

# Error-driven Data-efficient Large Multimodal Model Tuning

Barry Menglong Yao  
UC Davis  
bmyao@ucdavis.edu

Qifan Wang  
Meta AI  
wqfcr@meta.com

Lifu Huang  
UC Davis  
lfuhuang@ucdavis.edu

## Abstract

Large Multimodal Models (LMMs) have demonstrated impressive performance across numerous academic benchmarks. However, fine-tuning still remains essential to achieve satisfactory performance on downstream tasks, while the task-specific tuning samples are usually not readily available or expensive and time-consuming to obtain. To address this, we propose an error-driven data-efficient tuning framework that aims to efficiently adapt generic LMMs to newly emerging tasks without requiring any task-specific training samples. In our approach, a generic LMM, acting as a student model, is first evaluated on a small validation set of the target task, and then a more powerful model, acting as a teacher model, identifies the erroneous steps within the student model’s reasoning steps and analyzes its capability gaps from fully addressing the target task. Based on these gaps, targeted training samples are further retrieved from existing task-agnostic datasets to tune the student model and tailor it to the target task. We perform extensive experiments across three different training data scales and seven tasks, demonstrating that our training paradigm significantly and efficiently improves LMM’s performance on downstream tasks, achieving an average performance boost of 7.01%.

## 1 Introduction

Pretrained large multimodal models (LMMs), such as GPT-4 (Achiam et al., 2023) and LLaVA (Liu et al., 2024a), have demonstrated strong performance across various academic benchmark datasets (Xu et al., 2022; Reddy et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2024c; Lu et al., 2022; Yue et al., 2024; Yu et al., 2023). However, when leveraging LMMs for real-world applications, despite direct task adaptation with techniques such as prompting (Radford et al., 2019; Wei et al., 2023; Qi et al., 2023; Yao et al., 2024) or in-context learning (Brown, 2020; Jiang et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2024b; Doveh et al.,

2024), careful fine-tuning on a substantial amount of task-specific training samples is still essential in order to achieve satisfactory performance (Luo et al., 2022; Gu et al., 2021; Liang et al., 2023; Yao et al., 2023), while such task-specific training samples are usually not readily available or expensive and time-consuming to achieve. Therefore, a critical question that we would like to answer is: *How can we effectively tune large multimodal models for newly emerging problems without requiring task-specific training samples?*

One potential solution is to apply data augmentation methods to automatically synthesize or enlarge the training samples (Lee et al., 2024b; Dai et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024b; Zhao et al., 2024a; Nayak et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2023b). However, they usually lead to undesired effects, such as introducing significant *bias* into the downstream tasks (Angelakis and Rass, 2024; Lin et al., 2024; Muthukumar et al., 2020; Hastie et al., 2022) or causing *model collapse* (Shumailov et al., 2023; Feng et al.), where models tuned from synthesized training samples tend to forget the true underlying distribution of human-generated datasets. Additionally, several recent studies explored selecting relevant tasks or data samples from external resources to fine-tune the models for target tasks, where the selection is based on the similarity between the evaluation instances of the target task and training samples of other tasks using either features such as n-grams and task instructions (Lee et al., 2024a; Xie et al., 2023; Gururangan et al., 2020) or gradients calculated from the model (Xia et al., 2024a; Han et al., 2023). However, these approaches either necessitate a high degree of alignment between the surface forms of external datasets and the target task or rely on backward passes that are computationally intensive due to the large size of the external datasets.

In this work, we propose a novel *error-driven, data-efficient* tuning paradigm to effectively adapt generic, pre-trained large multimodal models

(LMMs) to various new and emerging downstream tasks without requiring any task-specific training samples. This paradigm is motivated by the *gap detection and filling* process in human learning (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2010), where learners identify knowledge gaps and incrementally fill them through targeted exploration. Based on this motivation, we design a teacher-student framework where a pre-trained LMM, acting as the student model, is first applied to a small set of validation samples specific to the target task. The student model’s predictions are then analyzed, and based on its errors, a teacher model—typically another large multimodal model (e.g., GPT-4o-mini)—is designed to identify the erroneous steps within the student model’s reasoning processes, and further analyze and summarize its missing skills, representing the capability gaps preventing the student model from fully addressing the target task. After identifying these gaps, a set of tuning samples that are specifically related to the missing skills is retrieved from existing task-agnostic, large-scale supporting datasets, to fine-tune the student model.

To evaluate the effectiveness of our framework, we employ different student models, including LLaVA-7B (Liu et al., 2024a) and Qwen2-VL-7B (Wang et al., 2024), and teacher models, including GPT-4o-mini (Achiam et al., 2023) and LLaVA-OneVision-72B (Li et al., 2024a), and conduct extensive experiments across seven tasks and datasets, including MM-Bench (Liu et al., 2024c), a comprehensive benchmark covering a wide range of multimodal processing tasks, and six downstream tasks including ScienceQA (Lu et al., 2022), Appliance Classification (Lin et al., 2014), Furniture Classification (Lin et al., 2014), Living Thing Classification (Li et al., 2022), Vision Question Answering (Zhu et al., 2016), and Image Caption Match (Lin et al., 2014). We utilize Vision-Flan (Xu et al., 2024) as the external supporting dataset as it covers hundreds of existing human-labeled tasks and datasets. Across different numbers of tuning samples retrieved from the supporting dataset, our approach significantly outperforms other data selection baselines as well as the LMM that is fine-tuned on the whole supporting dataset, highlighting the efficiency and effectiveness of our error-driven, data-efficient tuning framework in task adaptation.

The contributions of this work can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel error-driven, data-efficient tuning framework that identifies capability gaps in LMMs and retrieves targeted tuning samples from existing datasets to effectively adapt them to new downstream tasks without requiring task-specific training samples.
- We conduct comprehensive experiments, demonstrating that our framework significantly surpasses all baseline methods in effectively adapting generic LMMs to specific downstream tasks while incurring minimal training costs.

## 2 Related Work

**Error-driven Learning** Inspired by cognitive science, error-driven learning (Carpenter and Grossberg, 1987; Hoppe et al., 2022) emerges as a new paradigm to boost model performance, by either directly updating model parameters based on the loss computed on the error samples (Rumelhart et al., 1986) or explicitly analyzing errors and addressing them through various modules (Yang et al., 2023; Wang and Li, 2023; Akyürek et al., 2023; Xu et al., 2023a). For instance, Yang et al. (2023) and Wang and Li (2023) directly prompt large language models (LLMs) to summarize guidance from a set of error samples and append the guidance into the prompt to avoid making similar errors on subsequence data samples. Akyürek et al. (2023) and Xu et al. (2023a) propose a critique generator to pinpoint defects within the current prediction so that LLMs can refine the prediction based on the critique during inference. Other studies (Lee et al., 2024b; An et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2023a; Wang and Huang, 2024) propose targeted data augmentation which automatically generates synthetic data based on these error samples, instead of all seed data. In contrast to all these studies, our approach conducts further fine-tuning of LMMs based on the additional training samples retrieved from existing and domain-agnostic large-scale datasets, driven by the missing skills of LMMs analyzed from the error samples.

**Data Selection** Data selection is frequently approached as a coreset selection problem (Phillips, 2016), which aims to identify a subset of training examples that can achieve performance similar to using the entire dataset. This is done by evaluating training data quality (Liu et al., 2024d; Chen et al., 2023b; Zhou et al., 2024; Toneva et al., 2018; Sener and Savarese, 2017; Killamsetty et al., 2021; Xia

et al., 2024b) or measuring uncertainty (Kung et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024b) to select the most valuable training samples. Within this broader domain, targeted data selection focuses on the selection of fine-tuning data from an extensive pool of datasets, ensuring alignment with the desired target distribution. This process involves evaluating the similarity between targeted evaluation instances and training instances, typically using surface form features like n-grams and task instructions (Lee et al., 2024a; Xie et al., 2023; Gururangan et al., 2020) or gradient vectors from LLMs (Xia et al., 2024a; Han et al., 2023). While these traditional approaches assess the similarity between the entire evaluation dataset and training dataset based on surface forms or computationally intensive gradient information, our method identifies the LMM’s underlying weak capabilities through error samples, enabling a more data-efficient selection process.

**Curriculum Learning** Inspired by the cognitive principle of humankind, Bengio et al. (2009) firstly introduced the Curriculum Learning (CL) paradigm where a model is trained in a meaningful order, from the easy samples to the hard ones. Vanilla curriculum learning studies (Bengio et al., 2009; Spitzkovsky et al., 2010) leverage rule-based criterion for sample selection, e.g., longer sequences are harder to predict than shorter ones so the model is gradually trained from shorter samples to longer ones. Self-paced learning methods (Kumar et al., 2010; Lee and Grauman, 2011; Ma et al., 2017) compute hardness for all the samples based on the model learning dynamics, such as model performance, training loss, likelihood of predictions, and so on. Several recent studies (Matiisen et al., 2017; Kim and Choi, 2018; Hacoen and Weinsshall, 2019; Zhang et al., 2019) proposed teacher-student architectures where a teacher model is designed to select suitable training samples for a student model based on a reinforcement learning reward. Our work shares a similar teacher-student framework, but different from all these prior studies, we introduce two novel components, including Mistake Identification and Skill Analysis, to efficiently identify the weakness of the student model driven by the errors it has made.

### 3 Approach

#### 3.1 Overview

Given an emerging new task with a test set  $\mathcal{D}_{test}$  and a validation set  $\mathcal{D}_{val}$ , we aim to efficiently

adapt a generic and pre-trained large multimodal model (LMM) to this new task without requiring a large amount of task-specific training samples. To achieve this goal, we propose an error-driven data-efficient tuning framework, as shown in Figure 1, which consists of three iterative steps:

**Step 1** is to take the generic and pre-trained LMM as a student model  $\mathcal{M}_S$  to make predictions on  $\mathcal{D}_{val}$  while each prediction is also associated with a rationale from the student model itself. Based on these predictions, we will collect a set of error samples, denoting the cases that the student model cannot address very well.

At **Step 2**, a new large multimodal model, e.g., GPT-4o-mini (Achiam et al., 2023), is introduced as a teacher model  $\mathcal{M}_T$  to analyze the incorrect predictions from the student model and locate the most important erroneous step from the rationale that leads to the final wrong prediction (**Mistake Identification**). For example, for the error sample shown in Figure 1, the second step “*one magnet’s south end facing the other magnet’s north end*” is identified as the mistake step as it contributes most to the final wrong prediction of the student model. Based on the erroneous step identified from each error sample, we prompt the teacher model to summarize a missing skill, denoting the capability that the student model needs to further improve (**Skill Analysis**). For example, in the error sample in Figure 1, the student model lacks proficiency in the skill of “*identifying the poles of a magnet*”.

Based on the identified missing skills, **Step 3** involves retrieving a set of targeted samples from a supporting dataset, e.g., existing datasets created for other tasks. These training samples are used to construct a targeted tuning dataset,  $\mathcal{D}_{train}$ , for further fine-tuning of the student model (**Targeted Tuning**). These three steps iterate until the maximum number of iterations is reached.

#### 3.2 Error Collection from Student Model

Given a target task with a validation set  $\mathcal{D}_{val}$ , we leverage a generic and pre-trained LMM as the student model, which is prompted to generate a sequence of intermediate reasoning steps (Wei et al., 2023) and a final answer for each validation sample. The LMM is prompted to specifically follow an answer format such as “The final answer is option A”, and we will directly parse the final answer from the model’s response based on the answer format.<sup>1</sup> An

<sup>1</sup>We also consider the variants of the answer format shown in Table 6 in Appendix A.




Figure 1: Overview of the error-driven data-efficient tuning paradigm. In **Step 1**, a student model (i.e., a pre-trained LLM) is first evaluated on the validation dataset to obtain error samples and corresponding rationales. In **Step 2**, based on the wrong predictions and rationales from the student model, a teacher model (i.e., GPT-4o-mini) identifies the mistakes from the rationales and analyzes the missing skills from the current student model. In **Step 3**, based on missing skills of the student model, we retrieve a set of targeted training samples from an external supporting dataset to fine-tune the student model.

example prompt for ScienceQA task is shown in Figure 3 in Appendix B.1. We finally compare the predicted answer with gold answer for each validation example and obtain a set of error samples and their corresponding intermediate reasoning steps as rationales.

### 3.3 Mistake Identification

Given an error sample containing a question  $q$ , a wrong prediction  $y$  with a rationale  $r$  from the student model, and a gold answer  $\tilde{y}$ , we first split the rationale  $r$  into a sequence of reasoning steps  $r = [r_1, r_2, \dots]$ .<sup>2</sup> The goal of the **Mistake Identification** module is to locate the *Mistake Step*  $r_m$ , a.k.a., the most significant erroneous reasoning step that leads to the final incorrect answer, from the rationale. Motivated by previous studies (Tyen et al., 2024), we define the most significant erroneous reasoning step  $r_m$  as the first rationale step that leads to the prediction of the wrong answer  $y$ .

We propose an *answer-switch* based method to identify the mistake step, as shown in Figure 2. The core idea is to prompt the teacher model to respond to the same question using the rationales provided by the student model. We then analyze the changes

in the probabilities of the candidate answers as each individual rationale step is incrementally appended. To encourage the teacher model to favor the correct answer at the beginning, we modify the prompt to include prior knowledge that indicates a higher probability for the correct answer, e.g., “*There is a probability of 60% that option B (repel) is correct*”, and instruct the teacher model to rely on this prior knowledge if it lacks sufficient information to determine the answer.<sup>3</sup> We then gradually append each reasoning step into the prompt of the teacher model  $\mathcal{M}_T$  and monitor the changes in the model prediction, with the expectation that the probability of wrong answer  $y$  will gradually become higher after we append the erroneous reasoning steps. We restrict the teacher model from accessing the image so that it’s forced to choose the answer solely based on the reasoning steps of the student model.

Figure 4 shows an example to illustrate the process of mistake identification. For each round of inference, the input prompt to  $\mathcal{M}_T$  consists of the question “*Will these magnets attract or repel each other?*”, the prior knowledge about the correct

<sup>2</sup>Following previous studies (Tyen et al., 2024), we treat each sentence in the rationale as one reasoning step.

<sup>3</sup>Based on our preliminary experiments, the teacher model, when provided with such prior knowledge, generates a higher probability for the correct answer in 77% of the samples in our evaluation dataset.




Figure 2: Example for illustrating the process of mistake identification. At each iteration, we append one more reasoning step into the prompt to ask the teacher model to answer the question and track the probability changes of all the candidate option tokens.

answer “*There is a probability of 60% that option B is correct*”, and a subset of reasoning steps, while the output consists of a template-based answer, e.g., “*The answer is the option A*”.<sup>4</sup> To determine the probability of each candidate option, we first identify the position of the option token (e.g., “A”) in the answer, and obtain the probabilities of other candidate option tokens such as “B”, “C”, and “D”, from the teacher model. This process is repeated as we sequentially append each reasoning step to the prompt, enabling us to track the probabilities of all answer options across iterations, e.g.,  $\{P(A|q,r_1), P(A|q,r_1,r_2), \dots, P(A|q,r_1,r_2,\dots,r_i)\}$ ,  $\{P(B|q,r_1), P(B|q,r_1,r_2), \dots, P(B|q,r_1,r_2,\dots,r_i)\}$ , respectively. Based on the change in probabilities of the correct answer “B” and the wrong answer “A”, we identify the mistake step  $r_m$  as the first reasoning step that causes the probability of the wrong answer to be higher than the probability of the correct answer by a predefined margin  $\delta$  and the margin is maintained for the following  $\lambda$  iterations:

$$m := \min \{i \mid \forall j \in \{0, \dots, \lambda - 1\}, P(A \mid q, r_1, \dots, r_{i+j}) - \delta \geq P(B \mid q, r_1, \dots, r_{i+j})\}$$

where  $\delta$  is the probability gap between the wrong answer and the correct answer, and  $\lambda$  is the number of steps where the probability gap persists.<sup>5</sup>

### 3.4 Skill Analysis

After identifying the erroneous reasoning step  $r_m$  from the rationale of each error sample, we further perform **Skill Analysis**, where the teacher model is

<sup>4</sup>If the downstream task is not a multiple-choice QA task, we can easily convert it by treating the gold answer as option B and the wrong prediction as option A.

<sup>5</sup>We manually labeled the mistake step for 100 error examples from the validation set of ScienceQA and tuned the hyper-parameters  $\delta$  and  $\lambda$  on the 100 examples.

prompted to summarize one missing skill  $s$ ,<sup>6</sup> such as *identifying the poles of a magnet* in Figure 1, which is required to correct the wrong reasoning step  $r_m$ . Note that, for each error sample, we focus on one missing skill in one iteration and leave other missing skills for the following iterations. To achieve this goal, we design an in-context learning (ICL) (Wei et al., 2022a,b) based approach where the input of each in-context exemplar consists of a question together with its correct answer, complete rationale steps and a mistake step, and the output is the missing skill which is required to correct the mistake. The prompt template for **Skill Analysis** is shown in Figure 5 in Appendix B.3.

### 3.5 Targeted Tuning

After analyzing the missing skills for all the error samples from the validation set  $D_{val}$ , we then retrieve a set of relevant training samples from a domain-agnostic large-scale supporting dataset and utilize them to fine-tune the student model to enhance its capability and address the identified skill gaps for the target downstream task.

Specifically, for each sample in the supporting dataset, we pre-compute a set of required skills by prompting the teacher model to follow in-context exemplars and provide detailed analysis of the skills that are required to achieve the correct answer. The prompt template is shown in Figure 6 in Appendix B.4. Then, for each error sample in  $D_{val}$ , we apply BM25 (Robertson et al., 2009) to

<sup>6</sup>We follow (Chen et al., 2023c) and define a skill  $s$  as a unit of behavior with associated data  $X$  such that if the LMM is trained on dataset  $D$ , where  $D \subseteq X$ , it has improved performance on samples belonging to  $X \setminus D$ . See Appendix D for more details on skill definition.

Method	# of Tuning Samples	MM-Bench	Appliance CIs	Furniture CIs	Living Thing CIs	VQA	Image-Cap Match	ScienceQA
Pre-trained LMM	0	64.30	45.80	49.00	79.40	77.00	64.10	65.34
Random	10K	63.40	57.70	61.00	85.60	74.80	63.20	64.06
INSTA*	10K	63.25	60.00	64.10	89.20	72.20	74.70	62.52
Our Approach	10K	63.86	62.10	64.80	90.60	76.00	77.70	65.89
Random	30K	62.65	61.10	63.60	87.90	77.10	73.50	63.01
INSTA*	30K	63.25	61.90	66.10	92.90	72.10	76.90	65.39
Our Approach	30K	64.01	62.20	67.10	93.30	77.30	80.00	67.53
Random	100K	62.95	61.20	66.30	91.00	77.10	78.30	65.74
INSTA*	100K	62.05	62.90	66.80	92.80	74.00	77.60	65.25
Our Approach	100K	64.41	64.10	67.70	93.60	79.00	80.10	68.02
Full Data	1,552K	62.43	63.50	69.80	90.60	74.90	84.70	67.23
Validation Data	1K	63.86	59.90	57.80	89.00	77.40	67.80	65.39

Table 1: Evaluation results on seven downstream tasks with different numbers of tuning samples retrieved from the supporting dataset. (%). **Full Data** means that the whole supporting dataset is used to tune the LMM while **Validation Data** stands for fine-tuning the pre-trained LMM on 1K validation samples of the target task.

calculate similarity scores between its missing skill  $s$  and the concatenation of all required skills of each sample in the supporting dataset. The samples in the supporting dataset are then ranked according to the similarity scores, and the top- $K$  samples are selected as the training samples to improve the missing skills of the student model.

## 4 Experiment

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

For evaluation, we experiment with two different student models, including the instruction-tuned LLaVA-v1.5-7B (Liu et al., 2024a)<sup>7</sup> and Qwen2-VL-7B (Wang et al., 2024; Bai et al., 2023)<sup>8</sup>, and two different teacher models, including GPT-4o-mini (Achiam et al., 2023) (gpt-4o-mini-2024-07-18) and LLaVA-OneVision-72B (Li et al., 2024a)<sup>9</sup>, and evaluate our framework on seven downstream tasks and datasets: **MM-Bench**, a generic benchmark dataset for evaluating large multimodal models and covering diverse categories of tasks such as *Attribute Recognition*, *Action Recognition*, *Object Localization*, and so on. MM-Bench is used to demonstrate the potential of our error-driven efficient-tuning framework as a post pre-training step to further improve the general capabilities of large multimodal models; and six downstream tasks, including **ScienceQA** (Lu et al., 2022), **Appliance Classification** (Lin et al., 2014), **Furniture Classification** (Lin et al., 2014), **Living Thing Classification** (Li et al., 2022), **Vision Question Answering** (Zhu et al., 2016), and **Image Caption Match** (Lin et al., 2014). For each

of the downstream tasks, we sample 1K data points as the test set and 1K data points as the validation set. These tasks are employed to demonstrate the efficiency of our framework in adapting the generic pre-trained large multimodal model to specific downstream tasks. We use **Vision-Flan-1-million** (Xu et al., 2024)<sup>10</sup> as the supporting dataset as it covers hundreds of existing tasks and datasets created by humans.

We compare the student model tuned using our error-driven data-efficient tuning framework with three baselines: (1) **Pre-trained LMM**, which denotes the vanilla student model without any tuning; (2) a **Random Sampling** baseline where the training samples are randomly sampled from the supporting set; and (3) **INSTA\*** (Lee et al., 2024a), which ranks the training samples based on their SBERT (Reimers and Gurevych, 2019) similarity scores to the validation samples, and select the same number of samples for targeted tuning. Additionally, to better demonstrate the effectiveness and efficiency of our error-driven model tuning framework, we also show the performance of the student model that is fine-tuned on the whole supporting dataset (**Full Data**) or the 1K task-specific validation samples (**Validation Data**).

### 4.2 Main Results

Table 1 shows the performance of our framework when using LLaVA-v1.5-7B as the student model and GPT-4o-mini as the teacher model. We use different numbers of tuning samples retrieved from the supporting dataset and compare it with the baselines. We can see that: (1) The pre-trained LMM fails to achieve satisfactory performance on some

<sup>7</sup><https://huggingface.co/liuhaotian/llava-v1.5-7b>

<sup>8</sup><https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2-VL-7B-Instruct>

<sup>9</sup><https://huggingface.co/lmms-lab/llava-onevision-qwen2-72b-ov-chat>

<sup>10</sup>We removed all the samples of the seven evaluation tasks from Vision-Flan-1-million to guarantee that there is no overlap between the evaluation dataset and the supporting dataset.

Method	Teacher	# of Tuning Samples	MM-Bench	Appliance CIs	Furniture CIs	Living Thing CIs	VQA	Image-Cap Match	ScienceQA
Pre-trained LMM	-	0	64.30	45.80	49.00	79.40	77.00	64.10	65.34
Our Approach	LLaVA-72B	10K	63.55	62.00	64.40	89.00	75.50	75.00	64.90
Our Approach	GPT-4o-mini	10K	63.86	62.10	64.80	90.60	76.00	77.70	65.89
Our Approach	LLaVA-72B	100K	64.31	63.40	67.00	93.20	77.60	78.60	66.58
Our Approach	GPT-4o-mini	100K	64.41	64.10	67.70	93.60	79.00	80.10	68.02

Table 2: Evaluation results when using LLaVA-v1.5-7B as the student model and LLaVA-OneVision-72B and GPT-4o-mini as different teacher models.

Method	# of Tuning Samples	MM-Bench	Appliance CIs	Furniture CIs	Living Thing CIs	VQA	Image-Cap Match	ScienceQA
Pre-trained LMM	0	82.80	63.70	67.60	93.60	87.90	84.30	85.50
Our Approach	10K	82.36	64.60	69.90	94.00	88.30	88.00	85.47
Our Approach	100K	82.83	66.20	71.40	95.80	88.50	88.60	87.34

Table 3: Evaluation results when using Qwen2-VL-7B as the student model and GPT-4o-mini as the teacher model.

of the downstream tasks, e.g., 45.80% accuracy on Appliance Classification and 49.00% on Furniture Classification, indicating the necessity of further fine-tuning; (2) With our error-driven model tuning framework, the LMM’s performance can be significantly improved across different training scales. Notably, our approach achieves an average performance boost of 7.01% across seven tasks on the 100K tuning sample setting, compared to the pre-trained LMM. (3) By carefully analyzing the missing skills of the pre-trained LMM, our approach is consistently more effective in adapting it to the target task than other data selection approaches across different training scales. (4) Remarkably, using just 6% of the full supporting dataset (i.e., 100K samples), our approach achieves at least 94.57% of the **Full Data** performance across all benchmarks and even exceeds the performance of **Full Data** setting on five tasks: Appliance Classification, Living Thing Classification, VQA, MM-Bench, and ScienceQA. This indicates that training LMM with large-scale task-agnostic datasets may suffer from task interference issue (Wang et al., 2023; Shen et al., 2024) which hinders the development of some specific capabilities, and highlights the necessity of targeted data selection for more efficiently adapting generic LMMs to specific downstream tasks. (5) The more complex the tasks, the more training samples are required, e.g., the Image-Caption-Match and Living Thing Classification tasks can be significantly improved by our approach with 10K training samples while the VQA task requires 100K.

**Requirement of a Small Validation Set** Though we have seen significant improvements on the various downstream tasks brought by our error-driven data efficient tuning framework, we admit that the requirement of a validation set for each target task may hinder the generalizability of our framework. However, we argue that our approach only requires

a very small validation set, e.g., 1,000 samples, which is usually achievable compared to the need for a large, human-annotated, task-specific training dataset. Additionally, fine-tuning a large generic LMM on a small task-specific dataset (e.g., 1,000 samples) may not be effective enough. For example, when we fine-tune the pre-trained LMM on the validation set of each downstream task, the performance improvement of the LMM falls significantly short of our approach, with an average performance gap of 5.11%.

### Results of Different Student and Teacher Models

To demonstrate the generalizability of our framework, we employ different LMMs as student models or teacher models and show the performance on seven downstream tasks. Specifically, Table 2 shows the performance of our framework when utilizing LLaVA-v1.5-7B as the student model, and LLaVA-72B or GPT-4o-mini as the teacher model. Despite the capability gap between these two teacher models on general multimodal tasks, their performance is quite comparable when utilizing them as the teacher model in our framework, demonstrating the generalizability and robustness of our framework. Additionally, Table 3 shows the performance of our framework when using Qwen2-VL-7B as the student model and GPT-4o-mini as the teacher model. As we can see, though the pre-trained Qwen2-VL-7B has already significantly outperformed LLaVA-v1.5-7B across all downstream tasks, by employing our error-driven data-efficient tuning framework, its performance can be further improved by up to 3.80%, which further underscores the potential of our framework for effectively adapting generic LLMs to specific downstream tasks.

### 4.3 Ablation Study

As shown in Table 4, we further conduct ablation studies to demonstrate the effectiveness of each key

component in our framework, where LLaVA-v1.5-7B is employed as the student model, GPT-4o-mini is used as the teacher model, Furniture Classification and Image Caption Match are used as the downstream evaluation tasks. We can see that: (1) when we randomly treat one intermediate step as the mistake step (**Ours w/o Mistake Identification**) instead of leveraging our **Mistake Identification** module to identify the true mistake steps, the performance drops up to 3.50%. One potential reason is the incorrect missing skills identified from the randomly sampled mistake steps; (2) when directly leveraging the mistake step as the query to retrieve targeted training samples from the supporting dataset (**Ours w/o Skill Analysis**), we can observe a significant performance drop up to 7.90%. This performance drop is expected since the query used for data retrieval (i.e., mistake step) is not precisely aligned with the index of the supporting dataset (i.e., skills), though there is a correlation between them; (3) when randomly sampling samples from the supporting dataset (**Ours w/o Targeted Tuning**), the performance also consistently drops, indicating the effectiveness of error-driven data selection for targeted tuning and adaptation to each downstream task.

Method	# of Tuning Samples	Furniture CIs	Image-Text Match
Pre-trained LMM	0	49.00	64.10
<b>Ours</b>	10K	<b>64.80</b>	<b>77.70</b>
Ours w/o Mistake Identification	10K	64.10	74.20
Ours w/o Skill Analysis	10K	62.30	69.80
Ours w/o Targeted Tuning	10K	61.00	63.20
<b>Ours</b>	30K	<b>67.10</b>	<b>80.00</b>
Ours w/o Mistake Identification	30K	65.20	78.80
Ours w/o Skill Analysis	30K	64.70	74.30
Ours w/o Targeted Tuning	30K	63.60	73.50

Table 4: Ablation study where Vision-Flan-1-million is used as the supporting dataset. (%)

#### 4.4 Effectiveness of Mistake Identification

We further evaluate the effectiveness of our **Mistake Identification** method and compare it with three baselines: (1) **Random**, where we randomly sample an intermediate step as the mistake step; (2) **Prompt Per Step** (Tyen et al., 2024), where GPT-4o-mini is prompted to verify the correctness of each intermediate reasoning step separately, and the first incorrect reasoning step is selected as the mistake step; (3) **Pseudo Rationale Match**, where GPT-4o-mini is first prompted to generate a sequence of pseudo reasoning steps based on the question and gold answer and compare them with the reasoning steps generated by the student model

to find the mistake step. Since there are no gold labels for the mistake steps of the validation datasets, we sample 100 error samples from the validation set of ScienceQA and manually label the mistake step for each error sample. The annotation process is detailed in Appendix C.

Method	Accuracy (%)
Random	7.0
Prompt Per Step (Tyen et al., 2024)	28.0
Pseudo Rationale Match	59.0
<b>Our Method</b>	<b>65.0</b>

Table 5: Evaluation of various mistake identification methods on ScienceQA.

As shown in Table 5, the **Random** baseline achieves an accuracy of 7.0%, highlighting the challenge of mistake identification, which is consistent with the fact that, on average, there are 15.22 reasoning steps per sample in the validation set. **Prompt Per Step** outperforms the **Random** baseline. By checking its error cases, we see that the baseline method tends to verify if the current step can be directly inferred from the preceding steps. If not, it marks the current step as incorrect. For example, given the following reasoning steps: “*Magnet sizes affect the magnitude of the magnetic force. Imagine magnets that are the same shape and material. The larger the magnets, the greater the magnetic force.*”, the baseline method identifies the second step as incorrect because “*The context doesn’t indicate that they are all identical in shape or size. So this rationale step is incorrect.*”. Instead, our mistake identification method surpasses all baselines by effectively analyzing the dynamics of the probabilities for each candidate answer from the teacher model, demonstrating its robustness.

## 5 Conclusion

We propose a novel error-driven, data-efficient tuning paradigm to effectively adapt generic, pre-trained large multimodal models (LMMs) to various new and emerging downstream tasks without requiring any task-specific training samples. Extensive experiments show that our framework can significantly improve pre-trained LMM’s performance on seven downstream tasks by retrieving targeted tuning samples from the supporting dataset. Future work can explore loss-driven latent skills (Xu et al., 2023c) to support more fine-grained skills.

## Limitations

Though the extensive experiments have demonstrated the effectiveness of our error-driven data-efficient tuning framework, it still has several limitations: (1) **Requirement of Validation Set.** The task-specific validation set is crucial in our framework to measure the downstream task distribution and LMM’s capability gaps. For certain tasks, even creating and labeling 1,000 samples could be expensive and time-consuming. Further research is necessary to remove the requirement of such task-specific validation sets. (2) **Mistake Identification Needs Further Improvement.** In this work, we develop a straightforward yet effective method for identifying mistakes within the rationales of LMMs. However, there is still potential for further enhancing this component, which is crucial for precisely analyzing the capability gaps of LMMs for target downstream tasks.

## Ethics Statement

We carefully follow the ACM Code of Ethics<sup>11</sup> and have not found potential societal impacts or risks so far. To the best of our knowledge, this work has no notable harmful effects and uses, environmental impact, fairness considerations, privacy considerations, security considerations, or other potential risks.

## References

- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Afra Feyza Akyürek, Ekin Akyürek, Aman Madaan, Ashwin Kalyan, Peter Clark, Derry Wijaya, and Niket Tandon. 2023. [RL4F: Generating Natural Language Feedback with Reinforcement Learning for Repairing Model Outputs](#). *arXiv*.
- Shengnan An, Zexiong Ma, Zeqi Lin, Nanning Zheng, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. 2023. [Learning From Mistakes Makes LLM Better Reasoner](#). *arXiv*.
- Athanasios Angelakis and Andrey Rass. 2024. A data-centric approach to class-specific bias in image data augmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04120*.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. Qwen-vl: A versatile

vision-language model for understanding, localization, text reading, and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12966*.

- Paul Bambrick-Santoyo. 2010. *Driven by data: A practical guide to improve instruction*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Yoshua Bengio, Jérôme Louradour, Ronan Collobert, and Jason Weston. 2009. [Curriculum learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML '09*, page 41–48, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Tom B Brown. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*.
- Gail A Carpenter and Stephen Grossberg. 1987. A massively parallel architecture for a self-organizing neural pattern recognition machine. *Computer vision, graphics, and image processing*, 37(1):54–115.
- Hailin Chen, Amrita Saha, Steven Hoi, and Shafiq Joty. 2023a. [Personalised Distillation: Empowering Open-Sourced LLMs with Adaptive Learning for Code Generation](#). *arXiv*.
- Lichang Chen, Shiyang Li, Jun Yan, Hai Wang, Kalpa Gunaratna, Vikas Yadav, Zheng Tang, Vijay Sriniwasan, Tianyi Zhou, Heng Huang, et al. 2023b. [Alpapasus: Training a better alpaca with fewer data](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08701*.
- Mayee F Chen, Nicholas Roberts, Kush Bhatia, Jue Wang, Ce Zhang, Frederic Sala, and Christopher Ré. 2023c. [Skill-it! A Data-Driven Skills Framework for Understanding and Training Language Models](#). *arXiv*.
- Haixing Dai, Zhengliang Liu, Wenxiong Liao, Xiaoke Huang, Yihan Cao, Zihao Wu, Lin Zhao, Shaochen Xu, Wei Liu, Ninghao Liu, Sheng Li, Dajiang Zhu, Hongmin Cai, Lichao Sun, Quanzheng Li, Dinggang Shen, Tianming Liu, and Xiang Li. 2023. [AugGPT: Leveraging ChatGPT for Text Data Augmentation](#). *arXiv*.
- Sivan Doherty, Shaked Perek, M. Jehanzeb Mirza, Wei Lin, Amit Alfassy, Assaf Arbelle, Shimon Ullman, and Leonid Karlinsky. 2024. [Towards multimodal in-context learning for vision & language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.12736.
- Ksenia Dmitrievna Dyatlova, Irina Mikchailovna Shvets, Elena Sergeevna Orlova, Yulia Vitalievna Sinitsyna, and Irina Valerievna Struchkova. 2018. Project-based learning as an instrument for the formation and development of research skills of biology students. In *Handbook of Research on Students’ Research Competence in Modern Educational Contexts*, pages 132–150. IGI Global.
- Yunzhen Feng, Elvis Dohmatob, Pu Yang, Francois Charton, and Julia Kempe. A tale of tails: Model collapse as a change of scaling laws. In *ICLR 2024*

<sup>11</sup><https://www.aclweb.org/portal/content/acl-code-ethics>

- Workshop on Navigating and Addressing Data Problems for Foundation Models.*
- Francis Green. 2011. *What is Skill?: An Inter-Disciplinary Synthesis*. Centre for Learning and Life Chances in Knowledge Economies and Societies London.
- Yu Gu, Robert Tinn, Hao Cheng, Michael Lucas, Naoto Usuyama, Xiaodong Liu, Tristan Naumann, Jianfeng Gao, and Hoifung Poon. 2021. Domain-specific language model pretraining for biomedical natural language processing. *ACM Transactions on Computing for Healthcare (HEALTH)*, 3(1):1–23.
- Suchin Gururangan, Ana Marasović, Swabha Swayamdipta, Kyle Lo, Iz Beltagy, Doug Downey, and Noah A Smith. 2020. Don't stop pretraining: Adapt language models to domains and tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10964*.
- Guy Hacohen and Daphna Weinshall. 2019. On the power of curriculum learning in training deep networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2535–2544. PMLR.
- Xiaochuang Han, Daniel Simig, Todor Mihaylov, Yulia Tsvetkov, Asli Celikyilmaz, and Tianlu Wang. 2023. Understanding in-context learning via supportive pre-training data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15091*.
- Trevor Hastie, Andrea Montanari, Saharon Rosset, and Ryan J Tibshirani. 2022. Surprises in high-dimensional ridgeless least squares interpolation. *Annals of statistics*, 50(2):949.
- Dorothee B Hoppe, Petra Hendriks, Michael Ramscar, and Jacolien van Rij. 2022. An exploration of error-driven learning in simple two-layer networks from a discriminative learning perspective. *Behavior Research Methods*, 54(5):2221–2251.
- Yixing Jiang, Jeremy Irvin, Ji Hun Wang, Muhammad Ahmed Chaudhry, Jonathan H Chen, and Andrew Y Ng. 2024. Many-shot in-context learning in multimodal foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09798*.
- Krishnateja Killamsetty, Durga Sivasubramanian, Ganesh Ramakrishnan, Abir De, and Rishabh Iyer. 2021. [GRAD-MATCH: Gradient Matching based Data Subset Selection for Efficient Deep Model Training](#). *arXiv*.
- Tae-Hoon Kim and Jonghyun Choi. 2018. Screener-net: Learning self-paced curriculum for deep neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.00904*.
- M Kumar, Benjamin Packer, and Daphne Koller. 2010. Self-paced learning for latent variable models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 23.
- Po-Nien Kung, Fan Yin, Di Wu, Kai-Wei Chang, and Nanyun Peng. 2023. [Active Instruction Tuning: Improving Cross-Task Generalization by Training on Prompt Sensitive Tasks](#). *arXiv*.
- Changho Lee, Janghoon Han, Seonghyeon Ye, Stanley Jungkyu Choi, Honglak Lee, and Kyunghoon Bae. 2024a. Instruction matters, a simple yet effective task selection approach in instruction tuning for specific tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16418*.
- Nicholas Lee, Thanakul Wattanawong, Sehoon Kim, Karttikeya Mangalam, Sheng Shen, Gopala Anumanchipali, Michael W Mahoney, Kurt Keutzer, and Amir Gholami. 2024b. Llm2llm: Boosting llms with novel iterative data enhancement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15042*.
- Yong Jae Lee and Kristen Grauman. 2011. Learning the easy things first: Self-paced visual category discovery. In *CVPR 2011*, pages 1721–1728. IEEE.
- Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Dong Guo, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Yanwei Li, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. 2024a. Llava-onevision: Easy visual task transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03326*.
- Fei-Fei Li, Marco Andreoto, Marc' Aurelio Ranzato, and Pietro Perona. 2022. [Caltech 101](#).
- Haoran Li, Qingxiu Dong, Zhengyang Tang, Chaojun Wang, Xingxing Zhang, Haoyang Huang, Shaohan Huang, Xiaolong Huang, Zeqiang Huang, Dongdong Zhang, et al. 2024b. Synthetic data (almost) from scratch: Generalized instruction tuning for language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13064*.
- Wenyan Li, Jonas F Lotz, Chen Qiu, and Desmond Elliott. 2023. [Data Curation for Image Captioning with Text-to-Image Generative Models](#). *arXiv*.
- Zhenwen Liang, Wenhao Yu, Tanmay Rajpurohit, Peter Clark, Xiangliang Zhang, and Ashwin Kalyan. 2023. [Let GPT be a math tutor: Teaching math word problem solvers with customized exercise generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 14384–14396, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chi-Heng Lin, Chiraag Kaushik, Eva L Dyer, and Vidya Muthukumar. 2024. The good, the bad and the ugly sides of data augmentation: An implicit spectral regularization perspective. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(91):1–85.
- Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. 2014. 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.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. 2024a. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36.

- Liangxin Liu, Xuebo Liu, Derek F Wong, Dongfang Li, Ziyi Wang, Baotian Hu, and Min Zhang. 2024b. Selectit: Selective instruction tuning for large language models via uncertainty-aware self-reflection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16705*.
- Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhang, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, Kai Chen, and Dahua Lin. 2024c. *Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player?* *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.06281.
- Zikang Liu, Kun Zhou, Wayne Xin Zhao, Dawei Gao, Yaliang Li, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2024d. *Less is More: Data Value Estimation for Visual Instruction Tuning*. *arXiv*.
- Pan Lu, Swaroop Mishra, Tony Xia, Liang Qiu, Kai-Wei Chang, Song-Chun Zhu, Oyvind Tafjord, Peter Clark, and Ashwin Kalyan. 2022. Learn to explain: Multimodal reasoning via thought chains for science question answering. In *The 36th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Renqian Luo, Liai Sun, Yingce Xia, Tao Qin, Sheng Zhang, Hoifung Poon, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2022. Biogpt: generative pre-trained transformer for biomedical text generation and mining. *Briefings in bioinformatics*, 23(6):bbac409.
- Fan Ma, Deyu Meng, Qi Xie, Zina Li, and Xuanyi Dong. 2017. Self-paced co-training. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 2275–2284. PMLR.
- Tambet Matiisen, Avital Oliver, Taco Cohen, and John Schulman. 2017. *Teacher-Student Curriculum Learning*. *arXiv*.
- Vidya Muthukumar, Kailas Vodrahalli, Vignesh Subramanian, and Anant Sahai. 2020. Harmless interpolation of noisy data in regression. *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, 1(1):67–83.
- Nihal V Nayak, Yiyang Nan, Avi Trost, and Stephen H Bach. 2024. Learning to generate instruction tuning datasets for zero-shot task adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18334*.
- Pascual Pérez-Paredes and María Sánchez-Tornel. 2009. Understanding e-skills in the flt context. In *Handbook of Research on E-Learning Methodologies for Language Acquisition*, pages 1–21. IGI Global.
- Jeff M Phillips. 2016. *Coresets and Sketches*. *arXiv*.
- Jingyuan Qi, Zhiyang Xu, Ying Shen, Minqian Liu, Di Jin, Qifan Wang, and Lifu Huang. 2023. *The art of socratic questioning: Recursive thinking with large language models*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.14999.
- Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9.
- Revant Gangi Reddy, Xilin Rui, Manling Li, Xudong Lin, Haoyang Wen, Jaemin Cho, Lifu Huang, Mohit Bansal, Avirup Sil, Shih-Fu Chang, et al. 2022. Mumuqa: Multimedia multi-hop news question answering via cross-media knowledge extraction and grounding. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 36, pages 11200–11208.
- Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. *Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks*. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Stephen Robertson, Hugo Zaragoza, et al. 2009. The probabilistic relevance framework: Bm25 and beyond. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Retrieval*, 3(4):333–389.
- David E Rumelhart, Geoffrey E Hinton, and Ronald J Williams. 1986. Learning representations by back-propagating errors. *nature*, 323(6088):533–536.
- Ozan Sener and Silvio Savarese. 2017. Active learning for convolutional neural networks: A core-set approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.00489*.
- Ying Shen, Zhiyang Xu, Qifan Wang, Yu Cheng, Wenpeng Yin, and Lifu Huang. 2024. Multimodal instruction tuning with conditional mixture of lora. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15896*.
- Iliia Shumailov, Zakhar Shumaylov, Yiren Zhao, Yarin Gal, Nicolas Papernot, and Ross Anderson. 2023. The curse of recursion: Training on generated data makes models forget. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17493*.
- Valentin I Spitzkovsky, Hiyan Alshawi, and Dan Jurafsky. 2010. From baby steps to leapfrog: How “less is more” in unsupervised dependency parsing. In *Human Language Technologies: The 2010 Annual Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 751–759.
- Mariya Toneva, Alessandro Sordani, Remi Tachet des Combes, Adam Trischler, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey J Gordon. 2018. *An Empirical Study of Example Forgetting during Deep Neural Network Learning*. *arXiv*.
- Gladys Tyen, Hassan Mansoor, Victor Cărbune, Yuanzhu Peter Chen, and Tony Mak. 2024. Llms cannot find reasoning errors, but can correct them given the error location. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pages 13894–13908.
- Danqing Wang and Lei Li. 2023. Learning from mistakes via cooperative study assistant for large language models. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 10667–10685.

- Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Yang Fan, Kai Dang, Mengfei Du, Xuancheng Ren, Rui Men, Dayiheng Liu, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. 2024. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*.
- Sijia Wang and Lifu Huang. 2024. Targeted augmentation for low-resource event extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.08729*.
- Yizhong Wang, Hamish Ivison, Pradeep Dasigi, Jack Hessel, Tushar Khot, Khyathi Chandu, David Wadden, Kelsey MacMillan, Noah A Smith, Iz Beltagy, et al. 2023. How far can camels go? exploring the state of instruction tuning on open resources. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:74764–74786.
- Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. 2022a. Emergent abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2023. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Preprint*, arXiv:2201.11903.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022b. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837.
- Mengzhou Xia, Sadhika Malladi, Suchin Gururangan, Sanjeev Arora, and Danqi Chen. 2024a. Less: Selecting influential data for targeted instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04333*.
- Mengzhou Xia, Sadhika Malladi, Suchin Gururangan, Sanjeev Arora, and Danqi Chen. 2024b. LESS: Selecting Influential Data for Targeted Instruction Tuning. *arXiv*.
- Sang Michael Xie, Shibani Santurkar, Tengyu Ma, and Percy S Liang. 2023. Data selection for language models via importance resampling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:34201–34227.
- Wenda Xu, Daniel Deutsch, Mara Finkelstein, Juraj Juraska, Biao Zhang, Zhongtao Liu, William Yang Wang, Lei Li, and Markus Freitag. 2023a. Pinpoint, Not Criticize: Refining Large Language Models via Fine-Grained Actionable Feedback. *arXiv*.
- Zhiyang Xu, Chao Feng, Rulin Shao, Trevor Ashby, Ying Shen, Di Jin, Yu Cheng, Qifan Wang, and Lifu Huang. 2024. Vision-flan: Scaling human-labeled tasks in visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11690*.
- Zhiyang Xu, Jay Yoon Lee, and Lifu Huang. 2023b. Learning from a friend: Improving event extraction via self-training with feedback from abstract meaning representation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 10421–10437.
- Zhiyang Xu, Ying Shen, and Lifu Huang. 2022. Multiinstruct: Improving multi-modal zero-shot learning via instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10773*.
- Zifan Xu, Haozhu Wang, Dmitriy Bespalov, Peter Stone, and Yanjun Qi. 2023c. Latent Skill Discovery for Chain-of-Thought Reasoning. *arXiv*.
- Zeyuan Yang, Peng Li, and Yang Liu. 2023. Failures Pave the Way: Enhancing Large Language Models through Tuning-free Rule Accumulation. *arXiv*.
- Barry Menglong Yao, Yu Chen, Qifan Wang, Sijia Wang, Minqian Liu, Zhiyang Xu, Licheng Yu, and Lifu Huang. 2023. Ameli: Enhancing multimodal entity linking with fine-grained attributes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14725*.
- Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2024. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Weihao Yu, Zhengyuan Yang, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Kevin Lin, Zicheng Liu, Xinchao Wang, and Lijuan Wang. 2023. Mm-vet: Evaluating large multimodal models for integrated capabilities. *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.02490.
- Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoqi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, Cong Wei, Botao Yu, Ruibin Yuan, Renliang Sun, Ming Yin, Boyuan Zheng, Zhenzhu Yang, Yibo Liu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhui Chen. 2024. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. *Preprint*, arXiv:2311.16502.
- Min Zhang, Zhongwei Yu, Hai Wang, Hongbo Qin, Wei Zhao, and Yan Liu. 2019. Automatic digital modulation classification based on curriculum learning. *Applied Sciences*, 9(10):2171.
- Chenyang Zhao, Xueying Jia, Vijay Viswanathan, Tongshuang Wu, and Graham Neubig. 2024a. Self-guide: Better task-specific instruction following via self-synthetic finetuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.12874*.
- Haozhe Zhao, Zefan Cai, Shuzheng Si, Xiaojian Ma, Kaikai An, Liang Chen, Zixuan Liu, Sheng Wang, Wenjuan Han, and Baobao Chang. 2024b. Mmicl: Empowering vision-language model with multi-modal in-context learning. *Preprint*, arXiv:2309.07915.

Chunting Zhou, Pengfei Liu, Puxin Xu, Srinivasan Iyer, Jiao Sun, Yuning Mao, Xuezhe Ma, Avia Efrat, Ping Yu, Lili Yu, et al. 2024. Lima: Less is more for alignment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.

Yuke Zhu, Oliver Groth, Michael Bernstein, and Li Fei-Fei. 2016. Visual7w: Grounded question answering in images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4995–5004.

## A Answer Format

Table 6 shows the answer formats that we use to parse the answer.

## B Prompt Template

### B.1 Inference Prompt Template

Figure 3 shows the Inference Prompt Template.

### B.2 Mistake Identification Prompt Template

Figure 4 shows Mistake Identification Prompt Template

### B.3 Skill Analysis Prompt Template

Figure 5 shows Skill Analysis Prompt Template

### B.4 Skill Set Analysis Prompt Template

Figure 6 shows Skill Set Analysis Prompt Template.

## C Human Annotation for Mistake Identification

We first run the student model on the evaluation set of ScienceQA dataset and obtain error samples as we mentioned in Section 3.2. We then randomly select 100 error samples for annotation. For each error sample, we split the student model’s rationale into a sequence of reasoning steps<sup>12</sup>. The annotator will then annotate these error samples following the following guidelines:

- Open one of your annotation web pages
- For each sample, check through the question, the choices, the image, the correct answer, and the wrong prediction.
- Then you will read rationale step one by one and check whether the current rationale step contains logical errors. If yes, you can record the corresponding index (starting from 0).
- If you did not record any rationale step after checking all of them, you can provide "-1" as the label of mistake step for this sample.

## D Definition and Explanation of skills

In the education domain, skill is defined as an ability to carry out a task with pre-determined results, often within a given amount of time, energy, or

both (Dyatlova et al., 2018). Some studies stress out the expandability of skill: skill refers to any ability acquired by training or practice, allowing individuals to perform well in multifarious types of tasks (Pérez-Paredes and Sánchez-Tornel, 2009; Green, 2011). In this work, we follow (Chen et al., 2023c) and define a skill  $s$  as a unit of behavior with associated data  $X$  such that if the LMM is trained on dataset  $D$ , where  $D \subseteq X$ , it has improved performance on samples belonging to  $X \setminus D$ . This definition of a skill is flexible—it focuses on the expandability of skill and means that given a training dataset associated with the skill, a model  $f$  has an improved performance when evaluated on validation data associated with this skill. Under this definition, a skill could be a fine-grained, instance-specific ability like “Identify the poles of a magnet”, instead of general skills like “color recognition”, “shape recognition”, and “texture recognition”.

## E Experiment Details

We conduct experiments on 8 A100 GPUs. In the 100K training sample setting, one training can run for 2 hours. The search space of hyperparameters is as follows: the learning rate  $\in \{2^{-4}, 2^{-5}, 5^{-4}, 5^{-5}, \}$  and batch size  $\in \{32, 64, 128, 256, 512, 1024\}$ .

<sup>12</sup>Following previous studies (Tyen et al., 2024), we treat each sentence in the rationale as one reasoning step.

Answer Format	Regular Expression Pattern
Answer is (A)	(?i)answer is \(([A-Z])
Answer is (A	(?i)answer is \(([A-Z]
Answer is A.	(?i)answer is ([A-Z])\.
Answer: A	(?i)answer:\s?([a-z])
A is the correct answer	(?i)([A-Z]) is the correct
A	(?<\S)[a-zA-Z](?!S)(?!.*[a-zA-Z])
answer is the option A	(?<\S)[a-zA-Z] (?!\S)(?!.*[a-zA-Z])
choose the answer, A	(?i)choose the answer,\s?([a-z])

Table 6: Answer format table

**Inference Prompt Template**

**Question:** Is a violin a good or a service?  
**Choices:** (A) a good. (B) a service.  
**Rationale:** To decide whether a violin is a good or a service, ask these questions: Is a violin something you can touch? Yes. Is a violin a job you might pay someone else to do? No. So, a violin is a good. **The final answer is A.**

---

N

S

S

N

**Question:** Will these magnets attract or repel each other?  
**Choices:** (A) attract (B) repel  
**Let us think step by step. Provide your Rationale and the final answer. The final answer should be the option's letter from the given choices.**

Figure 3: One example prompt for ScienceQA task to obtain the student model's prediction.

**Mistake Identification Prompt Template**

**{few-shot demonstrations}**  
**Question:** Will these magnets attract or repel each other?  
**Choices:** (A) attract (B) repel  
**Prior Knowledge:** There is a probability of 60% that these magnets repel each other.  
**Rationale:**  
Identify the magnets: There are two magnets in the image.  
Determine their polarity: we see two magnets placed end to end, with **one magnet's "S" end facing the other magnet's "N" end.**  
**Answer with the option's letter from the given choices directly. Please provide the answer without explanation. If you can not find the correct answer, then guess based on the Prior Knowledge. Please provide the answer in the format of 'The answer is A/B/C/D/E'**

Figure 4: One example prompt to obtain the teacher model's prediction by following the student model's rationale steps. We then identify the mistake rationale step based on the evolution in probabilities of predicted options from the teacher model.

**Skill Analysis Prompt Template**

**{few-shot demonstrations}**

**Question:** Will these magnets attract or repel each other?

**Choices:** (A) attract (B) repel

**Correct Answer:** (B) repel

**Rationale:**  
 Identify the magnets: There are two magnets in the image.  
**Determine their polarity: we see two magnets placed end to end, with one magnet's "S" end facing the other magnet's "N" end.**  
 Understand the interaction between magnets: Opposite poles attract each other, while like poles repel  
 Apply the knowledge to the question: Since the north pole of one magnet is facing the south pole of the other magnet, they will attract each other.

**Wrong Rationale Step:**  
**Determine their polarity: we see two magnets placed end to end, with one magnet's "S" end facing the other magnet's "N" end.**

**Please refer to Demonstration to find the Missing Skill. Each Question comes with its Options, and Correct Answer. The Rationale Steps and the specific Wrong Rationale Step will be provided to you. Please analyze the Missing Skill based on the Wrong Rationale Steps.**

Figure 5: One example prompt to trigger the teacher model to analyze the missing skill based on the wrong rationale step.

**Skill Set Analysis Prompt Template**

**{few-shot demonstrations}**

**Question:** Think about the magnetic force between the magnets in each pair. Which pair has the stronger magnetic force?

**Context:** The images show two pairs of magnets. The magnets in different pairs do not affect each other. All the magnets shown are made of the same material.

**Answer:** The magnetic force is stronger in Pair 1

**Based on the question, answer, and the image, could you provide a detailed analysis of the skills required to answer the questions? Provide some skills that are specific to the questions instead of general skills like reasoning or observation skills.**

Figure 6: One example prompt to trigger the teacher model to analyse a sequence of required skills for each sample in the supporting dataset.