

---

# SPORTU: A COMPREHENSIVE SPORTS UNDERSTANDING BENCHMARK FOR MULTIMODAL LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS

**Haotian Xia<sup>1,2\*</sup> Zhengbang Yang<sup>3</sup> Junbo Zou<sup>2</sup> Rhys Tracy<sup>4</sup> Yuqing Wang<sup>5</sup>**  
**Chi Lu<sup>2</sup> Christopher Lai<sup>4</sup> Yanjun He<sup>2</sup> Xun Shao<sup>2</sup> Zhuoqing Xie<sup>4</sup>**  
**Yuan-fang Wang<sup>4</sup> Weining Shen<sup>2</sup> Hanjie Chen<sup>1</sup>**  
<sup>1</sup>Rice University <sup>2</sup>University of California, Irvine <sup>3</sup>George Mason University  
<sup>4</sup>University of California, Santa Barbara <sup>5</sup>Stanford University  
{xiah6, weinings}@uci.edu, hanjie@rice.edu

## ABSTRACT

Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) are advancing the ability to reason about complex sports scenarios by integrating textual and visual information. To comprehensively evaluate their capabilities, we introduce SPORTU, a benchmark designed to assess MLLMs across multi-level sports reasoning tasks. SPORTU comprises two key components: SPORTU-text, featuring 900 multiple-choice questions with human-annotated explanations for rule comprehension and strategy understanding. This component focuses on testing models' ability to reason about sports solely through question-answering (QA), without requiring visual inputs; SPORTU-video, consisting of 1,701 slow-motion video clips across 7 different sports and 12,048 QA pairs, designed to assess multi-level reasoning, from simple sports recognition to complex tasks like foul detection and rule application. We evaluate four prevalent LLMs mainly utilizing few-shot learning paradigms supplemented by chain-of-thought (CoT) prompting on the SPORTU-text part. We evaluate four LLMs using few-shot learning and chain-of-thought (CoT) prompting on SPORTU-text. GPT-4o achieves the highest accuracy of 71%, but still falls short of human-level performance, highlighting room for improvement in rule comprehension and reasoning. The evaluation for the SPORTU-video part includes 7 proprietary and 6 open-source MLLMs. Experiments show that models fall short on hard tasks that require deep reasoning and rule-based understanding. Claude-3.5-Sonnet performs the best with only 52.6% accuracy on the hard task, showing large room for improvement. We hope that SPORTU will serve as a critical step toward evaluating models' capabilities in sports understanding and reasoning. The dataset is available at <https://github.com/haotianxia/SPORTU>.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The sports domain has witnessed a surge in interdisciplinary research, combining Natural Language Processing (NLP) and computer vision (CV) to tackle a wide range of applications. For instance, NLP-based approaches have been leveraged for automated sports news generation, producing detailed summaries and news articles from game data (Huang et al., 2020a; Wang et al., 2022b). Concurrently, hate speech detection has been employed to mitigate the impact of toxic content on social media (Vujičić Stanković & Mladenović, 2023), enabling athletes to maintain focus on their game. In the realm of CV, action recognition (Zhu et al., 2022b; Li et al., 2021), player detection (Maglo et al., 2022; Vandeghen et al., 2022), and tactical analysis (He et al., 2024b; Xia et al., 2023) have been explored, enhancing visual content for analysis and fan engagement. The recent emergence of Large Language Models (LLMs) (OpenAI, 2024c; AI@Meta, 2024; Jiang et al., 2024; Anil et al., 2023) and Multimodal LLMs (MLLMs) (OpenAI, 2024b; Gemini Team, 2024a; Anthropic, 2024a;

---

\*Work done at Rice University




Figure 1: SPORTU consists of two parts: SPORTU-text, which evaluates sports understanding through text-based multiple-choice questions, and SPORTU-video, which assesses multi-level reasoning through video-based QA tasks. SPORTU provides a comprehensive sports understanding evaluation of multi-leveled reasoning beyond perception. Right side is a sample from the scenario-based question in SPORTU-text, along with examples of both hard-level and easy-level questions from SPORTU-video.

Lin et al., 2023) has further accelerated this trend, enabling researchers to develop novel tasks such as AI-assisted refereeing (Held et al., 2024a; 2023), where models analyze game videos to identify fouls and violations, and interactive sports education (Zhang et al., 2025; Zeng et al., 2023), where users engage with LLMs to learn rules, strategies, and game-related content.

However, the effectiveness of these applications depends crucially on the model’s deep understanding of sports knowledge. While LLMs act as study guides, helping users learn rules and general strategies through text, MLLMs extend this knowledge to video-based tasks that require video and action perception, as well as the ability to connect movements with context-based rules. For example, when answering a question like “Why is it a rule violation in the video?”, a model must distinguish the series of actions performed by the players and understand the corresponding rules that define the fault. This capability underscores the deeper reasoning required for real-world sports comprehension. The challenges, ranging from general video recognition to deep sports knowledge reasoning, highlight the need for a dedicated sports-focused question-answering (QA) dataset to improve the model’s ability to comprehend and contextualize sports information effectively.

Existing sports QA datasets, either text-based or video-based, have limitations that hinder a comprehensive evaluation of sports understanding. Text-based datasets (bench authors, 2023; Liu et al., 2020; Xia et al., 2024a; Jardim et al., 2023) primarily assess comprehension of numerical data, rules, and context extraction, but lack detailed explanations to evaluate the underlying reasoning processes. In addition, video-based datasets, such as SportsQA (Li et al., 2024a) and SoccerNet-XFoul (Held et al., 2024b), focus on action understanding and multi-view QA, but are constrained by their narrow scope, covering only a single sport or lacking multi-level reasoning. For example, in SportsQA, questions like “What does TEAM A do before/after TEAM B’s action?” mainly require recognizing sequences of actions and their outcomes, rather than connecting these actions to the underlying rules and game dynamics. This highlights the need for a comprehensive multimodal sports benchmark to evaluate the capabilities of MLLMs across a diverse range of sports, with varying levels of difficulty, to assess their ability to apply deep reasoning and rule-based understanding in real-world scenarios.

To address this gap, we introduce SPORTU, a comprehensive Sports Understanding Benchmark for sports knowledge and slow-motion multilevel video reasoning. As a multifaceted benchmark, SPORTU comprises both text and video components to facilitate a thorough assessment of models’ capabilities. As illustrated in Figure 1, our dataset includes two parts: SPORTU-text and SPORTU-video. The text component, SPORTU-text, features 900 multiple-choice questions with human-annotated explanations for rule comprehension and strategy understanding. This component focuses

---

on testing models’ ability to reason about sports through question-answering, independent of visual inputs. The video component, SPORTU-video, comprises 1,701 slow-motion video clips, including 300 clips with varying camera angles and 12,048 QA pairs, categorized into three difficulty levels. The easy level is designed to be answerable without requiring sports domain knowledge, while the hard level demands in-depth rule comprehension and accurate video perception. This tiered structure allows SPORTU-video to evaluate the sports understanding capabilities of MLLMs in a more nuanced and progressive manner. The use of slow-motion clips is crucial, as most fouls involve brief and subtle actions that may be overlooked in real-time footage. By providing models with a better opportunity to perceive and interpret these critical moments accurately, we can more effectively evaluate their performance.

To gain deeper insights into SPORTU, we evaluate 4 LLMs for SPORTU-text and 13 MLLMs that can handle videos or image sequences on SPORTU-video, including both open-source and proprietary models. To gain deeper insights into SPORTU, we evaluate 4 LLMs on SPORTU-text and 13 MLLMs that handle videos or image sequences on SPORTU-video, including both open-source and proprietary models. We selected GPT-4o, Claude-3.5, LLaMA-3, and Gemini 1.5 Pro for SPORTU-text, while for SPORTU-video, we included a broader range such as GPT-4V, Gemini 1.5 Flash, and Video-ChatGPT. The models were evaluated using few-shot learning for SPORTU-text and multi-frame input for SPORTU-video. Key results show that GPT-4o performs best on SPORTU-text, achieving 71% accuracy. Claude-3.5-Sonnet leads the SPORTU-video evaluation with an overall accuracy of 69.52%, but it achieves only 52.57% on hard-level tasks, indicating challenges with more complex reasoning

In summary, our contributions are threefold:

- We introduce SPORTU, a comprehensive Sports Understanding Benchmark that integrates both text-based and video-based tasks to evaluate models’ sports reasoning and knowledge application capabilities. SPORTU-text tests models’ understanding of facts, rules, strategies, and scenario-based sports knowledge, while SPORTU-video presents a three-tiered difficulty level, featuring challenging sports scenarios such as foul detection and complex rule application, with slow-motion footage to capture fine-grained details essential for understanding nuanced actions and rule violations.
- This research deepens our understanding of LLM and MLLM performance on sports tasks, showing GPT-4o achieved 71% accuracy on SPORTU-text, while Claude-3.5-Sonnet led SPORTU-video with 69.52% overall accuracy. However, Claude-3.5-Sonnet struggled on hard-level tasks, achieving only 52.57%, highlighting significant gaps in deep reasoning with rule comprehension.
- We will make the SPORTU benchmark publicly available to support advancements in sports analytics and applications.

## 2 RELATED WORK

### 2.1 MULTIMODAL SPORTS ANALYSIS

Recent surveys, such as (Xia et al., 2024b), have highlighted the importance of integrating sports with NLP and CV techniques to advance research in the sports community. Traditional text-based applications have encompassed a range of tasks, including sentiment analysis (Baca et al., 2023; Ljajić et al., 2015), game predictions (Beal et al., 2021; Xia et al., 2022; Oved et al., 2020; Tracy et al., 2023), game statistics summarization (Thomson et al., 2020; Hu et al., 2024a), and game news generation and narrative construction (Sarfati et al., 2023; Huang et al., 2020b; Wang et al., 2022a; Hu et al., 2024b). In the CV domain, studies have focused on sports action recognition (Xu et al., 2024b; Li et al., 2024c; Yuan et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2022a), sports action quality assessment (Zahan et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2024a), and tactic analysis (He et al., 2024b). Notably, Chen et al. (2022) has demonstrated the efficacy of multimodal integration by leveraging natural language input to enhance sports videos with visualizations.

While prior work has made significant strides in sports understanding, the advent of MLLMs offers a fresh perspective on this domain. In contrast to earlier multimodal approaches, MLLMs boast

a distinctive blend of scalability, expressiveness, and flexibility, thereby enabling the tackling of intricate sports understanding tasks with unparalleled depth and nuance.

Table 1: Comparison of various QA datasets across multiple dimensions. This table highlights key distinctions between SPORTU and other QA datasets, including QA Type (MC: Multiple Choice, OE: Open Ended), whether explanations are provided, the presence of Multilevel Difficulty, and coverage of Domain Knowledge in terms of both Action and Rule. Additional features compared include whether datasets incorporate Slow Motion, Multi-Camera Angles, and the number of sports covered. Avg Exp. or Ans. Length refers to the average word count for open-ended explanations or answers.

Benchmark	QA Type	Question Type	Explanation	Multilevel Diff.	Domain Knowledge		Slow Motion	Multi Camera Angle	No. of Sports	Avg Exp. or Ans. Length
					Action	Rule				
Text										
BIG-bench	Context-free	MC	✗	✗	✗	✗	-	-	5	-
LiveQA	Context extractive	MC	✗	✗	✗	✗	-	-	1	-
QASports	Context extractive	OE	✗	✗	✗	✗	-	-	3	-
SportQA	Context-free	MC	✗	✓	✗	✓	-	-	35	-
<b>SPORTU-text (Ours)</b>	Context-free	MC	✓	✓	✗	✓	-	-	5	100.19
Video										
Sports-QA	Video QA	OE	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	8	-
SoccerNet-XFoul	Video QA	OE	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓	1	25
<b>SPORTU-video (Ours)</b>	Video QA	OE+MC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	7	13.29

## 2.2 MULTIMODAL SPORTS QA

Question answering (QA) has been widely adopted to evaluate the comprehension abilities of LLMs across various domains. However, existing QA datasets have limited coverage of sports understanding, as shown in 2.1. Several QA datasets have been introduced to evaluate models’ understanding of textual information, ranging from factual recall to multi-hop reasoning (Joshi et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2018; Clark et al., 2019). In the multimodal domain, QA Benchmarks have been extended to evaluate MLLMs’ image and video understanding by answering questions based on visual inputs (Fu et al., 2024; Yue et al., 2024a;b; He et al., 2024a; Zhou et al., 2024). However, sports-related QA is underrepresented in these general datasets, and even when sports topics are included, the questions often lack sufficient difficulty due to the datasets’ broader focus. Existing general QA datasets tend to focus on surface-level aspects of sports, such as historical facts or well-known events in text-based tasks, and perception-level tasks, like object or action identification in video-based tasks. As a result, they often fail to assess the deep, domain-specific knowledge and reasoning required for a nuanced understanding of sports.

Existing sports-domain-specific QA benchmarks are limited in their ability to test models’ sports understanding. Text-based datasets, such as BIG-bench (bench authors, 2023), LiveQA (Liu et al., 2020), and QASports (Jardim et al., 2023), focus on factual recall, while SportQA (Xia et al., 2024a) is a notable exception, introducing rule-based questions that require scenario-based reasoning. However, even SportQA lacks explanations, which are crucial for evaluating MLLMs’ reasoning processes, particularly for complex tasks. The absence of explanations limits the ability to fully assess a model’s reasoning capabilities.

On the other hand, sports-domain-specific VQA datasets that effectively combine video and text modalities to test comprehensive sports understanding are scarce. Sports-QA (Li et al., 2024a) stands out by covering eight sports, including volleyball and basketball, with videos sourced from MultiSports (Li et al., 2021) and FineGym (Shao et al., 2020). However, although it provides detailed action recognition annotations, Sports-QA does not assess models on understanding sports rules, such as foul detection. This limitation arises because MultiSports does not include foul clips, and FineGym focuses solely on granular gymnastic actions, which do not encompass rule-based scenarios.

Foul detection requires models to recognize player actions and determine rule violations, making it a critical component of sports understanding. Another benchmark, SoccerNet-XFoul (Held et al., 2024b), evaluates soccer understanding, including rule violation detection and explanation. However, its focus on a single sport limits its generalizability, as an MLLM’s performance in one sport may not extend to others with different rules and dynamics. To address the limitations of previous works, we introduce SPORTU, a comprehensive benchmark that spans multiple sports and incorporates both rule-based reasoning and foul detection across text and video modalities, offering a more diverse and in-depth evaluation of sports understanding.

### 3 SPORTS UNDERSTANDING BENCHMARK



Figure 2: Examples of SPORTU-text (left) and SPORTU-video (right). Figure 1 also shows an example of an open-ended SPORTU-video question.

To address the limitations in the current sports-domain QA dataset and evaluations, we introduce SPORTU. This benchmark consists of two datasets:

**SPORTU-text** – the first pure-text-based sports QA dataset designed to evaluate models’ understanding of rules, factual knowledge, scenario-based situations, and strategies with human-annotated explanations. It contains 900 QA pairs, with each question having one or more correct answers.

**SPORTU-video** – the first VQA dataset covering multiple sports, designed to evaluate MLLMs’ sports understanding abilities. It features a multilevel question design using slow-motion videos, with some clips offering multiple camera angles. The tasks range from easy-level tasks, such as sports recognition, to medium-level tasks, such as Team Role Recognition, and hard-level tasks, such as rule violation explanations. The dataset contains 1,701 slow-motion video clips across 7 sports, with 12,048 QA pairs designed to test models’ multi-level video-text reasoning capabilities.

Overall, SPORTU provides a comprehensive evaluation of MLLMs’ ability to understand and apply sports knowledge. It fills the existing gap in current sports QA benchmarks by offering a detailed assessment across both text-based reasoning and multimodal video tasks.

To guarantee the accuracy of annotations in SPORTU, we employed a rigorous quality verification process. Our annotator team consisted of nine sports experts, including two intercollegiate athletes and seven players with over five years of training experience (the detailed annotation and verification process is described in Appendix A).

#### 3.1 SPORTU-TEXT: PURE TEXT QA

SPORTU-text is designed as the first pure-text-based sports QA dataset that provides detailed explanations for each question option, aiming to evaluate models’ understanding of rules, factual knowledge, scenario-based reasoning, and strategies. The dataset consists of 900 QA pairs, with each question having one or more correct answers and accompanied by human-annotated explanations to ensure a high-quality assessment of reasoning processes. SPORTU-text can also serve as a benchmark for model explainability, allowing researchers to compare models’ generated reasoning with human-provided explanations.

---

**Dataset Construction** Among all sports-specific QA benchmarks, only SportQA (Xia et al., 2024a) Level-3 questions assess models’ deep understanding of sports knowledge. We randomly selected 900 questions from five different sports: American football, soccer, volleyball, table tennis, and tennis. Each question was carefully annotated, with detailed explanations provided for each option—whether correct or incorrect. Annotators explained why an option was correct or not, offering clear insights into the reasoning required for each answer. Examples can be found in the appendix E or in the actual SPORTU-text dataset.

### 3.2 SPORTU-VIDEO: MULTIMODAL VIDEO QA

SPORTU-video is the first multimodal video QA dataset designed to evaluate MLLMs’ sports understanding across various tasks, with a specific focus on integrating visual and textual reasoning. It is unique in its use of slow-motion video clips across multiple sports and includes a multilevel question design to test a range of model abilities, from simple recognition to complex rule-based reasoning.

SPORTU-video consists of 1,701 slow-motion video clips across 7 different sports, including soccer, basketball, volleyball, ice hockey, tennis, baseball, and badminton. We also ensured that for some sports, the videos featured multiple camera angles to challenge the models’ ability to capture consistent judgments across different perspectives. Specifically, 300 video scenes were selected to include multi-angle views. Each clip is accompanied by one or more QA pairs, for a total of 12,048 QA pairs (with 10,973 Multiple Choice Questions and 1,075 open-ended questions based on the explanations that the annotators labeled), with three levels of complexity: Easy: 25.36%, Medium: 50.22%, Hard: 24.42%.

**Dataset Construction** The construction of SPORTU-video began by identifying the types of tasks that could be asked based on the sports domain. Some questions, such as sports recognition and identifying the number of players, are common across all sports. Other questions are sports-specific, requiring knowledge of rules or strategies unique to each sport. The full question template can be found in the appendix D.

To classify the questions, we considered three different levels of difficulty based on the sports knowledge and reasoning required. **Easy-level questions:** These tasks rely on commonsense, such as basic sports recognition. For example, questions like “What sport does the video show?” or “How many players are shown?” do not require sports knowledge. **Medium-level questions:** These questions require sports knowledge beyond commonsense. For example, models are asked to identify which team is on offense based on the video or to recognize specific roles, such as a libero in volleyball, by identifying the libero’s jersey color. **Hard-level questions:** These tasks involve deep rule-based reasoning. For example, identifying rule violations or technical errors requires models to understand the sport’s rules in detail and apply them to the specific context of the video.

Once the question types were defined, the annotators collected the appropriate video clips and labeled the corresponding ground truths that the videos showed, as multiple questions could often be answered from a single video. These slow-motion clips were sourced from YouTube under the Creative Commons License, and each video was manually cropped to ensure high-quality footage suitable for detailed action analysis and rule comprehension. For each video, annotators carefully reviewed the content and annotated the answers for the designed questions. After the initial annotation, we used templates to generate both open-ended questions and multiple-choice questions based on the annotator-labeled ground truths. For multiple-choice questions, the ground truth answer was included as one of the options, while distractors were selected based on the question type. For example, distractors for jersey color questions were drawn from a set of plausible colors, while for “what sport” questions, the distractors consisted of similar sports. In foul-related questions, the distractors included other types of fouls within the same sport. For open-ended questions, the annotators’ explanations were used directly as the ground truth.

**Explanations** One of the unique aspects of SPORTU-video is its emphasis on tasks involving foul detection and technical errors, where open-ended questions are accompanied by detailed human-annotated explanations. These explanations provide insights into why certain fouls or errors occurred, helping to evaluate models not only on their accuracy but also on their ability to explain the reasoning behind their answers. Due to limited annotation resources, these explanations are only provided for the most challenging tasks involving rule violations and technical errors, as these

---

require models to combine action recognition with textual rule understanding to determine the violation. We believe that these tasks offer the most rigorous test of a model’s ability to connect sports knowledge with video comprehension.

## 4 EXPERIMENTS

We compare MLLM’s performance on the SPORTU benchmark. We also evaluate the ability of models to produce explanations. We start by describing the MLLMs in our experiments and their Experimental Setup (§4.1), followed by evaluation metrics (§4.2).

### 4.1 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

**SPORTU-text Evaluation:** We evaluated several leading language models on the SPORTU-text, including open-source models like Llama-3.1-405B (Dubey et al., 2024), and closed-source models such as GPT-4o (2024-08-06 version) (OpenAI, 2024a), Gemini-1.5 Pro (Gemini Team, 2024a), and Claude-3.5-Sonnet (20240620 version) (Anthropic, 2024b). Access to these models was facilitated through their respective APIs.

We primarily focused on the Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting method, based on evidence from Wei et al. (2022), which demonstrates the effectiveness of few-shot CoT in reasoning tasks, including sports understanding. In addition to CoT, we explored standard prompting (SP) for both zero-shot and few-shot settings (Brown, 2020) and zero-shot CoT (Kojima et al., 2022) as baselines. In the few-shot settings, five exemplars were provided for each task, with answers annotated by human experts. Exemplars were consistently sourced from the development set, with the temperature parameter set to 0 to ensure consistent response generation.

**SPORTU-video Evaluation:** We investigate a range of MLLMs, including 7 close source models and 6 open source models. For Close source models, we evaluate GPT-4o (2024-08-06 version) and -4omini (OpenAI, 2024a), GPT-4V (OpenAI, 2023), Gemini 1.5 Pro (Gemini Team, 2024a), Gemini 1.5 Flash (Gemini Team, 2024b) and Claude-3.5-Sonnet (20240620 version) (Anthropic, 2024b) and -3.0-Haiku Anthropic (2024). For Open source models, we evaluate ChatUniVi (Jin et al., 2023), LLaVA-NeXT (Liu et al., 2024), mPLUG-Owl3 (Ye et al., 2024), Tarsier (Wang et al., 2024), VideoChatGPT (Maaz et al., 2024), and VideoChat2 (Li et al., 2024b). For the closed-source models, we adhered to the default settings provided by their official APIs. GPT and Claude family models processed ten image frames extracted from the video content as input. The Gemini family models processed the entire video, as their API supports video input. Due to computing resource limitations, we used the 7b versions of all open-source models in this evaluation. For VideoChat, we set ‘max\_frames’ to 100, while for the other open-source models, we used 16 frames as input. Across all closed and open-source models, we set the temperature parameter to 0 to ensure consistent response generation.

Models were prompted to generate the answer first, followed by an explanation for why the model chose that answer. This method has been shown to be effective in generating interpretable results in reasoning tasks (Chen et al., 2023), and it also facilitates human error analysis. More details regarding the specific prompts used for both SPORTU-text and SPORTU-video can be found in Appendix B. All inferences are run on an NVIDIA RTX A6000.

### 4.2 EVALUATION METRICS

We use accuracy (prediction compared to ground truth) to evaluate the predictions of each model in multiple-choice tasks. We explore several methods to evaluate different aspects of model-generated explanations and open-ended questions: ROUGE-L (Lin, 2004), BERTScore (Zhang et al., 2019), BLEURT (Sellam et al., 2020), CTC-Preservation (Deng et al., 2021), and G-Eval Score (Liu et al., 2023). ROUGE-L computes the surface-form similarity between model-generated explanations and reference (human-annotated) explanations. BERTScore and BLEURT measure semantic similarity using pre-trained BERT (Devlin, 2018) and fine-tuned BERT models respectively. CTC metrics evaluate the information alignment of model-generated explanations. G-Eval is a framework that uses large language models with chain-of-thought reasoning and a form-filling paradigm to assess the quality of NLG outputs. We apply this framework to evaluate the accuracy, conciseness, and

relevance of the model-generated explanations compared to the ground truth, reporting these as an overall score. We use GPT-4o to implement the G-Eval process. The detailed prompt can be found in the Appendix B. To ensure the reliability of the G-Eval scores, we conducted a human evaluation on a randomly selected set of 20 questions per sport across 7 sports, totaling 140 questions. This subset was used to compare the G-Eval scores with human-annotated scores across 13 models. By using the same set of questions for all models, we ensured consistency in comparison, allowing us to assess whether the G-Eval scores were in line with human judgment. The human annotators rated the model-generated content using the same criteria as G-Eval, providing a reference point for how well the automated evaluation aligns with human evaluation.

## 5 RESULTS

We compared the performance of different models across both SPORTU-text and SPORTU-video. The overall results for SPORTU-text are shown in Table 2 and Table 3, while the multiple-choice QA results for SPORTU-video are presented in Table 4, and the open-ended QA results are displayed in Table 5. Among all models, GPT-4o performs the best in SPORTU-text, achieving the highest accuracy of 71% in the five-shot CoT prompt setting, along with a G-Eval score of 4.16 in the zero-shot CoT prompt setting. The G-Eval score confirms that GPT-4o can somewhat grasp sports-related rules, strategies, and scenario-based questions. However, there remains a notable gap compared to expert performance, which exceeds 90%, as mentioned in Xia et al. (2024a).

Table 2: Performance of LLMs with Standard Prompt Settings

Setting	Model	Acc.(%)
Zero-Shot(SP)	Claude-3.5-Sonnet	64.33
	gemini-1.5 Pro	63.33
	GPT-4o	70.22
	Llama3.1-405B	66.67
Five-Shot(SP)	Claude-3.5-Sonnet	68.44
	gemini-1.5 Pro	64.11
	GPT-4o	70.78
	Llama3.1-405B	66.33

Table 3: Performance of LLMs on SPORTU-text evaluation across CoT settings, including accuracy for both standard and CoT prompting strategies. Explanation quality metrics (ROUGE-L, BERTScore, BLEURT, CTC Preservation, and G-Eval) are provided for CoT settings generated-explanation assessment.)

Setting	Model	Acc.(%)	ROUGE-L	BERTScore	BLEURT	CTC Presv.	G-Eval
Zero-Shot(CoT)	Claude-3.5-Sonnet	64.67	0.26	0.65	0.57	0.43	3.78
	gemini-1.5 Pro	62.67	0.28	0.62	0.53	0.43	3.79
	GPT-4o	68.78	0.27	0.66	0.57	0.43	4.16
	Llama3.1-405B	61.95	0.63	0.65	0.55	0.43	3.89
Five-Shot(CoT)	Claude-3.5-Sonnet	65.22	0.27	0.65	0.56	0.43	3.98
	gemini-1.5 Pro	61.22	0.30	0.62	0.53	0.43	3.73
	GPT-4o	71.00	0.33	0.68	0.58	0.44	4.13
	Llama3.1-405B	65.22	0.32	0.67	0.57	0.44	3.81

For the SPORTU-video multiple-choice task, Claude-3.5-Sonnet achieved the highest overall accuracy at 69.52%. However, performance dropped significantly from easy to hard questions, with only 52.57% accuracy on the hard problems. Among the open-source models, LLAVA-NeXT outperformed others, including some closed-source models. While it excelled on easy and medium-level questions, its performance on hard questions was only 33.44%, indicating a lack of domain knowledge, particularly in rule comprehension. For open-ended questions, GPT-4o again led with a G-Eval score of 1.84, a result further validated by human annotators. Even with human ratings, the score remained close to G-Eval’s assessment, with the model not exceeding a score of 3. A score of 1 indicates very poor performance, and 2 suggests poor performance based on the evaluation criteria. This highlights the model’s struggle to connect observed actions with relevant domain knowledge, such as identifying technical errors or specific rules. Overall, none of the MLLMs achieved an average score above 3, demonstrating a gap in deep domain knowledge required for video sports understanding. Among the evaluated metrics, G-Eval shows the closest alignment with human ratings, with a Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.41. However, this correlation is still relatively low, suggesting the need for a domain-specific metric for evaluating sports content. Additionally, we notice that



Table 4: Overall performance of MLLMs on SPORTU-video for multiple-choice questions across three difficulty levels: easy, medium, and hard. The table shows a clear trend of decreasing accuracy as task difficulty increases, with both closed-source and open-source models demonstrating significant drops in performance on harder questions.

Model(%)	Easy	Medium	Hard	Overall
Closed-source Model				
Claude-3.0-Haiku	68.41	46.43	20.12	48.07
Claude-3.5-Sonnet	88.65	65.10	52.57	69.52
Gemini 1.5 Pro	85.85	58.25	53.53	65.13
Gemini 1.5 Flash	85.99	53.38	38.73	59.97
GPT-4omini	66.09	55.69	47.54	57.24
GPT-4o	84.89	62.31	57.84	68.00
GPT-4V	83.71	59.79	45.48	64.01
Open-source Model				
ChatUniVi	59.22	36.95	32.21	42.35
LLaVA-NeXT	94.24	67.02	33.44	68.89
mPLUG-Owl3	87.28	55.58	25.40	59.26
Tarsier	89.71	58.43	24.25	61.32
Video-ChatGPT	62.36	39.40	32.55	44.63
VideoChat2	88.30	58.73	26.94	61.55

the performance of models on multi-angle videos shows variability depending on the camera perspectives for the same scene, indicating that models struggle with consistent understanding across different angles. More details can be found in the appendix B.

Table 5: Model performance on SPORTU-video open-ended tasks, evaluated using various metrics for generated-explanation quality assessment. The table also includes human ratings (denoted with a \*), which were conducted to verify the reliability of the G-Eval scores as mentioned in 4.2.

Model	ROUGE-L	BERTScore	BLEURT	CTC Preserv.	G-Eval	Human Rate*
Close-source Models						
Claude-3.0-Haiku	0.08	0.41	0.43	0.39	1.55	1.93
Claude-3.5-Sonnet	0.05	0.40	0.43	0.39	1.62	2.13
Gemini 1.5 Pro	0.08	0.38	0.36	0.38	1.11	1.19
Gemini 1.5 Flash	0.13	0.45	0.42	0.39	1.34	1.84
GPT-4omini	0.05	0.39	0.36	0.38	1.60	2.17
GPT-4o	0.07	0.41	0.43	0.39	1.84	2.51
GPT-4V	0.05	0.40	0.37	0.39	1.61	2.35
Open-source Models						
ChatUniVi	0.07	0.39	0.37	0.38	1.27	1.48
LLaVA-NeXT	0.17	0.47	0.38	0.40	1.47	1.62
mPLUG-Owl3	0.15	0.44	0.37	0.39	1.38	1.46
Tarsier	0.12	0.45	0.36	0.40	1.36	1.63
Video-ChatGPT	0.08	0.39	0.35	0.38	1.08	1.22
VideoChat2	0.23	0.49	0.35	0.40	1.43	1.48

### 5.1 ERROR ANALYSIS

To gain deeper insights into the limitations of MLLMs, we applied the  $X \rightarrow YR$  prompting method, where models first generated an answer and then explained their reasoning. This provided valuable information about how models approached reasoning, especially in complex tasks like foul detection. We analyzed errors across both open-ended and multiple-choice tasks, selecting 20 incorrect examples per sport for each model, resulting in a total of 3640 errors.

Figure 3 shows the radar chart representing the distribution of different error types. The most frequent error was Question Understanding Error, particularly in questions like “Why is it a foul in the video?” where models incorrectly responded that there was no foul despite the question’s clear presupposition. Another common issue was Hallucination Error, such as when a model mentioned a referee in its explanation, even though no referee was visible in the video. We also observed that

the appearance of Question Understanding Error is much less frequent in multiple-choice questions. When presented with four options, the model tends to select one of the provided answers rather than completely misinterpreting the premise of the question.

Detailed examples of these errors and further case studies are provided in Appendix C.




Figure 3: Error type distribution across different MLLMs on SPORTU-video tasks. The analysis reveals that Question Understanding Error is the most common issue, followed by Hallucination Error. Each error type highlights specific model limitations in comprehending the task.

## 6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduced SPORTU, a comprehensive benchmark designed to evaluate the sports understanding capabilities of Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs). SPORTU consists of two key components: a text-based section, SPORTU-text, which focuses on evaluating models’ ability to comprehend rules, strategies, and scenario-based reasoning through multiple-choice questions, and a video-based section, SPORTU-video, which challenges models to apply these insights to real-world sports footage, including tasks like sports recognition, foul detection, and rule application. By combining both text-based and video-based tasks, SPORTU provides a holistic assessment of models’ reasoning abilities across multiple levels, from basic recognition tasks to complex scenario-based reasoning. Our evaluation results indicate that while leading models such as GPT-4o have made progress in understanding fundamental rules and strategies through the pure text task, they still struggle with deeper, scenario-based reasoning that requires connecting visual actions with domain-specific knowledge. Additionally, we observed that multi-angle video inputs introduce further challenges, as model performance varies significantly across different perspectives of the same scene, revealing limitations in their ability to maintain consistent understanding. The error analysis further highlights key challenges such as question misunderstanding and hallucination, revealing areas where future models need to improve. We hope SPORTU will serve as a critical resource to push the boundaries of multimodal understanding in real-world sports environments.

## REFERENCES

AI@Meta. Llama 3 model card, 2024. URL [https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3/blob/main/MODEL\\_CARD.md](https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3/blob/main/MODEL_CARD.md).

Rohan Anil, Andrew M. Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, Eric Chu, Jonathan H. Clark, Laurent El Shafey, Yanping Huang, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Gaurav Mishra, Erica Moreira, Mark Omernick, Kevin Robinson, Sebastian Ruder, Yi Tay, Kefan Xiao, Yuanzhong Xu, Yujing Zhang, Gustavo Hernandez Abrego, Junwhan Ahn, Jacob Austin, Paul Barham, Jan Botha, James Bradbury, Siddhartha Brahma, Kevin Brooks, Michele Catasta, Yong Cheng, Colin Cherry, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Clément Crepy, Shachi Dave, Mostafa Dehghani, Sunipa Dev, Jacob Devlin, Mark Díaz, Nan Du, Ethan Dyer, Vlad Feinberg, Fangxiaoyu Feng, Vlad Fienber, Markus Freitag, Xavier Garcia, Sebastian Gehrmann, Lucas Gonzalez, Guy Gur-Ari, Steven Hand, Hadi Hashemi, Le Hou, Joshua Howland, Andrea Hu, Jeffrey Hui,

- 
- Jeremy Hurwitz, Michael Isard, Abe Ittycheriah, Matthew Jagielski, Wenhao Jia, Kathleen Keenely, Maxim Krikun, Sneha Kudugunta, Chang Lan, Katherine Lee, Benjamin Lee, Eric Li, Music Li, Wei Li, YaGuang Li, Jian Li, Hyeontaek Lim, Hanzhao Lin, Zhongtao Liu, Frederick Liu, Marcello Maggioni, Aroma Mahendru, Joshua Maynez, Vedant Misra, Maysam Mousaleem, Zachary Nado, John Nham, Eric Ni, Andrew Nystrom, Alicia Parrish, Marie Pellat, Martin Polacek, Alex Polozov, Reiner Pope, Siyuan Qiao, Emily Reif, Bryan Richter, Parker Riley, Alex Castro Ros, Aurko Roy, Brennan Saeta, Rajkumar Samuel, Renee Shelby, Ambrose Slone, Daniel Smilkov, David R. So, Daniel Sohn, Simon Tokumine, Dasha Valter, Vijay Vasudevan, Kiran Vodrahalli, Xuezhi Wang, Pidong Wang, Zirui Wang, Tao Wang, John Wieting, Yuhuai Wu, Kelvin Xu, Yunhan Xu, Linting Xue, Pengcheng Yin, Jiahui Yu, Qiao Zhang, Steven Zheng, Ce Zheng, Weikang Zhou, Denny Zhou, Slav Petrov, and Yonghui Wu. Palm 2 technical report, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.10403>.
- Anthropic. Claude 3.5 sonnet model card addendum, 2024a. URL [https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/fed9cc193a14b84131812372d8d5857f8f304c52/Model\\_Card\\_Claude\\_3\\_Addendum.pdf](https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/fed9cc193a14b84131812372d8d5857f8f304c52/Model_Card_Claude_3_Addendum.pdf).
- Anthropic. Introducing the next generation of claude, 2024b. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-family>.
- Anthropic. The claude 3 model family: Opus, sonnet, haiku, 2024. URL [https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/de8ba9b01c9ab7cbabf5c33b80b7bbc618857627/Model\\_Card\\_Claude\\_3.pdf](https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/de8ba9b01c9ab7cbabf5c33b80b7bbc618857627/Model_Card_Claude_3.pdf).
- Luis Baca, Nátali Ardiles, Jose Cruz, Wilson Mamani, and John Capcha. Deep learning model based on a transformers network for sentiment analysis using nlp in sports worldwide. In Mayank Singh, Vipin Tyagi, P.K. Gupta, Jan Flusser, and Tuncer Ören (eds.), *Advances in Computing and Data Sciences*, pp. 328–339. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023. ISBN 978-3-031-37940-6.
- Ryan Beal, Stuart E Middleton, Timothy J Norman, and Sarvapali D Ramchurn. Combining machine learning and human experts to predict match outcomes in football: A baseline model. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pp. 15447–15451, 2021.
- BIG bench authors. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=uyTL5Bvosj>.
- Tom B Brown. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*, 2020.
- Hanjie Chen, Faeze Brahman, Xiang Ren, Yangfeng Ji, Yejin Choi, and Swabha Swayamdipta. REV: Information-theoretic evaluation of free-text rationales. In Anna Rogers, Jordan Boyd-Graber, and Naoaki Okazaki (eds.), *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 2007–2030, Toronto, Canada, July 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.acl-long.112. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-long.112>.
- Zhutian Chen, Qisen Yang, Xiao Xie, Johanna Beyer, Haijun Xia, Yingcai Wu, and Hanspeter Pfister. Sporthesia: Augmenting sports videos using natural language. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics*, 29(1):918–928, 2022.
- Christopher Clark, Kenton Lee, Ming-Wei Chang, Tom Kwiatkowski, Michael Collins, and Kristina Toutanova. Boolq: Exploring the surprising difficulty of natural yes/no questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.10044*, 2019.
- Mingkai Deng, Bowen Tan, Zhengzhong Liu, Eric P Xing, and Zhiting Hu. Compression, transduction, and creation: A unified framework for evaluating natural language generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.06379*, 2021.
- Jacob Devlin. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.

- 
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- Chaoyou Fu, Yuhan Dai, Yondong Luo, Lei Li, Shuhuai Ren, Renrui Zhang, Zihan Wang, Chenyu Zhou, Yunhang Shen, Mengdan Zhang, et al. Video-mme: The first-ever comprehensive evaluation benchmark of multi-modal llms in video analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.21075*, 2024.
- Gemini Team. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context, 2024a.
- Gemini Team. Gemini flash, 2024b. URL <https://deepmind.google/technologies/gemini/flash/>.
- Xuehai He, Weixi Feng, Kaizhi Zheng, Yujie Lu, Wanrong Zhu, Jiachen Li, Yue Fan, Jianfeng Wang, Linjie Li, Zhengyuan Yang, et al. Mmworld: Towards multi-discipline multi-faceted world model evaluation in videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08407*, 2024a.
- Yuchen He, Zeqing Yuan, Yihong Wu, Liqi Cheng, Dazhen Deng, and Yingcai Wu. Vistec: Video modeling for sports technique recognition and tactical analysis. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pp. 8490–8498, 2024b.
- Jan Held, Anthony Cioppa, Silvio Giancola, Abdullah Hamdi, Bernard Ghanem, and Marc Van Droogenbroeck. Vars: Video assistant referee system for automated soccer decision making from multiple views. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 5086–5097, 2023.
- Jan Held, Anthony Cioppa, Silvio Giancola, Abdullah Hamdi, Christel Devue, Bernard Ghanem, and Marc Van Droogenbroeck. Towards ai-powered video assistant referee system for association football. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.12483*, 2024a.
- Jan Held, Hani Itani, Anthony Cioppa, Silvio Giancola, Bernard Ghanem, and Marc Van Droogenbroeck. X-vars: Introducing explainability in football refereeing with multi-modal large language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 3267–3279, 2024b.
- Yebowen Hu, Kaiqiang Song, Sangwoo Cho, Xiaoyang Wang, Hassan Foroosh, Dong Yu, and Fei Liu. Sportsmetrics: Blending text and numerical data to understand information fusion in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10979*, 2024a.
- Yebowen Hu, Kaiqiang Song, Sangwoo Cho, Xiaoyang Wang, Wenlin Yao, Hassan Foroosh, Dong Yu, and Fei Liu. When reasoning meets information aggregation: A case study with sports narratives. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12084*, 2024b.
- Kuan-Hao Huang, Chen Li, and Kai-Wei Chang. Generating sports news from live commentary: A chinese dataset for sports game summarization. In *Proceedings of the 1st Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 10th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pp. 609–615, 2020a.
- Kuan-Hao Huang, Chen Li, and Kai-Wei Chang. Generating sports news from live commentary: A chinese dataset for sports game summarization. In *Proceedings of the 1st Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 10th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pp. 609–615, 2020b.
- Pedro Calciolari Jardim, Leonardo Mauro Pereira Moraes, and Cristina Dutra Aguiar. Qasports: A question answering dataset about sports. In *Anais do V Dataset Showcase Workshop*, pp. 1–12. SBC, 2023.
- 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, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Bour, Guillaume Lample, L elio Renard Lavaud, Lucile Saulnier, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Sandeep Subramanian, Sophia Yang, Szymon Antoniak, Teven Le Scao, Th eophile Gervet, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth ee Lacroix, and William El Sayed. Mixtral of experts, 2024.

- 
- Peng Jin, Ryuichi Takanobu, Caiwan Zhang, Xiaochun Cao, and Li Yuan. Chat-univi: Unified visual representation empowers large language models with image and video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08046*, 2023.
- Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel S Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Triviaqa: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.03551*, 2017.
- Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:22199–22213, 2022.
- Haopeng Li, Andong Deng, Qiuhong Ke, Jun Liu, Hossein Rahmani, Yulan Guo, Bernt Schiele, and Chen Chen. Sports-qa: A large-scale video question answering benchmark for complex and professional sports. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01505*, 2024a.
- Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yanan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Ping Luo, et al. Mvbench: A comprehensive multi-modal video understanding benchmark. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 22195–22206, 2024b.
- Qi Li, Tzu-Chen Chiu, Hsiang-Wei Huang, Min-Te Sun, and Wei-Shinn Ku. Videobadminton: A video dataset for badminton action recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12385*, 2024c.
- Yixuan Li, Lei Chen, Runyu He, Zhenzhi Wang, Gangshan Wu, and Limin Wang. Multisports: A multi-person video dataset of spatio-temporally localized sports actions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 13536–13545, 2021.
- Bin Lin, Bin Zhu, Yang Ye, Munan Ning, Peng Jin, and Li Yuan. Video-llava: Learning united visual representation by alignment before projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10122*, 2023.
- Chin-Yew Lin. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pp. 74–81, 2004.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Sheng Shen, and Yong Jae Lee. Llava-next: Improved reasoning, ocr, and world knowledge, January 2024. URL <https://llava-vl.github.io/blog/2024-01-30-llava-next/>.
- Qianying Liu, Sicong Jiang, Yizhong Wang, and Sujian Li. Liveqa: A question answering dataset over sports live. In *Chinese Computational Linguistics: 19th China National Conference, CCL 2020, Hainan, China, October 30–November 1, 2020, Proceedings 19*, pp. 316–328. Springer, 2020.
- Yang Liu, Dan Iter, Yichong Xu, Shuohang Wang, Ruochen Xu, and Chenguang Zhu. G-eval: Nlg evaluation using gpt-4 with better human alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16634*, 2023.
- Adela Ljajić, Ertan Ljajić, Petar Spalević, Branko Arsić, and Darko Vučković. Sentiment analysis of textual comments in field of sport. In *24th International Electrotechnical and Computer Science Conference (ERK 2015), IEEE, Slovenia*, 2015.
- Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Rasheed, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Video-chatgpt: Towards detailed video understanding via large vision and language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2024)*, 2024.
- Adrien Maglo, Astrid Orcesi, and Quoc-Cuong Pham. Efficient tracking of team sport players with few game-specific annotations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 3461–3471, 2022.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4v(ision) system card., 2023. URL <https://openai.com/index/gpt-4v-system-card>.
- OpenAI. Hello gpt-4o, 2024a. URL <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>.
- OpenAI. Hello gpt-4o, 2024b. URL <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>.

- 
- OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024c. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774>.
- Nadav Oved, Amir Feder, and Roi Reichart. Predicting in-game actions from interviews of nba players. *Computational Linguistics*, 46(3):667–712, 2020.
- Noah Sarfati, Ido Yerushalmy, Michael Chertok, and Yosi Keller. Generating factually consistent sport highlights narrations. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop on Multimedia Content Analysis in Sports*, pp. 15–22, 2023.
- Thibault Sellam, Dipanjan Das, and Ankur P Parikh. Bleurt: Learning robust metrics for text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.04696*, 2020.
- Dian Shao, Yue Zhao, Bo Dai, and Dahua Lin. Finegym: A hierarchical video dataset for fine-grained action understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 2616–2625, 2020.
- Craig Thomson, Ehud Reiter, and Somayajulu Sripada. Sportset: basketball-a robust and maintainable data-set for natural language generation. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Intelligent Information Processing and Natural Language Generation*, pp. 32–40, 2020.
- Rhys Tracy, Haotian Xia, Alex Rasla, Yuan-Fang Wang, and Ambuj Singh. Graph encoding and neural network approaches for volleyball analytics: From game outcome to individual play predictions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.11142*, 2023.
- Renaud Vandeghen, Anthony Cioppa, and Marc Van Droogenbroeck. Semi-supervised training to improve player and ball detection in soccer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 3481–3490, 2022.
- Staša Vujičić Stanković and Miljana Mladenović. An approach to automatic classification of hate speech in sports domain on social media. *Journal of Big Data*, 10(1):109, 2023.
- Jiaan Wang, Zhixu Li, Tingyi Zhang, Duo Zheng, Jianfeng Qu, An Liu, Lei Zhao, and Zhigang Chen. Knowledge enhanced sports game summarization. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, pp. 1045–1053, 2022a.
- Jiaan Wang, Zhixu Li, Tingyi Zhang, Duo Zheng, Jianfeng Qu, An Liu, Lei Zhao, and Zhigang Chen. Knowledge enhanced sports game summarization. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, pp. 1045–1053, 2022b.
- Jiawei Wang, Liping Yuan, and Yuchen Zhang. Tarsier: Recipes for training and evaluating large video description models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.00634>.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- Haotian Xia, Rhys Tracy, Yun Zhao, Erwan Fraise, Yuan-Fang Wang, and Linda Petzold. Vren: Volleyball rally dataset with expression notation language. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Knowledge Graph (ICKG)*, pp. 337–346. IEEE, 2022.
- Haotian Xia, Rhys Tracy, Yun Zhao, Yuqing Wang, Yuan-Fang Wang, and Weining Shen. Advanced volleyball stats for all levels: Automatic setting tactic detection and classification with a single camera. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*, pp. 1407–1416, 2023. doi: 10.1109/ICDMW60847.2023.00179.
- Haotian Xia, Zhengbang Yang, Yuqing Wang, Rhys Tracy, Yun Zhao, Dongdong Huang, Zezhi Chen, Yan Zhu, Yuan-fang Wang, and Weining Shen. Sportqa: A benchmark for sports understanding in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15862*, 2024a.
- Haotian Xia, Zhengbang Yang, Yun Zhao, Yuqing Wang, Jingxi Li, Rhys Tracy, Zhuangdi Zhu, Yuan-fang Wang, Hanjie Chen, and Weining Shen. Language and multimodal models in sports: A survey of datasets and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12252*, 2024b.

- 
- Jinglin Xu, Sib0 Yin, Guohao Zhao, Zishuo Wang, and Yuxin Peng. Fineparser: A fine-grained spatio-temporal action parser for human-centric action quality assessment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 14628–14637, 2024a.
- Jinglin Xu, Guohao Zhao, Sib0 Yin, Wenhao Zhou, and Yuxin Peng. Finesports: A multi-person hierarchical sports video dataset for fine-grained action understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 21773–21782, 2024b.
- Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William W Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D Manning. Hotpotqa: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.09600*, 2018.
- Jiabo Ye, Haiyang Xu, Haowei Liu, Anwen Hu, Ming Yan, Qi Qian, Ji Zhang, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. mplug-owl3: Towards long image-sequence understanding in multi-modal large language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.04840>.
- Hangjie Yuan, Dong Ni, and Mang Wang. Spatio-temporal dynamic inference network for group activity recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 7476–7485, 2021.
- 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 multi-modal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 9556–9567, 2024a.
- Xiang Yue, Tianyu Zheng, Yuansheng Ni, Yubo Wang, Kai Zhang, Shengbang Tong, Yuxuan Sun, Ming Yin, Botao Yu, Ge Zhang, et al. Mmmu-pro: A more robust multi-discipline multimodal understanding benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.02813*, 2024b.
- Sania Zahan, Ghulam Mubashar Hassan, and Ajmal Mian. Learning sparse temporal video mapping for action quality assessment in floor gymnastics. *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, 2024.
- Boyi Zeng, Jun Zhao, and Shantian Wen. A textual and visual features-jointly driven hybrid intelligent system for digital physical education teaching quality evaluation. *Mathematical Biosciences and Engineering*, 20(8):13581–13601, 2023.
- Jiawen Zhang, Dongliang Han, Shuai Han, Heng Li, Wing-Kai Lam, and Mingyu Zhang. Chat-match: Exploring the potential of hybrid vision–language deep learning approach for the intelligent analysis and inference of racket sports. *Computer Speech & Language*, 89:101694, 2025.
- Tianyi Zhang, Varsha Kishore, Felix Wu, Kilian Q Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09675*, 2019.
- Junjie Zhou, Yan Shu, Bo Zhao, Boya Wu, Shitao Xiao, Xi Yang, Yongping Xiong, Bo Zhang, Tiejun Huang, and Zheng Liu. Mlvu: A comprehensive benchmark for multi-task long video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04264*, 2024.
- Kevin Zhu, Alexander Wong, and John McPhee. Fencenet: Fine-grained footwork recognition in fencing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 3589–3598, 2022a.
- Kevin Zhu, Alexander Wong, and John McPhee. Fencenet: Fine-grained footwork recognition in fencing. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 3589–3598, 2022b.

## A DATASET QUALITY CONTROL

To guarantee the accuracy and consistency of annotations and question generation in SPORTU, we employed a rigorous quality verification process. Our team of annotators consisted of nine experts: two were intercollegiate student-athletes with over 12 years of experience, and seven were players

who had undergone at least 5 years of training in their respective sports. It helped maintain the high standard of explanations and annotations for both SPORTU-text and SPORTU-video.

During the training phase, each team member worked with twenty examples per batch for both text-based questions and VQA tasks. They were asked to: Annotate explanations for the SPORTU-text dataset. Collect videos for SPORTU-video and annotate the key information necessary for generating questions. These key annotated variables were later used in a template-based system to generate questions. Once each annotator demonstrated full mastery of the annotation process, we officially launched the large-scale annotation phase.

As part of our verification protocol, annotators were required to double-review the videos they collected to ensure accuracy and quality. We prioritized the removal of controversial or hard-to-interpret clips, especially those where even human experts might disagree or feel unsure about the decision, to minimize the risk of mislabeling.

## B SUPPLEMENTARY EXPERIMENTS AND RESULTS

In this section, we provide supplementary experiments and results of the SPORTU-video benchmark, covering model performance across multiple camera angles (Section B.1), accuracy across different sports and difficulty levels (Section B.2), criteria for evaluating model-generated explanations (Section B.3), and the correlation between automatic evaluation metrics, human-annotated scores (Section B.4), and example of prompt in Section B.5

### B.1 MODEL PERFORMANCE OF MULTI-ANGLE VIDEOS

Table 6: Accuracy comparison across multiple camera angles of the same question

Model (%)	P(All Correct)	P(All False)	P(At least One Correct & At least One False)
Claude-3.0-Haiku	32.17	32.11	35.72
Claude-3.5-Sonnet	52.86	18.59	28.55
Gemini 1.5 Pro	43.24	25.41	31.35
Gemini 1.5 Flash	48.48	22.96	28.55
GPT-4omini	36.89	28.40	34.72
GPT-4o	47.42	20.84	31.73
GPT-4V	45.57	22.61	31.82
ChatUniVi	29.31	38.52	32.17
LLaVA-NeXT	53.67	22.26	24.07
mPLUG-Owl3	42.77	27.91	29.31
Tarsier	48.25	26.05	25.70
Video-ChatGPT	25.06	35.84	39.10
VideoChat2	47.84	21.27	30.89

In this section, we analyze the performance of models when answering the same question from different camera angles within the same scene. The objective is to evaluate how consistently models understand the same scenario when presented from multiple perspectives. For example, if the question is “What color is the person’s jersey?”, the same question is asked across different camera angles for the same scene. The results are categorized into three distinct cases:

- P(All Correct): This indicates the percentage of instances where the model answered correctly for all camera angles of the same scene. A higher percentage reflects the model’s ability to consistently interpret and understand the scene across multiple perspectives.
- P(All False): This shows the percentage of instances where the model answered incorrectly for all angles of the same scene, highlighting consistent misunderstanding across different perspectives.
- P(At least One Correct& At least One False): This category reflects situations where the model answered correctly for at least one camera angle but incorrectly for at least one other, indicating that the model’s understanding varies depending on the perspective.



The analysis reveals that camera angle variation can significantly affect the model’s performance. While some models are more consistent across angles, others show a noticeable drop in accuracy when the angle changes, suggesting challenges in maintaining robust understanding across multiple viewpoints. This highlights a critical area for further research and improvement in multimodal models when handling multi-angle video inputs

## B.2 RESULTS ACROSS DIFFERENT LEVELS OF DIFFICULTY AND SPORTS FOR EACH MODEL

Table 7 shows the accuracy of 13 models across different sports and difficulty levels.

Table 7: Model accuracy across different sports and difficulties.

Model(%)	American Football	Badminton	Baseball	Basketball	Ice Hockey	Soccer	Volleyball	Overall
<b>Easy</b>								
Claude-3.0-Haiku	76.77	41.45	93.10	73.33	75.00	62.77	85.25	68.41
Claude-3.5-Sonnet	92.69	68.16	98.89	96.14	90.87	88.50	100.00	88.65
Gemini 1.5 Pro	86.14	79.91	96.45	79.23	76.98	86.87	100.00	85.85
Gemini 1.5 Flash	83.48	77.56	97.12	84.56	81.75	86.59	100.00	85.99
GPT-4omini	73.06	39.96	93.33	67.37	69.84	60.24	100.00	66.09
GPT-4o	87.90	68.16	96.44	91.58	82.54	84.06	100.00	84.89
GPT-4V	89.50	62.61	98.00	91.93	78.97	82.61	100.00	83.71
ChatUniVi	67.65	24.15	93.79	55.09	69.05	54.89	68.85	59.22
LLaVA-NeXT	96.12	82.26	99.56	98.59	96.03	94.66	98.36	94.24
mPLUG-Owl3	86.07	84.83	97.34	86.27	82.54	85.33	100.00	87.28
Tarsier	88.86	82.48	98.23	94.04	83.73	89.31	100.00	89.71
Video-ChatGPT	67.88	40.17	92.87	54.74	66.67	59.42	39.34	62.36
VideoChat2	90.68	72.22	96.90	94.01	89.29	88.95	88.52	88.30
<b>Medium</b>								
Claude-3.0-Haiku	44.08	49.36	43.78	50.15	53.83	45.57	45.02	46.43
Claude-3.5-Sonnet	66.00	74.13	85.80	73.04	52.51	55.04	68.25	65.10
Gemini 1.5 Pro	62.45	73.77	79.63	55.12	50.92	47.41	61.14	58.25
Gemini 1.5 Flash	52.19	56.47	45.43	57.38	56.99	54.35	52.61	53.38
GPT-4omini	54.61	84.44	75.00	54.97	46.70	49.65	40.28	55.69
GPT-4o	63.73	85.33	81.92	66.57	51.72	53.86	55.92	62.31
GPT-4V	53.25	69.22	76.64	66.42	59.63	53.65	47.39	59.79
ChatUniVi	31.69	35.34	25.76	37.95	49.87	41.61	29.86	36.95
LLaVA-NeXT	70.95	74.13	90.05	75.30	61.74	54.06	71.56	67.02
mPLUG-Owl3	52.94	76.50	71.66	54.37	45.38	48.51	52.13	55.58
Tarsier	56.99	58.83	68.85	68.07	62.00	52.14	57.82	58.43
Video-ChatGPT	45.95	40.25	35.61	36.30	41.42	39.12	32.23	39.40
VideoChat2	55.86	59.02	63.82	71.54	67.81	54.47	43.13	58.73
<b>Hard</b>								
Claude-3.0-Haiku	22.35	6.17	16.03	31.50	25.42	26.82	36.36	20.12
Claude-3.5-Sonnet	41.57	79.01	52.63	36.22	50.00	52.94	45.45	52.57
Gemini 1.5 Pro	41.34	78.40	64.08	24.60	43.22	40.24	45.45	53.53
Gemini 1.5 Flash	61.11	12.96	34.49	43.31	46.61	44.00	36.36	38.73
GPT-4omini	48.31	84.44	53.71	45.67	38.98	38.82	40.28	47.54
GPT-4o	39.89	78.40	67.98	37.80	56.78	44.94	36.36	57.84
GPT-4V	50.00	65.43	69.28	69.89	64.22	59.88	56.80	45.48
ChatUniVi	36.11	12.96	40.69	22.83	22.03	27.06	27.27	32.21
LLaVA-NeXT	37.64	9.88	32.46	45.24	51.69	33.88	36.36	33.44
mPLUG-Owl3	30.34	11.11	19.93	27.56	29.66	37.18	36.36	25.40
Tarsier	42.22	8.64	18.38	29.92	40.68	27.29	36.36	24.25
Video-ChatGPT	17.98	40.12	37.80	23.62	22.88	31.76	13.64	32.55
VideoChat2	36.31	6.79	20.17	37.01	22.88	41.88	31.82	26.94
<b>All Levels</b>								
Claude-3.0-Haiku	50.73	40.29	43.28	54.09	56.48	48.34	52.72	48.07
Claude-3.5-Sonnet	70.68	72.43	75.57	74.81	65.02	64.10	73.13	69.52
Gemini 1.5 Pro	66.67	76.84	77.09	57.91	58.48	57.59	68.03	65.13
Gemini 1.5 Flash	61.96	58.86	52.03	62.92	63.68	62.19	61.22	59.97
GPT-4omini	59.04	52.75	70.53	57.16	53.27	51.43	53.06	57.24
GPT-4o	67.77	74.62	79.52	69.80	62.88	61.29	63.61	68.00
GPT-4V	62.99	66.07	69.28	69.89	64.22	59.88	56.80	64.01
ChatUniVi	42.27	27.82	45.92	40.71	51.94	43.74	37.75	42.35
LLaVA-NeXT	74.20	68.53	69.53	77.93	71.70	63.17	74.49	68.89
mPLUG-Owl3	59.62	70.82	56.84	59.63	55.41	57.52	60.88	59.26
Tarsier	64.20	61.32	55.30	70.45	65.95	59.80	64.97	61.32
Video-ChatGPT	48.92	40.20	48.50	39.68	46.99	43.97	32.31	44.63
VideoChat2	63.37	57.08	53.71	73.40	67.96	62.69	51.70	61.55

---

### B.3 CRITEIRA OF G-EVAL

This score assesses the overall accuracy, conciseness, and relevance of the model-generated explanation to the ground truth explanation. The explanation should focus on identifying and clearly explaining the key issue or relevant action.

Scoring Breakdown:

- **Score 1 (very poor):**  
The explanation is incorrect or does not address the key issue at all. It might be filled with irrelevant details that distract from the main point.
- **Score 2 (poor):**  
The explanation contains some correct elements but fails to clearly identify the key issue. There may be excessive irrelevant details that obscure the main point.
- **Score 3 (adequate):**  
The explanation identifies the key issue but includes too much unnecessary information or lacks clarity. The key point is present but could be more concise.
- **Score 4 (good):**  
The explanation clearly identifies the key issue with some minor unnecessary details. The core explanation is correct and relevant but may include a few extra, non-essential details.
- **Score 5 (excellent):**  
The explanation is concise, accurate, and directly addresses the key issue without any unnecessary information. It clearly and effectively answers the question.

Evaluation Steps:

1. Read the ground truth explanation.
2. Identify the specific context in the ground truth explanation that represents the key issue (e.g., a foul, a mistake).
3. Read the model output explanation.
4. Compare the model's explanation to the ground truth explanation, focusing on how directly and concisely the model output identifies the key issue.
5. Assign a score for explanation of overall relevance on a scale of 1 to 5, based on the criteria.

**Model Generated Explanation:** {{Model Generated Content}}

**Ground Truth Explanation:** {{Ground Truth Content}}

**Evaluation Form (scores ONLY): Overall:**

## B.4 CORRELATION MATRIX OF EVALUATION METRICS

We applied Pearson correlation to assess the relationship between the automatic evaluation metrics and human-annotated scores. As shown in Figure 4, G-eval has the highest correlation with the human scores among all the automatic metrics. However, the correlation is still relatively weak, indicating the need for the development of a new evaluation metric in the future to improve the assessment process



Figure 4: Correlation matrix of different evaluation metrics in SPORTU-video

## B.5 PROMPT TEMPLATES

Detailed templates for zero- and five-shot standard prompts, as well as zero- and five-shot CoT (Chain of Thought) prompts in the SPORTU-text task, are shown in table 8 - table 11. The template prompt for the SPORTU-video multiple-choice task is shown in table 12, and for the SPORTU-video open-ended task, it is shown in Table 13.

Table 8: Zero-Shot Standard Prompt for SPORTU-text

---

```

{role: "system",
content: "You are a helpful assistant who is good at answering multiple-choice sports
questions." }
{role: "user",
content: "**Question:** {{question}}. You are a sports expert who answers the
above question. What are the correct answers to this question?" }

```

---

## C ADDITIONAL ERROR ANALYSIS

This section presents the error analysis of the models we evaluated on SPORTU-video. For the error types, we evaluated the models with coarse granularity, dividing the errors into five categories as follows:

- Question Understanding Error – The model misinterprets the intent or context of the question, providing an answer that does not align with what the question is asking.

Table 9: Zero-Shot CoT for SPORTU-text

```
{role: "system",
content: "You are a helpful assistant who is good at answering multiple-choice sports
questions."}
{role: "user",
content: "**Question:** {{question}}. You are a sport expert who answers the above
question. What are the correct answers for this question? Think step by step, and
please explain why correct answers are correct while the rest options are incorrect.
You should explain each option in detail. Add one more sentence after your detailed
explanation at the end to show the correct answers' option letters only with A, B, C,
D. The correct answers: " }
```

Table 10: Five-Shot Standard Prompt for SPORTU-text

```
{role: "system",
content: "You are a helpful assistant who is good at answering multiple-choice sports
questions. Some examples are given below. {{five-shot examples}} " }
{role: "user",
content: "**Question:** {{question}}. You are a sports expert who answers the
above question. What are the correct answers to this question?" }
```

- Visual Perception Error – The model incorrectly interprets the visual content, leading to faulty assumptions about the data presented in the video.
- Hallucinations – The model generates content or details that do not exist in the actual data, essentially 'hallucinating' information.
- Reasoning Error – The model exhibits poor logical reasoning, resulting in incorrect conclusions based on the available data.
- Lack of Domain Knowledge – The model fails to answer questions that require specific domain expertise, revealing a gap in its knowledge.

### C.1 ERROR ANALYSIS FOR SPORT-VIDEO




Figure 5: Error type distribution across different MLLMs on SPORTU-video tasks: the left side represents errors from multiple-choice questions, while the right side represents errors from open-ended questions.

We observe that open-ended questions have the highest frequency of question understanding errors. For instance, when asked 'Why is it a foul in the video?', the model might respond that there is no foul, which is a question understanding error because the phrasing of the question already implies that a foul occurred. This issue is much less frequent in multiple-choice questions (as shown on the left side of the figure 5). When presented with four options, the model tends to select one of the provided answers, rather than completely misinterpreting the premise of the question.

Table 11: Five-Shot CoT for SPORTU-text

```
{role: "system",
content: "You are a helpful assistant who is good at answering multiple-choice sports
questions. Some examples are given below. {{five-shot examples with human-
annotated explanations }}" }
{role: 'user',
content: "***Question:** {{question}}}. You are a sports expert who answers the
above question. What are the correct answers to this question?" }
```

Table 12: Zero-Shot Standard Prompt for SPORTU-video Multiple Choice Questions

```
{role: "system",
content: "You are a sports expert analyzing a series of video frames that form a con-
tinuous short video clip. Your task is to answer questions based on the content of the
video." }
{role: "user",
content: "***Question:** {{question}}}. Answer this sports-related question based on
the video{{frames}}, Respond with the letter of the correct option (A, B, C, or D),
formatted as 'The correct answer is: ', and explain why you chose that option." }
```

## C.2 EXAMPLES OF EACH ERROR TYPE




Figure 6: Examples of Each Error Type

## D QUESTIONS FOR EACH SPORT

This section shows the questions we use for each sport. (Table 14 - Table 20).


## E SAMPLE QUESTIONS

### E.1 SPORTU-TEXT EXAMPLES

This section shows examples of our SPORTU-text. (Table 21 - Table 26)

Table 13: Zero-Shot Standard Prompt for SPORTU-video Open-Ended Questions

```
{role: "system",
content: "You are a sports expert analyzing a series of video frames that form a continuous short video clip. Your task is to answer questions based on the content of the video."}
{role: "user",
content: "**Question:** {{question}}. Answer this sports-related question based on the video{{frames}}. Please provide a detailed explanation focusing on the sports aspects of the video."}
```




**Question:**What main color jersey does the player who committed the foul wear?  
**A)** black & blue **B)** gray **C)**white **D)**orange  
**Correct answer:** C  
**Model answer:** A. The correct answer is: A because The player who committed the foul is wearing a black and blue jersey.  
**Error category :** 2

Figure 7: Examples of Each Error Type

## E.2 SROUTU-VIDEO EXAMPLES

This section shows examples of our SPORTU-video. (Figure 11 - Figure16)




**Question:**Why is it a foul in the video?

**Correct answer:** player in green jersey pushes player in purple

**Model answer:** In a football match, a player wearing a white jersey is seen dribbling the ball towards the goal. He is closely followed and challenged by players in red jerseys. As he approaches the goal area, he attempts to pass the ball to a teammate. However, one of the red-jerseyed players makes contact with him, which is considered a foul. The referee blows the whistle, signaling the foul committed by the red-jerseyed player. The incident takes place on a well-maintained grass field with a 'JUST EAT' advertisement banner visible in the background. The stands are filled with spectators watching the match.

**Error category :** 3

Figure 8: Examples of Each Error Type



**Question:**What kind of error does the player make in this video?

**A) Missed catch B) Missed tackle C)Interception D)Unknown**

**Correct answer:** B

**Model answer:** The correct answer is: D, Unknown.We do not see what happens before or after this very short clip, so it is impossible to determine if a player made an error.

**Error category :** 4

Figure 9: Examples of Each Error Type

**Question:** Is there a rule violation in the video?  
**A) Yes B) No**  
**Correct answer:** A  
**Model answer:** The correct answer is: B. Based on the video frames, there does not appear to be any rule violation visible. The players are engaged in a volleyball match, and their actions and interactions on the court do not show any clear infractions of the rules of the game.  
**Error category :** 5

Figure 10: Examples of Each Error Type

Table 14: Question Template for Volleyball

<p>What sport does this video show?          What kind of fault or foul does this video show?          What main color jersey is the libero wearing?          If the libero's jersey color does not count, what main color jerseys are the players on the right side wearing?          If the libero's jersey color does not count, what main color jerseys are the players on the left side wearing?          If the libero's jersey color does not count, what main color jerseys are the players on the far side wearing?          If the libero's jersey color does not count, what main color jerseys are the players on the close side wearing?          What main color jersey is the libero on the close side wearing?          What main color jersey is the libero on the far side wearing?          What main color jersey is the libero on the left side wearing?          What main color jersey is the libero on the right side wearing?          Is there a rule violation in the video?</p>
---

Table 15: Question Template for Basketball

<p>What sport does this video show?          What specific type of foul, if any, occurred in the video? Choose the most appropriate one.          What main color jersey is the offensive team wearing?          What main color jersey is the defensive team wearing?          What main color jersey does the player who committed the foul wear?          What main color jersey is the player who was fouled wearing?          What main jersey colors do the two teams wear in this video?          Is there a rule violation in the video?          Why is it a foul in the video?</p>
--



Table 16: Question Template for Badminton

<p>Why is it a rule violation in the video? How is the player making a technical error in the video? What sport does this video show? What kind of rule violation is in the video? What main color jersey is the left side team wearing? What main color jersey is the right side team wearing? What main color jersey is the close side team wearing? What main color jersey is the far side team wearing? What specific action does the player perform in the video? How many players are shown in total in this video? Is the player making a technical error in the video? Is there a rule violation in the video?</p>
--

Table 17: Question Template for Baseball

<p>What sport does this video show? What kind of rule violation is in the video? Based on this video, which of the following descriptions best applies to the situation? As a referee, what procedure would you follow in this situation in the video? What main color jersey is the fielder team wearing? What main color jersey is the batting team wearing? What main jersey colors do the two teams wear in this video? Is there a rule violation in the video? Why did the rule violation occur in the video?</p>
--

Table 18: Question Template for Soccer

<p>Why is it a foul in the video? Why is it not a foul in the video? Based on this video, which of the following descriptions apply to the situation that occurred? What sport does this video show? What kind of foul does this video show? What main color jersey is the offensive team wearing? What main color jersey is the defensive team wearing? What main color jersey does the player who committed the foul wear? What main color jersey is the player who was fouled wearing? What main color jersey does the goalkeeper wear? What main jersey colors do the two teams wear in this video? How many players are shown in total in this video? Is there a rule violation in the video?</p>
--

Table 19: Question Template for Ice Hockey

<p>What sport does this video show? What kind of foul is committed in the video? What main color jersey does the player who committed the foul wear? What main color jersey is the player who was fouled wearing? What main jersey colors do the two teams wear in this video? Is there a rule violation in the video? If we consider the fight in the video to be a legit fight, defined as a fight between two willing participants who drop their gloves and helmets, with the fight ending when one player falls or officials intervene, and this fight does not result in a penalty, is there any other foul in the video that will cause a penalty? Why is it a foul in the video?</p>
--

Table 20: Question Template for American Football

Why is it an error in the video? Why is it a foul in the video? What sport does this video show? What kind of foul does this video show? What kind of error does the player make in this video? What main color jersey is the offensive team wearing? What main color jersey is the defensive team wearing? What main jersey colors do the two teams wear in this video? Is there a foul in this video? Does any player make an error in this video?
---

Table 21: Sample Question 1

<p><b>Question:</b> Which of the following scenarios would most likely result in a red card offense in a football match?</p> <p>A) A player politely disagrees with the referee’s decision. B) A player accidentally trips another player while trying to get the ball. C) A player uses offensive language or gestures towards the referee. D) A player passes the ball back to his own goalkeeper.</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> C</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Disagreeing with the referee’s decision, as long as it is done reasonably and without abuse, will not result in a red card, therefore option A is incorrect. Accidentally tripping a player will not result in a red card because it is not intentional, therefore option B is incorrect. Using offensive language or gestures violates sportsmanship and will result in a red card, therefore option C is correct. Passing the ball back to the goalkeeper does not result in a red card; it will result in an indirect free kick, therefore option D is incorrect. Hence, the correct answer is option C.</p>
---

Table 22: Sample Question 2

<p><b>Question:</b> How is a penalty awarded in football?</p> <p>A) When a player intentionally handles the ball. B) When a player scores a goal. C) When a player passes the ball to another player. D) When a player runs with the ball towards the goal.</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> A</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Handling the ball in the penalty area may result in a penalty kick, therefore option A is correct. Scoring a goal does not result in a penalty kick, therefore option B is incorrect. Passing the ball does not result in a penalty kick, therefore option C is incorrect. Dribbling towards the goal does not result in a penalty kick, therefore option D is incorrect. Hence, the correct answer is option A.</p>
---

Table 23: Sample Question 3

<p><b>Question:</b> Why might a team be penalized with a loss of 5 yards in American football?</p> <p>A) For a false start offense. B) For scoring a touchdown. C) For completing a pass. D) For calling a timeout.</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> A</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> A team is penalized with a loss of 5 yards in American football for a false start offense, therefore option A is correct. Option B is incorrect because it isn’t a stated rule in American football. Option C is incorrect because it isn’t a stated rule in American football. Option D is incorrect because it isn’t a stated rule in American football. Hence, the correct answer is option A.</p>
--

Table 24: Sample Question 4

<p><b>Question:</b> Which of the following scores is considered a "deuce" in a tennis match?</p> <p>A) 30-30 B) 40-40 C) 15-15 D) 0-0</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> B</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> "Deuce" refers to a score of 40-40 in tennis. 30-30 is not a deuce, therefore option A is incorrect. 40-40 is a deuce, therefore option B is correct. 15-15 is not a deuce, therefore option C is incorrect. 0-0 is not a deuce, therefore option D is incorrect. Hence, the correct answer to this question is B.</p>
---

Table 25: Sample Question 5

<p><b>Question:</b> How many sets does a player need to win for a Grand Slam men's singles tennis match to be declared the winner?</p> <p>A) 1 set B) 2 sets C) 3 sets D) 4 sets</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> C</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Grand Slam men's singles matches are best of five sets, meaning the first player to win three sets wins the match. Winning one set is not enough to win the match, therefore option A is incorrect. Winning two sets is also not enough to win the match, therefore option B is incorrect. The first player to win three sets wins the match, therefore option C is correct. Winning four sets is not possible since winning three sets is the maximum in a best-of-five format. Therefore, option D is incorrect. Hence, the correct answer is C.</p>
--

Table 26: Sample Question 6

<p><b>Question:</b> How can the player holding the ball be considered out of bounds?</p> <p>A) If the player's foot is touching the boundary line B) If the player is holding the ball while standing outside the boundary line C) If the player jumps from outside the boundary line and catches the ball while in the air D) All of the above</p> <p><b>Answer:</b> D</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> A player is out of bounds if their foot touches the boundary line, but this is not the only factor determining if a player is out of bounds. Therefore, option A is incorrect. Standing outside the boundary line also is considered out of bounds, but again is not the only determining factor. Therefore, option B is incorrect. Catching the ball in the air while jumping from outside the boundary line also counts as out of bounds, but this is not the only determining factor. A player holding the ball is considered out of bounds if their foot touches the boundary line, if they are standing outside the boundary line while holding the ball, or if they jump from outside the boundary line and catch the ball while in the air, so all of the above answers include the factors that determine if a player is considered out of bounds. Therefore, option D is correct. Hence, the correct answer is D.</p>
---




Figure 11: Examples of SPORTU-video




Figure 12: Examples of SPORTU-video




Figure 13: Examples of SPORTU-video




Figure 14: Examples of SPORTU-video




Figure 15: Examples of SPORTU-video




Figure 16: Examples of SPORTU-video