

# LogicVista: Multimodal LLM Logical Reasoning Benchmark in Visual Contexts

Yijia Xiao<sup>1\*</sup>, Edward Sun<sup>1\*</sup>, Tianyu Liu<sup>2</sup>, Wei Wang<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of California, Los Angeles,

<sup>2</sup>Yale University

<sup>1</sup>{yijia.xiao, weiwang}@cs.ucla.edu,

<sup>1</sup>edwardsun12895@g.ucla.edu

<sup>2</sup>tianyu.liu@yale.edu

## Abstract

We propose LogicVista, an evaluation benchmark that assesses the integrated logical reasoning capabilities of multimodal large language models (MLLMs) in **Visual** contexts. Recent advancements in MLLMs have demonstrated various fascinating abilities, from crafting poetry based on an image to performing mathematical reasoning. However, there is still a lack of systematic evaluation of MLLMs’ proficiency in logical reasoning tasks, which are essential for activities like navigation and puzzle-solving. Thus we evaluate general logical cognition abilities across 5 logical reasoning tasks encompassing 9 different capabilities, using a sample of 448 multiple-choice questions. Each question is annotated with the correct answer and the human-written reasoning behind the selection, enabling both open-ended and multiple-choice evaluation. A total of 8 MLLMs are comprehensively evaluated using LogicVista. Code and Data Available at <https://github.com/Yijia-Xiao/LogicVista>.

## 1 Introduction

Recent advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs) are gradually turning the vision of a generalist AI agent into reality. These models exhibit near-human expert-level performance across a variety of tasks and have recently been augmented with visual understanding capabilities, enabling them to tackle even more complex visual challenges. This branch of work, led by proprietary projects such as GPT-4 [1] and Flamingo [2], as well as open-source efforts like LLaVA [3], Mini-GPT4 [4], enhances existing LLMs by incorporating visual comprehension. These models, known as Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs), use LLMs as the foundation for processing information and generating reasoned outcomes [5], thereby bridging the gap between language and vision.


Recent MLLMs have demonstrated a range of impressive abilities, such as writing poems based on an image [6], engaging in mathematical reasoning [2], and even aiding in medical diagnosis [7]. To evaluate the performance of these models, various benchmarks have been proposed, as shown in Figure. 1 targeting the performance on common tasks such as objects recognition [8], text understanding in images [9], or mathematical problem solving [10]. However, as seen in Figure. 1, there is a notable shortage of benchmarks for MLLMs’ abilities in critical logical reasoning tasks that underlie most tasks. Perception and reasoning are two representative abilities of high-level intelligence that are used in unison during human problem-solving processes.

Many current MLLM datasets have focused solely on perception tasks, which require fact retrieval where the MLLM identifies and retrieve relevant information from a scene. However, complex multimodal reasoning, such as interpreting graphs [11], everyday reasoning, critical thinking, and problem-solving

---

\* Both authors contributed equally.

## LogicVista (Ours)




Q: Which of the boxes comes next?

A: E

Reasoning Skill: Inductive

Capability: Diagram




Q: Which of these are the top view?

A: B

Reasoning Skill: Spatial

Capability: 3D Shape



Q: What is the weight if balanced?

A: C: 35 lb

Reasoning Skill: Mechanical

Capability: Physics

## VQAv2, TextVQA and MM-vet




Q: Is the girl touching the ground?

A: No

Reasoning Skill: None

Capability: Recognition



Q: What is the final destination?

A: New York

Reasoning Skill: None

Capability: OCR



Q: What will girl on right write?

A: 14

Reasoning Skill: Numerical

Capability: OCR

Figure 1: Capabilities and reasoning skills of various existing benchmarks. Traditional benchmarks seldom assess reasoning skills, whereas LogicVista emphasizes the fundamental capacities necessary for solving specific problems, going beyond simple recognition or math tasks.

[12, 13] requires a combination of perception and logical reasoning. Proficiency in these reasoning skills is a reliable indicator of cognitive capabilities required for performing specialized or routine tasks across different domains. To our knowledge, MathVista [14] is the only benchmark that attempts to evaluate multimodal logical reasoning, but its scope is limited to mathematical-related reasoning. For a better understanding of how MLLMs perform on general reasoning tasks, there is a need for a comprehensive and general visual reasoning benchmark.

We argue that a universal comprehensive evaluation benchmark should have the following characteristics: (1) cover a wide range of logical reasoning tasks, including deductive, inductive, numeric, spatial, and mechanical reasoning; (2) present information in both graphical and Optical Character Recognition (OCR) formats to accommodate different types of data inputs; and (3) facilitate convenient quantitative analysis for rigorous assessment and comparison of model performance.

To this end, we present a comprehensive MLLM evaluation benchmark, named LogicVista, which meets all these criteria:

- LogicVista covers 5 representative categories of logical reasoning tasks: inductive (*sample* = 107), deductive (*sample* = 93), numerical (*sample* = 95), spatial (*sample* = 79), and mechanical (*sample* = 74).
- LogicVista includes a variety of capabilities, ranging from diagrams (*sample* = 330), OCR, (*sample* = 234), patterns (*sample* = 105), graphs (*sample* = 67), tables (*sample* = 70), 3D shapes (*samples* = 45), puzzles (*samples* = 256), sequences (*samples* = 76), and physics (*samples* = 69).
- All images, instructions, solution, and reasoning are manually annotated and validated.

- With our instruction design “please select from A, B, C, D, and E.” and our LLM answer evaluator, we can assess different reasoning skills and capabilities and easily perform quantitative statistical analysis based on the natural language output of MLLMs. Additionally, We provide more in-depth human-written explanations for why each answer is correct, allowing for thorough open-ended evaluation.

As shown in Figure. 1, LogicVista covers a wide range of reasoning capabilities and evaluates them comprehensively. For instance, answering the question “Which of these images is the top view of the given object” in Figure 1(b) requires not only recognizing the objects’ orientation but also the ability to spatially reason over the object from a different perspective. Since these questions and diagrams are presented without context, they effectively probe the MLLM’s underlying ability rather than relying on contextual cues from the surrounding real-life environment.

Furthermore, we provide two evaluation strategies with our annotations: multiple-choice question (MCQ) evaluation and open-ended evaluation. Our annotation of MCQ choices along with our LLM evaluator allows quick evaluations of answers provided by MLLMs. Additionally, our annotation of the reasoning and thought process behind each MCQ enables open-ended evaluation, capturing the nuances of the MLLM responses and identifying which reasoning steps were correct or incorrect.

We comprehensively evaluate the performance of 8 representative open and closed source MLLMs on 448 tasks across 5 main logical reasoning categories. LogicVista’s evaluation strategy allows users to see a detailed breakdown of an MLLM’s performance on each reasoning skill and capability. This approach provides more insights than a single overall score, enabling users to better understand the specific skills in which a model excels or needs improvement.

## 2 Related Works

	VQAv2 [8, 15]	COCO [16]	TextCaps [17]	Contextual [18]	MM-vet [10]	MathVista [14]	VisIT-Bench [19]	LogicVista
Number of Logical Reasoning Skills Tested	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	5
Number of Multimodal Capabilities Tested	1	1	2	2	6	12	2	9
Dataset Size	204,721	330,000	28,000	506	217	6,141	592	448
Scene and Object Recognition	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Inductive Reasoning	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Deductive Reasoning	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
Numerical Reasoning	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Spatial Reasoning	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
Mechanical Reasoning	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
Answer Choice Explanations	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓
Human Annotation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Human Evaluation	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗
Auto/GPT-4 Evaluation	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Open-ended Evaluation	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 1: Comparison with related vision-language benchmarks.

**Multimodal Language Models** The field of vision-language models [20–29] has made significant progress towards achieving a cohesive understanding and generation of both visual and linguistic information. This progress is largely driven by the remarkable generalization and quality capabilities of recent large language models (LLMs) [30, 1, 31, 32]. As a result, there has been a surge in the development of MLLMs that aim to integrate the diverse capabilities of vision and language for complex multimodal tasks.

Efforts to create these multimodal generalist systems include enhancing LLMs with multi-sensory processing abilities, as demonstrated by innovative projects like Frozen [33], Flamingo [2], PaLM-E [34], and GPT-4 [1]. Recent releases of open-source LLMs [35, 32, 36] have further propelled research in this field, leading to the development of OpenFlamingo [37], LLaVA [38], MiniGPT-4 [4], Otter [39], InstructBLIP [40], among others [41, 38, 42]. Additionally, multimodal agents [43–45] have been explored for their ability to link various vision tools with LLMs [30, 1], aiming to enhance integrated vision-language capabilities

**Vision-Language Benchmarks** Traditional vision-language benchmarks have focused on assessing specific capabilities, including visual recognition [21], generating image descriptions [20, 46], and




Figure 2: a) Data collected for LogicVista were gathered from closed sources to avoid data leakage. b) Manual annotators used the gathered tests, gathered the correct answers, and came up with reasonings on why the selected answers were correct. All these annotations were then stored in JSON format.

other specialized functions such as understanding scene text [47, 17, 48], commonsense reasoning [49], mathematical reasoning [14], instruction following [19], and external knowledge incorporation [50]. While some benchmarks incorporate reasoning [18], they are often presented in real-life contexts, which may reduce the task to mere recognition based on contextual cues.

The emergence of general MLLMs has highlighted the need for updated vision-language benchmarks that encompass complex multimodal tasks requiring comprehensive vision-language skills. Our benchmark, LogicVista, aligns closely with recent evaluation studies like MM-Vet and MMBench [10, 51], which aim to provide thorough evaluations of MLLMs through well-designed evaluation samples. A key distinction of LogicVista lies in its focus on integrated vision-language capabilities, offering deeper insights beyond mere model rankings.

**LLM-Based Evaluation.** LogicVista adopts an open-ended LLM-based evaluation approach, which facilitates the generation and assessment of diverse answer styles and question types beyond the limitations of binary or multiple-choice responses. This innovative method leverages the capabilities of large language models (LLMs) for comprehensive model evaluation, a technique that has been effectively applied in natural language processing (NLP) tasks [52–55]. Our findings indicate that this LLM-based evaluation framework is not only versatile but also robust, enabling a unified and flexible assessment across various modalities. By accommodating a wide range of answer styles and question types, this approach enhances evaluation depth and breadth, which contributes to a more thorough understanding of model performance.

### 3 Data annotation and organization

#### 3.1 Data Sources

To ensure the integrity and quality of LogicVista’s evaluations, we have implemented a stringent data collection and curation process specifically designed to prevent data leakage detailed in Figure. 2. Our approach involves sourcing and annotating our samples from proprietary sources that require licenses, registration, payment, or a combination of these barriers to access. This methodology is critical to minimizing the risk that our benchmark data has been previously seen or utilized in the training of other multi-modal models. We prioritized sourcing data from closed sources to further reduce the potential of data leakage.

- **Licensed Access:** We obtain data from sources that require formal licensing, ensuring the data is used solely for research purposes and not freely available for general use or scraping on the internet.




Figure 3: Proportion of reasoning skills and capabilities. On the left is the proportion of questions belonging to each reasoning skill. These proportions add up to 100% as each skill is independent of another. On the right is the proportion of questions belonging to each multi-modal capability. These do not add up to 100% due to the use of mixed capabilities.

- **Registration Requirements:** Some of our data sources mandate user registration and account verification, adding an additional layer of access control to ensure that the data remain restricted and not easily accessible.
- **Paid Content:** We utilize paid sources where content is accessible only through purchase or subscription, further restricting the data from being freely available on the internet.

Additionally, we obtained permission from the creators of IQ tests and other evaluation materials included in our dataset. This permission specifically allows the use of their content for research purposes, ensuring the data’s legitimacy and accuracy.

## 3.2 Annotation and Data Collection

LogicVista consists of images designed to assess the underlying reasoning capacities of MLLMs. Using real-life scenes as explicit tests of logical reasoning can be challenging, as they often contain context clues that AI agent can use to deduce answers without directly reasoning through the scene. Therefore, LogicVista presents multiple-choice questions across 9 explicit capabilities that specify the type of reasoning required, without the additional context of real-life scenes typically found in intelligence and reasoning tests. The dataset is manually collected and annotated from various licensed intelligence test sources. Over a period of 3 months, 5 annotators extracted images, correct answers, and explanations when available. The explanations detailing the reasoning behind answer choices were extensively annotated and cross-validated among annotators, ensuring data integrity through multiple rounds of quality checks. The data is structured in JSON format to facilitate easy retrieval and processing in our evaluation pipeline. For our evaluation, we focused on summarizing five reasoning skills spanning two multimodal capabilities. For detailed examples of these reasoning skills and capabilities, please refer to Appendix. [A](#) and Appendix. [B](#).

### 3.2.1 Capabilities

We distinguish multimodal capabilities from reasoning skills, considering these capabilities fundamental to understanding a multimodal scene and extracting information. Capabilities refer to the modalities

through which logical reasoning questions are delivered. To ensure comprehensive coverage in LogicVista, we have defined a diverse array of 9 capabilities for evaluation. This diversity guarantees that LogicVista thoroughly assess various logical situations that an MLLM may encounter in everyday reasoning. Figure 3 demonstrates how LogicVista contains a balanced mix of capabilities, including samples that utilize multiple capabilities to solve a problem.

- **Diagrams:** Simple flow diagrams and logical diagrams (e.g., Markov diagrams).
- **OCR:** Text embedded within an image (e.g., “gas station” in an image of a gas station).
- **Patterns:** Repeated sequences such as a series of diagrams, numbers, shapes, and objects (e.g., identifying patterns in how a box moves through repeated images of boxes).
- **Graphs:** Mathematical graphs with axes (e.g., graphs of  $y = 2x$  and  $y = x^2$ ).
- **Tables:** Data tables (e.g., pie charts and T-tables).
- **3D Shapes:** The ability to understand and differentiate 3D objects from 2D ones (e.g., recognizing a 3D shape in different rotations).
- **Puzzles:** Puzzles with logical implications embedded within the shapes (e.g., chess puzzles).
- **Sequences:** Sequences of related items or objects (e.g., predicting the next item in a sequence).
- **Physics:** Situations involving physics (e.g., diagrams of projectile motion).

### 3.2.2 Reasoning Skills

The reasoning skills of interest for this benchmark are based on common critical thinking and problem-solving skills used by humans in various contexts. For our evaluation, we summarize these into the following five skills. For our evaluation, we summarize these to include the following 5 skills. As seen in Figure 3, LogicVista encompasses a wide range of all these reasoning skills:

- **Inductive Reasoning:** The ability to infer the next entry in a pattern given a set of observations. This involves making generalizations based on specific observations to form an educated guess. It moves from many specific observations to a generalization. For example, observing that John gets a stomach ache when he eats dairy products leads to the inductive conclusion that he is likely lactose intolerant.
- **Deductive Reasoning:** The ability to conclude a specific case from a general principle or pattern. This involves moving from the general to the specific. For example, from the statement “all men are mortal,” one can deduce that “John is mortal” because John is a man.
- **Numerical Reasoning:** The ability to read arithmetic problems in an image and solve the math equations. For example, given the equation “ $10 + 10 = ?$ ,” the answer would be “20.”
- **Spatial Reasoning:** The ability to understand the spatial relationships between objects and patterns and reason with those relationships. For example, seeing an unfolded box and understanding what the box would look like when folded.
- **Mechanical Reasoning:** The ability to recognize a physical system and solve equations based on that system or answer questions about it. For example, seeing a set of three gears and understanding which gears will turn clockwise and which will turn counterclockwise.




Figure 4: Pipeline of evaluating open-ended LMM outputs using MCQ answer choice extraction.

### 3.3 LLM-based Multiple Choice Answer Extractor

LLMs generate non-deterministic and open-ended responses [56, 57], making direct evaluation challenging. To address this, we use an LLM evaluator to compare these open-ended responses to our annotations as detailed in 4. This evaluator can assess both MCQ answer choices and the MLLM’s reasoning behind those selections, as both elements are included in our annotations. This step is achieved by feeding various contexts such as the question, and the available choices, along with the LLM-generated answers to an extraction LLM (GPT, LLaMA, etc.). Based on the provided rich context, the LLM can generate the selected letter answer choice. The final output is also repeatedly validated and if the validation fails, the extraction repeats with the provided feedback to obtain correct results.

## 4 Evaluation Setup

Model	Size	Language Model	Vision Model
LLaVA-Vicuna-7B	7B	Vicuna-7B	CLIP ViT-L/14
LLaVA-Vicuna-13B	13B	Vicuna-13B	CLIP ViT-L/336px
LLaVA-NeXT-Mistral-7B	7B	Mistral-7B	CLIP ViT-L/14
LLaVA-NeXT-Vicuna-7B	7B	Vicuna-7B	CLIP ViT-L/14
LLaVA-NeXT-Vicuna-13B	13B	Vicuna-13B	CLIP ViT-L/336px
LLaVA-NeXT-Nous-Hermes-Yi-34B	34B	Nous Hermes 2-Yi-34B	CLIP ViT-L/336px
MiniGPT-4-7B	7B	Vicuna-7B	BLIP-2 Q-Former
MiniGPT-4-13B	13B	Vicuna-13B	BLIP-2 Q-Former
Otter-9B	9B	MPT-7B	CLIP ViT-L/14
GPT-4 Vision	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A	N/A
BLIP-2	2.7B	OPT-2.7B	EVA-ViT-G
Pix2Struct	1.3B	ViT	ViT
InstructBLIP-Vicuna-7B	7B	Vicuna-7B	BLIP-2 Q-Former
InstructBLIP-Vicuna-13B	13B	Vicuna-13B	BLIP-2 Q-Former
InstructBLIP-FLAN-T5-xl	3B	FLAN-T5 XL	BLIP-2 Q-Former
InstructBLIP-FLAN-T5-xxl	11B	FLAN-T5 XXL	BLIP-2 Q-Former

Table 2: Summary of the MLLMs used for evaluations in this study.

To evaluate the performance of MLLMs on LogicVista, we selected a range of representative models detailed in Table. 2. Specifically, we chose 8 models for evaluation, including LLaVA [3, 58], MiniGPT4

[4], Otter [39], GPT-4 Vision [1], BLIP-2 [59], and InstructBLIP [40] We also included pix2struct [60] which has been fine-tuned to understand chart and diagram data.

Each model generated outputs using the LogicVista dataset. Our LLM-based multiple-choice extractor was then employed to isolate the multiple-choice selections from the MLLMs’ outputs (which often appear as full-sentence responses rather than single letters) and compare them to the ground truth answers. The overall logical reasoning score is calculated as follows:

$$S = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N s_i}{N} * 100\% \quad (1)$$

Here,  $S$  represents the overall score,  $s_i$  indicate whether a sample  $i$  is evaluated as correct or not (regardless of category), and  $N$  is the total number of samples. The score for each reasoning skill subcategory is calculated as:

$$S_{LR} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N_{LR}} s_i}{N_{LR}} * 100\% \quad (2)$$

where  $S_{LR}$  represents the score for a specific reasoning skill category,  $N_{LR}$  is the total number of samples in that reasoning skill category, and  $s_i$  indicate whether a sample  $i$  from that category was evaluated as correct. Similarly, the score for each multi-modal capability is calculated as:

$$S_c = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N_c} s_i}{N_c} * 100\% \quad (3)$$

where  $S_c$  represents the score for a specific capability,  $N_c$  is the total number of samples in that capability, and  $s_i$  indicates whether a sample  $i$  in the capability category is evaluated correctly.

## 5 LogicVista Benchmarking and Performance Interpretation

### 5.1 Logical Reasoning Skills

We present the performance results of various multimodal LLMs on LogicVista. Table 3 outlines the outcome for these models across five logical reasoning categories. We analyzed models of different architectures and sizes, benchmarking them against a random baseline that assumes an average of five choices per question in the LogicVista dataset. Our findings indicate that many models perform below expectations, often yielding results that are worse than random guessing. This outcome is somewhat anticipated, given that most training data for multimodal LLMs and LLMs are derived from classical computer vision datasets such as COCO, which focus on recognition tasks rather than complex reasoning.

Traditional benchmarks typically emphasize recognition tasks, resulting in a lack of emphasis on reasoning tasks during both training and evaluation phases. This is evident from the observation that while many models excel on recognition-based benchmarks like COCO, TextVQA, and MM-vet, they often struggle to outperform a random baseline on logical reasoning tasks.

Upon closer examination, we find that models perform best on deductive, numerical, and mechanical reasoning tasks. These types of reasoning are more prevalent in real-life scenarios, which makes models more adept at handling them. For example, deductive reasoning can be applied in predicting a character’s actions based on a scene, while numerical reasoning is crucial in solving arithmetic visual tasks. Mechanical reasoning involves understanding physical principles and interactions.

In contrast, induction and spatial reasoning are less frequently encountered in standard training data, potentially explaining the lower performance of models in these areas. These insights underscore the necessity for enhanced training and evaluation methodologies that prioritize reasoning tasks to bolster the logical reasoning capabilities of multimodal LLMs.



Model	Inductive	Deductive	Numerical	Spatial	Mechanical
LLAVA7B	29.91%	29.03%	26.32%	25.32%	36.49%
LLAVA13B	18.69%	31.18%	20.00%	27.85%	24.32%
otter9B	31.78%	24.73%	18.95%	18.99%	21.62%
GPT4	23.36%	54.84%	24.21%	21.52%	41.89%
BLIP2	17.76%	23.66%	23.16%	24.05%	18.92%
LLAVANEXT-7B-mistral	16.82%	34.41%	23.16%	21.52%	22.97%
miniGPTvicuna7B	10.28%	9.68%	7.37%	3.80%	27.03%
miniGPTvicuna13B	13.08%	23.66%	10.53%	10.13%	17.57%
pix2struct	12.15%	6.45%	2.11%	7.59%	17.57%
instructBLIP-vicuna-7B	4.67%	21.51%	24.21%	2.53%	22.97%
instructBLIP-vicuna-13B	3.74%	10.75%	18.95%	5.06%	17.57%
instructBLIP-flan-t5-xl	23.36%	22.58%	22.11%	7.59%	33.78%
instructBLIP-flan-t5-xxl	17.76%	30.11%	24.21%	20.25%	22.97%
LLAVANEXT-7B-vicuna	26.17%	21.51%	25.26%	27.85%	29.73%
LLAVANEXT-13B-vicuna	22.43%	22.58%	26.32%	26.58%	25.68%
LLAVANEXT-34B-NH	20.56%	52.69%	30.53%	24.05%	40.54%

Table 3: LogicVista evaluation results for various multimodal LLMs on each logical reasoning skill are presented as %, with the highest possible accuracy being 100%. The highest-scoring models are highlighted in green and the lower-scoring models are highlighted in yellow.

## 5.2 Visual Capabilities

In Table 4, we present the results of multimodal LLMs on logical reasoning tasks across diagrammatic and OCR mediums. Generally, we observe that OCR tasks tend to perform better than diagrammatic tasks. This difference stems from the nature of traditional computer vision tasks, which often prioritize recognizing prominent objects (“landmarks”) in a scene, such as distinct cars, planes, people, or balls. Diagrams, in contrast, lack such prominent features and mainly consist of lines and shapes, making it challenging for models to extract intricate relationships between objects.

In OCR tasks, once the text is accurately extracted from the image, the remainder of the reasoning task relies on the underlying LLM’s ability to process and interpret the content. This process typically bypasses the complexities of multimodal reasoning, leading to better performance on OCR tasks compared to diagrammatic tasks. These findings highlight the necessity for enhanced evaluation methodologies tailored to diagrammatic reasoning in multimodal LLMs, as current approaches may overlook critical details inherent in these types of tasks.

## 5.3 Relationship between Model Size and Performance

Figure 5 presents a comparative analysis of the model size and the average score achieved across all logical reasoning tasks and capabilities. Each plot includes a shaded region denoting the 95% confidence interval for the regression estimate, visually representing the uncertainty associated with the regression line. Dot sizes in the scatter plot indicate the number of models with identical parameter counts, illustrating the distribution density. This visual evidence strongly suggests a positive correlation between larger model sizes and improved performance in LogicVista. Specifically, as model size increases, performance tends to improve, indicating that larger models may have greater capacity to handle complex patterns and reasoning tasks.

## 6 Conclusion

Reasoning skills are critical for solving complex tasks and serve as the foundation for many challenges that humans expect AI agents to tackle. However, the exploration of reasoning abilities in multimodal LLM agents remains limited, with most benchmarks and training datasets predominantly focused on

Model	Diagram	OCR	Patterns	Graphs	Tables	3D Shapes	Puzzles	Sequences	Physics
LLAVA7B	29.70%	28.21%	30.47%	25.37%	25.71%	22.22%	28.52%	25.00%	43.48%
LLAVA13B	21.52%	22.65%	16.19%	16.42%	20.00%	31.11%	26.17%	15.79%	26.09%
otter9B	23.64%	20.51%	30.48%	14.93%	22.86%	13.33%	26.17%	26.32%	24.64%
GPT4	26.06%	39.74%	20.95%	20.90%	22.86%	31.11%	31.25%	28.95%	47.83%
BLIP2	20.30%	21.79%	20.00%	17.91%	24.29%	17.78%	22.27%	15.79%	20.29%
LLAVANEXT-7B-mistral	20.30%	26.92%	21.90%	23.88%	22.86%	13.33%	22.27%	23.68%	30.43%
miniGPTvicuna7B	10.91%	11.54%	12.38%	7.46%	8.57%	11.11%	9.77%	7.89%	23.19%
miniGPTvicuna13B	12.73%	17.52%	12.38%	10.45%	11.43%	11.11%	14.84%	6.58%	20.29%
pix2struct	9.39%	8.55%	10.48%	0.00%	4.29%	11.11%	10.55%	11.84%	14.49%
instructBLIP-vicuna-7B	11.82%	21.37%	7.62%	22.39%	22.86%	6.67%	10.55%	0.00%	24.64%
instructBLIP-vicuna-13B	10.91%	13.68%	5.71%	19.40%	15.71%	11.11%	6.25%	2.63%	18.84%
instructBLIP-flan-t5-xl	20.30%	22.22%	20.00%	17.91%	22.86%	13.33%	18.36%	15.79%	33.33%
instructBLIP-flan-t5-xxl	20.91%	24.36%	22.86%	20.90%	25.71%	20.00%	21.09%	14.47%	21.74%
LLAVANEXT-7B-vicuna	26.67%	23.08%	26.67%	20.90%	27.14%	33.33%	26.56%	19.74%	30.43%
LLAVANEXT-13B-vicuna	25.15%	22.65%	23.81%	20.90%	27.14%	26.67%	24.61%	15.79%	27.54%
LLAVANEXT-34B-NH	27.58%	39.32%	25.71%	28.36%	32.86%	26.67%	30.86%	21.05%	46.37%

Table 4: LogicVista evaluation results on various multimodal LLMs across each multi-modal capability. Accuracy results are presented as %, with a maximum possible accuracy of 100%. Models achieving the highest scores are highlighted **green**, while lower-scoring models are highlighted **yellow**.

traditional computer vision tasks like recognition. For multimodal LLMs to excel in critical thinking and complex tasks, they must comprehend the underlying logical relationships inherent in these challenges.




Figure 5: correlation between model size and average accuracy. The scatter plot uses varying dot sizes to represent the density of models with identical sizes.

To address this gap, we introduce LogicVista, a novel benchmark designed to evaluate multimodal LLMs through a comprehensive assessment of logical reasoning capabilities. This benchmark features a dataset of 448 samples covering five distinct reasoning skills, providing a robust platform for evaluating cutting-edge multimodal models. Our evaluation aims to shed light on the current state of logical reasoning in multimodal LLMs.

To facilitate straightforward evaluation, we employ an LLM-based multiple-choice question-answer extractor, which helps mitigate the non-deterministic nature often associated with multimodal LLM outputs. While LogicVista primarily focuses on explicit logical reasoning tasks isolated from real-life

contexts, this approach represents a crucial step toward understanding fundamental reasoning skills. However, it is equally important to explore how AI agents perform tasks that blend abstract reasoning with real-world scenarios, a direction that will guide our future research endeavors.

## Acknowledgements

We extend our sincere appreciation to the student researchers at the University of California, Los Angeles, for their diligent efforts in the manual annotation and validation of our dataset: Evan Li, Srinath Saikrishnan, Lawrence Li, and Oscar Cooper Stern.

## References

- [1] OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix, Simón Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Kiros, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kosic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rajeesh Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Long Ouyang, Cullen O’Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokornyy, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine B. Thompson, Phil Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayvergiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu,

- Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024.
- [2] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katie Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, Roman Ring, Eliza Rutherford, Serkan Cabi, Tengda Han, Zhitao Gong, Sina Samangooei, Marianne Monteiro, Jacob Menick, Sebastian Borgeaud, Andrew Brock, Aida Nematzadeh, Sahand Sharifzadeh, Mikolaj Binkowski, Ricardo Barreira, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew Zisserman, and Karen Simonyan. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning, 2022.
  - [3] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning, 2023.
  - [4] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigpt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models, 2023.
  - [5] Shukang Yin, Chaoyou Fu, Sirui Zhao, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Tong Xu, and Enhong Chen. A survey on multimodal large language models, 2023.
  - [6] Chaoyou Fu, Peixian Chen, Yunhang Shen, Yulei Qin, Mengdan Zhang, Xu Lin, Jinrui Yang, Xiawu Zheng, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Yunsheng Wu, and Rongrong Ji. Mme: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for multimodal large language models, 2023.
  - [7] Xiaoman Zhang, Chaoyi Wu, Ziheng Zhao, Weixiong Lin, Ya Zhang, Yanfeng Wang, and Weidi Xie. Pmc-vqa: Visual instruction tuning for medical visual question answering, 2023.
  - [8] Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jiasen Lu, Margaret Mitchell, Dhruv Batra, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. Vqa: Visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, December 2015.
  - [9] Amanpreet Singh, Vivek Natarajan, Meet Shah, Yu Jiang, Xinlei Chen, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Marcus Rohrbach. Towards vqa models that can read, 2019.
  - [10] Weihao Yu, Zhengyuan Yang, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Kevin Lin, Zicheng Liu, Xinchao Wang, and Lijuan Wang. Mm-vet: Evaluating large multimodal models for integrated capabilities, 2023.
  - [11] Michael J. Wavering. Logical reasoning necessary to make line graphs. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 26(5):373–379, May 1989.
  - [12] Catherine Sophian and Susan C. Somerville. Early developments in logical reasoning: Considering alternative possibilities. *Cognitive Development*, 3(2):183–222, 1988.
  - [13] Hugo Bronkhorst, Gerrit Roorda, Cor Suhre, and Martin Goedhart. Logical reasoning in formal and everyday reasoning tasks - international journal of science and mathematics education, Dec 2019.
  - [14] Pan Lu, Hritik Bansal, Tony Xia, Jiacheng Liu, Chunyuan Li, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Hao Cheng, Kai-Wei Chang, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. Mathvista: Evaluating mathematical reasoning of foundation models in visual contexts, 2024.
  - [15] Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Making the V in VQA matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in Visual Question Answering. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2017.
  - [16] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C. Lawrence Zitnick. *Microsoft COCO: Common Objects in Context*, page 740–755. Springer International Publishing, 2014.

- [17] Oleksii Sidorov, Ronghang Hu, Marcus Rohrbach, and Amanpreet Singh. Textcaps: a dataset for image captioning with reading comprehension, 2020.
- [18] Rohan Wadhawan, Hritik Bansal, Kai-Wei Chang, and Nanyun Peng. Contextual: Evaluating context-sensitive text-rich visual reasoning in large multimodal models, 2024.
- [19] Yonatan Bitton, Hritik Bansal, Jack Hessel, Rulin Shao, Wanrong Zhu, Anas Awadalla, Josh Gardner, Rohan Taori, and Ludwig Schmidt. Visit-bench: A benchmark for vision-language instruction following inspired by real-world use, 2023.
- [20] Xinlei Chen, Hao Fang, Tsung-Yi Lin, Ramakrishna Vedantam, Saurabh Gupta, Piotr Dollar, and C. Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco captions: Data collection and evaluation server, 2015.
- [21] Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Making the v in vqa matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in visual question answering, 2017.
- [22] Jiasen Lu, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Stefan Lee. Vilt: Pretraining task-agnostic visiolinguistic representations for vision-and-language tasks, 2019.
- [23] Yen-Chun Chen, Linjie Li, Licheng Yu, Ahmed El Kholy, Faisal Ahmed, Zhe Gan, Yu Cheng, and Jingjing Liu. Uniter: Universal image-text representation learning, 2020.
- [24] Xiujuan Li, Xi Yin, Chunyuan Li, Pengchuan Zhang, Xiaowei Hu, Lei Zhang, Lijuan Wang, Houdong Hu, Li Dong, Furu Wei, Yejin Choi, and Jianfeng Gao. Oscar: Object-semantics aligned pre-training for vision-language tasks, 2020.
- [25] Wonjae Kim, Bokyung Son, and Ildoo Kim. Vilt: Vision-and-language transformer without convolution or region supervision, 2021.
- [26] Zirui Wang, Jiahui Yu, Adams Wei Yu, Zihang Dai, Yulia Tsvetkov, and Yuan Cao. Simvlm: Simple visual language model pretraining with weak supervision, 2022.
- [27] Jianfeng Wang, Zhengyuan Yang, Xiaowei Hu, Linjie Li, Kevin Lin, Zhe Gan, Zicheng Liu, Ce Liu, and Lijuan Wang. Git: A generative image-to-text transformer for vision and language, 2022.
- [28] Zhengyuan Yang, Zhe Gan, Jianfeng Wang, Xiaowei Hu, Faisal Ahmed, Zicheng Liu, Yumao Lu, and Lijuan Wang. Unitab: Unifying text and box outputs for grounded vision-language modeling, 2022.
- [29] Zhe Gan, Linjie Li, Chunyuan Li, Lijuan Wang, Zicheng Liu, and Jianfeng Gao. Vision-language pre-training: Basics, recent advances, and future trends, 2022.
- [30] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners, 2020.
- [31] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Ben Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier Garcia, Vedant Misra, Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander

- Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pillai, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways, 2022.
- [32] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models, 2023.
- [33] Maria Tsimpoukelli, Jacob Menick, Serkan Cabi, S. M. Ali Eslami, Oriol Vinyals, and Felix Hill. Multimodal few-shot learning with frozen language models, 2021.
- [34] Danny Driess, Fei Xia, Mehdi S. M. Sajjadi, Corey Lynch, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Brian Ichter, Ayzaan Wahid, Jonathan Tompson, Quan Vuong, Tianhe Yu, Wenlong Huang, Yevgen Chebotar, Pierre Sermanet, Daniel Duckworth, Sergey Levine, Vincent Vanhoucke, Karol Hausman, Marc Toussaint, Klaus Greff, Andy Zeng, Igor Mordatch, and Pete Florence. Palm-e: An embodied multimodal language model, 2023.
- [35] Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, Todor Mihaylov, Myle Ott, Sam Shleifer, Kurt Shuster, Daniel Simig, Punit Singh Koura, Anjali Sridhar, Tianlu Wang, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models, 2022.
- [36] Baolin Peng, Chunyuan Li, Pengcheng He, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. Instruction tuning with gpt-4, 2023.
- [37] Anas Awadalla, Irena Gao, Josh Gardner, Jack Hessel, Yusuf Hanafy, Wanrong Zhu, Kalyani Marathe, Yonatan Bitton, Samir Gadre, Shiori Sagawa, Jenia Jitsev, Simon Kornblith, Pang Wei Koh, Gabriel Ilharco, Mitchell Wortsman, and Ludwig Schmidt. Openflamingo: An open-source framework for training large autoregressive vision-language models, 2023.
- [38] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning, 2023.
- [39] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Liangyu Chen, Jinghao Wang, Jingkang Yang, and Ziwei Liu. Otter: A multi-modal model with in-context instruction tuning, 2023.
- [40] Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale Fung, and Steven Hoi. Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning, 2023.
- [41] Tao Gong, Chengqi Lyu, Shilong Zhang, Yudong Wang, Miao Zheng, Qian Zhao, Kuikun Liu, Wenwei Zhang, Ping Luo, and Kai Chen. Multimodal-gpt: A vision and language model for dialogue with humans, 2023.
- [42] Qinghao Ye, Haiyang Xu, Guohai Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Yiyang Zhou, Junyang Wang, Anwen Hu, Pengcheng Shi, Yaya Shi, Chenliang Li, Yuanhong Xu, Hehong Chen, Junfeng Tian, Qian Qi, Ji Zhang, and Fei Huang. mplug-owl: Modularization empowers large language models with multimodality, 2023.
- [43] Zhengyuan Yang, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Kevin Lin, Ehsan Azarnasab, Faisal Ahmed, Zicheng Liu, Ce Liu, Michael Zeng, and Lijuan Wang. Mm-react: Prompting chatgpt for multimodal reasoning and action, 2023.
- [44] Yongliang Shen, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Dongsheng Li, Weiming Lu, and Yueting Zhuang. Hugging-gpt: Solving ai tasks with chatgpt and its friends in hugging face, 2023.

- [45] Difei Gao, Lei Ji, Luowei Zhou, Kevin Qinghong Lin, Joya Chen, Zihan Fan, and Mike Zheng Shou. Assistgpt: A general multi-modal assistant that can plan, execute, inspect, and learn, 2023.
- [46] Harsh Agrawal, Karan Desai, Yufei Wang, Xinlei Chen, Rishabh Jain, Mark Johnson, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, Stefan Lee, and Peter Anderson. nocaps: novel object captioning at scale. In *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. IEEE, October 2019.
- [47] Amanpreet Singh, Vivek Natarajan, Meet Shah, Yu Jiang, Xinlei Chen, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Marcus Rohrbach. Towards vqa models that can read, 2019.
- [48] Zhengyuan Yang, Yijuan Lu, Jianfeng Wang, Xi Yin, Dinei Florencio, Lijuan Wang, Cha Zhang, Lei Zhang, and Jiebo Luo. Tap: Text-aware pre-training for text-vqa and text-caption, 2020.
- [49] Rowan Zellers, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. From recognition to cognition: Visual commonsense reasoning, 2019.
- [50] Kenneth Marino, Mohammad Rastegari, Ali Farhadi, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. Ok-vqa: A visual question answering benchmark requiring external knowledge, 2019.
- [51] Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhang, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, Kai Chen, and Dahua Lin. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player?, 2023.
- [52] Cheng-Han Chiang and Hung yi Lee. Can large language models be an alternative to human evaluations?, 2023.
- [53] Yang Liu, Dan Iter, Yichong Xu, Shuohang Wang, Ruochen Xu, and Chenguang Zhu. G-eval: Nlg evaluation using gpt-4 with better human alignment, 2023.
- [54] Jinlan Fu, See-Kiong Ng, Zhengbao Jiang, and Pengfei Liu. Gptscore: Evaluate as you desire, 2023.
- [55] Yiqiao Jin, Minje Choi, Gaurav Verma, Jindong Wang, and Srijan Kumar. Mm-soc: Benchmarking multimodal large language models in social media platforms. In *ACL*, 2024.
- [56] Mina Lee, Percy Liang, and Qian Yang. Coauthor: Designing a human-ai collaborative writing dataset for exploring language model capabilities. In *CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI '22. ACM, April 2022.
- [57] Shuyin Ouyang, Jie M. Zhang, Mark Harman, and Meng Wang. Llm is like a box of chocolates: the non-determinism of chatgpt in code generation, 2023.
- [58] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Sheng Shen, and Yong Jae Lee. Llava-next: Improved reasoning, ocr, and world knowledge, January 2024.
- [59] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models, 2023.
- [60] Kenton Lee, Mandar Joshi, Iulia Turc, Hexiang Hu, Fangyu Liu, Julian Eisenschlos, Urvashi Khandelwal, Peter Shaw, Ming-Wei Chang, and Kristina Toutanova. Pix2struct: Screenshot parsing as pretraining for visual language understanding, 2023.



# Appendix: LogicVista: Multimodal LLM Logical Reasoning Benchmark in Visual Contexts

## A Examples of LogicVista Logical Reasoning Data

Table 5: Three samples requiring inductive logical reasoning skills.

(Case A)	
<b>Q:</b>	Which choice (A, B, C, or D) completes the series?
<b>Answer:</b>	D
<b>Reasoning:</b>	In this example, there are two rules to be applied. The first is that the circle moves counter-clockwise in the hexagon. It follows that, in the following diagram, the circle will be in the upper corner of the hexagon, pointing to D as the answer. To confirm this, the second rule can be applied, according to which the position of the black triangle alternates between the bottom left and the top right. Thus, in the following diagram, the black triangle will need to be in the upper right corner of the hex. The answer is therefore definitely D.
<b>Logical Reasoning Skill:</b>	Inductive
<b>Required capability</b>	Diagram

Table 6: Three samples requiring inductive logical reasoning skills (Case B).

(Case B)	
<b>Q:</b>	Two grids containing colored symbols and following a common rule are presented. In the block on the right, four additional grids are presented. The candidate must find the two grids that follow the same rule out of these four options. What options (A, B, C, or D) follow this same rule?
<b>Answer:</b>	B, D
<b>Reasoning:</b>	In this example, it is easy to see that the rule governing the two grids on the left is: that blue triangles are present in each of the two bottom lines. This rule is followed in the two grids on the right.
<b>Logical Reasoning Skill:</b>	Inductive
<b>Required capability</b>	Diagram, OCR

<sup>1</sup>N/A: Not disclosed

Table 7: Three samples requiring inductive logical reasoning skills (Case C).










(Case C)									
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	
									
<b>Q:</b>	Who is the odd-one-out? Select answers from A-I.								
<b>Answer:</b>	G								
<b>Reasoning:</b>	Element G constitutes the exception and is therefore the correct answer.								
<b>Logical Reasoning Skill:</b>	Inductive								
<b>Required capability:</b>	Diagram								

Table 8: Three samples requiring deductive logical reasoning skills (Case A).

(Case A)	
	<i>All footballers are fit and healthy.</i>
	<i>All famous sports players are footballers.</i>
	<i>Given that the above is true, which of the following is the logical deduction?</i>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>All footballers are famous sports people</i></li> <li>2. <i>All famous people are fit and healthy</i></li> <li>3. <i>All famous sports players are fit and healthy</i></li> <li>4. <i>All fit and healthy people are footballers</i></li> <li>5. <i>All football players are men</i></li> </ol>
<b>Q:</b>	Which is the correct answer according to the image? Select from 1-5?
<b>Answer:</b>	3
<b>Reasoning:</b>	Using deductive reasoning, the only logical answer is 3. To get to this answer, you need to simplify the given facts. All famous sports players are footballers, and all footballers are fit and healthy. We can not deduce that all footballers are famous sports people, as we have not got that information. We can not deduce that all famous people are fit and healthy, because the fact is about famous sports people. This is the logical answer. This information is not given; all footballers are fit and healthy but we can not logically link that all fit and healthy people are footballers. This is obviously incorrect, as gender is not mentioned at all in the question.
<b>Logical Reasoning Skill:</b>	Deductive
<b>Required capability:</b>	OCR

Table 9: Three samples requiring deductive logical reasoning skills (Case B).

(Case B)

The vast majority of swallows are blue. What is the most logical conclusion?

- A. There is a white swallow.
- B. Not everything that is blue is a swallow.
- C. There is a blue swallow.
- D. None of the answers are satisfactory.

**Q:** What is the correct answer to the question in the image? Select from A-D.

**Answer:** C

**Reasoning:** The vast majority of swallows are blue so the answer must be C: there is a blue swallow.

**Logical Reasoning Skill:** Deductive

**Required capability:** OCR

Table 10: Three samples requiring deductive logical reasoning skills (Case C).

(Case C)

The people determine what is produced.  
 The government is made up of the people.  
 Production is determined by the free-market.  
 The free-market is made up of production.  
 Government is determined by the free-market.

**Q:** What is produced is determined by the people. Select from A, B, and C. (A) True (B) False (C) Insufficient Information?

**Answer:** A

**Reasoning:** Line 1 states that the people determine what is produced. Line 2 states that the government is made up of the people. Therefore, the people determine what is produced. This is a syllogism. Thus, this statement is true.

**Logical Reasoning Skill:** Deductive

**Required capability:** OCR

Table 11: Three samples requiring numerical logical reasoning skills (Case A).

(Case A)

Share Price Index				
Company	Today's Price (€)	Change from previous day (%)	Past 12 months Max price (€)	Min price (€)
Huver Co.	1,150	1.10	1,360	860
Drebs Ltd	18	0.50	22	11
Fevs Plc	1,586	-9.00	1,955	1,242
Fauvers	507	-1.00	724	464
Steapars	2,537	1.00	2,630	2,216

Dividend Index					
Dividend paid per share (€)	Huver Co.	Drebs Ltd	Fevs Plc	Fauvers	Steapars
Interim Dividend	0.83	0.44	0.34	0.09	0.48
Final Dividend	1.75	1.12	1.25	0.32	0.96

**Note:** the total annual dividend paid per share is the sum of the interim dividend and the final dividend.

**Q:** Which share had the largest difference between the highest and lowest price over the last 12 months? Select from A, B, C, D and E. (A) Huver Co. (B) Drebs Ltd (C) Fevs Plc (D) Fauvers (E) Steapars

**Answer:** C

**Reasoning:** Step 1- Calculate the difference between the maximum and the minimum prices. Huver Co. = 1,360 - 860 = 500 Drebs Ltd = 22 - 11 = 11 Fevs Plc = 1,955 - 1,242 = 713 Fauvers = 724 - 464 = 260 Steapars = 2,630 - 2,216 = 414. Tip: Notice the wording of the question is asking for the share with the largest absolute change in price, NOT the largest percentage change, which would have been Drebs Ltd. If the question had wanted the percentage change it would have used the word percentage. Thus the correct answer is (C) Fevs Plc

**Logical Reasoning Skill:** Numerical

**Required capability:** OCR

Table 12: Three samples requiring numerical logical reasoning skills (Case B).

(Case B)

Reyes Heslop Consulting Profits (£ millions)

Sector	European	American	Pacific Rim
Leisure	5.2	7.4	4.6
Manufacturing	5.0	7.2	6.3
Retail	4.4	5.8	3.8
Government	4.5	5.9	3.6
Utilities	3.5	5.1	6.2

**Q:** Reyes Heslop had a target for Leisure profits to be a quarter of their total profits. Assuming profits in other areas remain the same, by how much did the Leisure profits miss this target? Select from A, B, C, D and E. (A) 31.8 million (B) 32.4 million (C) 32.7 million (D) 33.2 million (E) 33.4 million

**Answer:** D

**Reasoning:** Step 1- Calculate the total Reyes Heslop profits across all areas other than Leisure.  $(6.3 + 7.2 + 5.0) + (3.8 + 5.8 + 4.4) + (3.6 + 5.9 + 4.5) + (6.2 + 5.1 + 3.5) = 61.3$  million. Step 2- This needs to be 1/4 of all profits for the condition to be met. Therefore all profits, across all sectors, would be  $61.3 / 75\% = 81.7333$  million. Step 3- Now we look at the difference between actual and target Leisure profits. Actual =  $(4.6 + 7.4 + 5.2) = 17.2$  Target =  $(81.7333 - 61.3) = 20.4333$  Shortfall = 3.2333 (millions) Thus the correct answer is (D) 33.2 million

**Logical Reasoning Skill:** Numerical

**Required capability:** Diagram, OCR

Table 13: Three samples requiring numerical logical reasoning skills (Case C).

(Case C)

Building Energy Use 1990  
Total: 17,000 kWh

Building Energy Use 2000  
Total: 15,000 kWh

**Q:** Which space experienced the smallest reduction in kWh used between 1990 and 2000? Select from A, B, C, and D. (A) Office Space (B) Print Room (C) Meeting Rooms (D) PC Room

**Answer:** D


**Reasoning:** Step 1- Calculate the value of kWh for 1990 and 2000 for each of the rooms. Room 1990 per kWh 2000 per kWh Meeting Rooms 2.04 2.10 Office Space 6.97 5.85 Print Room 2.55 1.80 PC Room 3.40 3.15 Kitchen 2.04 2.10 Step 2- Subtract the kWh for 2000 from that of 1990 for each of the rooms. Room change (1990 - 2000) kWh Meeting Rooms -0.06 Office Space 1.12 Print Room 0.75 PC Room 0.25 Kitchen -0.06 Step 3- Look for the smallest positive value. Negative values represent an increase between 1990 and 2000. Tip- You only need to perform 4 calculations, as two of the rooms have the same values. Thus, the correct answer is (D) PC Room.

**Logical Reasoning Skill:** Deductive

**Required capability:** Diagram, OCR

Table 14: Three samples requiring spatial logical reasoning skills (Case A).

(Case A)



**Q:** Which figure is a rotation of the object? Select from A, B, C, and D. (A) (B) (C) (D)

**Answer:** B


**Reasoning:** The answer is B.

**Logical Reasoning Skill:** Spatial

**Required capability:** Diagram

Table 15: Three samples requiring spatial logical reasoning skills (Case B).

(Case B)



**Q:** Which figure can be formed with the given piece? Select from A, B, C, and D. (A) (B) (C) (D)

**Answer:** C


**Reasoning:** The answer is C.

**Logical Reasoning Skill:** Spatial

**Required capability:** Diagram

Table 16: Three samples requiring spatial logical reasoning skills (Case C).

(Case C)



**Q:** To which object does the given top view correspond? Select from A, B, C, and D. (A) (B) (C) (D)

**Answer:** A

**Reasoning:** The answer is A.

**Logical Reasoning Skill:** Spatial

**Required capability:** Diagram

Table 17: Three samples requiring mechanical logical reasoning skills (Case A).

(Case A)



**Q:** A non-pressurised cylindrical metal tank filled with air is submerged underwater. As the air escapes, the tank gradually moves deeper underwater. Which statement provides the best reason for this motion? Select from A, B, C, D, and E. (A) The bubbles provide a downward thrust on the tank (B) The metal increases in density so it gets heavier (C) The bubbles lower the density of the water which lowers its buoyancy (D) Water replaces the air in the tank which makes it heavier (E) Impossible to tell

**Answer:** D

**Reasoning:** As air escapes the available space is quickly replaced with water, so the tank's density becomes the same as that of the water and with the added weight and density of the tank itself continues to sink.

**Logical Reasoning Skill:** Mechanical

**Required capability:** Diagram

Table 18: Three samples requiring mechanical logical reasoning skills (Case B).



(Case B)	
	
<b>Q:</b>	It is a cold winter outside and a well-insulated house has its heater turned on. The front door is opened and cold air rushes in. If the wind speed outside is very low, how would the cold air enter the house? Select from A, B, C, D, and E. (A) Scenario A, the cold air will flow towards the floor (B) Scenario B, the cold air will flow towards the ceiling (C) A combination of A and B (D) The cold air will not enter the house (E) Impossible to tell
<b>Answer:</b>	A
<b>Reasoning:</b>	Cold air sinks, whereas hot air rises. The house and the air inside it are warmer than the outside air temperature, so if these two systems (house and outside) were to be suddenly connected (door opening) the cold air would sink and the hot air would sit above the cold air until the heat transferred between the two.
<b>Logical Reasoning Skill:</b>	Mechanical
<b>Required capability:</b>	Diagram

Table 19: Three samples requiring mechanical logical reasoning skills (Case C).


(Case C)	
	
<b>Q:</b>	In which direction does the orange gear rotate? Select from A, B, and C. (A) Clockwise (B) Counter-clockwise (C) No rotation
<b>Answer:</b>	A
<b>Reasoning:</b>	The correct answer is clockwise.
<b>Logical Reasoning Skill:</b>	Mechanical
<b>Required capability:</b>	Diagram

## B Examples of Different LogicVista Capabilities Data

Table 20: Three samples of diagram, OCR, and mixed LogicVista data (Case A).

---

(Case A)



**Q:** Which ball is the heaviest? Select from A, B, C, and D. (A) A (B) B (C) C (D) CAN NOT SAY

**Answer:** D

**Reasoning:** The correct answer is D.

**Logical Reasoning Skill:** Mechanical

**Required capability:** Diagram

---

Table 21: Three samples of diagram, OCR, and mixed LogicVista data (Case B).

---

(Case B)

Which of these objects will not float on water?

**Q:** Select from A, B, C, and D. (A) banana (B) scissors (C) empty plastic soda bottle (D) wooden pencil

**Answer:** B

**Reasoning:** The correct answer is B because scissors have metal and are most likely to sink.

**Logical Reasoning Skill:** Deductive


**Required capability:** OCR

---



Table 22: Three samples of diagram, OCR, and mixed LogicVista data (Case C).

(Case C)



Two Legal Sector IT Firms Income for Consultancy Services (10,000s)

	Make Fit Ltd	Pure Gap Pic
Year 1	290	230
Year 2	180	310
Year 3	260	300
Year 4	320	290

**Q:** Which of the following statements is false regarding legal sector spending between Year 4 and projected Year 5? Select from A, B, C, D, and E. (A) IT consulting will increase by 35 million. (B) IT consulting will match that of year 2. (C) IT software will exceed IT consulting. (D) Spending on IT hardware will decline. (E) None of these.

**Answer:** D

**Reasoning:** Step 1- Check in turn whether each statement is true or false: a) The projected spend on IT consulting is projected to increase by 35 million. Option A is true. b) The projected spend on IT consulting is 320 million, which matches year 2. Option B is true. c) The projected spend on IT software is 330 million and for IT consulting it is 320 million. Option C is true. d) There are increases projected for IT hardware, IT software, and consulting, therefore “spending on IT hardware will decline” is not true. The option for D is false. e) We see that option D is false, so E cannot be the correct answer. Thus the correct answer is (D) Spending on IT hardware, software, and consulting is projected to decline.

**Logical Reasoning Skill:** Numerical

**Required capability:** Diagram, OCR