes how the most efficient moves can be calculated, purely based on the seen graph and the current node. It can be applied to the entire graph $G = (V, E)$ and any subgraph of it. The first relevant subgraph is the visited graph G_{vis} which includes all nodes V_{vis} that have been visited by Player A. The second relevant subgraph is the seen graph G_{seen} which is based on the idea that Player A is informed about adjacent rooms at each position. This subgraph includes the same nodes as the visited graph plus all adjacent ones ($V_{seen} = V_{vis} \cup V_{adj}$). Two nodes are adjacent to each other if there is an edge $e \in E$ that connects them.

$$\forall e \in E. \exists v_1, v_2 \in V. e = (v_1, v_2) \wedge adj(v_1, v_2)$$

The goal now is to find the shortest path that visits every node in the seen graph which is not in the visited graph. Inputs to the algorithm are:

- E - the set of all edges of the graph
- V_{vis} - all the nodes that have been visited already
- V_{seen} - all the nodes that have been seen and should be visited
- $current$ - The node currently visited, denoting the starting point

Algorithm 1 find_shortest_paths

```

 $q \leftarrow Queue([current])$    ▷ all paths start here
 $found \leftarrow \{\}$            ▷ set of shortest paths
 $min\_l \leftarrow inf$          ▷ length of shortest path
while  $q$  do
   $path \leftarrow Get(q)$ 
  if  $Set(path) = V_{seen}$  then
     $found \leftarrow path$ 
     $min\_l \leftarrow Length(path)$ 
    continue
  end if
  if  $Length(path) \geq min\_l$  then
    continue
  end if
  for  $(v_1, v_2)$  in  $E$  do
    if  $path[-1] = v_1$  then
       $path \leftarrow Append(v_2)$ 
       $q \leftarrow Put(path)$ 
    end if
  end for
end while
return  $found$ 

```

The algorithm explores all possible paths through the seen graph G_{seen} (breadth-first) and finds all paths of minimum length min_l . These paths can be calculated at any point in the game. For each step that the player takes, we evaluate whether it was a good or bad move based on the information provided to the player and store the result in a list Good_Moves. The Efficiency score is then calculated as:

$$Efficiency = 100 * avg(Good_Moves)$$

D.5.2 Graph Similarity Metric

Used to determine the difference between the player's generated graph and the original graph in the EE-gr game version. The score is based on the graph edit distance (GED), a graph similarity metric provided in the NetworkX Python library¹⁰. By taking into account the minimum number of operations required to transform one graph into another, this method is very useful for assessing the distance between graphs. The resulting distance is then normalized by applying a stretched logistic function. Subtracting the normalized distance from 1 and multiplying by 100 yields the final similarity score, ranging from 0 to 100.

¹⁰<https://networkx.org/>

In short, the Similarity of two graphs, $G1$ and $G2$, is calculated as follows:

$$dist = GED(G1, G2)$$

$$norm_dist = 2 * (\frac{1}{1+e^{-0.5 dist}} - 0.5)$$

$$Similarity = 100 * (1 - norm_dist)$$

D.6 Transcripts

Figure 18 shows a complete transcript of the multimodal *EE* subgame on a small map (4 rooms). The player is being controlled by Claude-3 in this example. The game is over in only 3 turns and thus very short in comparison. Let's go through each turn, one by one.

In the first turn the player is in position [0,3] (which are x and y coordinates) on the map. They are presented with the task instructions, Image A and the available directions (south) and are asked to give their first instruction. The player correctly identifies the room as a bathroom and chooses to move to the only available direction (south).

The player's position changes to [0,2]. The player is told they can go either back north or further down south. They are also presented with Image B. The player correctly identifies the room as a bedroom and chooses to move further south.

Now in position [0,1], the player is again told they can either go north or south and are presented with Image C. They give an accurate description of the image and decide they are done exploring the map.

Since the player still had the option to move south from the last room they visited, it is clear that they have not explored the map fully.

Figure 19 shows a full graphical transcript of an *EE* instance on a large map with a cycle. The player in this case is GPT-4o and they are playing the multimodal version of this game.

The game starts off very successfully with the player finding the single outlying room east of the starting position and then steadily moves down to the very south end of the map (turn 7). Afterwards, they decide to move back north again, missing an unexplored room on the way (room at location (2, 2)). Once the player reaches the unexplored room on the north end on turn 10, they make a critical mistake. The only unexplored room the player can know of at this point is south of their current position. Yet, they decide to move east. This decision may be motivated by the fact that, while the room to the east was already visited before (it is the starting

room), this edge to/from it was not. This is one reason why we suspected cycles to make exploration more difficult. After making another step east and reaching a dead end, the player turns around and heads straight to the last unexplored room. After finding the last room and having fully explored the graph, the player still does not choose to stop exploring and instead moves around the graph until they use up their 20 moves and the game aborts.

D.7 Prompts

The full prompts are given in Figure 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25

#	A	Game Master	B
1		[GM]B {"start": [0, 3]}	
2	[A]GM <TASK DESCRIPTION> <Image A> From here we can go: south. What is your next instruction?		
3		[GM]B <TASK DESCRIPTION> <Image A> From here we can go: south. What is your next instruction?	
4		[GM]B {"description": "We are in a bathroom with a bathtub and vanity.", "action": "GO: south"}	
5		[GM]GM {"old": [0, 3], "new": [0, 2]}	
6	[A]GM We have made a step and are now in this room. <Image B> From here we can go: south, north. What is your next instruction?		
7		[GM]B We have made a step and are now in this room. <Image B> From here we can go: south, north. What is your next instruction?	
8		[GM]B {"description": "We are in a bedroom with two beds and floral bedding.", "action": "GO: south"}	
9		[GM]GM {"old": [0, 2], "new": [0, 1]}	
10	[A]GM We have made a step and are now in this room. <Image C> From here we can go: south, north. What is your next instruction?		
11		[GM]B We have made a step and are now in this room. <Image C> From here we can go: south, north. What is your next instruction?	
12		[GM]B {"description": "We are in a wine cellar with large wooden barrels.", "action": "DONE"}	
13		[GM]GM DONE	




Image A



Image B



Image C

Figure 18: Example dialogue from multimodal *EE Map World* game. B (green) is the player navigating the map and A (orange) acts as oracle, feeding information (images and available directions) to the game master.




Figure 19: A full game where the Player (GPT-4o) reaches the turn limit after exploring the graph exhaustively. The currently visited room is marked as cyan, rooms that have been visited are olive colored and the gray rooms have not been visited yet.

TEMPLATE D.7.1

Please help me with the following task. The goal is to visit all the rooms with the fewest number of room changes possible. In each room, you need to decide the direction to go in. Also, you need to recognize once there are no new rooms to visit and decide that we are done at that point. Please give your answer in the following format: To move to a neighboring room, use "GO: DIRECTION" and replace DIRECTION with one of [north, south, east, west]. To stop the exploration, answer with "DONE" instead. Omit any other text.

Here is an example:

You are in the Kitchen. Currently available directions: south, west. What is your next instruction?

GO: west

You have made a step and entered a Lobby. Currently available directions: east, north. What is your next instruction?

GO: north

...

You have made a step and entered a Bedroom. Currently available directions: south. What is your next instruction?

DONE

Let us start. You are in the \$INITIAL_ROOM\$. Currently available directions: \$INITIAL_DIRECTIONS\$. What is your next instruction?

TEMPLATE D.7.2

We are currently in this room. Please help me with the following task. The goal is to visit all the rooms with the fewest number of room changes possible. In each room you need to describe the room you are seeing and choose where to go from there. Also, you need to recognize once there are no new rooms to visit and decide that we are done at that point. Please give your answer in the following format: {"description": "<room description>", "action": "<action>"}. Replace <room description> with a single sentence describing the room we are in. To move to a neighboring room, replace <action> with "GO: DIRECTION" where DIRECTION can be one of [north, south, east, west]. To stop the exploration, replace <action> with "DONE". Omit any other text.

Here is an example:

We are in this room. From here we can go: north, west. What is your next instruction?

{"description": "We are in a kitchen with a red fridge.", "action": "GO: north"}

We have made a step and are now in this room. From here we can go: south, east. What is your next instruction?

{"description": "We are in a living room with a couch and a tv.", "action": "GO: east"}

...

We have made a step and are now in this room. From here we can go: south, east. What is your next instruction?


{"description": "We are in a bathroom", "action": "DONE"}

Let us start. We have made a step and are now in this room. From here we can go: \$INITIAL_DIRECTIONS\$. What is your next instruction?

(a) Text-only Map World Game: Initial prompt template for the EE version (1)


(b) Multimodal Map World Game: Initial prompt template for the EE version (2)

Figure 20: Initial prompts for the EE version of Map World Game



(a) Text-only Map World Game: answers templates for valid (3) or invalid (4) moves (b) Multimodal Map World Game: answers templates for valid (5) or invalid (6) moves

Figure 21: Answer templates for the Player B of the Map World Game



(a) Text-only Map World Game: template for question re-prompt (7) and the question itself (8) for the EE-qa version (b) Multimodal Map World Game: template for question re-prompt (9) and the question itself (10) for the EE-qa version

Figure 22: Re-prompt and question templates for the EE-qa version of Map World Game

TEMPLATE D.7.11

Please help me with the following task. The goal is to explore rooms and find the target room. In each room, you need to decide the direction to go in. Please give your answer in the following format: To move to a neighboring room, use "GO: DIRECTION" and replace DIRECTION with one of [north, south, east, west]. Most importantly, once we have found the target room, answer with "DONE" instead. Omit any other text.

Here is an example:

The target room is a Bedroom. You are in the Kitchen. Currently available directions: south, west. What is your next instruction?

GO: west

You have made a step and entered a Lobby. Currently available directions: east, north. What is your next instruction?

GO: north

...

You have made a step and entered a Bedroom. Currently available directions: south. What is your next instruction?

DONE

Let us start. The target room is \$GOAL\$. You are in the \$INITIAL_ROOM\$. Currently available directions: \$INITIAL_DIRECTIONS\$. What is your next instruction?

TEMPLATE D.7.12

Please help me with the following task. The goal is to explore rooms and find target room. In each room I will show you an image of the room and tell you in what directions we can go from there. You then give me a description of the room you see in exactly one sentence. Please give your answer in the following format: ""description": "<room description>", "action": "<action>"". To move to a neighboring room, replace <action> with "GO: DIRECTION" where DIRECTION can be one of [north, south, east, west]. Most importantly, once we have found the target room, replace <action> with "DONE" instead. Omit any other text.

Here is an example:

The target room is a bathroom. We have made a step and are now in this room. From here we can go: north, west. What is your next instruction?

"description": "We are in a kitchen with a red fridge.", "action": "GO: north"

We have made a step and are now in this room. From here we can go: south, east. What is your next instruction?

"description": "We are in a living room with a couch and a tv.", "action": "GO: east"

... We have made a step and are now in this room. From here we can go: south, east. What is your next instruction?

"description": "We are in a bathroom, there is a shower and a sink", "action": "DONE"

Let us start. The target room is a \$GOAL\$ We are now in this room. From here we can go: \$INITIAL_DIRECTIONS\$. What is your next instruction?

(a) Text-only Map World Game: Initial prompt template for the G2X version (11)

(b) Multimodal Map World Game: Initial prompt template for the G2X version (12)

Figure 23: Initial prompt and answer templates for the G2X version of Map World Game

TEMPLATE D.7.13

Please help me with the following task. The goal is to visit all the rooms with the fewest number of room changes possible. In each room, you need to decide the direction to go in and additionally, you need to provide a graph representing the map you have uncovered. Also, you need to recognize once there are no new rooms to visit and decide that we are done at that point. Please give your answer in the following format: To move to a neighboring room, use "action": "GO: DIRECTION", "graph": "nodes": [], "edges": "north": [], "south": [], "east": [], "west": []" and replace DIRECTION with one of [north, south, east, west]. To stop the exploration, answer with "DONE" instead. Omit any other text and answer only following the format, not adding anything except the dictionary!

Here is an example:

You are in the Living Room. Currently available directions: south, west. What is your next instruction? "action": "GO: west", "graph": "nodes": ["Living Room"], "edges": "north": [], "south": [], "east": [], "west": []

You have made a step and entered a Library. Currently available directions: east, north. What is your next instruction? "action": "GO: north", "graph": "nodes": ["Living Room", "Library"], "edges": "north": [], "south": [], "east": [], "west": ["Living Room", "Library"]

You have made a step and entered a Kitchen. Currently available directions: south, east. What is your next instruction? "action": "GO: east", "graph": "nodes": ["Living Room", "Library", "Kitchen"], "edges": "north": ["Library", "Kitchen"], "south": [], "east": [], "west": ["Living Room", "Library"]

...

You have made a step and entered a Bedroom. Currently available directions: south, west. What is your next instruction? "action": "DONE", "graph": ...

Let us start. You are in the \$INITIAL_ROOMS\$. Currently available directions: \$INITIAL_DIRECTIONS\$. What is your next instruction?

TEMPLATE D.7.14

We are currently in this room. Please help me with the following task. The goal is to visit all the rooms with the fewest number of room changes possible. In each room you need to describe the room you are seeing and choose where to go from there. Additionally, you need to provide a graph representing the map you have uncovered. Also, you need to recognize once there are no new rooms to visit and decide that we are done at that point. Please give your answer in the following format: "action": "<action>", "description": "<room description>", "graph": "<graph>". <action> needs to be in the format "GO: <direction>" where <direction> is one of [north, east, south, west]. Alternatively, choose "DONE" as your action once you have explored the entire map. <room description> should be a single sentence describing the room shown to you. <graph> represents the map in this format: "nodes": [], "edges": "north": [], "south": [], "east": [], "west": [] Omit any other text and answer only following the format, not adding anything except the dictionary!

Here is an example:

We are in this room. From here we can go: south, west. What is your next instruction?

"action": "GO: north", "description": "We are in a kitchen with a red fridge.", "graph": "nodes": ["Kitchen"], "edges": "north": [], "south": [], "east": [], "west": []

We have made a step and are now in this room. From here we can go: east. What is your next instruction?

"action": "GO: east", "description": "We are in a living room with a couch and a tv.", "graph": "nodes": ["Kitchen", "Living Room"], "edges": "north": ["Kitchen", "Living Room"], "south": [], "east": [], "west": []

You have made a step and are now in this room. From here we can go: west, south. What is your next instruction?

"action": "GO: south", "description": "We are in a bedroom with two beds and a nightstand.", "graph": "nodes": ["Kitchen", "Living Room", "Bedroom"], "edges": "north": ["Kitchen", "Living Room"], "south": [], "east": ["Living Room", "Bedroom"], "west": []

...

You have made a step and are now in this room. From here we can go: north. What is your next instruction?

Example answer: "action": "DONE", "description": "We are in a stairwell, the stair is curved.", "graph": "..."

Let us start. Currently available directions: \$INITIAL_DIRECTIONS\$. What is your next instruction?

(a) Text-only Map World Game: Initial prompt template for EE-gr version (13)

(b) Multimodal Map World Game: Initial prompt template for EE-gr version (14)

Figure 24: Initial prompts for the EE-gr version of the Map World Game

TEMPLATE D.7.15

Please help me with the following task. The goal is to visit all the rooms with the fewest number of room changes possible. You are given a description of the room at each step and need to decide the direction to go in. Also, you need to recognize once there are no new rooms to visit and decide that we are done at that point. Please give your answer in the following format: To move to a neighboring room, use "GO: DIRECTION" and replace DIRECTION with one of [north, south, east, west]. To stop the exploration, answer with "DONE" instead. Omit any other text. Here is an example: You are in the initial room, which has the following description: a kitchen with light wooden cabinets, a grey floor and a silver oven and dishwasher. Currently available directions: south, west. What is your next instruction? GO: west You have made a step and entered a room, which has the following description: a bedroom with a large bed, couch, a ceiling fan, 3 windows equipped with shutter and a white floor carpet. Currently available directions: east, north. What is your next instruction? GO: north ... You have made a step and entered a room, which has the following description: a bathroom with blue tiles, a sink and a mirror with two towels hanging on the wall to the left. Currently available directions: south. What is your next instruction? DONE

Let us start. You are in the initial room, which has the following description: \$INITIAL_ROOM\$. Currently available directions: \$INITIAL_DIRECTIONS\$. What is your next instruction?

Figure 25: Image Description Map World Game (*EE-id*): Initial prompt template (15)