

InsTALL: Context-aware Instructional Task Assistance with Multi-modal Large Language Models

Pha Nguyen^{*,a} Sailik Sengupta^a Girik Malik^a Arshit Gupta^a Bonan Min^a

^{*} University of Arkansas ^a AWS AI Labs

^{*} panguyen@uark.edu ^a {sailiks, girikm, arshig, bonanmin}@amazon.com




Figure 1. InsTALL showcasing its ability to understand visual cues of the user’s environment and comprehend user instructions to provide context-aware assistance.

Abstract

The improved competence of generative models can help building multi-modal virtual assistants that leverage modalities beyond language. By observing humans performing multi-step tasks, one can build assistants that have situational awareness of actions and tasks being performed, enabling them to cater assistance based on this understanding. In this paper, we develop a Context-aware Instructional Task Assistant with Multi-modal Large Language Models (InsTALL) that leverages an online visual stream (e.g. a user’s screen share or video recording) and responds in real-time to user queries related to the task at hand. To enable useful assistance, InsTALL 1) trains a multi-modal model on task videos and paired textual data, and 2) automatically extracts task graph from video data and leverages it at inference time. We show InsTALL achieves state-of-the-art performance across proposed sub-tasks considered for multimodal activity understanding— task recognition (TR), action recognition (AR), next action prediction (AP), and plan prediction (PP)— and outperforms existing baselines on two novel sub-tasks related to automatic error identification.

^{*} Work done as an intern at Amazon.

1. Introduction

In recent years, Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) have shown remarkable advancements in various multi-modal tasks [74]. For example, vision-language models have achieved significant success in areas such as visual captioning and visual question answering [41, 46]. In essence, these models have demonstrated the ability to understand the visual content in images while being able to follow human instructions. To do so, these works often use a lightweight adapter that connects a visual encoder to a language model and pre-trains the composite network on large-scale multi-modal datasets, at times followed by fine-tuning on task-specific datasets for downstream applications. Beyond images, researchers have further extended the capabilities of MLLMs to consider procedural tasks in videos (VideoLLM [14]; [8]). With the widespread availability of instructional videos that demonstrate multistep tasks [3, 50, 51, 60, 67, 89, 91], there is an opportunity to develop systems that can understand the actions that are being performed in the context of a task and provide context-aware assistance. In the paper, we seek to empower MLLMs to answer real-time user queries related to various sub-tasks related to this goal, such as Task Recognition (TR), Action

Method	Onl.	QA	PG	Tasks				
				Retr.	TR	AR	AP	PP
ClipBERT [38]	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗
ProcedureVRL [87]	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗
TimeSformer [9]	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
DistantSup [44]	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
VideoTF [53]	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
Paprika [88]	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗
TaskGraph [7]	✗	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗
VideoLLM-onl. [14]	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓
InsTALL (Ours)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 1. Our work considers an online (**Onl.**), conversational (**QA**) setting for procedural tasks, where we can leverage Procedural Graphs (**PG**). In the context of online assistance, our approach can support offline text-to-video retrieval (**Retr.**), and all sub-tasks proposed in prior works, such as Video Task Recognition (TR), Action Recognition (AR), and Action Prediction (AP), Plan Prediction (PP) (§3). In addition, we formulate two new auxiliary tasks related to error detection that are important for effective assistance (see §4.4). Methods in **blue** use Multi-modal LLMs (MLLMs).

Recognition (AR), Next Action Prediction (AP), and Plan Prediction (PP).

Prior works have shown that encoding visual tokens into LLMs’ input space, using a visual encoder and translator, can aid in the seamless use of visual and text signals [14]. In online settings, leveraging such an architecture alongside real-time video frames has also been shown to improve performance across the aforementioned sub-problems [7]. Interestingly, these works train models on extensive dialog or narration data alongside video inputs and over rely on the generalization capability of LLMs to make sense of action dependencies in tasks. Given that previous works have shown the complexity of assistance for planning tasks [25] and questionable planning capabilities of current LLMs [68], we revisit this assumption and seek to improve the performance of MLLM-based online assistants for procedural tasks.

Contribution. In this work, we enable more effective and contextual guidance for users engaged in multi-step tasks by introducing several key innovations. First, we leverage the VideoLLM style architecture (with Mistral as the base LLMs) and introduce inductive bias by developing query prompts for narration, planning, answering questions, and detecting mistakes; this minimizes the need for extensive manual annotation (Table 2). Second, we leverage existing video data to understand task dependencies and construct graph representations that empower reliable guidance across sub-tasks necessary for offline Task Recognition (Eqn. (TR)) and online (Eqn. (AR), (AP), (PP), (PP+)) conversational guidance based on contextual video understanding (§4.3). We note that InsTALL is, to the best of our knowledge, the first to enable MLLMs to learn from both graphical and

Method	#Anns	Multi-choice	Negation	Mistake
VideoLLM-onl. [14]	134K	✗	✗	✗
InsTALL (Ours)	245K	✓	✓	✓

Table 2. Num. of annotated samples and tasks featured in InsTALL.

visual representations (Fig. 2) and enable the use of both VectorRAG [22, 26, 32, 39, 40] and GraphRAG [16, 18, 79] style approaches for real-time multi-modal assistance. Finally, our comprehensive evaluation on a holistic set of five sub-tasks across two datasets showcases that InsTALL consistently outperforms existing state-of-the-art (SoTA) methods and closed-source models.

2. Related Work

Multimodal Large Language Models Prior works on Multi-modal LLMs consider using pre-trained encoders to transform images onto an LLM’s input token space [31, 34, 64, 90]. Some works improve upon this base multi-modal encoding mechanism, such as Flamingo [4] which uses a multi-modal cross-attention mechanism across all layers, while others like BLIP-2 [41] incorporate a lightweight transformer model to merge image and text before the LLM input stage. Subsequently, works have adopted similar practices for other modalities, such as video [27, 62, 84] and audio [83]. PandaGPT [65] builds upon this and is able to comprehend six different modalities simultaneously by integrating a multimodal encoder [24]. The improvements have empowered recent works to explore multi-modal decision-making problems [30, 61, 73].

Instructional Video Understanding. Beyond fully autonomous computer usage [6] or autonomous driving scenarios, lies a crucial realm of assistance that requires a contextual understanding of visual cues and temporal grounding [36, 85]. In such cases, the agent takes as input a video alongside a textual query and seeks to provide assistance in textual format. These videos may belong to various domains, such as cooking [2, 57], daily activities [11], indoor scenes [21], and movies [37]. Previous approaches have relied on sliding window-based methods [5, 21, 48] and scanning-and-ranking-based techniques [13, 15, 23, 45, 77, 82] for visual understanding. The leveraged video understanding can then be interpolated into the text space to identify actions and enable procedure/task planning based on the textual predicates/states and video frames [10, 12, 19, 42, 54, 66, 70, 71, 86] (where the latter works have leveraged diffusion [28] and/or transformer [69] models). Recent developments in MLLMs reformulate the problem of visual question answering with online video clips [14] by relying on the reasoning capabilities of the backbone LLMs. Recent works have also critiqued the plan-

ning capabilities of LLMs [68]. In this paper, we improve the planning abilities of MLLMs to support instructional assistance tasks by leveraging Task Procedural Graphs.

Procedural Graphs (PG) In this regard, PGs offer a structured representation of the sequential steps and transitions involved in a given task. Recent works highlight that utilization of graph structures in LLMs can enhance semantic understanding and reasoning capabilities [43, 59]. Further, automatically generating plausible plans for daily tasks shows that LLMs can be used to develop reasonable ordering of actions and goal identification [49, 76, 81], while others have expressed a limit to their effectiveness [58]. In essence, incorporating this graph-based knowledge helps models to better comprehend the logical flow and the dependencies between steps. We take advantage of this idea for MLLMs and showcase its efficacy in improving instructional assistance tasks. Table 1 compares key features of various approaches to understanding instructional videos and shows that our approach, InsTALL, uniquely leverages PG alongside other input signals. Further, InsTALL supports video retrieval (**Retr.**) that draws inspiration from the notion of GraphRAG [18] but for multi-modal RAG scenarios. In addition, Table 2 reports that the number of annotated samples constructed using PG (§4.2); it is much larger than recent MLLM approaches [14].

2.1. Discussion

Our approach aims to provide a more comprehensive and interactive experience for the instructional assistant. Specifically, we (i) formally model the procedures involved in multi-step tasks (Alg. 1) and (ii) generalize this knowledge into a representation to support the assistant’s understanding (Eqn. (6)). Furthermore, contextual awareness enables the assistant to (iii) flexibly train on different objectives for the language model (Eqn. (1), (2), (3), and (4)). Moreover, our approach (iv) diversifies the user’s queries, creating an on-line streaming dialog that simulates a natural conversation (Sec. 4.3 and Sec. 4.4). This is a significant advance over previous work that has focused mainly on annotations for single-shot question-answering [80]. Through this comprehensive approach, our aim is to develop an instructional assistant who not only *understands the procedures and knowledge involved* but also provides *interactive assistance* tailored to the needs of the user and the state of the task at hand. Note that our approach is a multimodal LLM-based technique that uniquely employs a procedural graph to model context and enhance recognition and forecasting capabilities. It is important to note that the predictions are not simply derived from the graph mining process used in previous works [7, 45, 88].

3. Objectives for Multi-task Learning

We seek to design a single Multi-modal LLM (MLLM) that is capable of performing well on several sub-tasks necessary for clear instructional assistance. To achieve this, we define a prompt \mathbf{Q}_{task} for each task that enables the MLLM to adapt its behavior and outputs based on the assistance scenario at hand. We denote $\mathbf{V} = \{\mathbf{v}_t \mid 0 \leq t < |\mathbf{V}|\}$ as the video associated with a particular activity or task \mathbf{T} (e.g. `cooking omelette`), where \mathbf{v}_t are *action clips* denoting an action \mathbf{a}_t (e.g. `fry eggs`) used to perform the task. Now, we describe four tasks:

Task Recognition (TR) Given a video snippet \mathbf{V} and a task prompt \mathbf{Q}_{TR} , we seek to identify the task being performed by minimizing the following objective:

$$\min \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{V}, Y} \left[- \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \log \left(\mathbb{1}_Y \left(p(\mathbf{T} | \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{Q}_{\text{TR}}) \right)_i \right) \right] \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{T} is the text response from the MLLM. As this is a classification task, we expect a one-hot mapping that maps the response to the set of task categories Y , i.e., denoted as $\mathbb{1}_Y(\cdot)$, and $n = |Y|$.

Action Recognition (AR) Given a clipped video \mathbf{v}_t and a task prompt \mathbf{Q}_{AR} , we seek to identify the action being performed in it by minimizing the following objective:

$$\min \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_t, y} \left[- \sum_{i=1}^m y_i \log \left(\mathbb{1}_y \left(p(\mathbf{a}_t | \mathbf{v}_t, \mathbf{Q}_{\text{AR}}) \right)_i \right) \right] \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{a}_t is the answer and y_i is the action/step annotation for clip $\mathbf{v}_t (\in \mathbf{V})$, and $m = |y|$.

Action Prediction (AP) Given the task prompt \mathbf{Q}_{AP} , a video upto a particular point $\mathbf{v}_{<t}$, we learn to predict the next likely step \mathbf{a}_t by minimizing the objective below:

$$\min \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_{<t}, y} \left[- \sum_{i=1}^m y_i \log \left(\mathbb{1}_y \left(p(\mathbf{a}_t | \mathbf{v}_{<t}, \mathbf{Q}_{\text{AP}}) \right)_i \right) \right] \quad (3)$$

Plan Prediction (PP) Given the task prompt \mathbf{Q}_{PP} , a video upto a particular point $\mathbf{v}_{<t}$, we seek to predict an ordered list of actions $\mathbf{a}_{\geq t}$ by minimizing the multiple-class mapping function $\mathbb{T}_y(\cdot)$:

$$\min \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_{<t}, y} \left[- \sum_{i=1}^m y_i \log \left(\mathbb{T}_y \left(p(\mathbf{a}_{\geq t} | \mathbf{v}_{<t}, \mathbf{Q}_{\text{PP}}) \right)_i \right) \right] \quad (4)$$

where the number of procedural steps in $|\mathbf{a}_{\geq t}| > |\mathbf{a}_t| = 1$.

With all the task objectives defined, we now explore how to teach LLMs all these objectives and incorporate additional knowledge from a procedural knowledge graph.

4. Developing InsTALL

In this section, we relax the assumption imposed by prior work on developing online video assistance [14]; namely, its reliance on the dependency understanding capabilities of LLMs for procedural tasks. Specifically, we investigate how the integration of procedural graphs can be used to generate contextually accurate responses for the various tasks.

4.1. Designing Multimodal LLM (MLLMs)

Our model takes as input a video content \mathbf{V} and a query \mathbf{Q} , and auto-regressively generates a text response of length L denoted as the target answer $\mathbf{A} = [x_0, \dots, x_i, \dots, x_{L-1}]$.

$$p(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{Q}) = \prod_{i=0}^{L-1} p(x_i|\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{Q}, x_{<i}) \quad (5)$$

The model architecture, shown in Fig. 2, is similar to LLaVA [47]. It comprises of an image encoder, a temporal aggregator, a Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) layer, and a language model. For the image encoder, we utilize CLIP ViT-L [17, 56] to extract embeddings for each video frame. Then, the model extracts spatio-temporal features using a grid of image patches across multiple frames. Each frame embedding has N pooled spatial tokens where a *temporal aggregator* compresses $T \times N$ embeddings along the temporal axis. The resulting video embeddings from the temporal aggregator are then projected using an MLP to frame tokens that are then interleaved with language tokens as input to a large language model. In our experiments, we consider the Mistral-7B-Instruct [33] as the language model. Finally, we add LoRA [29] parameters with every linear layer of the language model for efficient learning of the tasks in §3.

4.2. Leveraging Procedural Graph

In addition to the video clips and the query, we also consider a procedural graph \mathbf{G} for generating the answer \mathbf{A} .

$$p(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{G}) = \prod_{i=0}^{L-1} p(x_i|\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{G}, x_{<i}) \quad (6)$$

Procedural Graph Construction Before the *training* phase, we construct a procedural graph by mining the training data using Alg. 1. The graph $\mathbf{G} = (\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{G}}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{G}})$ consists of a vertex set $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{G}}$ and an edge set $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{G}}$. We obtain the nodes in $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{G}}$ using the function $\text{getAnn}(\cdot) : \mathbf{V} \mapsto \mathcal{V}$ which gets the action annotation (*e.g.*, add milk) v_t for clips of \mathbf{v}_t present in a task video \mathbf{V} (*e.g.*, how to make latte). The edges represent temporally ordered transitions between two consecutive actions (v_{t-1}, v_t) observed in the task videos, which may be instructional [2, 51, 67, 91] or procedural [35, 55] in nature. An example subgraph in \mathbf{G} is illustrated in Fig. 3.




Figure 2. InsTALL comprises of an image encoder, an MLP projector, a temporal aggregator, and an LLM. An input sequence of video frames is processed by the image encoder followed by the MLP. The extracted spatio-temporal features are shown using a grid of image patches across multiple frames, where each frame embedding has N pooled spatial tokens. We then compress $T \times N$ embeddings along the temporal axis. The *MLP* helps transform these video embeddings to the text space. In addition, InsTALL includes a graph structure constructed from task procedures and language tokens, all input to the LLM.

Online Assistance During the *inference* phase, we construct an online search path $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_t$ as the video scene unfolds. For this, whenever we predict a change in action (using action recognition), we map it to a node in \mathbf{G} . Given the auto-regressive model recognizes action \mathbf{a}_t as free-form text, we use a one-hot (similarity) mapping to select nodes in \mathbf{G} and add it to a (predicted) online search path $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$ (see Alg. 2).

$$\text{node } \hat{v}_t = \arg \max (\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{G}}}(\mathbf{a}_t)), \quad \text{edge } (\hat{v}_{t-1}, \hat{v}_t) \\ \hat{\mathbf{G}}_t = \left(\underbrace{\{\hat{v}_0\} + \{\hat{v}_t\}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}_t}}, \underbrace{\{(\hat{v}_{t-1}, \hat{v}_t)\}}_{\mathcal{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}_t}} \right), \quad t \in (0, |\mathbf{V}|) \quad (7)$$

Projecting an online video onto a predicted subgraph $\hat{\mathbf{G}} (\in \mathbf{G})$ enables the possibility of leveraging $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$ alongside video and query embedding all the aforementioned tasks described in §3. We hypothesize this reduces the burden of reasoning (needed for plan/action recognition and prediction) of the LLM by using plan prefixes $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$ as part of the input.

The tasks defined in §3 can now be defined as

$$p(\mathbf{A}|\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{Q}_{\text{TR}}, \hat{\mathbf{G}}_t) \quad (\text{TR})$$

$$p\left(\mathbf{a}_t|\mathbf{v}_t, \mathbf{Q}_{\text{AR}}, \underbrace{\left(\{v_0\} + \{v_{<t}\}, \{(v_{<t-1}, v_{<t})\}\right)}_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}_{<t}}\right) \quad (\text{AR})$$

$$p(\mathbf{a}_t|\mathbf{v}_{<t}, \mathbf{Q}_{\text{AP}}, \hat{\mathbf{G}}_{<t}) \quad (\text{AP})$$

For *Plan Prediction*, we choose to look at two variants– with (PP+) and without (PP) knowing the target task \mathbf{T} :

$$p(\mathbf{a}_{\geq t}|\mathbf{v}_{<t}, \mathbf{Q}_{\text{PP}}, \hat{\mathbf{G}}_{<t}), \quad (\text{PP})$$

$$p(\mathbf{a}_{\geq t}|\mathbf{v}_{<t}, \mathbf{Q}_{\text{PP}}, \mathbf{T}, \hat{\mathbf{G}}_{<t}) \quad (\text{PP+})$$

where the number of procedural steps in $|\mathbf{a}_{\geq t}| > |\mathbf{a}_t| = 1$.




Figure 3. Procedural graph¹ \mathbf{G} is a directed graph where nodes are steps of activity and edges are chains of steps that are mined from video data. The graph plays an important role in modeling procedures involved in multi-step tasks to train different instructional understanding objectives (e.g., TR, AR, AP, PP, PP+, with step and order mistake detection in §4.4) and create online streaming dialog.

4.3. Incorporating Conversational Context

To support streaming dialog with a user, previous works consider annotation efforts that require significant human effort [14] or train models using single-shot question answering [80]. To overcome these limitations, our approach uses the procedural graph to naturally generate this type of annotation. Both at *training* and *inference* time, a verbalization process is used for graph nodes. Specifically, we construct a conversational context by varying $t \in (0, |\mathbf{V}|)$ and use the conversation template:

{**Stream:** $\langle \mathbf{v}_0 \rangle$; **User:** $\langle \mathbf{Q} \rangle$; **Assistant:** $\langle \hat{\mathbf{v}}_0 \rangle$; ...;
Stream: $\langle \mathbf{v}_t \rangle$; **User:** $\langle \mathbf{Q} \rangle$; **Assistant:** $\langle \hat{\mathbf{v}}_t \rangle$ }, $0 < t < |\mathbf{V}|$

Negative Choice Question. We also augment the dialog guided by the procedure graph \mathbf{G} by adding negative nodes that are distinct from v_t and its neighboring nodes $\mathcal{N}(v_t)$. These negative nodes $v(\notin \mathcal{N}(v_t) \cup v_t)$, enhance the ability of the model to distinguish between relevant and irrelevant information in the dialogue stream:

{**Stream:** $\langle \mathbf{v}_t \rangle$; **User:** $\langle \mathbf{Q} \rangle$, should I $\langle v(\notin \mathcal{N}(v_t) \cup v_t) \rangle$?;
Assistant: No, you should do $\langle v_t \rangle$ instead.}

Multiple Choice Question is constructed via the template:

{**Stream:** $\langle \mathbf{v}_t \rangle$; **User:** $\langle \mathbf{Q} \rangle$, in one of $\langle v \in \mathcal{N}(v_{t-1}) \rangle$;
Assistant: Yes, please do $\langle v_t \rangle$.}

where v_t was added to $\mathcal{N}(v_{t-1})$ while constructing \mathbf{G} (see L6 in Alg. 1).

4.4. Error Detection

Beyond the five main tasks, also studied in prior works [14], our graph implementation allows us to perform well on two

¹ Code for *visualization* is adapted from [facebookresearch/TaskGraph](https://github.com/facebookresearch/TaskGraph) [7].

Algorithm 1 Procedural Graph \mathbf{G} Construction

Input: $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{G}} \leftarrow \emptyset, \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{G}} \leftarrow \emptyset$
1: **for all** videos \mathbf{V} **do**
2: $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{G}}.\text{insert}(\text{getAnn}(\mathbf{v}_0))$ ▷ get category of step clip
3: **for** $\mathbf{v}_t \in \{\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{|\mathbf{V}|-1}\}$ **do**
4: $v_{t-1}, v_t \leftarrow \text{getAnn}(\mathbf{v}_{t-1}), \text{getAnn}(\mathbf{v}_t)$
5: **if** $v_t \notin \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{G}}$ **then** $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{G}}.\text{insert}(v_t)$
6: $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{G}}.\text{insert}(v_{t-1}, v_t)$
7: $\mathbf{G} \leftarrow (\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{G}}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{G}})$

Algorithm 2 Online Assistance w/ Procedural Graph

Input: Video \mathbf{V} , $\mathcal{V}_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}} \leftarrow \emptyset, \mathcal{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}} \leftarrow \emptyset, \hat{\mathbf{G}} \leftarrow (\mathcal{V}_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}}, \mathcal{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}})$
1: **for** clip $\mathbf{v}_t \in \{\mathbf{v}_0, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{|\mathbf{V}|-1}\}$ **do**
2: $\mathbf{A} \leftarrow p(\mathbf{A} | \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{Q}, \hat{\mathbf{G}})$
3: $\hat{v}_t \leftarrow \arg \max (\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{V}_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}}(\mathbf{A})})$
4: $\mathcal{V}_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}}.\text{insert}(\hat{v}_t)$
5: **if** $t > 0$ **then** $\mathcal{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}}.\text{insert}(\hat{v}_{t-1}, \hat{v}_t)$
6: $\hat{\mathbf{G}} \leftarrow (\mathcal{V}_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}}, \mathcal{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}})$

auxiliary tasks that leads to a more holistic validation of the instructional video understanding problem.

Incorrect Action Detection We create samples with incorrect actions by modifying each video in the data. Precisely, we randomly replace one step with an incorrect step $v(\notin \mathcal{N}(v_t) \cup v_t)$. This leads to an erroneous graph $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$ generation. The task is to identify this mistaken step within the sequence and we measure the average accuracy of correctly identifying the index of the mistaken step:

$$\mathcal{V}_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}} = \{v_0, \dots, v(\notin \mathcal{N}(v_t) \cup v_t), \dots, v_{|\mathbf{V}|-1}\} \quad (8)$$

Incorrect Order Detection By randomly shuffling the order of steps, we create a dataset for detecting mistakes in the ordering. The framework is then trained to determine whether the steps in a given video are in the correct order (or not). As one task can be achieved via different plans (or paths in the graph), we ensure the randomly shuffled order of actions is different from all action orderings present in the videos belonging to a particular task. Our evaluation metric is the average accuracy of the model in predicting whether a sequence is correctly ordered or not on the test split data:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}} = \{\dots, (v_{t-1}, v_{\neq t}), \dots\} \quad (9)$$

5. Experiments

5.1. Benchmarks and Metrics

In our experiments, we consider two prominent video-based datasets— Comprehensive INstructional video analysis

	#TR	#AR	#AP	#PP	#PP+	#Action _G	#Order _G	#Videos	#Tasks _≠	#Actions _≠
CrossTask [91]	4,462	36,117	31,656	27,253	27,253	4,462	4,462	4,462	83	105
COIN [67]	10,166	39,747	29,584	19,420	19,420	10,166	10,166	10,166	180	746

Table 3. Statistics of samples for the constructed tasks **TR**, **AR**, **AP**, **PP**, and **PP+** from video datasets and our graph. **#Tasks_≠** and **#Actions_≠** denote the number of *unique* activity and step categories. Training and testing splits are roughly 80:20 with no videos in common.

	Shape	AR	AP	PP	PP+	TR
Flatten	$T \times N \times D$	54.0	47.1	47.3	52.3	77.3
Averag.	$1 \times N \times D$	60.8	58.0	49.5	57.4	79.4
Pooling	$T \times N \times D / W$	78.5	65.9	52.3	59.1	98.9

Table 4. Performance of Temporal Aggregation methods.

(COIN; [67]) and CrossTask [91]. These datasets encompass a wide range of everyday activities with explicitly defined steps, making them ideal for instructional video analysis. As highlighted in Table 3, COIN contains 10,166 videos covering 180 different activities and 746 distinct steps, organized in a three-level semantic structure of domain, activity, and step. It primarily focuses on daily tasks (cleaning, repairing, etc.) related to vehicles, gadgets, etc. CrossTask comprises 4,462 videos across 83 activities, covering tasks related to cooking, car maintenance, crafting, home repairs, etc. The tasks and action annotations in CrossTask are derived from wikiHow [35]. Both datasets aim to establish a rich semantic taxonomy for organizing instructional videos. We organize these datasets to obtain labeled data for all tasks described in §3– Task Recognition (**TR**), Action Recognition (**AR**), Action Prediction (**AP**), Plan Prediction (**PP**) with a known goal (**PP+**)– and §4.4– Incorrect Action and Ordering detection. Precisely, we report the number of data samples, videos, tasks, actions, incorrect actions, and order-shuffled examples in Table 3. We use the same number of training samples across all methods and accuracy as the metric for evaluating performance on all the tasks.

5.2. Implementation Details

We employ CLIP-ViT-L-336 [17, 56] as the video frame encoder, a 2-layer MLP as the connector, and Mistral-7B-Instruct [33] as the LLM. Each video frame is encoded into 10 tokens. Further, we use LoRA [29] for training, applying it to all linear layers with a rank of 128 and a scaling factor of 256. With a batch size of 128 and gradient accumulation over 16 iterations, we observe a training time duration of \approx 12 hours for 2 epochs when these runs are parallelized on 8 A100 GPUs on AWS’ P4d instances. We now consider some of the design choices made for our model architecture that were made based on experimental results.

	Recall	Precision	F1-Score
CLIP-B-16	65.1%	68.4%	66.7%
CLIP-L-14	78.3%	89.3%	83.4%
CLIP-H-14	92.2%	95.8%	93.8%

Table 5. Retrieval performance of VectorRAG alternatives.

Temporal Aggregation Operations While various operations, such as flattening, averaging, or custom pooling, can be considered for aggregating along the temporal dimensions, we wanted to determine this empirically based performance of these alternatives of all the tasks in §3. In Table 4, we observe that Pooling yields the best results across all tasks. We hypothesize that Flatten, which simply concatenates features across the temporal dimension, introduces a lot of (irrelevant) data into the visual representation, making it difficult for the LLM to identify the needles in the visual haystack needed to excel on the tasks. On the other hand, averaging across all the temporal features risks losing out on fine-grained information that might be relevant to the downstream task. Spatial pooling strikes a good balance by reducing the spatial dimension at each time step, preventing the LLM from being overwhelmed with extra information.

CLIP Backbone Selection To determine the best visual encoding for our model, we consider the precision, recall, and F1 metrics for a text-to-video retrieval task. In this task, we use a task name as the text query Q_{TR} and retrieve relevant videos. Table 5 highlights that the CLIP-H-14 backbone results in the best retrieval performance.

Effect of Dataset on Graph Construction To test the robustness of our graph construction approach on different data sources, in Table 6, we observe the performance of using a **G** constructed from three different sources on the downstream tasks. We consider (1) the top-5 retrieved videos from text-to-video retrieval (Table 5), (2) WikiHow [35], and (3) the entire training dataset as the three alternative data sources. On the COIN dataset, using retrieved videos for graph construction outperform others for **AR** (79.1%) and **PP** (52.5%), while using the entire training dataset excels on **AP** (65.9%), **PP** (59.1%) and **TR** (98.9%). For CrossTask, using the entire training set results in the best performance across all tasks except on **AR** (70.1% < 71.5%). We note that **G** constructed

G	COIN					G	CrossTask				
	AR	AP	PP	PP+	TR		AR	AP	PP	PP+	TR
Retrieved	79.1	63.8	52.5	57.3	98.8	Retrieved	71.5	49.2	38.5	40.4	99.6
WikiHow	63.6	48.2	44.6	46.4	85.9	WikiHow	58.5	27.6	24.3	25.8	94.0
Trainset	78.5	65.9	52.3	59.1	98.9	Trainset	70.1	49.7	39.0	42.9	99.6

Table 6. Performance on different data sources for graph construction, including the retrieval results, WikiHow, and entire training dataset.

with WikiHow consistently underperforms across all tasks in both datasets. We postulate that the comparable performance of Retrieved on recognition-related tasks can be attributed to their more focused contextual scope, enabling more precise information extraction. Conversely, the full training dataset excels in future action/plan anticipation tasks due to a more holistic understanding of action dependencies in tasks gathered from a larger and diverse set of task videos.

5.3. Procedural Graph Usage for Inference

After our procedural graph extraction, we can leverage it at inference time regardless of the Multi-modal LLM (MLLM) used for the online assistance tasks. In Table 8, we highlight that considering the online graph path construction and incorporating it as input can unanimously improve the performance of any MLLM across all tasks (in §3) and datasets. For the VideoLLM-online model [14] on the COIN dataset, the addition of our graph implementation (VQG) led to substantial improvements (notably, absolute gains of +8.2% on AR, +13.7 on AP, and +8.7 on PP+) even when the baseline (VQ) used an enhanced version of Llama-3-8B. The GPT models [1] also benefited significantly from our approach. When augmented with our graph implementation, GPT-4o-mini showed improvements ranging from +2.5 to +16.9 percentage points across various tasks on both datasets. Further, GPT-4-turbo and GPT-4o models also exhibited substantial improvements when integrated with our graph approach; notably, absolute gains of +21.7% and +17.8% on AP for the two models respectively. These results reinforce that augmenting dependencies explicitly (via our graph approach) instead of heavily relying on the planning capabilities of LLMs in a multi-modal setting can improve task performance. We now show that leveraging the procedural task graphs for multi-task learning can provide further gains.

5.4. Efficacy of InsTALL

In Table 7A, we provide a comprehensive comparison of our method InsTALL against various State-of-The-Art (SoTA) approaches for instructional video understanding on COIN. While, the InsTALL base model (VQ) achieves the second-best scores on action recognition (AR) and prediction (AP) beating existing baselines, the latest work on VideoLLM-online+ [14] shows second best performance on task recognition and plan prediction tasks that need longer dependency

resolution. We hypothesize that this is due to the better reasoning capabilities of the LLM backbone for VideoLLM-online+ (i.e. Llama-3-8B) compared to our LLM backbone (i.e. Mistral-7B-Instruct). Regardless, when we incorporate our graph-based component (VQG), InsTALL’s performance improves exceptionally across all tasks beating all previous baselines (and the graph-augmented approaches developed in §5.3) across all existing video assistance tasks described in §3. Notably, InsTALL improves TR performance to 98.9% and all action and plan prediction tasks outperforming the previous best LLM-based method, VideoLLM-online+. We hypothesize that VideoLLM-online+, which creates simple augmented questions and transfers the burden of reasoning over the procedural video data to the LLM, is worse off than InsTALL’s better procedural context understanding due to the incorporation of task-graphs.

In Table 7B, we show similar results on CrossTask. While traditional video understanding models, such as S3D and SlowFast, achieve respectable performance (45.3% and 48.5% respectively) on AR, newer models, like VideoCLIP and TimeSformer, improve further (reaching 60.1% and 60.9% respectively). More recent, specialized models, such as DistantSup and TaskGraph (the latter uses graphs), push the accuracy further achieving 64.2% and 64.5% on AR. We also consider proprietary API-based MLLMs (OpenAI variants) that show competitive performance, particularly on PP and PP+ tasks. InsTALL, when using only visual and query inputs, outperforms all previous methods across most tasks, achieving 65.1% on AR and 97.6% on TR. When we incorporate the graph-based approach, InsTALL sets the SoTA performance with substantial improvement—70.1% on AR, 49.7% on AP, and nearly perfect 99.6% score on TR. While we also perform the best on plan prediction, undoubtedly the most difficult task, our numbers (39.0% on PP and 42.9% on PP+) highlight a large scope for improvement.

Error Detection On the auxiliary tasks for detecting errors in action and ordering (§4.4), we maintain the same train/test splits across methods and report the average accuracy of correctly identifying action and ordering errors in Table 7C. InsTALL demonstrates a significant improvement over all baselines when, esp. when using the procedural-graph implementation boosting error detection for action from 40.9% to 51.6%. For incorrect order detection, we observe a smaller

A. Understanding	COIN					B. Understanding	CrossTask				
	AR	AP	PP	PP+	TR		AR	AP	PP	PP+	TR
ClipBERT [38]	30.8	✗	✗	✗	65.4	S3D [75]	45.3	21.7	-	-	87.8
TSN [72]	36.5	✗	✗	✗	73.4	SlowFast [20]	48.5	24.0	-	-	89.8
S3D [75]	37.3	28.1	-	-	70.2	VSM [88]	58.9	57.9	-	-	62.2
SlowFast [20]	39.6	25.6	-	-	71.6	MIL-NCE [52]	59.9	58.0	-	-	61.7
MIL-NCE [52]	42.0	36.6	-	-	76.6	VideoCLIP [78]	60.1	26.0	-	-	92.3
VSM [88]	44.4	39.3	-	-	82.2	TimeSformer [9]	60.9	27.1	-	-	93.8
Paprika [88]	51.0	43.2	-	-	85.8	DistantSup [44]	64.2	29.7	-	-	95.2
VideoCLIP [78]	51.2	34.6	-	-	72.5	TaskGraph [7]	64.5	30.2	-	-	96.0
ProcedureVRL [87]	56.9	46.8	-	-	90.8	GPT-4o-mini	48.8	23.5	21.6	25.7	52.7
TaskGraph [7]	57.2	40.2	-	-	90.5	GPT-4-turbo	51.5	27.2	20.4	26.4	63.6
DistantSup [44]	54.1	39.4	-	41.3	90.0	GPT-4o	52.9	35.0	25.7	33.2	60.8
TimeSformer [9]	46.5	34.0	17.0	40.1	85.3	InsTALL (VQ)	65.1	31.5	27.9	29.7	97.6
VideoTF [53]	56.5	42.4	40.2	46.4	91.0	InsTALL (VQG)	70.1	49.7	39.0	42.9	99.6
VideoLLM-online [14]	59.8	48.1	47.9	52.9	92.1	C. Error Detection	COIN				
VideoLLM-online+ [14]	63.1	49.1	<u>49.8</u>	<u>54.1</u>	<u>92.7</u>		Action		Order		
GPT-4o-mini	42.5	31.2	20.8	29.4	64.2	SlowFast [20]	28.6		26.1		
GPT-4-turbo	52.4	41.2	26.2	34.4	68.6	MPNet [63]	34.2		33.4		
GPT-4o	64.7	43.6	33.0	41.8	69.9	TimeSformer [9]	37.6		31.8		
InsTALL (VQ)	<u>70.2</u>	<u>52.1</u>	48.5	50.3	89.5	VideoTF [53]	41.7		35.4		
InsTALL (VQG)	78.5	65.9	52.3	59.1	98.9	InsTALL (VQ)	40.9		42.1		
						InsTALL (VQG)	51.6		44.1		

Table 7. Comparison against State-of-the-Art Instructional Video Understanding methods. (A) and (B) report performances of AR, AP, PP, PP+, and TR tasks on COIN [67] and CrossTask [91], respectively. (C) reports the mistake detection in both step and order on COIN [67].

improvement from 42.1% to 44.1%. While having procedural graphs helps unanimously, we hypothesize that it is particularly effective in capturing short-term dependency relationships between actions, allowing to better identify out-of-context or incorrect steps. This hypothesis also explains (albeit *post-facto*) the lower magnitude of improvements seen for plan prediction tasks compared to action prediction tasks when **G** is incorporated in the earlier experiments.

Qualitative Comparison To illustrate the effectiveness of InsTALL, we present four qualitative comparisons in Fig. 4,

which showcases the procedure for making matcha tea, refilling a lighter, cooking omelet, and making a sandwich. Procedures often involve repetitive steps and can present ambiguous visual information, making challenges for purely visual systems. VideoLLM-online [14] (top), which relies solely on visual representations and piggybacks on LLM’s reasoning capabilities, without the benefit of our graph-based approach, misinterprets the step order. In contrast, our method models this procedure as a graph and injects it into the LLM, enables accurate prediction of the step order. Incorporating **G** provides crucial context and relational information, relieving

Table 8. Our procedural graph modeling improves overall performances of all AR, AP, PP, PP+, and TR tasks for LLM-based approaches.

	COIN					CrossTask				
	AR	AP	PP	PP+	TR	AR	AP	PP	PP+	TR
VideoLLM-online (VQ)	59.8	48.1	47.9	52.9	92.1	-	-	-	-	-
VideoLLM-online+ (VQ)	63.1 _(+3.3)	49.1 _(+1.0)	49.8 _(+1.9)	54.1 _(+1.2)	92.7 _(+0.6)	-	-	-	-	-
VideoLLM-online+ (VQG)	71.3 _(+8.2)	62.8 _(+13.7)	53.5 _(+3.7)	62.8 _(+8.7)	95.3 _(+2.6)	-	-	-	-	-
GPT-4o-mini (VQ)	42.5	31.2	20.8	29.4	64.2	48.8	23.5	21.6	25.7	52.7
GPT-4o-mini (VQG)	51.4 _(+8.9)	48.1 _(+16.9)	23.7 _(+2.9)	36.2 _(+6.8)	66.9 _(+2.7)	62.0 _(+13.2)	36.5 _(+13.0)	24.5 _(+2.9)	30.9 _(+5.2)	72.1 _(+19.4)
GPT-4-turbo (VQ)	52.4	41.2	26.2	34.4	68.6	51.5	27.2	20.4	26.4	63.6
GPT-4-turbo (VQG)	60.5 _(+8.1)	57.3 _(+16.1)	29.4 _(+3.2)	40.6 _(+6.2)	72.0 _(+3.4)	60.5 _(+9.0)	48.9 _(+21.7)	24.8 _(+4.4)	29.2 _(+2.8)	69.3 _(+5.7)
GPT-4o (VQ)	64.7	43.6	33.0	41.8	69.9	52.9	35.0	25.7	33.2	60.8
GPT-4o (VQG)	71.9 _(+7.2)	61.4 _(+17.8)	35.7 _(+2.7)	45.8 _(+4.0)	76.5 _(+6.6)	64.7 _(+11.8)	42.1 _(+7.1)	28.2 _(+2.5)	38.2 _(+5.0)	72.9 _(+12.1)




Figure 4. Qualitative comparison of our graph-based InsTALL versus VideoLLM-online [14] for (AR). Our InsTALL is aware of the position of the step in the entire procedure (arrows) and predicts the steps accurately. At the same time, VideoLLM-online misinterprets the order by relying solely on visual cues. Red texts denote incorrect steps while green texts denote correct steps. **Best viewed in color.**

reasoning expectations on the LLM, and helping the model correctly interpret and predict the sequence of steps, even in scenarios where visual cues alone might be ambiguous.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we presented a novel approach InsTALL for instructional video understanding. InsTALL leverages graph-based representations in conjunction with visual and textual embedding for adapter-style Multi-modal LLMs (MLLMs). InsTALL demonstrates significant improvements across a wide range of tasks including Action Recognition, Action Prediction, Plan Prediction, Task Recognition, and Error Identification. Injecting procedural task knowledge as graphs into the LLMs, we provide an accurate and rich representation of complex, multi-step processes, easing the reasoning burden on the LLMs. Extensive experiments showcase the consistent superiority of InsTALL compared to a wide range of approaches, ranging from traditional video understanding models and recent LLM-based approaches. Overall, our work contributes to building a solution that achieves SoTA across all tasks which is key for enabling visually aware assistants for procedural task videos.

Future Works While the online graph yields unanimous improvements, we observed, similar to prior work [58], that it can result in prediction errors as the model cannot faithfully follow the dependencies in the graph. We note that such errors compound across prediction steps, limiting their efficacy on plan prediction. We believe methods that improve ways to incorporate structured knowledge and improve the reasoning abilities of LLMs will be the path forward.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023. 7
- [2] Triantafyllos Afouras, Effrosyni Mavroudi, Tushar Nagarajan, Huiyu Wang, and Lorenzo Torresani. Ht-step: Aligning instructional articles with how-to videos. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 2, 4
- [3] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Piotr Bojanowski, Nishant Agrawal, Josef Sivic, Ivan Laptev, and Simon Lacoste-Julien. Unsupervised learning from narrated instruction videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4575–4583, 2016. 1
- [4] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:23716–23736, 2022. 2
- [5] Lisa Anne Hendricks, Oliver Wang, Eli Shechtman, Josef Sivic, Trevor Darrell, and Bryan Russell. Localizing moments in video with natural language. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 5803–5812, 2017. 2
- [6] Anthropic. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/developing-computer-use>, 2024. 2
- [7] Kumar Ashutosh, Santhosh Kumar Ramakrishnan, Triantafyllos Afouras, and Kristen Grauman. Video-mined task graphs for keystone recognition in instructional videos. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 2, 3, 5, 8
- [8] Kumar Ashutosh, Zihui Xue, Tushar Nagarajan, and Kristen Grauman. Detours for navigating instructional videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18804–18815, 2024. 1
- [9] Gedas Bertasius, Heng Wang, and Lorenzo Torresani. Is space-time attention all you need for video understanding? In *ICML*, page 4, 2021. 2, 8
- [10] Jing Bi, Jiebo Luo, and Chenliang Xu. Procedure planning in instructional videos via contextual modeling and model-based policy learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 15611–15620, 2021. 2
- [11] Fabian Caba Heilbron, Victor Escorcia, Bernard Ghanem, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Activitynet: A large-scale video benchmark for human activity understanding. In *Proceedings of the*

- ieee conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 961–970, 2015. 2
- [12] Chien-Yi Chang, De-An Huang, Danfei Xu, Ehsan Adeli, Li Fei-Fei, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Procedure planning in instructional videos. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 334–350. Springer, 2020. 2
- [13] Jingyuan Chen, Xinpeng Chen, Lin Ma, Zequn Jie, and Tat-Seng Chua. Temporally grounding natural sentence in video. In *Proceedings of the 2018 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 162–171, 2018. 2
- [14] Joya Chen, Zhaoyang Lv, Shiwei Wu, Kevin Qinghong Lin, Chenan Song, Difei Gao, Jia-Wei Liu, Ziteng Gao, Dongxing Mao, and Mike Zheng Shou. Videollm-online: Online video large language model for streaming video. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18407–18418, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9
- [15] Shaoxiang Chen and Yu-Gang Jiang. Semantic proposal for activity localization in videos via sentence query. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 8199–8206, 2019. 2
- [16] Wenhui Chen, Yu Su, Xifeng Yan, and William Yang Wang. KGPT: Knowledge-grounded pre-training for data-to-text generation. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 8635–8648, Online, 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2
- [17] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. 4, 6
- [18] Darren Edge, Ha Trinh, Newman Cheng, Joshua Bradley, Alex Chao, Apurva Mody, Steven Truitt, and Jonathan Larson. From local to global: A graph rag approach to query-focused summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16130*, 2024. 2, 3
- [19] Fen Fang, Yun Liu, Ali Koksul, Qianli Xu, and Joo-Hwee Lim. Masked diffusion with task-awareness for procedure planning in instructional videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07409*, 2023. 2
- [20] Christoph Feichtenhofer, Haoqi Fan, Jitendra Malik, and Kaiming He. Slowfast networks for video recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 6202–6211, 2019. 8
- [21] Jiyang Gao, Chen Sun, Zhenheng Yang, and Ram Nevatia. Tall: Temporal activity localization via language query. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 5267–5275, 2017. 2
- [22] Yunfan Gao, Yun Xiong, Xinyu Gao, Kangxiang Jia, Jinliu Pan, Yuxi Bi, Yi Dai, Jiawei Sun, and Haofen Wang. Retrieval-augmented generation for large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10997*, 2023. 2
- [23] Runzhou Ge, Jiyang Gao, Kan Chen, and Ram Nevatia. Mac: Mining activity concepts for language-based temporal localization. In *2019 IEEE winter conference on applications of computer vision (WACV)*, pages 245–253. IEEE, 2019. 2
- [24] Rohit Girdhar, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, Zhuang Liu, Mannat Singh, Kalyan Vasudev Alwala, Armand Joulin, and Ishan Misra. Imagebind: One embedding space to bind them all. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15180–15190, 2023. 2
- [25] Sachin Grover, Sailik Sengupta, Tathagata Chakraborti, Aditya Prasad Mishra, and Subbarao Kambhampati. Radar: automated task planning for proactive decision support. *Human-Computer Interaction*, 35(5-6):387–412, 2020. 2
- [26] Kelvin Guu, Kenton Lee, Zora Tung, Panupong Pasupat, and Mingwei Chang. Retrieval augmented language model pre-training. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 3929–3938. PMLR, 2020. 2
- [27] Bo He, Hengduo Li, Young Kyun Jang, Menglin Jia, Xuefei Cao, Ashish Shah, Abhinav Shrivastava, and Ser-Nam Lim. Ma-lmm: Memory-augmented large multimodal model for long-term video understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13504–13514, 2024. 2
- [28] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:6840–6851, 2020. 2
- [29] Edward J Hu, yelong shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 4, 6
- [30] Rongjie Huang, Mingze Li, Dongchao Yang, Jiatong Shi, Xuankai Chang, Zhenhui Ye, Yuning Wu, Zhiqing Hong, Jiawei Huang, Jinglin Liu, et al. AudioGPT: Understanding and generating speech, music, sound, and talking head. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 23802–23804, 2024. 2
- [31] Shaohan Huang, Li Dong, Wenhui Wang, Yaru Hao, Saksham Singhal, Shuming Ma, Tengchao Lv, Lei Cui, Owais Khan Mohammed, Barun Patra, et al. Language is not all you need: Aligning perception with language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:72096–72109, 2023. 2
- [32] Gautier Izacard and Edouard Grave. Leveraging passage retrieval with generative models for open domain question answering. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 874–880, Online, 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2
- [33] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023. 4, 6
- [34] Jing Yu Koh, Daniel Fried, and Russ R Salakhutdinov. Generating images with multimodal language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 2
- [35] Mahnaz Koupaee and William Yang Wang. Wikihow: A large scale text summarization dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.09305*, 2018. 4, 6
- [36] Xiaohan Lan, Yitian Yuan, Xin Wang, Zhi Wang, and Wenwu Zhu. A survey on temporal sentence grounding in videos.

- ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications and Applications*, 19(2):1–33, 2023. 2
- [37] Jie Lei, Licheng Yu, Tamara L Berg, and Mohit Bansal. Tvr: A large-scale dataset for video-subtitle moment retrieval. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XXI 16*, pages 447–463. Springer, 2020. 2
- [38] Jie Lei, Linjie Li, Luwei Zhou, Zhe Gan, Tamara L Berg, Mohit Bansal, and Jingjing Liu. Less is more: Clipbert for video-and-language learning via sparse sampling. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7331–7341, 2021. 2, 8
- [39] Matan Levy, Rami Ben-Ari, Nir Darshan, and Dani Lischinski. Chatting makes perfect: Chat-based image retrieval. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 2
- [40] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474, 2020. 2
- [41] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR, 2023. 1, 2
- [42] Zhiheng Li, Wenjia Geng, Muheng Li, Lei Chen, Yansong Tang, Jiwen Lu, and Jie Zhou. Skip-plan: Procedure planning in instructional videos via condensed action space learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 10297–10306, 2023. 2
- [43] Fangru Lin, Emanuele La Malfa, Valentin Hofmann, Elle Michelle Yang, Anthony G. Cohn, and Janet B. Pierrehumbert. Graph-enhanced large language models in asynchronous plan reasoning. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. 3
- [44] Xudong Lin, Fabio Petroni, Gedas Bertasius, Marcus Rohrbach, Shih-Fu Chang, and Lorenzo Torresani. Learning to recognize procedural activities with distant supervision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13853–13863, 2022. 2, 8
- [45] Daizong Liu, Xiaoye Qu, Xiao-Yang Liu, Jianfeng Dong, Pan Zhou, and Zichuan Xu. Jointly cross-and self-modal graph attention network for query-based moment localization. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 4070–4078, 2020. 2, 3
- [46] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 26296–26306, 2024. 1
- [47] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2024. 4
- [48] Meng Liu, Xiang Wang, Liqiang Nie, Xiangnan He, Baoquan Chen, and Tat-Seng Chua. Attentive moment retrieval in videos. In *The 41st international ACM SIGIR conference on research & development in information retrieval*, pages 15–24, 2018. 2
- [49] Aman Madaan, Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Yiming Yang, and Graham Neubig. Language models of code are few-shot commonsense learners. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1384–1403, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. 3
- [50] Jonathan Malmaud, Jonathan Huang, Vivek Rathod, Nicholas Johnston, Andrew Rabinovich, and Kevin Murphy. What’s cookin’? interpreting cooking videos using text, speech and vision. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 143–152, Denver, Colorado, 2015. Association for Computational Linguistics. 1
- [51] Antoine Miech, Dimitri Zhukov, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Makarand Tapaswi, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Howto100m: Learning a text-video embedding by watching hundred million narrated video clips. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 2630–2640, 2019. 1, 4
- [52] Antoine Miech, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Lucas Smaira, Ivan Laptev, Josef Sivic, and Andrew Zisserman. End-to-end learning of visual representations from uncurated instructional videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9879–9889, 2020. 8
- [53] Medhini Narasimhan, Licheng Yu, Sean Bell, Ning Zhang, and Trevor Darrell. Learning and verification of task structure in instructional videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13519*, 2023. 2, 8
- [54] Yulei Niu, Wenliang Guo, Long Chen, Xudong Lin, and Shih-Fu Chang. SCHEMA: State CHanges MATter for procedure planning in instructional videos. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 2
- [55] Xavier Puig, Kevin Ra, Marko Boben, Jiaman Li, Tingwu Wang, Sanja Fidler, and Antonio Torralba. Virtualhome: Simulating household activities via programs. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 8494–8502, 2018. 4
- [56] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 4, 6
- [57] Michaela Regneri, Marcus Rohrbach, Dominikus Wetzel, Stefan Thater, Bernt Schiele, and Manfred Pinkal. Grounding action descriptions in videos. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 1:25–36, 2013. 2
- [58] Shamik Roy, Sailik Sengupta, Daniele Bonadiman, Saab Mansour, and Arshit Gupta. FLAP: Flow-adhering planning with constrained decoding in LLMs. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 517–539, Mexico City,

- Mexico, 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. 3, 9
- [59] Keisuke Sakaguchi, Chandra Bhagavatula, Ronan Le Bras, Niket Tandon, Peter Clark, and Yejin Choi. proScript: Partially ordered scripts generation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*, pages 2138–2149, Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. 3
- [60] Fadime Sener, Dibyadip Chatterjee, Daniel Sheleпов, Kun He, Dipika Singhania, Robert Wang, and Angela Yao. Assembly101: A large-scale multi-view video dataset for understanding procedural activities. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 21096–21106, 2022. 1
- [61] Yongliang Shen, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Dongsheng Li, Weiming Lu, and Yueting Zhuang. Hugginggpt: Solving ai tasks with chatgpt and its friends in hugging face. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 2
- [62] Enxin Song, Wenhao Chai, Guan hong Wang, Yucheng Zhang, Haoyang Zhou, Feiyang Wu, Haozhe Chi, Xun Guo, Tian Ye, Yanting Zhang, et al. Moviechat: From dense token to sparse memory for long video understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18221–18232, 2024. 2
- [63] Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Tao Qin, Jianfeng Lu, and Tie-Yan Liu. Mpnet: Masked and permuted pre-training for language understanding. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:16857–16867, 2020. 8
- [64] Yixuan Su, Tian Lan, Yahui Liu, Fangyu Liu, Dani Yogatama, Yan Wang, Lingpeng Kong, and Nigel Collier. Language models can see: Plugging visual controls in text generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.02655*, 2022. 2
- [65] Yixuan Su, Tian Lan, Huayang Li, Jialu Xu, Yan Wang, and Deng Cai. PandaGPT: One model to instruction-follow them all. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Taming Large Language Models: Controllability in the era of Interactive Assistants!*, pages 11–23, Prague, Czech Republic, 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2
- [66] Jiankai Sun, De-An Huang, Bo Lu, Yun-Hui Liu, Bolei Zhou, and Animesh Garg. Plate: Visually-grounded planning with transformers in procedural tasks. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 7(2):4924–4930, 2022. 2
- [67] Yansong Tang, Dajun Ding, Yongming Rao, Yu Zheng, Danyang Zhang, Lili Zhao, Jiwen Lu, and Jie Zhou. Coin: A large-scale dataset for comprehensive instructional video analysis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1207–1216, 2019. 1, 4, 6, 8
- [68] Karthik Valmeekam, Matthew Marquez, Sarath Sreedharan, and Subbarao Kambhampati. On the planning abilities of large language models—a critical investigation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:75993–76005, 2023. 2, 3
- [69] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017. 2
- [70] An-Lan Wang, Kun-Yu Lin, Jia-Run Du, Jingke Meng, and Wei-Shi Zheng. Event-guided procedure planning from instructional videos with text supervision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 13565–13575, 2023. 2
- [71] Hanlin Wang, Yilu Wu, Sheng Guo, and Limin Wang. Pdpp: Projected diffusion for procedure planning in instructional videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14836–14845, 2023. 2
- [72] Limin Wang, Yuanjun Xiong, Zhe Wang, Yu Qiao, Dahua Lin, Xiaoou Tang, and Luc Van Gool. Temporal segment networks: Towards good practices for deep action recognition. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 20–36. Springer, 2016. 8
- [73] Chenfei Wu, Shengming Yin, Weizhen Qi, Xiaodong Wang, Zecheng Tang, and Nan Duan. Visual chatgpt: Talking, drawing and editing with visual foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.04671*, 2023. 2
- [74] Shengqiong Wu, Hao Fei, Leigang Qu, Wei Ji, and Tat-Seng Chua. NExt-GPT: Any-to-any multimodal LLM. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. 1
- [75] Saining Xie, Chen Sun, Jonathan Huang, Zhuowen Tu, and Kevin Murphy. Rethinking spatiotemporal feature learning: Speed-accuracy trade-offs in video classification. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 305–321, 2018. 8
- [76] Yaqi Xie, Chen Yu, Tongyao Zhu, Jinbin Bai, Ze Gong, and Harold Soh. Translating natural language to planning goals with large-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05128*, 2023. 3
- [77] Huijuan Xu, Kun He, Bryan A Plummer, Leonid Sigal, Stan Sclaroff, and Kate Saenko. Multilevel language and vision integration for text-to-clip retrieval. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 9062–9069, 2019. 2
- [78] Hu Xu, Gargi Ghosh, Po-Yao Huang, Dmytro Okhonko, Armen Aghajanyan, Florian Metzke, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. VideoCLIP: Contrastive pre-training for zero-shot video-text understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 6787–6800. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021. 8
- [79] Zhentao Xu, Mark Jerome Cruz, Matthew Guevara, Tie Wang, Manasi Deshpande, Xiaofeng Wang, and Zheng Li. Retrieval-augmented generation with knowledge graphs for customer service question answering. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 2905–2909, 2024. 2
- [80] Zhou Yu, Dejing Xu, Jun Yu, Ting Yu, Zhou Zhao, Yueting Zhuang, and Dacheng Tao. Activitynet-qa: A dataset for understanding complex web videos via question answering. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 9127–9134, 2019. 3, 5
- [81] Siyu Yuan, Jiangjie Chen, Ziquan Fu, Xuyang Ge, Soham Shah, Charles Jankowski, Yanghua Xiao, and Deqing Yang.

- Distilling script knowledge from large language models for constrained language planning. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4303–4325, Toronto, Canada, 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. [3](#)
- [82] Da Zhang, Xiyang Dai, Xin Wang, Yuan-Fang Wang, and Larry S Davis. Man: Moment alignment network for natural language moment retrieval via iterative graph adjustment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1247–1257, 2019. [2](#)
- [83] Dong Zhang, Shimin Li, Xin Zhang, Jun Zhan, Pengyu Wang, Yaqian Zhou, and Xipeng Qiu. SpeechGPT: Empowering large language models with intrinsic cross-modal conversational abilities. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 15757–15773, Singapore, 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. [2](#)
- [84] Hang Zhang, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. Video-LLaMA: An instruction-tuned audio-visual language model for video understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 543–553, Singapore, 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. [2](#)
- [85] Hao Zhang, Aixin Sun, Wei Jing, and Joey Tianyi Zhou. Temporal sentence grounding in videos: A survey and future directions. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(8):10443–10465, 2023. [2](#)
- [86] He Zhao, Isma Hadji, Nikita Dvornik, Konstantinos G Derpanis, Richard P Wildes, and Allan D Jepson. P3iv: Probabilistic procedure planning from instructional videos with weak supervision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 2938–2948, 2022. [2](#)
- [87] Yiwu Zhong, Licheng Yu, Yang Bai, Shangwen Li, Xueting Yan, and Yin Li. Learning procedure-aware video representation from instructional videos and their narrations. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14825–14835, 2023. [2](#), [8](#)
- [88] Honglu Zhou, Roberto Martín-Martín, Mubbasir Kapadia, Silvio Savarese, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Procedure-aware pretraining for instructional video understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10727–10738, 2023. [2](#), [3](#), [8](#)
- [89] Luowei Zhou, Chenliang Xu, and Jason Corso. Towards automatic learning of procedures from web instructional videos. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018. [1](#)
- [90] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. MiniGPT-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. [2](#)
- [91] Dimitri Zhukov, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Ramazan Gokberk Cinbis, David Fouhey, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Cross-task weakly supervised learning from instructional videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3537–3545, 2019. [1](#), [4](#), [6](#), [8](#)