

---

# VisMin: Visual Minimal-Change Understanding

---

Rabiul Awal\* Saba Ahmadi\* Le Zhang\* Aishwarya Agrawal  
Mila - Quebec AI Institute  
Université de Montréal  
{rabiul.awal,le.zhang,aishwarya.agrawal}@mila.quebec

## Abstract

Fine-grained understanding of objects, attributes, and relationships between objects is crucial for visual-language models (VLMs). To evaluate VLMs' fine-grained understanding, existing benchmarks primarily focus on evaluating VLMs' capability to distinguish between two very similar *captions* given an image. In this paper, our focus is on evaluating VLMs' capability to distinguish between two very similar *images* give a caption. To this end, we introduce a new, challenging benchmark termed **Visual Minimal-Change Understanding (VisMin)**, which requires models to predict the correct image-caption match given two images and two captions. Importantly, the image pair (as well as the caption pair) contains minimal-changes, i.e., between the two images (as well as between the two captions), only one aspect changes at a time from among the following possible types of changes: *object*, *attribute*, *count*, and *spatial relation*. These four types of minimal-changes are specifically designed to test the models' understanding of objects, attributes of objects (such as color, material, shape), counts of objects and spatial relationship between objects. To curate our benchmark, we built an automatic framework using large language models and diffusion models, followed by a rigorous 4-step verification process by human annotators. Empirical experiments reveal that current VLMs exhibit notable deficiencies in understanding spatial relationships and counting abilities. Furthermore, leveraging the automated nature of our data creation process, we generate a large-scale training dataset, which we use to finetune CLIP (a foundational VLM) and Idetics2 (a multimodal large language model). Our findings show that both these models benefit significantly from fine-tuning on this data, as evident by marked improvements in fine-grained understanding across a wide range of benchmarks. Additionally, such fine-tuning improves CLIP's general image-text alignment capabilities too. We release all resources including the benchmark, the training data and the finetuned model checkpoints at <https://vismin.net/>.

## 1 Introduction

Fine-grained understanding of objects, attributes, and their relationships is critical for Visual-Language Models (VLMs) to generalize effectively to new, unseen scenes and compositions. Previous studies such as ARO [40] and Sugarcrepe [8], highlighting the deficiencies of VLMs in this domain predominantly focus on understanding fine-grained differences between two very similar *captions* – a human-written caption and an automatically generated hard-negative<sup>2</sup> caption, where the hard-negative caption differs from the original caption only with respect to an *object*, or an *attribute* or a *relationship* between two objects. While such hard-negative examples for *captions* can be synthesized using rule-based approaches, synthesizing such hard-negative examples for images is very

---

\*denotes equal contribution

<sup>2</sup>In the context of contrastive learning, a hard-negative is a specific type of negative example that is particularly challenging to distinguish from the positive example.



Figure 1: Overview of our VisMin benchmark. VisMin consists of four types of minimal-changes – object, attribute, count and spatial relation – between two image-captions pairs. The evaluation task requires a model to predict the correct image-caption match given: 1) two images and one caption, 2) two captions and one image.

challenging. Existing benchmarks presenting *visual* hard-negatives suffer from two main limitations: 1) **Limited Difficulty**: In benchmarks such as Winoground [34], MMVP[35], the original images and their hard-negative counterparts differ in multiple aspects (objects, attributes of objects, image background, etc.). This multiplicity limits the difficulty of the benchmark and makes it challenging to precisely evaluate the models’ fine-grained understanding of specific aspects. 2) **Limited Complexity**: Although benchmarks such as EQBEN [36], SPEC [27] have controlled hard-negatives, the visual domain is limited to graphic engines, a few video domains or reliance on purely synthetic images depicting simplistic scenes.

Motivated by these observations, we propose a new benchmark, **Visual Minimal-Change Understanding (VisMin)**, built on top of the images from the COCO [21] dataset that consists of complex everyday scene images. VisMin is designed to measure VLMs’ ability to comprehend minimal changes, i.e., changes with respect to only one aspect (see Fig. 1), from among the following aspects: *object*, *attribute*, *count*, and *spatial relation*, while keeping other aspects unchanged as much as possible.

The evaluation task for a model is to predict the correct image-caption match given: 1) two images and one caption, 2) two captions and one image. To curate VisMin, we built an automated pipeline using large language models and diffusion models. To ensure the quality of our benchmark, the synthetic data generated using the automated pipeline undergoes a rigorous 4-step verification process by human annotators, with data retained in the benchmark only if it passes all four steps. We meticulously designed the benchmark ensuring uniformity across various categories to the extent possible. We conduct a detailed analysis of our benchmark, which enables a more transparent assessment of the various strengths and weaknesses of the models.

We conducted empirical tests on eight open-source VLMs, including foundational models like CLIP [30] and Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) such as Llava[23] and Idefics2[14]. We also evaluated two closed-source APIs, GPT-4 and Gemini. Our findings suggest that both foundational models and MLLMs perform relatively well in understanding minimal changes in objects and attributes. Surprisingly, MLLMs underperform foundational VLMs in object and attribute understanding! For spatial relation understanding, although MLLMs perform better than VLMs, both families of models perform below random chance! Similarly, both families of models show considerable room for improvement in counting capabilities. Our results underscore the need for an emphasis on spatial reasoning and counting understanding over attribute/object recognition in VLM evaluations. We anticipate that our benchmark will catalyze advancements in these critical areas within the community.

Lastly, owing to the automated nature of our synthetic data creation process, we generated a large-scale (64,392 samples) minimal-change image-text data for fine-tuning the VLMs to enhance their fine-grained understanding. Fine-tuning CLIP (a foundational VLM) and Idefics2 (a MLLM) on our minimal-change data, without any additional modifications to the model architecture or loss functions, results in significant improvements in fine-grained understanding across various benchmarks. Notably, such fine-tuning also enhances foundational VLMs’ general image-text alignment capabilities as evident by marked improvements in CLIP’s image-text retrieval performance on COCO. These observations suggest that our minimal-change dataset can serve as model-agnostic, general-purpose resource to enhance the capabilities of VLMs.

To summarize, our contributions are threefold: 1) **A controlled and challenging benchmark.** We introduce the VisMin benchmark, which challenges models to detect semantic differences between visually similar but semantically different images. Extensive testing on foundational VLMs and MLLMs reveals their difficulties with this task, highlighting areas for improvement. 2) **A pipeline for automated data creation and benchmark development.** We create an automated pipeline to generate visual minimal-change data at scale using large language models and diffusion models, with a rigorous four-step human verification system to ensure high data quality. 3) **Enhancement of VLMs’ fine-grained understanding with fine-tuning on minimal-change data.** We improve the fine-grained understanding of CLIP and Idefics2 by fine-tuning them on our large-scale minimal-change image-text data, demonstrating improved image-text alignment and overall performance.

## 2 Related work

**Fine-grained understanding benchmarks:** Most existing benchmarks focus on understanding fine-grained textual differences, such as VL-checklist [44], ARO [40], and Sugarcrepe [8]. Benchmarks presenting visual hard-negatives, such as EQBEN [36], Winoground [34], ImageCode [13], SPEC [27], either lack minimal changes or have limited visual complexity – graphic engines, a few video domains or purely synthetic images depicting simplistic scenes. Our benchmark addresses these gaps by utilizing the advances in LLMs [11] and diffusion models [29, 19, 20] to achieve minimal changes in complex COCO-like scenes without compromising the naturalness of the images, thus providing a more robust evaluation of fine-grained visual understanding in VLMs. Detailed comparisons of benchmarks are provided in section 4.

**Automatic approach to generate visual hard negatives:** Existing approaches to automatically generate visual hard negatives fall into three broad categories: (i) using nearby video frames with semantic changes [13, 36], (ii) using graphic engines [36], (iii) using diffusion models [27, 36, 16]. Our proposed framework falls in the third category. DEMON[16] is the closest to our work, creating training data using diffusion models to improve the learning of a given vision-language model. They use diffusion models to perform local editing on the images given the target object mask. However, this approach requires attention masks from the vision-language model being studied. SPEC [27] proposes a diffusion-based canvas-filling method for generating minimally-different image pairs limited to four types of minimal changes: size, position, count and existence. Compared to these existing methods, our automated pipeline to generate minimal-change data is more involved in order to achieve minimal-changes in complex scenes while maintaining the photo-realism of the scene and controlling changes across diverse categories. Our pipeline also has more a comprehensive automated filtering mechanism compared to previous pipelines that mainly rely on CLIP-based filtering.


**Enhancing fine-grained understanding in VLMs with hard negatives:** Most efforts to enhance fine-grained understanding of foundational VLMs such as CLIP focus on fine-tuning with caption-based hard negatives [39, 43, 31]) and designing loss functions to better leverage the learning signal from such hard-negatives [43]. Strategies for generating textual hard negatives include: (1) heuristic rules like random word swaps [40]; (2) using language models for word replacement [43, 5]; (3) using scene-graph information [7, 31]; and (4) integrating LLMs with semantic segmentation [6]. limited work on fine-tuning/finetuning visual hard-negatives. Some methods such as NegCLIP [39] and General Scene Difference [15] make use of nearest-neighbor images as visual hard negatives during model fine-tuning and model training respectively. However, nearest neighbor images often differ too much in context or composition, lacking fine-grained visual difference. Similarly, SpotDiff [10] uses nearby frames from video-surveillance footage for model learning, however, these frames are often too similar to each other lacking a clear semantic difference. So such data is not ideal but teaching fine-grained understanding of semantic concepts such as objects, attributes, counting, spatial

relations to models. The work closest to ours is SPEC [27] and CounterCurate [42] which similar to ours, finetune VLMs with minimal-change visual hard negatives. While SPEC only finetunes CLIP, both CounterCurate and our work additionally study fine-tuning of multimodal large language models with visual hard negatives. Moreover, unlike SPEC and CounterCurate, our evaluation is more comprehensive; we evaluate the performance of finetuned models on 10 out-of-distribution benchmarks compared to 1 and 2 evaluations in SPEC and CounterCurate respectively. Also, our fine-tuned models outperform all baseline models in most cases (see Table 4 and 5 for details), highlighting the efficacy of our approach.

### 3 Minimal-Change Image-Text Dataset Creation

We devised a framework to synthesize large-scale minimal-change data and introduce the VisMin benchmark (see overview fig. 2). The pipeline includes three stages: **Minimal-Change Pairs Synthesis**, where we minimally edit image and text pairs; **Automatic Filtering**, which verifies the faithfulness of the texts and synthesized images; and **Human Verification**, a four-step process to ensure that only data meeting all quality criteria is included. We will discuss each stage in detail.

Figure 2: Our dataset creation pipeline includes three stages: (i) **Minimal-Change Pairs Synthesis**: We develop methods for synthesizing minimal-change image-caption pairs involving Objects & Attributes and Counting & Spatial Relations. (ii) **Automatic Filtering**: An LLM generates questions and answers based on captions, and a VQA model predicts answers from images. Synthetically generated minimal-change data are excluded if answers don't match. (iii) **Human Verification**: Synthetically generated minimal-change data undergoes a rigorous 4-steps human verification, and only examples passing all stages are included in the benchmark.



**Stage 1: Minimal-Change Pairs Synthesis** In the first stage of our pipeline, we focus on synthesizing minimal-change image-text pairs across four strategic categories: objects, attributes, counting, and spatial relations. These categories are specifically chosen to test various levels of visual-linguistic comprehension. We generate minimal-change text pairs using LLM and then generate minimal-change image pairs using diffusion models. Our synthesis process distinctly tailors the creation of image-text pairs to the specific needs of each category, depicted in Stage 1 in Figure 2 (Object & Attribute Edit and Count & Spatial Relation Edit blocks).

**LLM-guided Edit Instructions Generation** To generate minimal-change text pairs, we start with source captions and then prompt an LLM (Mistral 47B [11]) to generate both the edit instructions specific to each edit category and the corresponding edited caption (see Appendix A.1 for the prompt used). For **Object and Attribute** edits, we use human-written captions from COCO [21] and VSR [22] datasets as our source captions. The LLM processes these captions to suggest edits targeting specific objects or attributes. For example, given the *source caption* “A dog in the middle of the couch”, the LLM generates the *edit instruction* “change dog to doll” which contains both the *source phrase* (“dog”) and the *edited phrase* (“doll”). The LLM also generates the *edited caption* “A doll in the middle of the couch”. We generate five plausible (based on the criteria outlined for LLM prompting) edit instructions and edited captions per source caption. To ensure the edited captions



are minimally changed w.r.t the source caption and contain visually plausible changes, we prompt the LLM again for filtering, removing 40% of the total LLM outputs that do not meet those criteria (see appendix A.2 for details on the criteria). For **Counting and Spatial Relation** edits, we generate the source captions synthetically due to the absence of a suitable human-written captions dataset containing descriptions of counts and spatial relations of objects. We prompt the LLM to create captions and outline object layouts and bounding boxes. For instance, the LLM might generate a *caption* like “A plate of cookies on a table and a cup of coffee to its right,” with the corresponding *bounding boxes*: {“plate of cookies”: [200, 300, 120, 80]; “cup of coffee”: [320, 300, 60, 80]}. The LLM generates a large pool of such synthetic captions. The edit instructions and the corresponding edited captions are generated using a rule-based method aimed at swapping the object positions for spatial relation edits (e.g. *edited caption*: “A cup of coffee on a table and a plate of cookies to its right”, *swapped bounding boxes*: {“1st crop”: [200, 300, 120, 80]; “2nd crop”: [320, 300, 60, 80]}) or adjusting the object counts for counting edits (e.g. *edited caption*: “A cup of coffee on a table”), *removed bounding boxes*: {[200, 300, 120, 80]}, in this example removing the plate of cookies from the image.

**Diffusion-guided Image Synthesis** We modify images according to the edit instructions generated by the LLM in the previous step. For **Object and Attribute** edits, we first mask the object to be edited in the source image using the Grounding-DINO model [24]. We obtain the source images from the COCO dataset. The object to be edited is specified in the source phrase of the edit instruction (e.g., “a dog” in the edit instruction “change dog to doll”). We then apply the SDXL inpainting model [29], using the *input image, masked region, and edited phrase* (obtained from the edit instruction, e.g., “a doll” in the edit instruction “change dog to doll”) to alter the masked image region to match the desired outcome, e.g., changing “a dog” to “a doll.” For **Counting and Spatial Relation** edits, we create a synthetically generated source image dataset based on LLM-suggested layouts from the previous step, using the LLM-grounded Diffusion (LMD) model [20] for image synthesis. To create an edited image, for the spatial relation edits, we first reposition the source image’s bounding boxes using a rule-based method. We then obtain image crops from the source image corresponding to the objects which we need to reposition w.r.t each other. Lastly, we use the GLIGEN layout-diffusion model [19] to smoothly insert the obtained crops into the source image at the repositioned bounding box locations. For counting edits, we obtain the edited image by always removing one or multiple objects from the source image. The object to be removed is specified by masking and we use the Lama model [32] to carry out the object removal. We employ layout-based diffusion models [20, 19] instead of using end-to-end diffusion models like Stable diffusion [29] as the layout-based model facilitates precise control over the object positions and counts and thus ensures the changes are faithful to the edit instruction as well as minimal. Unfortunately, end-to-end models such as Stable Diffusion are not good at precisely editing object positions and counts.

**Stage 2: Automatic Filtering** To ensure the consistency of synthesized hard-negative images, we use a Visual Question Answering (VQA) based filtering system, proven more effective than object detection (see Stage 2 in Figure 2). Questions are generated using an LLM [11] based on the *edit instruction and edited caption*, following the TIFA approach [9]. These questions ensure the faithfulness of the edited image with respect to the edited caption and confirm the positive caption is no longer true for the negative image. The LLaVa 7B model [23] answers these questions to evaluate the edits. For object and attribute edits, region-specific questions ensure faithfulness, while global questions confirm the background is unaltered. For spatial relations and counting, the VQA system verifies objects in their specified locations. This process filters out approximately 75% of synthesized images, ensuring only the most accurate examples are used for dataset creation.

**Stage 3: Human Verification** To ensure benchmark quality, we use Amazon Mechanical Turk for verification, supplementing automated filtering. Automatically generated images and captions must pass through four steps, with at least four out of five annotators agreeing on its validity at each step. The steps are: (1) **Naturalness and Image-Text Matching Verification**: In this step, humans evaluate the data samples using the following three criteria: a) whether the image looks natural or not, b) whether the caption sounds sensible or not, and c) whether the image matches the caption or not, addressing limitations of automatic filtering and maintaining robustness against manipulation [8]. Only 26% of synthetic images pass this step, highlighting the need for human verification. The low acceptance rate is mainly associated with the high rejection rate of criterion a, where most counting and spatial relation synthetic images do not appear nat-

ural. Please refer to Table 1 for detailed acceptance rates for each criterion. Please note that we aimed for a balanced benchmark. To address the higher rejection rates for the categories of counting and spatial relation, we began with a larger number of samples in these categories.

**(2) Visual Edit Verification:**

Ensures images accurately reflect the specified minimal edits without additional changes, with an acceptance rate of 80%. **(3) Edit Instruction Verification:** Ensures LLM-generated edit instructions are minimal and targeted, affecting only one aspect (object, attribute, counting, or spatial relation), with an acceptance rate of 84%.

**(4) Textual Edit Verification:** Verifies the edited sentence precisely reflects the minimal edit instruction, with an acceptance rate of 95%. In this step, annotators also categorize the edit type to verify LLM’s automatic categorization. These steps ensure minimal, targeted changes in both images and captions, resulting in a high-quality benchmark for fine-grained visual understanding. See Appendix A.3 for detailed instructions given to the annotators.

Table 1: Acceptance rates for all criteria across different categories.

Criterion	Object	Attribute	Counting	S. Relation	Overall
Step 1-a: Naturalness of Image	64%	80%	41%	22%	37%
Step 1-b: Sensicality of Caption	84%	79%	75%	70%	74%
Step 1-c: Image-Text Matching	83%	89%	52%	65%	65%
Step 2: Visual Edit Verification	81%	79%	81%	78%	80%
Step 3: Edit Instruction Verification	81%	86%	85%	84%	84%
Step 4: Textual Edit Verification	95%	94%	94%	95%	95%
Step 4: Automatic Categorization Verification	95%	91%	99%	100%	97%

**4 Training and Benchmark sets**

In our study, we create training and benchmark sets to improve and assess fine-grained understanding in VLMs. The training data is generated through a scalable pipeline with automatic filtering, while the benchmark data undergoes additional rigorous human verification to ensure high quality. For objects and attributes, the part relying on natural image editing, we source the training data from VSR (images sourced from COCO) and the COCO 2017 training split (118K images), while the benchmark data is sourced from the COCO 2017 validation split (5K images). This ensures benchmark images are unseen during training, maintaining the reliability of our evaluations per community standards. The Training dataset has 64,392 samples (37,017 objects, 10,352 attributes, 10,050 counting, 6,973 relations), while the VisMin benchmark has 2,084 samples (579 objects, 294 attributes, 589 counting, 622 relations). We aimed for a balanced benchmark across categories. However, the number of attribute samples in VisMin is relatively low. This is because we use an LLM to suggest edits on the COCO 5K validation set, and it suggests attribute edits for only 2000 samples, mostly color changes. To avoid skewing the attribute benchmark, we downsampled color instances. Figure 3 presents subcategories, providing an overview of the types of changes in VisMin. For detailed information on training set subcategories, refer to Appendix 14. Please refer to Appendix 17 and Appendix 18 for qualitative samples.

In table 2, we comprehensively compare VisMin with several similar benchmarks. **Visual Minimal HN:** This criterion evaluates if the visual hard negatives contain minimal changes. The positive and the hard negative images in Winoground and MMVP often differ along multiple aspects (object, attribute, background, etc.). In contrast, the hard negatives in our benchmark (VisMin) differ only along one aspect while keeping the other aspects unchanged as much as possible. This property of minimal change is also present in some existing benchmarks such as What’sUp, EQBEN, SPEC, ImageCoDe (for a subset of the images) and CounterCurate (for a subset of images). **Visual Complexity:** This criterion evaluates the complexity of visual scenes present in the benchmark. ImageCoDe and EQBEN mainly contain images from a few limited video domains and graphic engines, while What’sUp consists of simple household and tabletop images. SPEC generates simplistic scenes using diffusion models. In contrast, Winoground utilizes expert-curated images from Getty Images and MMVP leverages ImageNet and LAIONAesthetics. VisMin and CounterCurate (concurrent work) stand out by incorporating diverse and complex everyday scenes from the COCO [21] and Flickr30K Entities [28], respectively, which contain

















Figure 3: VisMin categories and subcategories.

common objects in their natural contexts. **Textual Complexity:** Benchmarks such as ImageCoDe, Winoground, and MMVP use free-form human-written captions. In contrast, benchmarks such as What’sUp, which focuses on spatial changes, and SPEC, which focuses on controlled changes, use template-based captions that often lack diversity. Both EQBEN and CounterCurate use a mix of free-form (human-written or LLM-generated) and template-based captions. VisMin uses a combination of human-written and LLM-generated free-form captions, yielding sufficient textual complexity to the benchmark.

**Human Verification:** For benchmarks using synthetic images such as EQBEN, SPEC, CounterCurate and VisMin, human evaluation is essential to ensure natural-looking images. Additionally, human verification is crucial for benchmarks where hard negative captions are generated automatically, as these may contain nonsensical captions unless they use well-defined templates like those in What’sUp. Automatically generated nonsensical captions make it easier for VLMs to identify these captions as incorrect [8]. Notably, VisMin is the only benchmark that conducts human verification, ensuring high quality and reliability of all captions and images. Note that CounterCurate also conducts human verification but only verifies image-caption consistency (on a subset of 300 examples); they do not verify whether the synthetically generated images are natural-looking or not and whether the synthetically generated captions are sensible. **Size:** This criterion evaluates the number of examples in the dataset. VisMin excels by combining **controlled minimal changes with complex, natural scenes and captions**, providing an optimal balance for robust evaluation.

Table 2: Comparison of benchmarks offering visual hard negatives (HN) across:  minimal HN,  visual complexity,  textual complexity,  human-approved captions ( and ), and  size.  $\surd$ : criterion holds for a subset of the benchmark.

Benchmark						
ImageCoDe [13]	$\surd$	Limited video domains, Open Images	Free-form (Human)	$\surd$	$\surd$	2,306
What’sUp (A/B) [12]	$\surd$	Household, Tabletop	Template	$\surd$	$\surd$	1,232
Winoground [34]	$\times$	Expert curated using Getty Images API	Free-form (Human)	$\surd$	$\surd$	400
EQBEN [36]	$\surd$	Limited video domains, Graphic engine, Synthetic-diffusion	Free-form (Human), Template	$\times$	$\surd$	250,612
SPEC [27]	$\surd$	Synthetic-diffusion (limited objects)	Template	$\times$	$\times$	3,000
MMVP [35]	$\times$	ImageNet, LAIONAesthetics	Free-form (Human)	$\surd$	$\surd$	150
CounterCurate [42]	$\surd$	Flicker30K Entities, Synthetic-diffusion	Free-form (Human, LLM), Template	$\surd$	$\surd$	45,400
VisMin (Ours)	$\surd$	COCO, Synthetic-diffusion	Free-form (Human, LLM)	$\surd$	$\surd$	2,084

## 5 Benchmarking VLMs on VisMin Benchmark

**Setup** We have comprehensively benchmarked existing *state-of-the-art* VLMs on VisMin, encompassing both foundational VLMs—such as CLIP [30], SigLip [41], BLIP [17], and Coca [37] and generative MLLMs including Llava [23], Idefics2 [14] and InternVL1.5 [2]. Additionally, closed-source MLLMs such as GPT4-o [1] and Gemini1.0 Pro [33] are also evaluated.

For foundational models like CLIP, we conducted an image-text matching task using cosine similarity, following [34]. The tasks involved two settings: choosing the correct image from two captions and selecting the correct caption from two images. In VisMin examples (see fig. 1) with pairs  $\{(I_1, C_1), (I_2, C_2)\}$ , the **text score** is 1 if  $(s(C_0, I_0) > s(C_1, I_0)) \wedge (s(C_1, I_1) > s(C_0, I_1))$ , and the **image score** is 1 if  $(s(C_0, I_0) > s(C_0, I_1)) \wedge (s(C_1, I_1) > s(C_1, I_0))$ ; the **group score** is 1 when both scores are 1. For MLLMs, we adapted these tasks to a visual question answering format with binary questions about the matching relationship between images and captions  $\{(I_1, C_1), (I_2, C_2)\}$ . To calculate the **text score**, we presented the model with one image and two captions, using the prompt “Does this image depict:  $\{C_1 \text{ or } C_2\}$ ?”<sup>3</sup> To calculate the **image score**, we presented the model with two images and one caption, using the prompt “Which image better aligns with the description: ‘ $C$ ’? The first or the second image?”. The score is 1 if the predicted answer matches the ground truth. Once both scores are obtained, the **group score** is 1 if both individual scores are 1.

**Results** Insights from Table 3 highlight key capabilities and limitations of current models. Text scores generally surpass image scores, especially in MLLMs, where text scores are often two to three times higher. In contrast, foundational VLMs show a modest discrepancy between image and text scores. We hypothesize that for MLLMs, the image score is lower compared to the text score because they lack training with multiple images, and simple vertical concatenation does not provide sufficient visual signals, leading to suboptimal alignment with captions. Notably, Idefics2, which supports multi-image processing, performs similarly on text and image scores, underscoring the importance of multi-image data during pretraining. Foundational VLMs’ higher text scores suggest that distinguishing between captions is easier than between images, highlighting the need for our

<sup>3</sup>For single-image models, such as Llava, we combine the two images vertically with a clear border.

Table 3: Performance of foundational variants and MLLMs across categories on the VisMin Dataset. Columns ‘I,’ ‘T,’ and ‘G’ denote Image, Text, and Group scores from Winoground [34]. AVG denotes the average across columns. The best results are highlighted in **bold**.

	Object			Attribute			S. Relation			Count			AVG
	T	I	G	T	I	G	T	I	G	T	I	G	
Random Chance	25	25	16.67	25	25	16.67	25	25	16.67	25	25	16.67	22.22
MTurk Human	86.87	95.50	83.07	82.31	91.15	76.87	81.67	92.76	76.20	88.96	96.77	86.41	86.54
CLIP (ViT-B/32) [30]	79.62	77.89	67.53	72.11	65.99	55.1	8.2	4.34	0.48	31.24	20.71	10.53	41.15
CLIP (ViT-B/16)	86.53	79.1	71.68	70.75	65.31	52.38	8.84	3.22	0.8	34.3	22.58	13.58	42.42
CLIP (ViT-L/14)	87.56	83.59	78.07	74.49	69.73	57.82	9.16	4.66	1.45	37.01	30.56	18.17	46.42
NegCLIP [39]	87.74	87.05	80.66	81.63	80.27	71.77	10.13	4.66	1.13	55.01	57.72	42.28	48.96
SigLip (ViT-B/16)[41]	90.5	88.95	83.25	86.05	79.25	73.13	11.58	6.43	1.77	60.95	47.03	38.37	55.61
SigLip (ViT-L/16)	93.44	88.43	84.46	84.35	78.23	68.37	10.29	4.82	1.29	61.8	57.05	<b>44.14</b>	<b>56.39</b>
BLIP [17]	92.4	92.57	<b>87.05</b>	88.44	86.73	<b>78.57</b>	11.25	4.98	<b>2.09</b>	52.97	46.01	33.28	56.36
Coca [37]	84.97	81.52	73.58	78.57	66.33	57.82	11.25	5.95	1.77	60.1	35.82	28.52	48.85
LlaVa1.6 (7B) [23]	93.0	32.8	32.2	92.2	34.4	33.3	91.8	7.8	7.4	73.6	25.0	20.2	38.28
Idefics2 [14]	95.4	69.4	<b>67.6</b>	89.1	71.4	<b>67.0</b>	18.6	18.8	4.8	72.2	50.6	<b>47.0</b>	<b>55.99</b>
InternVL1.5 [2]	94.65	40.24	39.72	91.16	42.86	41.16	74.28	14.79	<b>11.74</b>	73.51	31.58	27.5	48.60
Gemini1.0 Pro 📄	94.99	79.97	78.76	91.84	74.83	72.45	52.57	15.43	9.81	67.74	44.14	37.52	49.63
GPT4-o 📄	95.51	96.2	<b>93.44</b>	92.18	90.48	<b>87.07</b>	89.07	50.48	<b>46.78</b>	77.42	78.27	<b>68.42</b>	<b>73.93</b>

visual minimal change benchmark. Interestingly, foundational VLMs generally outperform MLLMs due to the latter’s lower image scores.

All models perform well on Object and Attribute splits, indicating that understanding semantic changes correlates strongly with recognition capabilities. Models excelling in image classification tend to perform better, reflecting a foundational understanding that does not require advanced reasoning. For instance, Idefics2, using the SigLip (ViT-L/16) vision encoder, performs worse with strong LLMs compared to its foundational VLM counterpart, likely due to limited multi-image understanding in MLLMs. The Spatial Relation split relies heavily on reasoning capabilities, with MLLMs outperforming foundational models. This suggests that LLMs can parse object relationships through reasoning. However, existing VLMs struggle with spatial relations, often scoring below random chance, indicating potential biases in models and highlighting an area for further research.

We document human baseline performance on our benchmark via Amazon Mechanical Turk (details in Appendix A.4). Humans generally outperform models on image scores, except in the attribute category where GPT4-o excels. Models typically surpass humans in text scores, especially with attributes and objects. However, in spatial relations and counting, humans significantly outperform models in group scores, highlighting areas for model improvement and the robustness of human scene comprehension.

## 6 Enhancing fine-grained understanding in VLMs

We use a synthetic minimal-change dataset to enhance fine-grained understanding through additional fine-tuning of VLMs. Training with pairs of images and captions with minimal differences provides a richer training signal, improving model performance in fine-grained understanding tasks. We demonstrate improvements on top of both foundational VLMs and MLLMs by conducting extensive evaluations across various benchmarks: (1) **Single image benchmarks** test the alignment between single images and multiple captions: VSR [22], CountBench [25], VALSE [26], SPEC [27], and Sugarcrepe [8]. (2) **Multiple image benchmarks** test the alignment between multiple images and captions: ImageCode [13], MMVP [35], Whatsup [12], Winoground [34], EQBEN [36], and our VisMin benchmark.

### 6.1 Fine-tuning Foundational VLMs

**Enhancement with Minimal-Change Data** Our approach uses a synthetic minimal-change dataset to improve visual representation without altering the training methodology. We construct training batches with both source and edited image-text pairs: In the original CLIP training, a mini-batch is  $\mathcal{B} = \{(T_1, I_1), (T_2, I_2), \dots, (T_n, I_n)\}$ , with pairs randomly sampled from the dataset as random negatives. With minimal-change data, we add edited image-text pairs as hard negatives, resulting in  $\mathcal{B} = \{(T_1, I_1), (T'_1, I'_1), (T_2, I_2), (T'_2, I'_2), \dots\}$ , where  $(I'_n, T'_n)$  is the edited pair of  $(I_n, T_n)$ . We use a total batch size of 128 with 4 A100 GPUs and retain other training protocols and hyperparameters as default from OpenCLIP [3], including a learning rate of 1e-05, weight decay of 0.2, Adam  $\beta_1$  of

0.9,  $\beta_2$  of 0.98, an eps of 1e-06, and a cosine scheduler. The training runs for 5 epochs, and we select checkpoints based on a separate VisMin validation set.

We fine-tuned the pre-trained CLIP on our minimal-change data, which we call VisMin-CLIP. To provide a comprehensive comparison, we implemented three existing models using the same pre-trained CLIP model: NegCLIP [39], CounterCurate-CLIP [42], and SPEC-CLIP [27], using their respective training sets. In our implementation of NegCLIP, we used the NegCLIP fine-tuning approach, which involves fine-tuning CLIP with automatically generated hard-negative captions as well as nearest-neighbor images as the hard-negative images (along with their associated human written captions). For CounterCurate-CLIP, we used CounterCurate hard-negative image-caption data, which consists of three types of hard-negatives: attribute, position, and counting. The position and counting hard-negatives are minimal-change, while the attribute hard-negatives are not. We trained one model with a mix of all three types of hard-negatives, unlike original CounterCurate-CLIP, which trains separate models for each type. For SPEC-CLIP, which contains six category-specific dataset splits (absolute size, relative size, absolute spatial, relative spatial, existence, and count), we fine-tuned on the combined dataset. The batch construction procedure for all models were similar, ensuring hard-negatives were included within the effective batch size. If the total number of hard-negatives exceeded the batch size due to variations in the number of hard-negatives for each positive pair, the excess hard-negatives were included in the next batch. We do this to ensure controlled comparison with VisMin-CLIP. All models use ViT-L/14 as their backbone and the original CLIP loss, initialized from OpenAI checkpoints. The best checkpoints for NegCLIP and CounterCurate-CLIP were chosen based on their respective validation sets, while SPEC-CLIP was chosen based on average performance across benchmarks, as it does not have a separate validation split. These controlled experimental comparisons between VisMin-CLIP, NegCLIP, CounterCurate-CLIP and SPEC-CLIP will help us understand which hard-negative data generation approach among these four approaches is more helpful in improving the fine-grained understanding capabilities of the pre-trained CLIP model.

Table 4: Performance of fine-tuned CLIP and Idefics2 across categories on the VisMin Dataset. The † symbol indicates the reproduced model checkpoints based on their respective training data.

	Object			Attribute			S. Relation			Count			AVG
	T	I	G	T	I	G	T	I	G	T	I	G	
CLIP(ViT-L/14)	87.56	83.59	78.07	74.49	69.73	57.82	9.16	4.66	1.45	37.01	30.56	18.17	46.02
NegCLIP†	87.74	87.05	80.66	81.63	80.27	71.77	10.13	4.66	1.13	55.01	57.72	42.28	48.96
CounterCurate-CLIP†	89.81	91.02	84.46	82.99	80.27	72.79	20.1	11.41	<b>7.4</b>	49.24	45.16	31.92	49.14
SPEC-CLIP†	86.53	86.01	78.58	78.57	71.77	63.95	9.16	5.31	1.13	45.5	47.71	32.43	44.02
VisMin-CLIP	91.54	91.19	<b>86.36</b>	85.03	83.67	<b>75.85</b>	11.9	3.38	1.29	82.34	79.97	<b>72.33</b>	<b>63.74</b>
Idefics2	95.4	69.4	67.6	89.1	71.4	67.0	18.6	18.8	4.8	72.2	50.6	47.0	55.99
VisMin-Idefics2	96.5	95.7	<b>93.3</b>	91.2	91.8	<b>86.7</b>	83.0	76.0	<b>69.3</b>	85.4	87.8	<b>80.5</b>	<b>86.43</b>

Table 5: Evaluation on other single and multi-image **visual** fine-grained understanding benchmarks. All models adopt **ViT-L-14** as the vision encoder. **CB** refers CountBench, **SG** refers to Sugarcrepe, **IC** refers to Imagecode. **I2T** and **T2I** indicate standard standard image-to-text and text-to-image retrieval metrics. Best-performing models in the CLIP-family are highlighted in **blue**, and best-performing MLLM models are highlighted in **green**.

	#Samples	SINGLE-IMAGE				MULTI-IMAGE													
		VSR	CB	VALSE	SG	Whatsup	SPEC		IC	MMVP	Winoground			EQBEN			VisMin		
							I2T	T2I			T	I	G	T	I	G	T	I	G
CLIP (ViT-L/14)	-	58.33	33.65	69.1	73.0	37.7	32.85	30.86	61.47	19.26	27.5	11.0	8.5	35.71	33.57	21.43	52.05	47.13	38.88
NegCLIP†	118k	56.56	40.0	<b>75.41</b>	<b>85.73</b>	41.2	37.73	35.45	<b>67.33</b>	29.63	25.25	12.0	7.0	42.86	40.0	30.0	58.63	57.42	48.96
CounterCurate-CLIP†	241k	56.74	30.79	68.47	83.66	<b>44.29</b>	37.99	35.24	65.81	25.19	28.0	13.25	9.0	45.0	33.57	28.57	60.88	56.68	49.1
SPEC-CLIP†	637k	<b>64.54</b>	32.06	68.75	79.34	43.35	<b>87.04</b>	<b>88.08</b>	66.25	30.37	22.5	7.75	4.75	41.43	40.0	30.71	54.94	52.7	44.02
VisMin-CLIP	65k	58.69	<b>49.84</b>	72.24	81.44	43.99	44.28	39.98	66.81	<b>32.59</b>	<b>32.75</b>	<b>14.75</b>	<b>9.75</b>	<b>54.29</b>	<b>40.71</b>	<b>33.57</b>	<b>67.7</b>	<b>64.55</b>	<b>58.96</b>
Idefics2	-	77.3	91.11	<b>88.91</b>	90.45	68.04	74.37	60.5	64.4	48.15	<b>47.25</b>	33.75	<b>22.5</b>	62.88	33.33	25.76	68.83	52.56	46.6
Idefics2-Vismin	-	<b>80.32</b>	<b>93.97</b>	86.08	91.14	74.42	76.2	76.58	70.7	48.89	47.0	35.75	22.5	<b>64.39</b>	<b>54.55</b>	<b>49.24</b>	89.01	87.83	82.44

**Results** We evaluated these models on the VisMin benchmark (results in Table 4). Fine-tuning with minimal-change data significantly improves CLIP’s performance on the Object, Attribute, and Count categories, demonstrating the usefulness of our minimal-change data in enhancing the fine-grained understanding of foundational VLMs such as CLIP. VisMin-CLIP consistently outperforms NegCLIP, CounterCurate-CLIP and SPEC-CLIP across all categories except spatial relations. This suggests that the visual minimal-change data is more helpful in improving the fine-grained understanding capabilities of the CLIP model compared to the nearest neighbor images in NegCLIP and not fully minimally-changed CounterCurate and SPEC data. We further conduct a zero-shot evaluation of the fine-tuned CLIP models on other fine-grained understanding benchmarks (beyond our VisMin benchmark) to test their generalization capabilities (see Table 5). VisMin-CLIP performs the best



in 11 out of 18 tasks. In comparison, NegCLIP, CounterCurate-CLIP, and SPEC-CLIP achieve the highest performance in 3, 1, and 3 tasks, respectively. Importantly, all models outperform the pre-trained CLIP model across these benchmarks. For benchmarks emphasizing counting and spatial relationship reasoning, our VisMin training data shows significant improvements over the other models. For instance, on the CountBench benchmark, we observed 9%, 19%, and 17% improvements over NegCLIP, CounterCurate-CLIP, and SPEC-CLIP, respectively. Similarly, on spatial reasoning benchmarks (SPEC [27], Whatsup [12], and VSR [22]), we observed an average improvement of 7.79% over NegCLIP and 5.21% over CounterCurate-CLIP. While the SPEC benchmark is in-distribution for SPEC-CLIP, leading to its best performance, VisMin-CLIP still outperforms other models on the SPEC benchmark. This indicates that our minimal-change data is effective in fundamentally enhancing the fine-grained understanding capabilities of CLIP. For VALSE [26] and SugarCreme [8], we see that NegCLIP performs the best. We hypothesize this is because the textual hard-negative generation process in these benchmarks is very similar to that used in generating the NegCLIP fine-tuning data, making both benchmarks more in-distribution for NegCLIP compared to other approaches.

Furthermore, our minimal-change data significantly outperforms others in multi-image understanding benchmarks. Fine-tuning on such visual minimal-change data enhances the model’s ability to differentiate between similar images. We observed notable improvements on challenging benchmarks such as Winoground, MMVP, and EQBEN, which assess models on compositional reasoning and fine-grained understanding of similar images. Our approach markedly improved the Text score, with increases of 6% on Winoground and 18% on EQBEN over baseline CLIP, indicating that minimal-change images effectively align visual and textual feature spaces. VisMin-CLIP outperforms other models in maximum no. of tasks, demonstrating its superior performance in multi-image settings and achieving comparable results in the remaining benchmarks (except for SPEC benchmark). Lastly, it is worth noting that we use the least number of samples (for example, 65K in VisMin training compared to 637K in SPEC) among all methods that aim to improve the fine-grained understanding of CLIP.




Figure 4: VisMin fine-tuned models show greater improvements with larger models. The circle radius reflects the number of model parameters.




Figure 5: (left) Recall results with ViT-L/14 on COCO benchmark (right) standard benchmark results on Idefics2.

**Additional Findings** Further experiments reveal several key findings: (1) **Scalability**: As illustrated in fig. 4, we evaluated varying sizes of OpenAI’s CLIP models—B/32 and L/16. Larger models demonstrated improved performance across both single-image and multi-image benchmarks after training on our synthetic data. This improvement is likely because understanding minimal changes is a complex task, demanding robust model capabilities. For instance, the smallest tested model, ViT-B/32 (149.62M parameters), exhibited improvements of 2.37 and 3.24 in single and multiple image benchmarks, respectively, when comparing VisMin-CLIP against the baseline CLIP. When the model’s capacity was expanded to ViT-L/14 (427.62M parameters), the improvements increased to 6.88 and 9.21, respectively. These results highlight the scalability and efficacy of our data in enhancing model performance. (2) **Enhanced Original Capabilities**: In addition to improvements in fine-grained understanding tasks, training on our data also enhances performance in standard retrieval tasks, as shown in fig. 5. This suggests that models achieve better alignment from training on minimal change tasks, indicating that our data is generally applicable across various cross-modal tasks.

## 6.2 Fine-tuning Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs)

We utilized Idefics2 [14] to improve fine-grained understanding, employing our instruction-formatted dataset. Given its proficiency in multimodal interactions and advanced multi-image processing, Idefics2 was chosen for its open-source accessibility, model size and leading zero-shot performance.

**Dataset and QLoRa Fine-tuning** Our dataset, *VisMin Instruct-IT*, includes image-text pairs created using a rule-based approach. We reformulated these pairs for MLLMs, where the task is to select the correct image from two options based on a given caption or choose the appropriate caption for an image from two possibilities. While the base Idefics2 model was trained with a variable number of images in a sequence, we limited it to two images to include one positive and one hard negative example from VisMin. We fine-tuned the Idefics2-8B model using the QLoRa technique [4], updating adapters in the language model and modality connector including perceiver resampler with 1 A100 80GB GPU. We used 4-bit quantization, with  $r = 64$  and  $\alpha = 16$  for LoRa, and a learning rate of  $1e - 5$ . The model was fine-tuned for one epoch with an accumulated batch size of 64.

**Results** The fine-tuned Idefics2 models shows significant improvement on VisMin (see table 4) across all categories, on par to GPT4-o (see table 3). These results demonstrate the effectiveness of our minimal-change data in enhancing fine-grained understanding capabilities of MLLMs. The most notable gains are for the Spatial Relation category, with gains of 64.4%, 57.2%, and 64.5% for Text, Image, and Group respectively. This is in contrast to the behaviour observed with CLIP where fine-tuning with minimal-change data did not improve the spatial understanding capabilities. The improvements brought about by fine-tuning Idefics2 on the minimal-change data transfer to several other fine-grained visual benchmarks too, achieving an overall improvement of  $>5\%$  (results in table 5). To further test the generalization capabilities of the fine-tuned model, we evaluate its 0-shot performance on other benchmarks that do not focus on fine-grained understanding, such as MMMU[38] and POPE [18]. Results are reported in fig. 5 (right). We note that the fine-tuned model maintains comparable performance (compared to the pre-trained model) on the POPE benchmark, but shows a drop in the performance on the multi-choice task MMMU benchmark. We believe this is perhaps due to the binary-choice task format in our fine-tuning data. These observations suggest potential improvements by combining our fine-tuning data with the instruction-tuning datasets, which were not pursued due to the extensive GPU requirements for fine-tuning an 8B model with additional data.

## 7 Conclusion and Limitations

We present VisMin , a benchmark for evaluating fine-grained visual understanding in VLMs like CLIP, SigLIP, LLaVA, and Idefics2. While VLMs excel at recognizing objects and attributes, they struggle with counting and spatial relationships. To address these gaps, we finetuned CLIP and Idefics2 on our minimal-change dataset. Fine-tuning significantly improved both models on objects, attributes, and counting. In spatial relations, CLIP showed limited improvement, whereas Idefics2 displayed significant gains. Fine-tuning also improved CLIP’s general image-text alignment, as seen in COCO retrieval tasks. These results highlight our dataset’s potential as a robust training resource for VLMs. **Limitations:** Despite automatic filtering, the minimal-change training data contains noise, such as image deformations and text-image mismatches due to the current diffusion models’ limitations. Future diffusion model advancements are expected to improve such minimal-change editing capabilities. Our experiments used uniform, simple prompts for consistent evaluation, which may have variably influenced model performance.

## Acknowledgments

We express our gratitude to Mojtaba Faramarzi and Yash Goyal for their constructive feedback throughout the different stages of the project. We also acknowledge the valuable feedback provided by Qian Yang, Kanish Jain, and Oscar Manas on the early draft. The technical support extended by the Mila IDT team in managing the computational infrastructure is greatly appreciated. Additionally, Aishwarya Agrawal received support from the Canada CIFAR AI Chair award throughout this project.

## References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.

- [2] Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Zhong Muyan, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14238*, 2023.
- [3] Mehdi Cherti, Romain Beaumont, Ross Wightman, Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Cade Gordon, Christoph Schuhmann, Ludwig Schmidt, and Jenia Jitsev. Reproducible scaling laws for contrastive language-image learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2818–2829, 2023.
- [4] Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [5] Sivan Doveh, Assaf Arbelle, Sivan Harary, Eli Schwartz, Roei Herzig, Raja Giryes, Rogerio Feris, Rameswar Panda, Shimon Ullman, and Leonid Karlinsky. Teaching structured vision & language concepts to vision & language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2657–2668, 2023.
- [6] Sivan Doveh, Assaf Arbelle, Sivan Harary, Roei Herzig, Donghyun Kim, Paola Cascante-Bonilla, Amit Alfassy, Rameswar Panda, Raja Giryes, Rogerio Feris, et al. Dense and aligned captions (dac) promote compositional reasoning in vl models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [7] Roei Herzig, Alon Mendelson, Leonid Karlinsky, Assaf Arbelle, Rogerio Feris, Trevor Darrell, and Amir Globerson. Incorporating structured representations into pretrained vision & language models using scene graphs, 2023.
- [8] Cheng-Yu Hsieh, Jieyu Zhang, Zixian Ma, Aniruddha Kembhavi, and Ranjay Krishna. Sugarcrepe: Fixing hackable benchmarks for vision-language compositionality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14610*, 2023.
- [9] Yushi Hu, Benlin Liu, Jungo Kasai, Yizhong Wang, Mari Ostendorf, Ranjay Krishna, and Noah A Smith. Tifa: Accurate and interpretable text-to-image faithfulness evaluation with question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11897*, 2023.
- [10] Harsh Jhamtani and Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick. Learning to describe differences between pairs of similar images. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2018.
- [11] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024.
- [12] Amita Kamath, Jack Hessel, and Kai-Wei Chang. What’s “up” with vision-language models? investigating their struggle with spatial reasoning. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 9161–9175, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.568. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.568>.
- [13] Benno Krojer, Vaibhav Adlakha, Vibhav Vineet, Yash Goyal, Edoardo Ponti, and Siva Reddy. Image retrieval from contextual descriptions. In Smaranda Muresan, Preslav Nakov, and Aline Villavicencio, editors, *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3426–3440, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.241. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.241>.
- [14] Hugo Laurençon, Lucile Saulnier, Léo Tronchon, Stas Bekman, Amanpreet Singh, Anton Lozhkov, Thomas Wang, Siddharth Karamcheti, Alexander Rush, Douwe Kiela, et al. Obelics: An open web-scale filtered dataset of interleaved image-text documents. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [15] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Liangyu Chen, Jinghao Wang, Fanyi Pu, Jingkang Yang, Chunyuan Li, and Ziwei Liu. Mimic-it: Multi-modal in-context instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05425*, 2023.

- [16] Juncheng Li, Kaihang Pan, Zhiqi Ge, Minghe Gao, Hanwang Zhang, Wei Ji, Wenqiao Zhang, Tat seng Chua, Siliang Tang, and Yueting Zhuang. Fine-tuning multimodal LLMs to follow zero-shot demonstrative instructions. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=BXY6fe7q31>.
- [17] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022.
- [18] Yifan Li, Yifan Du, Kun Zhou, Jinpeng Wang, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen. Evaluating object hallucination in large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10355*, 2023.
- [19] Yuheng Li, Haotian Liu, Qingyang Wu, Fangzhou Mu, Jianwei Yang, Jianfeng Gao, Chunyuan Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Gligen: Open-set grounded text-to-image generation. *ArXiv*, abs/2301.07093, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:255942528>.
- [20] Long Lian, Boyi Li, Adam Yala, and Trevor Darrell. Llm-grounded diffusion: Enhancing prompt understanding of text-to-image diffusion models with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.13655*, 2023.
- [21] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6-12, 2014, Proceedings, Part V 13*, pages 740–755. Springer, 2014.
- [22] Fangyu Liu, Guy Emerson, and Nigel Collier. Visual spatial reasoning. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 11:635–651, 2023.
- [23] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2024.
- [24] Shilong Liu, Zhaoyang Zeng, Tianhe Ren, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Jie Yang, Chunyuan Li, Jianwei Yang, Hang Su, Jun Zhu, et al. Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for open-set object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05499*, 2023.
- [25] Roni Paiss, Ariel Ephrat, Omer Tov, Shiran Zada, Inbar Mosseri, Michal Irani, and Tali Dekel. Teaching clip to count to ten, 2023.
- [26] Letitia Parcalabescu, Michele Cafagna, Lilitta Muradjan, Anette Frank, Iacer Calixto, and Albert Gatt. VALSE: A task-independent benchmark for vision and language models centered on linguistic phenomena. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8253–8280, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.567. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.567>.
- [27] Wujian Peng, Sicheng Xie, Zuyao You, Shiyi Lan, and Zuxuan Wu. Synthesize, diagnose, and optimize: Towards fine-grained vision-language understanding, 2023.
- [28] Bryan A. Plummer, Liwei Wang, Christopher M. Cervantes, Juan C. Caicedo, Julia Hockenmaier, and Svetlana Lazebnik. Flickr30k entities: Collecting region-to-phrase correspondences for richer image-to-sentence models. *IJCV*, 123(1):74–93, 2017.
- [29] Dustin Podell, Zion English, Kyle Lacey, Andreas Blattmann, Tim Dockhorn, Jonas Müller, Joe Penna, and Robin Rombach. Sdxl: Improving latent diffusion models for high-resolution image synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.01952*, 2023.
- [30] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021.

- [31] Harman Singh, Pengchuan Zhang, Qifan Wang, Mengjiao Wang, Wenhan Xiong, Jingfei Du, and Yu Chen. Coarse-to-fine contrastive learning in image-text-graph space for improved vision-language compositionality, 2023.
- [32] Roman Suvorov, Elizaveta Logacheva, Anton Mashikhin, Anastasia Remizova, Arsenii Ashukha, Aleksei Silvestrov, Naejin Kong, Harshith Goka, Kiwoong Park, and Victor Lempitsky. Resolution-robust large mask inpainting with fourier convolutions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.07161*, 2021.
- [33] Gemini Team. Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models, 2024.
- [34] Tristan Thrush, Ryan Jiang, Max Bartolo, Amanpreet Singh, Adina Williams, Douwe Kiela, and Candace Ross. Winoground: Probing vision and language models for visio-linguistic compositionality. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 5238–5248, June 2022.
- [35] Shengbang Tong, Zhuang Liu, Yuexiang Zhai, Yi Ma, Yann LeCun, and Saining Xie. Eyes wide shut? exploring the visual shortcomings of multimodal llms, 2024.
- [36] Tan Wang, Kevin Lin, Linjie Li, Chung-Ching Lin, Zhengyuan Yang, Hanwang Zhang, Zicheng Liu, and Lijuan Wang. Equivariant similarity for vision-language foundation models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 11998–12008, October 2023.
- [37] Jiahui Yu, Zirui Wang, Vijay Vasudevan, Legg Yeung, Mojtaba Seyedhosseini, and Yonghui Wu. Coca: Contrastive captioners are image-text foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01917*, 2022.
- [38] Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoqi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, et al. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16502*, 2023.
- [39] Mert Yuksekgonul, Federico Bianchi, Pratyusha Kalluri, Dan Jurafsky, and James Zou. When and why vision-language models behave like bags-of-words, and what to do about it? In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [40] Mert Yuksekgonul, Federico Bianchi, Pratyusha Kalluri, Dan Jurafsky, and James Zou. When and why vision-language models behave like bags-of-words, and what to do about it? In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=KRLUvvh8uaX>.
- [41] Xiaohua Zhai, Basil Mustafa, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. Sigmoid loss for language image pre-training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 11975–11986, 2023.
- [42] Jianrui Zhang, Mu Cai, Tengyang Xie, and Yong Jae Lee. Countercurate: Enhancing physical and semantic visio-linguistic compositional reasoning via counterfactual examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13254*, 2024.
- [43] Le Zhang, Rabiul Awal, and Aishwarya Agrawal. Contrasting intra-modal and ranking cross-modal hard negatives to enhance visio-linguistic fine-grained understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.08832*, 2023.
- [44] Tiancheng Zhao, Tianqi Zhang, Mingwei Zhu, Haozhan Shen, Kyusong Lee, Xiaopeng Lu, and Jianwei Yin. An explainable toolbox for evaluating pre-trained vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 30–37, Abu Dhabi, UAE, December 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.emnlp-demos.4>.



## A Appendix

### A.1 Prompts Used for Edit Instruction Generation

We utilize the Mixtral47B LLM to generate edit suggestions across selected categories: objects, attributes, counting, and spatial relations. The specific prompts used for each category are detailed in figs. 6 to 8. These prompts guide the LLM in creating minimal, precise modifications to captions, ensuring the generation of high-quality hard-negative instances.

```
Object Edit Instructions: As an AI language model, your task
  involves making minimal, targeted edits to a caption that
  describes an image, guiding corresponding visual changes
  to be made in the edited version of the image.
```

```
Follow these structured steps:
```

```
Suggest Edit: Identify and suggest a specific edit from the
  given caption. Your edit should only change an object in
  the scene.
```

```
The edit must adhere to the following criteria:
```

```
Object changes should be visually distinct and mutually
  exclusive.
```

```
Do not replace an object with its synonyms or closely related
  sub-categories.
```

```
The replacement object must fit within the original object's
  region and be visually plausible within the scene.
```

```
Maintain a one-to-one replacement ratio; do not introduce
  additional objects.
```

```
General Criteria for Edits: Avoid any changes related to
  action, spatial relations, counting, or the size of
  objects.
```

```
Edits must be visually and contextually plausible, ensuring
  the scene remains coherent and the edit does not introduce
  inconsistencies in other parts of the image.
```

```
Create an Edited Caption: Draft a new caption reflecting the
  image post-edit.
```

```
Specify Edit Category: Clearly state that your suggested edit
  falls under 'Object'.
```

Figure 6: In-context demonstrations for objects edit suggestions.

### A.2 Prompts Used for Edit Instruction Verification

We employ the Mixtral47B LLM to verify edit suggestions in the object and attribute categories. The specific prompts used for this verification process are illustrated in fig. 9. Verification is crucial because initial suggestions by the LLM can occasionally be implausible or violate the intended edit category. By thoroughly verifying the edits, we ensure the generation of accurate and high-quality hard-negative instances, which are essential for effectively testing and improving VLMs.

### A.3 Human Verification of Benchmark

The human verification process involves four main steps. First, **Naturalness and Image-Text Matching Verification** ensures that captions are sensible, images appear natural, and there is cohesive alignment between image and description, (see Figure 10). Second, **Visual Edit Verification** confirms that the edited images accurately reflect the specified edits without additional changes, ensuring visual minimal change (see Figure 11). Third, **Edit Instruction Verification** checks that LLM-generated edit instructions are minimal and targeted, altering only one aspect of the object, attribute, counting,

#### Attribute Edit Instructions:

As an AI language model, your task involves making minimal, targeted edits to a caption that describes an image, guiding corresponding visual changes in the edited version of the image.

Follow these structured steps:

**Suggest Edit:** Identify and suggest a specific edit from the given caption if it is editable.

Your edit should modify an attribute of existing objects in the caption.

The edit must adhere to the following criteria:

Change only the attributes of an object from one of the allowed sub-category: color, pattern, shape, appearance, material, state, condition.

Replacing an object itself or introducing new attributes is not allowed.

Attribute changes must be distinct, mutually exclusive, and not synonymous.

The edited attribute should make visual and contextual sense within the image without altering its overall composition.

**General Criteria for Edits:**

Do not suggest attribute changes related to spatial relations, counting, or the size of objects.

Edits must be visually and contextually plausible, ensuring the scene remains coherent and the edit does not introduce inconsistencies.

**Create an Edited Caption:** Draft a new caption reflecting the image post-edit.

**Specify Edit Category:** Clearly state that your suggested edit falls under 'Attribute'. If you cannot change an attribute due to a missing attribute in the given caption, please output 'EMPTY'.

Figure 7: In-context demonstrations for attributes edit suggestions.

or spatial relation in captions and images (see Figure 10). Finally, **Textual Edit Verification** ensures the edited sentence accurately reflects the specified edit instruction without additional changes and classifies the change type (see Figure 11).

#### A.4 Human baseline

We gather human annotations using Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT) to determine human performance on our benchmark, replicating the exact tasks given to models as described in Section 5. Additionally, annotators can choose “none” or “both” options (please see Figure 15 and Figure 16); we deliberately included these options to accurately estimate the best model performance when tasks are difficult for humans. We collect five annotations per sample for each of the four scenarios in the image-text matching task. We compute image score, text score, and group score as described in Section 5. If the answer “both” or “none” is chosen by three or more annotators, or if one annotator chooses “none” or “both” while the other options each receive exactly two votes, we randomly assign a 50% match to maintain consistency with the model evaluation setup.

#### A.5 Random qualitative samples from training and VisMin

```

"task_instruction_counting": "Your goal is to suggest a
textual description for creating a visual scene within a
512x512 pixel canvas, focusing specifically on a counting
task involving objects numbered between two and nine.
Follow these steps to ensure comprehensive output:
1. Input: Propose a scene with groups of distinct objects,
ensuring each group contains a different number of items
ranging from two to nine. These objects should be easily
countable and distinguishable. The objects should be
spread out across the canvas; cluttering or overlapping is
prohibited. Detail the arrangement of these objects within
the scene, considering their visibility for accurate
counting. Do not mention any activity in the scene.
2. Bounding Boxes and Object Counts: For each group of
objects, provide bounding box data in the format 'object
name', [x, y, width, height]. This data should reflect the
object's position and size within the 512x512 image,
aiding in identifying the exact number of objects present.
3. Background Prompt: Suggest a fitting and simple
background that does not detract from the main task of
counting the objects.
4. Negative Prompt: List elements that should be avoided
in the image to ensure clarity and focus on the counting
task.
5. Category (sub-category): Identify the most relevant
category and sub-category for the scene, based on the
objects and their arrangement. Choose categories that
enhance the clarity and focus of the counting task."

"task_instruction_relation": "Your goal is to suggest a
textual description and structured data for creating a
visual scene within a 512x512 pixel canvas. Follow these
steps to ensure a comprehensive output:
1. Input: Suggest a description with pairs of distinct objects
that commonly occur together in a scene. These objects
could be swapped in their positions if needed later on.
Avoid suggesting common background objects in this step.
You may occasionally mention the relative size, distance
and orientation between objects if applicable.
2. Bounding Boxes and Object Pairs: Detail each identified
object with its bounding box in the format 'object name',
[x, y, width, height], indicating the object's position
and size within the 512x512 image. Be specific about the
spatial relationship of objects, such as whether they are
on the 'top', 'down', 'above', 'below', 'left', or 'right'
of each other.
3. Background Prompt: Based on the scene described in the
input, suggest a fitting and straightforward background.
4. Negative Prompt: List elements to be excluded from the
image.
5. Category (sub-category): Identify the most relevant
category and sub-category for the scene based on the
objects and their arrangement. Limit the options for
sub-categories based on the provided reference examples."

```

Figure 8: In-context demonstrations for relation and counting image description generation.

**\*\*Task Instruction Object\*\***

Determine the acceptability of edits to an image caption based on following criteria:

Edits must only involve object changes within a specified scene region.

No changes related to attributes, spatial relations, counting, or any unrelated alterations.

The new object must be visually distinct and not closely related to the original.

Edits should be confined to one region without needing adjustments elsewhere for scene consistency.

Adhere to a one-to-one replacement rule, introducing no additional objects.

Reject edits that add unnecessary specificity or make assumptions not clear from the original caption.

Reject if information is insufficient or uncertain.

Strict filtering: When in doubt, reject the edit.

**\*\*Task Instruction Attribute\*\***

Evaluate edits to an image caption that change an object's attributes based on following criteria:

Reject changes involving the objects themselves, their spatial relations, counting, or size.

Acceptable modifications are distinct changes in color, pattern, shape, texture, material, state, or condition.

Attribute changes must be distinct and not synonymous.

Reject edits suggesting synonym replacements or adding new attributes.

Reject if information is insufficient or uncertain.

Strict filtering: When in doubt, reject the edit.

Figure 9: In-context demonstrations for LLM suggested edit verification for object and attribute category.

**Instructions**

In this HIT, you will be shown an image and a description associated with the image. Your task is to answer following questions:









1. Does the description sound sensical, i.e. is it fluent and plausible? Please see examples below.

Sounds sensical ✓	Does not sound sensical ✗
✓ A scene with four vehicles.	✗ Non-fluent: A group of cat.
✓ A covered box below a motorbike.	✗ Non-fluent: A street sign is parked on left and a car on the right.
✓ Bear playing hockey. (Although this phenomenon is unlikely to be observed in the real world, one can imagine this phenomenon and hence we consider such descriptions as sensical)	✗ Non-fluent: It heaving at a city.
✓ A toy car on the left and a teddy bear on the right.	✗ Implausible: The bush speaking in the garden.
✓ An apple on the top shelf and a banana on the bottom shelf.	✗ Implausible: Olives and grapes inside a plate.
✓ Elephant standing on top of a table. (Although this phenomenon is unlikely to be observed in the real world, one can imagine this phenomenon and hence we consider such descriptions as sensical)	✗ Implausible: Grass eating horse.





2. Does the image look natural, i.e. it does not have any major odd phenomenon inconsistent with the reality of the world? When evaluating, please keep these two scenarios in mind:

1. Animatic and artistic painting should be considered as natural as long as they adhere to fundamental real-world principles.
2. Minor deformations of objects can be acceptable as long as they align with the intended concept and do not appear overly unnatural or disruptive to the viewer.

Please review the examples below. We've provided sets of natural-looking images and sets of images that are not considered natural, along with descriptions explaining why each is categorized as such.

Natural-looking images ✓	Not natural-looking images ✗
 <p>✓ Despite being a painting, this image feels natural because it follows basic real-world rules and doesn't have any major oddities.</p>	 <p>✗ This image looks unnatural because the person is missing their full body and head.</p>
 <p>✓ This image gives off a natural impression, with no significant problems evident.</p>	 <p>✗ This image seems unnatural because it mixes the body of a zebra with the legs of a giraffe.</p>
 <p>✓ This image simply looks natural as it doesn't depict any major odd phenomena or disruptions.</p>	 <p>✗ This image seems unnatural because the surface where the three people are sitting doesn't appear to be supporting them, and their hands look deformed.</p>
 <p>✓ This image appears natural since it adheres to fundamental principles without major inconsistencies.</p>	 <p>✗ This image seems unnatural because several fruits are stuck together in a disruptive and unexpected manner.</p>

3. Does the description accurately describe the contents of the image? Please see the examples below, for each image, we have provided one incorrect description and one correct description.

 <p>✗ Incorrect description: A large bear sitting and eating a bamboo plant. ✓ Correct description: A large koala sitting and eating a bamboo plant.</p>	 <p>✗ Incorrect description: A male tennis player holding a green racket. ✓ Correct description: A male tennis player holding a red racket.</p>
 <p>✗ Incorrect description: A young woman is eating food. ✓ Correct description: A young man is eating food.</p>	 <p>✗ Incorrect description: Several women gathered together posing with pizzas in take out boxes. ✓ Correct description: Several women gathered together posing with cupcakes in take out boxes.</p>

For a detailed look at the image, please hover over it.

Please answer the questions below to the best of your knowledge. Careless work will be rejected. Thank you for your careful attention to detail and your valuable contribution!

Figure 10: Instructions for naturalness and image-text matching verification.



**Instructions**



In this HIT, you will be shown an image and an instruction that specifies some edits to be made to the image (we call this "edit instruction"). You will also be shown the edited image. Your task is to evaluate the correctness of the edited image. The edited image is judged to be correct if:

1. it accurately reflects the edit specified in the edit instruction, and
2. it does not contain any other changes beyond those specified in the edit instruction.

If you deem the edited image to be incorrect, please specify why the edited image is not correct.

Please see the examples below to understand the task better:

- Example 1:** **Edit instruction: Change grassy shore to rocky shore.**

Original Image                      Edited Image

Is the edited image correct?

Yes  
 No

In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edited image is not correct (please select all that apply):

It does not accurately reflect the edit specified in the edit instruction.  
 It contains other changes beyond those specified in the edit instruction.
- Example 2:** **Edit instruction: Change tents to yurts.**





Original Image                      Edited Image

Is the edited image correct?

Yes  
 No

In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edited image is not correct (please select all that apply):

It does not accurately reflect the edit specified in the edit instruction.  
 It contains other changes beyond those specified in the edit instruction.
- Example 3:** **Edit instruction: Change three men to three women.**




Original Image                      Edited Image

Is the edited image correct?

Yes  
 No

In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edited image is not correct (please select all that apply):

It does not accurately reflect the edit specified in the edit instruction.  
 It contains other changes beyond those specified in the edit instruction.
- Example 4:** **Edit instruction: Change "A yellow school bus on the right and a green sports car on the left." to "A green sports car on the right and a yellow school bus on the left."**





Original Image                      Edited Image

Is the edited image correct?

Yes  
 No

In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edited image is not correct (please select all that apply):

It does not accurately reflect the edit specified in the edit instruction.  
 It contains other changes beyond those specified in the edit instruction.
- Example 5:** **Edit instruction: Change triangular bathroom sink to round sink.**




Original Image                      Edited Image

Is the edited image correct?

Yes  
 No

In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edited image is not correct (please select all that apply):

It does not accurately reflect the edit specified in the edit instruction.  
 It contains other changes beyond those specified in the edit instruction.
- Example 6:** **Edit instruction: Change Two skateboards to two surfboards.**






Original Image                      Edited Image

Is the edited image correct?

Yes  
 No

In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edited image is not correct (please select all that apply):

It does not accurately reflect the edit specified in the edit instruction.  
 It contains other changes beyond those specified in the edit instruction.
- Example 7:** **Edit instruction: Change "A toy crane is above a toy car." to "A toy car is above a toy crane."**

Original Image                      Edited Image

Is the edited image correct?

Yes  
 No

In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edited image is not correct (please select all that apply):

It does not accurately reflect the edit specified in the edit instruction.  
 It contains other changes beyond those specified in the edit instruction.

**The edited image does not accurately reflect the edit specified in the edit instruction because the toy car is not above the toy crane; it is behind it. Note that, in this example, the original image is also incorrect since the toy crane is not above the toy car, it is behind; but that does not make the edited image correct. Both images are incorrect.**

For a detailed look at the image, please hover over it.

Please answer the questions below to the best of your knowledge. Careless work will be rejected. Thank you for your careful attention to detail and your valuable contribution!

Figure 11: Instructions for visual edit verification after applying edit instructions.

**Instructions**

In this HIT, you will be shown a sentence and an instruction that specifies some edits to be made to the sentence (we call this "edit instruction"). Your task is to verify the validity of the edit instruction. The edit instruction is considered valid if all of the following conditions holds for it:

- The suggested edit results in mutually exclusive concepts, e.g., changing dog to puppy is not a valid edit instruction since puppy is a type of dog, and hence they are not mutually exclusive. Please see the examples below to understand mutually exclusive concepts better:
  - Changing "Poodle" to "Bulldog", "Rose" to "Orchid", "woman" to "man", "car" to "truck", "cold drink" to "warm drink", "dog" to "cat", and "sofa" to "bed", are **mutually exclusive** changes.
  - Changing "dog" to "puppy", "Rose" to "flower", "woman" to "person", "car" to "vehicle", and "cold drink" to "drink" are **not mutually exclusive** changes. Please note that any replacement of words with their synonyms is also not considered mutually exclusive, e.g., changing "kids" to "children", changing "drink" to "beverage", and changing "insect" to "bug".
- The suggested edit modifies **only** one aspect of the sentence, chosen from one of the following categories only:
  - Object:** modifying an object (e.g., changing dog to cat).
  - Attribute:** modifying the properties of an object, such as its color, pattern, shape, or material (e.g., changing round table to rectangular table).
  - Counting:** modifying the count of an object (changing three dogs to two dogs).
  - Spatial Relationship:** modifying the spatial relationship between two objects (e.g., changing "A cat to the left of the dog." to "A dog to the left of the cat.").
- The modification type should fall within one of the **four specified categories:** object, attribute, counting, or spatial relationship. For example, changing verbs is not allowed.

If you deem the edit instruction to be invalid, please specify why the edit instruction is not valid.

Please see the examples below to understand the task better:

- Example 1:**  
**Original sentence:** A dog jumps for a frisbee over a pool.  
**Edit instruction:** Change frisbee to ball.  
 Is the edit instruction valid?  
 Yes  
 No  
 In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edit instruction is not valid (please select all that apply):  
 It does not result in mutually exclusive concepts.  
 It modifies more than one aspect of the sentence within the categories of object, attribute, counting, and spatial relationship.  
 The modification type does not fall within any of the four specified categories: object, attribute, counting, or spatial relationship.
- Example 2:**  
**Original sentence:** A picture of a couple who got married.  
**Edit instruction:** Change couple to bride and groom.  
 Is the edit instruction valid?  
 Yes  
 No  
 In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edit instruction is not valid (please select all that apply):  
 It does not result in mutually exclusive concepts.  
 It modifies more than one aspect of the sentence within the categories of object, attribute, counting, and spatial relationship.  
 The modification type does not fall within any of the four specified categories: object, attribute, counting, or spatial relationship.
- Example 3:**  
**Original sentence:** A group of children riding bicycles along a scenic path in the park.  
**Edit instruction:** Change bicycles to bikes.  
 Is the edit instruction valid?  
 Yes  
 No  
 In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edit instruction is not valid (please select all that apply):  
 It does not result in mutually exclusive concepts.  
 It modifies more than one aspect of the sentence within the categories of object, attribute, counting, and spatial relationship.  
 The modification type does not fall within any of the four specified categories: object, attribute, counting, or spatial relationship.
- Example 4:**  
**Original sentence:** A picture of a white cat.  
**Edit instruction:** Change white cat to black dog.  
 Is the edit instruction valid?  
 Yes  
 No  
 In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edit instruction is not valid (please select all that apply):  
 It does not result in mutually exclusive concepts.  
 It modifies more than one aspect of the sentence within the categories of object, attribute, counting, and spatial relationship.  
 The modification type does not fall within any of the four specified categories: object, attribute, counting, or spatial relationship.
- Example 5:**  
**Original sentence:** A purple bicycle chained to a metal tree enclosure.  
**Edit instruction:** Change purple bicycle to red bicycle.  
 Is the edit instruction valid?  
 Yes  
 No  
 In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edit instruction is not valid (please select all that apply):  
 It does not result in mutually exclusive concepts.  
 It modifies more than one aspect of the sentence within the categories of object, attribute, counting, and spatial relationship.  
 The modification type does not fall within any of the four specified categories: object, attribute, counting, or spatial relationship.
- Example 6:**  
**Original sentence:** Three apples sitting in a bowl.  
**Edit instruction:** Change 3 apples to 2 apples.  
 Is the edit instruction valid?  
 Yes  
 No  
 In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edit instruction is not valid (please select all that apply):  
 It does not result in mutually exclusive concepts.  
 It modifies more than one aspect of the sentence within the categories of object, attribute, counting, and spatial relationship.  
 The modification type does not fall within any of the four specified categories: object, attribute, counting, or spatial relationship.
- Example 7:**  
**Original sentence:** A flower vase on the table and a cake on the right.  
**Edit instruction:** Change "A flower vase on the table and a cake on the right." to "A cake on the table and a flower vase on the right."  
 Is the edit instruction valid?  
 Yes  
 No  
 In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edit instruction is not valid (please select all that apply):  
 It does not result in mutually exclusive concepts.  
 It modifies more than one aspect of the sentence within the categories of object, attribute, counting, and spatial relationship.  
 The modification type does not fall within any of the four specified categories: object, attribute, counting, or spatial relationship.

**Original sentence:** The kids joyfully dancing together in the sandbox.  
**Edit instruction:** Change dancing to playing.  
 Is the edit instruction valid?  
 Yes  
 No  
 In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edit instruction is not valid (please select all that apply):  
 It does not result in mutually exclusive concepts.  
 It modifies more than one aspect of the sentence within the categories of object, attribute, counting, and spatial relationship.  
 The modification type does not fall within any of the four specified categories: object, attribute, counting, or spatial relationship.

Please answer the questions below to the best of your knowledge. Careless work will be rejected. Thank you for your careful attention to detail and your valuable contribution!

Figure 12: Instructions for edit instruction verification.

**Instructions**

In this HIT, you will be shown a sentence and an instruction that specifies some edits to be made to the sentence (we call this 'edit instruction'). You will also be shown the edited sentence. Your task is to evaluate the correctness of the edited sentence. The edited sentence is judged to be correct if:

1. It accurately reflects the edit specified in the edit instruction, and
2. It does not contain any other changes beyond those specified in the edit instruction.

If you deem the edited sentence to be incorrect, please specify why the edited sentence is not correct.

Finally, you must select the **type** of the edit being specified in the edit instruction, from the following types:

- **Object:** modifying an object (e.g., changing dog to cat).
- **Attribute:** modifying the properties of an object, such as its color, pattern, shape, or material (e.g., changing round table to rectangular table).
- **Counting:** modifying the count of an object (changing three dogs to two dogs).
- **Spatial Relationship:** modifying the spatial relationship between two objects (e.g., changing "A cat to the left of the dog." to "A dog to the left of the cat.")

Please see the examples below to understand the task better:

• **Example 1:**  
**Original sentence:** A black and white cat is sitting in front of a laptop that is on a desk.  
**Edit instruction:** Change laptop to tablet.  
**Edited sentence:** A black and white cat is sitting in front of a tablet that is on a desk.  
 Is the edited sentence correct?  
 Yes  
 No  
 In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edited sentence is not correct (please select all that apply):  
 It does not accurately reflect the edit specified in the edit instruction.  
 It contains other changes beyond those specified in the edit instruction.  
 Finally, select the type of the edit being specified in the edit instruction:  
 Object  
 Attribute  
 Counting  
 Spatial Relationship

• **Example 2:**  
**Original sentence:** A white park bench sitting on a middle of a forest.  
**Edit instruction:** Change white park bench to red park bench.  
**Edited sentence:** A red park bench sitting on a middle of a forest.  
 Is the edited sentence correct?  
 Yes  
 No  
 In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edited sentence is not correct (please select all that apply):  
 It does not accurately reflect the edit specified in the edit instruction.  
 It contains other changes beyond those specified in the edit instruction.  
 Finally, select the type of the edit being specified in the edit instruction:  
 Object  
 Attribute  
 Counting  
 Spatial Relationship

• **Example 3:**  
**Original sentence:** A dog sleeping on top of a red chair with two books.  
**Edit instruction:** Change two books to one book.  
**Edited sentence:** A red chair without a dog sleeping on it and without the two books nearby.  
 Is the edited sentence correct?  
 Yes  
 No  
 In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edited sentence is not correct (please select all that apply):  
 It does not accurately reflect the edit specified in the edit instruction.  
 It contains other changes beyond those specified in the edit instruction.  
 Finally, select the type of the edit being specified in the edit instruction:  
 Object  
 Attribute  
 Counting  
 Spatial Relationship

• **Example 4:**  
**Original sentence:** A bike to the left of a door.  
**Edit instruction:** Change "A bike to the left of a door." to "A door to the left of a bike."  
**Edited sentence:** A door to the left of a bike.  
 Is the edited sentence correct?  
 Yes  
 No  
 In case you selected "No" for the above question, please specify why the edited sentence is not correct (please select all that apply):  
 It does not accurately reflect the edit specified in the edit instruction.  
 It contains other changes beyond those specified in the edit instruction.  
 Finally, select the type of the edit being specified in the edit instruction:  
 Object  
 Attribute  
 Counting  
 Spatial Relationship

Please answer the questions below to the best of your knowledge. Careless work will be rejected. Thank you for your careful attention to detail and your valuable contribution!

Figure 13: Instructions for textual edit verification.

Distribution of Categories and Subcategories in the Training Set




Figure 14: Categories and subcategories distribution in the training split.

## Instructions

In this HIT, you will be shown a description along with two images. Your task is to select the image that accurately depicts the description. If you believe both images accurately depict the description, please select both. However, if you find that neither image accurately depicts the description, choose none.

Please see the examples below to understand the task better:

• **Example 1:**

**Description:** A plate that has three donuts on it next to a cup.



First image




Second image

Which image(s) accurately depicts the description?


- First image
- Second image
- Both
- None

• **Example 2:**

**Description:** A ball lying to the left of a toy car.



First image



Second image

Which image(s) accurately depicts the description?

- First image
- Second image
- Both
- None

• **Example 3:**

**Description:** A person in a kitchen with an open refrigerator.



First image



Second image

Which image(s) accurately depicts the description?

- First image
- Second image
- Both
- None

• **Example 4:**

**Description:** Two giraffes standing by a barbed wire fence.



First image



Second image

Which image(s) accurately depicts the description?

- First image
- Second image
- Both
- None

For a detailed look at the image, please hover over it.

Please answer the questions below to the best of your knowledge. Careless work will be rejected. Thank you for your careful attention to detail and your valuable contribution!

Figure 15: Instructions for choosing the best matching image.




**Instructions**

In this HIT, you will be shown an image along with two descriptions. Your task is to select the description that accurately describes the image. If you believe both descriptions accurately describe the image, please select both. However, if you believe neither description accurately describes the image, choose none.

Please see the examples below to understand the task better:


- Example 1:**



**Description 1:** A cat that is laying down on a laptop.  
**Description 2:** A cat lying down, not on a laptop.

Which description(s) accurately describes the image?


Description 1  
 Description 2  
 Both  
 None
- Example 2:**



**Description 1:** 2 sheep lay in the grass in a field.  
**Description 2:** One sheep lay in the grass in a field.

Which description(s) accurately describes the image?


Description 1  
 Description 2  
 Both  
 None
- Example 3:**



**Description 1:** A young man dressed in a blazer, dress shirt and skinny tie.  
**Description 2:** A young man dressed in a jacket dress shirt and skinny tie.

Which description(s) accurately describes the image?

Description 1  
 Description 2  
 Both  
 None
- Example 4:**



**Description 1:** Two skateboards sitting on the rug in a room.  
**Description 2:** Two surfboards are lying on the rug in a room.

Which description(s) accurately describes the image?


Description 1  
 Description 2  
 Both  
 None

For a detailed look at the image, please hover over it.


Please answer the questions below to the best of your knowledge. Careless work will be rejected. Thank you for your careful attention to detail and your valuable contribution!

Figure 16: Instructions for choosing the best matching description.


VisMin Benchmark- Object



VisMin Benchmark- Attribute



VisMin Benchmark- Counting



VisMin Benchmark- Relation




























Figure 17: Random qualitative samples from VisMin.













Training- Object

					
A man hitting a tennis ball with a tennis racket.	A woman hitting a tennis ball with a tennis racket.	Two buses are stopped on the side of the road.	Two taxis are stopped on the side of the road.	A plate of roast beef in barbecue sauce with broccoli and carrots.	A plate of roast beef in barbecue sauce with broccoli and peas.
					
The microwave is near the person.	The coffee maker is near the person.	The person is in front of the zebra.	The person is facing the lion.	Woman in red skirt and floral top about to throw a Frisbee.	A woman in a red skirt and floral top is about to throw a football.

Training- Attribute

					
A tv sits on top of a wooden table near plants.	A tv sits on top of a glass table near plants.	A man in a tie has a short stubby beard.	A man in a tie has a long beard.	A woman with blue hair taking a picture of herself with a phone.	A woman with blonde hair taking a picture of herself with a phone.
					
A beach scene with a beach chair decorated with the Canadian flag and surfboards walking by with their surfboards.	A beach scene with a beach chair decorated with the American flag and surfboards walking by with their surfboards.	A cat is curled up on a brown couch in this living room.	A cat is curled up on a green couch in this living room.	A personal pepperoni pizza on a white plate.	A personal veggie pizza on a white plate.

Training- Counting

					
Five cooking pots on a shelf.	Four cooking pots on a shelf.	Two water bottles and a mug on a table.	One water bottle and a mug on a table.	A collection of two wrapped gifts.	A collection of one wrapped gift.
					
A scene containing four small blue signs.	A scene containing two small blue signs.	Three antelopes running in a field.	Two antelopes running in a field.	Two yellow teddies.	One yellow teddy.

Training- Relation













					
A laptop is on the bottom and a printer is on the top.	A printer is on the bottom and a laptop is on the top.	A teddy bear below a bed and a night lamp above the bed.	A night lamp below a bed and a teddy bear above the bed.	A plant on the left and a bookshelf on the right.	A bookshelf on the left and a plant on the right.
					
A drone on the top and a car on the bottom.	A car on the top and a drone on the bottom.	A sunflower is located to the left of a rose.	A rose is located to the left of a sunflower.	A guitar on the top of a piano.	A piano on the top of a guitar.

Figure 18: Random qualitative samples from the training set.