

SimpleVQA: Multimodal Factuality Evaluation for Multimodal Large Language Models

Xianfu Cheng^{1*}, Wei Zhang^{1*}, Shiwei Zhang^{2*}, Jian Yang^{1*†}, Xiangyuan Guan¹, Xianjie Wu¹
Xiang Li¹, Ge Zhang³, Jiaheng Liu³, Yuying Mai⁴, Yutao Zeng¹, Zhoufutu Wen³, Ke Jin¹
Baorui Wang¹, Weixiao Zhou¹, Yunhong Lu⁵, Tongliang Li^{1†}, Wenhao Huang³, Zhoujun Li^{1,6}
¹Beihang University; ²Baidu Inc., China; ³M-A-P; ⁴Beijing Jiaotong University;
⁵Yantai University; ⁶Shenzhen Intelligent Strong Technology Co.,Ltd.
{buaacxf,lizj}@buaa.edu.cn,zhangshiwei05@baidu.com

Abstract

The increasing application of multi-modal large language models (MLLMs) across various sectors has spotlighted the essence of their output reliability and accuracy, particularly their ability to produce content grounded in factual information (e.g. common and domain-specific knowledge). In this work, we introduce SimpleVQA, the first comprehensive multi-modal benchmark to evaluate the factuality ability of MLLMs to answer natural language short questions. SimpleVQA is characterized by six key features: it covers multiple tasks and multiple scenarios, ensures high quality and challenging queries, maintains static and timeless reference answers, and is straightforward to evaluate. Our approach involves categorizing visual question-answering items into 9 different tasks around objective events or common knowledge and situating these within 9 topics. Rigorous quality control processes are implemented to guarantee high-quality, concise, and clear answers, facilitating evaluation with minimal variance via an LLM-as-a-judge scoring system. Using SimpleVQA, we perform a comprehensive assessment of leading 18 MLLMs and 8 text-only LLMs, delving into their image comprehension and text generation abilities by identifying and analyzing error cases.

* Equal Technical Contributions.

† Corresponding Authors.

Contents

- 1 Introduction** **3**

- 2 SimpleVQA** **4**
 - 2.1 Overview 4
 - 2.2 Dataset Criteria 5
 - 2.3 Data Collection and Processing 6
 - 2.4 Human Annotation & Quality Control 7
 - 2.5 Dataset Statistics 7

- 3 Experiments** **9**
 - 3.1 Setup 9
 - 3.2 Baseline Models 10
 - 3.3 Evaluation Metrics 10
 - 3.4 Main Results 10

- 4 Further Analysis** **11**

- 5 Related Works** **11**

- 6 Conclusion** **12**

- A Human Annotation cost.** **16**

- B Nine task categories SimpleVQA Samples of SimpleVQA.** **16**

- C Results of Mainstream LLMs** **16**

- D Results of Task Categories** **16**

- E Results of Domain Categories** **18**

- F Model Lists** **20**

- G Prompts** **21**

1. Introduction

A significant challenge in large language models (LLMs) is ensuring that LLMs [AI@Meta, 2024, OpenAI, 2023] generate factually accurate and evidence-based responses. Current state-of-the-art LLMs often produce outputs that are misleading or unsupported by evidence phenomenon known as “hallucinations” [Tonmoy et al., 2024, Cheng et al., 2023, Zhang et al., 2023]. This issue of generating incorrect or unsubstantiated information remains a major barrier to the broader adoption and reliability of general-purpose AI technologies.

OpenAI proposes SimpleQA [Wei et al.] to measure factuality simple and reliable with nearly 4K concise and fact-seeking questions. Further, Chinese SimpleQA [He et al., 2024b] comprised of 3K Chinese questions spanning 6 major topics is proposed to target the Chinese language. However, the SimpleQA benchmark and Chinese SimpleQA benchmark mainly evaluate the model capabilities of text modality, ignoring wider real-world scenarios (e.g. vision modality). For the vision modality, the research progress of the multi-modal large language models (MLLMs) is still hindered by the “hallucinations” introduced by the given images. Therefore, *The community of MLLMs has an urgent need for how to measure the simple and reliable factuality introduced by the image.*

To address this limitation, we develop the SimpleVQA benchmark as shown in Figure 1, where we define the factual question-answering capability of the visual language model. For the proposed factual Visual Question Answering (VQA), we collect 2,025 high-quality question-answer pairs covering 9 different topics across 9 different application tasks. As a factual benchmark for a short answer, SimpleVQA has the following advantages: (1) **English and Chinese:** SimpleVQA provides general knowledge visual Q&A in both English and Chinese backgrounds, and comprehensively assesses the fact-generating capacity of MLLMs in Chinese and English communities. (2) **Multi-task division:** We divide the SimpleVQA assessment set into 16 different forms of VQA tasks according to the collected questions and different needs of pictures, and summarized SimpleVQA into 4 forms of Q&A according to the complexity of images and the amount of information of question text. (3) **Diversified scenarios:** SimpleVQA covers 9 domains (Literature, education & sports, Euro-American History & Culture, Contemporary Society, Engineering, Technology & Application, Film, Television & Media, Natural Science, Art, Chinese History & Culture, and Life), and 9 tasks (Logic & Science, Object Identification Recognition, Time & Event, Person & Emotion, Location & Building, Text Processing, Quantity & Position Relationship, Art & Culture, and Object Attributes Recognition). (4) **High quality:** We implement a comprehensive and rigorous quality control process to ensure the quality of questions and the accuracy of answers at SimpleVQA. (5) **Challenge:** simpleVQA focuses on factual questions that mainstream MLLMs cannot answer accurately, and cannot trace the cause of errors through the model itself. (6) **Static answers:** Following SimpleQA’s factual definition, all the standard answers provided in our benchmark don’t change over time. (7) **Easy to evaluate:** SimpleQA’s short answers make it possible to use existing LLMs (such as




Figure 1. An example from our proposed SimpleVQA.

Benchmark	Multimodal	Data Size	Language	Data Source	Domain	Factuality	Reasoning	Metric
MMBench [Liu et al., 2024]	Image&Text	2,438	Chi.&Eng.	Real World	Knowledge	×	×	MCQ Eval
CCBench [Liu et al., 2024]	Image&Text	510	Chinese	Knowledge	Knowledge	×	×	MCQ Eval
MME [Li et al., 2024]	Image&Text	1300	English	Real World	General	×	×	TFQ Eval
MM-Vet [Yu et al., 2023]	Image&Text	200	English	Human	General	×	×	LLM-as-a-Judge
Dynamath [Zou et al., 2024]	Image&Text	5000	English	Exams	Math	×	×	Accuracy
MMMU [Yue et al., 2024a]	Image&Text	11.5k	English	Human&GPT	General	×	✓	Accuracy
MMMU-Pro [Yue et al., 2024b]	Image&Text	3460	English	Human&GPT	General	×	✓	Accuracy
ChineseFactEval [Yang et al., 2023]	Text Only	125	Chinese	Human	Knowledge	✓	×	LLM-as-a-Judge
AGI-Eval [Zhong et al., 2023]	Text Only	8062	Chi.&Eng.	Exams	Knowledge	×	×	Accuracy
C-Eval [Huang et al., 2023]	Text Only	13,948	Chinese	Exams	Knowledge	×	×	Accuracy
SimpleQA [Wei et al., 2024]	Text Only	4,326	English	Human	Knowledge	✓	×	LLM-as-a-Judge
Chinese SimpleQA [He et al., 2024c]	Text Only	3,000	Chinese	Human&GPT	Knowledge	✓	×	LLM-as-a-Judge
SimpleVQA (Ours)	Image&Text	2,025	Chi.&Eng.	Human&GPT	Knowledge	✓	✓	LLM-as-a-Judge

Table 1. Comparisons between our SimpleVQA and other benchmarks, where “TFQ” means True or False questions, “MCQ” means multi-choice questions, “Chi.& Eng.” means Chinese and English.

OpenAI GPT-4o) to run a judge program to quickly determine right or wrong and get an overall accuracy rate.

We systematically evaluate 18 MLLMs on SimpleVQA and create a dynamic leaderboard to show results. Further, a series of probing experiments are performed to explore the effect of the key factors for SimpleVQA. We classify the capabilities possessed by MLLMs for factual questions into two aspects, visual understanding and internalized knowledge capabilities: (1) visual understanding refers to the ability of the model to identify the subject of the question being asked in the question; and (2) internalized knowledge capabilities test whether the model has already mastered the relevant knowledge of the subject of the question being asked, and thus is able to answer the relevant question correctly after identifying that subject. Based on this definition, we added an abductive reasoning experiment to the basic assessment to help determine whether the badcase came from a lack of visual understanding ability or a lack of internalized knowledge ability by generating and labeling atomic questions (each atomic question corresponds to an atomic fact) for each VQA example.

The remarkable findings from SimpleVQA are summarized as: (1) The factual accuracy of most evaluation models in the field of visual question-answering is insufficient. (2) The training data of MLLMs contains knowledge errors and they are overconfident in what they generate. (3) Image content understanding is still a major challenge for MLLMs to achieve improved capabilities. (4) Improving the model’s visual understanding ability and enhancing the model’s internalized knowledge can greatly improve the overall accuracy of the model, such as through Supervised fine-tuning (SFT) training. (5) The ability of MLLMs to internalize massive world knowledge still needs to be improved, and overcoming illusions remains a great challenge for large language models.

2. SimpleVQA

2.1. Overview

The SimpleVQA benchmark consists of 2,025 samples spanning 9 core tasks and 9 primary domains, with each question-image pair categorized into relevant subcategories, enabling a comprehensive evaluation of MLLMs across diverse knowledge areas. The dataset 9 tasks, including covers Logic & Science (LS), Object Identification Recognition (OIR), Time & Event (TE), Person & Emotion (PE), Location & Building (LB), Text Processing (TP), Quantity & Position Relationship (QPR), Art & Culture (AC), and Object Attributes Recognition (OAR). To ensure




Figure 2. An overview of the data construction process of SimpleVQA.

broad topic coverage, SampleVQA is structured around 9 key domains: Literature, education & sports (LES), Euro-American History & Culture (EHC), Contemporary Society (CS), Engineering, Technology & Application (ETA), Film, Television & Media (FTM), Natural Science (NS), Art (AR), Chinese History & Culture (CHC), and Life (LI).

As shown in Table 1, SampleVQA differs from existing MLLM benchmarks by focusing on factual knowledge boundaries instead of general vision-language understanding. Politically sensitive and ideological content is excluded to maintain neutrality and avoid controversy. Designed for efficiency, the dataset features concise questions and standardized answers, reducing complexity in model evaluation. All samples follow a short-answer Q&A format, enabling simple and objective assessment through direct answer matching. These refinements ensure SampleVQA serves as a robust benchmark for evaluating MLLMs’ factual reasoning abilities.

2.2. Dataset Criteria

SampleVQA adheres to strict criteria ensuring objectivity, temporal stability, and verifiability in its questions, images, and answers. The following guidelines define these standards.

Question Guidelines. *Clear and Unique Answers:* Questions must have a single, undisputed answer. They should precisely define scope (e.g., "Which city?" instead of "Which location?") and specify time references (e.g., "Which year?" rather than "When?"). *Evidence-Based:* Each question must be supported by verifiable sources. Manually annotated questions include reference links, while automatically generated ones undergo independent validation by two AI trainers. *Challenging for MLLMs:* Questions are tested on GPT-4o, GPT-4o-mini, doubao-vision-pro, and ERNIE-VL. Only those that at least one model answers incorrectly are retained; others are revised. *Answerable by August 2024:* All questions must be answerable based on knowledge available before September 1, 2024, ensuring a fair evaluation across models with similar knowledge cutoffs.

Visual Guidelines. *No Direct Textual Clues:* Images must not contain text revealing the answer. *Authenticity:* Only real, unaltered images are allowed to prevent factual distortion. *Supports Question Reasoning:* Each image must provide sufficient context for answering. Manually labeled samples undergo multi-annotator verification. *Fixed Before August 2024:* Image content must be valid and confirmable before August 2024.

Answer Guidelines. *Temporal Stability:* Answers must remain unchanged and unaffected by new information. Time-sensitive topics (e.g., sports, media) should specify a timeframe rather than a general answer that may change. *Sufficiently Challenging:* Answers are tested against four high-precision MLLMs. If all models respond correctly, the question is revised to increase difficulty. *Fully Objective and Evaluable:* Answers must be precise, verifiable, and free from subjective interpretation. *Unambiguous:* Each answer must have a single, clear meaning to prevent misinterpretation.

2.3. Data Collection and Processing

As shown in Figure 2, the construction of SimpleVQA follows a structured five-step process:

Step 1: Seed Example Collection. SimpleVQA’s seed examples are sourced from two primary channels. First, we filter images and Q&A pairs from publicly available VQA datasets that align with factual knowledge criteria. We select MMVet (English), MME (English), Dynamath (English), MMbench_CN (Chinese), and CCBench (Chinese) due to their recent construction (post-2023) and their relevance to real-world applications. Second, we collect images and relevant factual knowledge from search engines (e.g., Google, Baidu, Wikipedia), with expert annotators generating corresponding questions and answers. These data focus on entities and events across multiple domains, ensuring answers are objective, fact-based, and centered on entity recognition or attribute extraction.

Step 2: Data Enhancement and QA Pair Generation. Once sufficient seed examples are gathered, we employ GPT-4o [Hurst et al., 2024] to refine the data and generate Q&A pairs for factual categories. For multiple-choice questions (MCQs) from sources like MMbench_CN and CCBench, to ensure answer uniqueness, we use LLMs to rephrase the original question and introduce qualifiers that precisely align with the correct response. For MME, we extract the answer entity and rewrite the question based on its attributes, ensuring a one-to-one correspondence. Datasets like MMVet, Dynamath, and CCBench, which contain discrepancies from factual Q&A formats (e.g., incorrect answer options, image descriptions, or MCQ distractors), are processed using GPT-4o to align the content with factual reasoning. These refinements produce the initial version of SimpleVQA.

Step 3: LLM-Based Quality Verification. The refined dataset undergoes verification using GPT-4 to assess adherence to quality standards, ensuring answer stability, uniqueness, and question difficulty. Following LLM screening, two professional annotators conduct rigorous quality checks and refine samples as needed.

Step 4: Difficulty Screening. To maximize the dataset’s utility in model evaluation, we filter out overly simple Q&A pairs. We assess responses from four mainstream MLLMs (GPT-4o, GPT-4o-mini, Doubao-vision-pro, and ERNIE-VL). Any question correctly answered by all four models is deemed too simple and excluded from the dataset, thereby maintaining a challenging benchmark.

Step 5: Extracting Atomic Facts. To analyze visual comprehension and language alignment in MLLMs more precisely, we generate atomic questions from each SimpleVQA entry. An atomic fact represents the most fundamental, indivisible attribute or characteristic of an object. For instance, given the question "In what year was the person in the image born?", the corresponding atomic question is "Who is the person in the image?". MLLMs generate candidate answers, which are then reviewed and refined by professional annotators to ensure accuracy.

Statistics	Number	Statistics	Number
Data	2025	Domain Categories	9
- Chinsne(CN)	1012	- Literature, Education & Sports(LES)	13.48%
- English(EN)	1013	- Euro-American History & Culture(EHC)	12.89%
Task Categories	9	- Contemporary Society(CS)	11.51%
- Logic & Science(LS)	5.04%	- Engineering, Technology & Application(ETA)	7.95%
- Object Identification Recognition(OIR)	14.07%	- Film, Television & Media(FTM)	10.62%
- Time & Event(TE)	9.98%	- Natural Science (NS)	12.64%
- Person & Emotion(PE)	13.58%	- Art (AR)	7.65%
- Location & Building(LB)	21.53%	- Chinese History & Culture(CHC)	9.68%
- Text Processing(TP)	10.07%	- Life (LI)	13.58%
- Quantity & Position Relationship(QPR)	10.12%	Query Words	
- Art & Culture(AC)	9.09%	- Max query words	314
- Object Attributes Recognition(OAR)	6.52%	- Min query words	5

Table 2. Statistics of SimpleVQA

2.4. Human Annotation & Quality Control

To ensure dataset quality, we implement a rigorous manual validation process following automated data collection. All the collaborators in this paper participated in the necessary data annotation, and we also selected three domain experts from the collaborators. Each question is independently reviewed by two expert annotators to verify factual accuracy. If either annotator finds a question unsuitable, it is discarded. Annotators fact-check answers using authoritative sources such as Wikipedia and Baidu Encyclopedia, providing at least two supporting URLs. If their answers differ, a third expert conducts a final review to ensure consistency and correctness. Only Q&A pairs that fully align with both human evaluations and LLM-generated responses are retained.

A difficulty assessment further refines the dataset. We begin with 8,360 Q&A pairs, filtering out 22% of image-based samples that lack challenge or fail to meet predefined criteria. 1,108 pairs are removed through multi-model testing to ensure that questions pose a meaningful challenge to MLLMs. To maintain category balance, we carefully select 200 high-difficulty mathematical Q&As from 5,000 Dynamath samples, avoiding an overrepresentation of simpler factual questions. Through multiple validation rounds, we retain 2,025 high-precision Q&A pairs, accounting for 24% of the original dataset. This process ensures factual integrity, topic diversity, and appropriate difficulty levels, making SampleVQA a robust benchmark for evaluating MLLMs’ reasoning and knowledge boundaries.

2.5. Dataset Statistics

As shown in Table 1, our SimpleVQA benchmark consists of 2,025 samples across 9 major tasks, 9 major domains, and 244 image types. Examples of each category can be found in Figure 2. This design facilitates a comprehensive assessment of MLLMs across different domains. Regarding the distribution of topics and image types in SimpleVQA, nine main topics are defined and subcategories are assigned based on each topic. In Table 1, we also compare SimpleVQA with several mainstream MLLMs’ evaluation benchmarks, which suggests that SimpleVQA is the first MLLMs’ benchmark that focuses on the evaluation of knowledge boundaries in factual categories. We excluded ideological and politically relevant data from the dataset to prevent social controversies and negative impacts. In addition, we implemented several optimizations to improve the efficiency of the evaluation. The dataset features concise questions and standardized answers, minimizing the input and output markers required for GPT assessment. In addition,

all examples are in short-answer question-and-answer (QA) format, and they can be assessed by simple matching.

Models	Overall results					F-score on 9 task categories									
	CO	NA	IN	CGA	F-score	LS	OIR	TE	PE	LB	TP	QPR	AC	OAR	
Closed-source Multi-modal Large Language Models															
GPT-4o	47.2	7.8	45.0	51.2	49.1	58.7	53.4	48.1	36.4	44.3	57.5	61.8	35.1	61.0	
GPT-4o-mini	35.5	10.0	54.5	39.4	37.3	30.0	44.4	38.5	29.6	36.2	42.1	45.9	25.8	40.6	
Doubao-vision-pro-128k	39.7	20.8	39.5	50.1	44.3	48.3	53.5	53.4	39.6	35.0	38.5	46.9	35.9	62.9	
Doubao-vision-pro-32k	25.4	23.6	51.4	32.7	28.3	24.2	37.9	18.0	31.6	21.3	39.2	32.9	18.6	36.6	
Gemini-2.0-flash	52.8	6.0	41.2	56.1	54.4	63.7	60.9	54.3	55.0	44.3	61.5	65.7	33.9	64.4	
Claude-3.5-Sonnet	48.5	9.8	41.8	53.7	50.9	57.1	53.9	52.1	29.7	47.2	58.4	62.7	46.7	60.1	
Qwen-Max	25.4	15.3	59.3	30.0	27.5	15.1	33.7	13.5	30.1	27.7	36.0	34.4	12.1	36.4	
ERNIE-VL	46.5	9.5	44.0	51.4	48.8	49.0	55.9	48.3	40.7	40.7	54.4	59.7	33.6	70.8	
Open-source Multi-modal Large Language Models															
InternVL2.5-78B-MPO	45.4	5.9	48.6	48.3	46.8	57.4	54.6	50.3	26.4	34.4	57.0	65.8	32.8	72.3	
InternVL2.5-78B	41.5	7.7	50.8	45.0	43.2	49.5	49.4	45.0	28.4	31.0	49.6	63.7	32.0	65.2	
InternVL2-Llama3-76B	35.7	8.4	55.9	38.9	37.2	34.7	43.5	35.6	26.2	28.4	44.3	53.5	29.0	54.1	
InternVL2.5-38B-MPO	42.9	5.4	51.8	45.3	44.0	51.7	52.5	45.7	22.1	34.0	52.0	67.8	32.8	60.4	
InternVL2.5-26B-MPO	39.9	7.6	52.5	43.2	41.5	43.4	44.5	47.7	27.1	31.7	45.9	58.6	29.0	68.0	
InternVL2.5-8B-MPO	33.6	7.5	58.9	36.3	34.9	45.1	37.4	30.9	19.1	26.0	44.3	52.2	26.4	56.2	
Qwen2.5-VL-72B	49.4	5.4	45.2	52.2	50.8	57.7	50.8	51.0	38.6	51.6	57.8	65.8	29.8	62.8	
Qwen2-VL-72B-Instruct	44.7	10.3	45.0	49.8	47.1	48.8	51.9	46.3	37.9	38.5	55.3	63.0	35.9	59.7	
Qwen2.5-VL-7B-Instruct	43.2	5.1	51.7	45.6	44.3	38.6	52.7	37.6	32.7	41.0	52.6	53.6	39.2	56.7	
Janus-pro-7B	31.3	10.6	58.1	35.0	33.0	27.0	43.4	26.5	23.7	28.2	24.0	50.4	36.2	42.3	

Table 3. Results of different models on SimpleVQA. For metrics, CO, NA, IN, and CGA denote “Correct”, “Not attempted”, “Incorrect”, and “Correct given attempted”, respectively. We report the scores across different tasks, including “Logic & Science (LS)”, “Object Identification Recognition (OIR)”, “Time & Event (TE)”, “Person & Emotion (PE)”, “Location & Building (LB)”, “Text Processing (TP)”, “Quantity & Position Relationship (QPR)”, “Art & Culture (AC)”, and “Object Attributes Recognition (OAR)”.




Figure 3. Calibration of LLMs based on their stated confidence. The x-axis represents the confidence level of the LLMs, and the y-axis represents the accuracy.

Models	Chinese partial results			English partial results			F-score on 9 domains categories								
	CO	CGA	F-score	CO	CGA	F-score	LES	EHC	CS	ETA	FTM	NS	AR	CHC	LI
Closed-source Multi-modal Large Language Models															
GPT-4o	48.7	51.6	50.1	45.7	50.7	48.1	47.0	37.5	58.2	62.0	50.5	61.7	30.3	29.6	58.8
GPT-4o-mini	33.0	36.0	34.4	38.2	43.1	40.5	36.0	25.4	44.4	41.5	41.1	40.6	22.9	26.6	52.3
Doubao-vision-pro-128k	51.1	56.4	53.6	28.5	41.8	33.9	51.8	23.7	50.1	52.2	49.0	44.3	32.6	44.9	48.7
Doubao-vision-pro-32k	29.0	37.8	32.8	15.6	26.2	19.6	34.9	13.4	33.0	38.2	29.3	23.4	15.2	29.1	37.4
Gemini-2.0-flash	54.8	57.9	56.3	50.7	54.3	52.5	54.1	35.4	59.9	67.5	70.9	64.6	29.2	36.3	64.6
Claude-3.5-Sonnet	48.0	50.6	49.3	49.2	57.0	52.8	49.1	42.7	52.7	56.5	48.1	61.1	38.7	34.4	66.5
Qwen-Max	25.2	29.4	27.1	25.6	30.6	27.9	28.1	21.0	35.4	34.8	31.6	20.0	14.2	11.9	44.1
ERNIE-VL	54.0	55.3	54.6	40.7	44.9	42.7	55.9	32.9	60.0	54.6	42.8	50.7	27.8	45.4	59.4
Open-source Multi-modal Large Language Models															
InternVL2.5-78B-MPO	51.7	54.7	53.1	39.2	41.8	40.5	54.2	22.5	60.2	53.6	35.5	56.7	27.5	37.9	63.6
InternVL2.5-78B	46.7	49.2	47.9	36.3	40.6	38.3	48.3	18.6	55.2	56.0	33.0	53.9	25.6	33.7	57.5
InternVL2-Llama3-76B	34.2	37.4	35.7	37.1	40.4	38.7	38.3	19.0	44.0	44.4	35.4	45.6	20.4	21.4	57.1
InternVL2.5-38B-MPO	48.0	49.5	48.8	37.7	40.9	39.2	52.3	21.0	54.2	59.5	29.3	51.5	27.9	31.6	61.6
InternVL2.5-26B-MPO	45.5	47.3	46.3	34.4	38.8	36.4	46.9	20.6	54.5	47.6	32.4	51.6	20.5	34.4	54.3
InternVL2.5-8B-MPO	35.8	38.5	37.1	31.4	34.0	32.7	36.0	14.0	43.7	43.2	26.4	46.4	20.3	22.5	53.5
Qwen2.5-VL-72B-Instruct	48.0	50.4	49.2	50.7	54.0	52.3	49.4	45.2	64.3	62.4	53.6	58.3	20.9	30.3	61.8
Qwen2-VL-72B-Instruct	46.1	48.6	47.3	43.3	51.2	46.9	45.2	30.4	54.0	57.2	51.6	53.5	29.4	29.7	65.2
Qwen2.5-VL-7B-Instruct	41.9	44.0	42.9	44.5	47.1	45.8	42.9	42.8	54.9	49.8	40.4	46.4	25.9	30.3	56.9
Janus-pro-7B	29.5	32.1	30.7	33.2	38.1	35.5	30.5	21.5	40.2	40.8	26.2	37.1	26.8	15.3	53.2

Table 4. Results of different models on SimpleVQA. For metrics, CO, NA, IN, and CGA denote “Correct”, “Not attempted”, “Incorrect”, and “Correct given attempted”, respectively. SimpleVQA is structured around nine key domains: “Literature, education & sports (LES)”, “Euro-American History & Culture (EHC)”, “Contemporary Society (CS)”, “Engineering, Technology & Application (ETA)”, “Film”, “Television & Media (FTM)”, “Natural Science (NS)”, “Art (AR)”, “Chinese History & Culture (CHC)”, and “Life (LI)”.




Figure 4. F-score results for eight different models across nine task categories.

3. Experiments

3.1. Setup

We maintain a consistent prompt format across all experiments. The temperature and sampling parameters adhere to each LLM’s official configuration or default settings and GPT-4o serves as the primary model for evaluation and data construction.

3.2. Baseline Models

We evaluate 18 models in total, comprising 8 closed-source and 10 open-source models, providing a diverse evaluation of model capabilities across different architectures and training paradigms. The closed-source models include GPT-4o, GPT-4o-mini, Doubao-pro-128k, Doubao-pro-32k, Gemini-2.0-flash, Claude-3.5-Sonnet, Qwen-Max, ERNIE-VL. The open-source models cover a wide range of frameworks, including InternLM2.5, Qwen2.5, Qwen2, Janus-pro-7B.

3.3. Evaluation Metrics

The evaluation of the SampleVQA benchmark employs a set of rigorous metrics designed to assess the accuracy, reliability, and consistency of the model’s predictions. These metrics include: (1) **Correct (CO)** evaluates whether the predicted answer matches the reference answer exactly without any contradiction. (2) **Not Attempted (NA)** identifies cases where the model does not attempt to answer, ensuring no contradictions are present. (3) **Incorrect (IN)** flags instances where the predicted answer contradicts the reference answer, even if resolved. (4) **Correct Given Attempted (CGA)** measures the proportion of correct answers among those attempted by the model, reflecting its performance when engaged. (5) **F-score** computes the harmonic mean between "Correct" and "Correct Given Attempted," providing a balanced evaluation that combines accuracy and attempt success.

3.4. Main Results

Results on Different Tasks Table 3 presents the performance of various closed-source and open-source vision-language models on SimpleVQA, highlighting their F-scores across different tasks in Chinese and English. Among the closed-source models, Gemini-2.0-flash and Doubao-vision-pro-128k show strong performance, particularly in tasks like “Time & Event (TE)” and “Person & Emotion PE”. In contrast, models like Claude-3.5-Sonnet and Qwen-Max exhibit moderate performance. Open-source models, such as InternVL2.5-78B-MPO and Qwen2.5-VL-72B-Instruct, demonstrate competitive results, though slightly lower than the top closed-source models. Notably, most LLMs, such as InternVL2-Llama3-76B and DeepSeek-VL2-27B, get poor performance, indicating a significant clear gap between the state-of-the-art LLMs and open-source LLMs (except Qwen2.5-VL-72B).

Results on Different Domains Table 4 also shows that the results of different LLMs on SimpleVQA reveal a clear distinction between closed-source and open-source large vision-language models in terms of different domains. SimpleVQA is split into different subdomains, including “Literature, education & sports (LES)”, “Euro-American History & Culture (EHC)”, “Contemporary Society (CS)”, “Engineering, Technology & Application (ETA)”, “Film”, “Television & Media (FTM)”, “Natural Science (NS)”, “Art (AR)”, “Chinese History & Culture (CHC)”, and “Life (LI)”. Among the closed-source models, Gemini-2.0-flash and Cluade-3.5-Sonnet stand out with the highest overall F-score of 56.3 and 52.8 for Chinese and English queries, while the open-source LLMs Qwen2.5-VL-72B-Instruct follows closely with a strong performance. In contrast, open-source LLMs InternVL2.5-78B-MPO can still get competitive results compared to the state-of-the-art closed-source LLMs. Overall, both closed-source and open-source LLMs gets poor performance in SimpleVQA, which is still very challenging for the current MLLMs.

Results on Different LLMs In order to ensure the robustness of all the quizzes, we conducted experiments using 8 mainstream LLMs with no image input-direct questioning questions, and

the results of the experiments are shown in Table 6, where we set up a VQA that could not be answered efficiently by the LLMs without providing an image, but the LLMs still achieved a small degree of accuracy, and in particular DeepSeek-R1 showed a more prominent guessing ability.

4. Further Analysis

Based on SimpleVQA, we conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the mainstream MLLMs, exposing serious factual problems in the LLM. We also conduct an in-depth causal analysis of the existing factual problems from the perspective of the visual understanding of MLLMs and text generation capabilities, providing a forward-looking direction for the optimization of subsequent models. First, we identify the three most robust MLLMs through evaluation. For each VQA task, if the response of LLM is incorrect, we simplify the question into an atomic problem related to content recognition using a prompt. This atomic problem corresponds to an atomic fact. When provided, it transforms the original question into a purely factual text-based query. If the model still cannot answer the atomic query correctly, we attribute the failure to the MLLM’s insufficient understanding of the image. Next, since some of the original questions are atomic questions, we collect cases where the atomic questions are different from the original questions and use them to extract a test set, called the complex fact question (CFQ) set, to verify whether the performance of the model improves when given atomic facts. In another experiment, we incorporate the answer to the atomic question as a hint into the CFQ query and reassess the model’s response. If the model still provides an incorrect answer, we attribute the failure to a lack of background knowledge. The table below shows the results of our CFQ experiment.

The results of CFQ are shown in Table 5. We select difficult CFQ examples from all samples totaling 569. we use as the CFQ dataset to test the visual understanding ability and knowledge internalization ability of LLMs such as o1-preview, o1-mini, DeepSeek-R1 and MLLMs such as GPT-4o, Qwen2.5-VL-72B-Instruct and InternVL2.5-78B-MPO. For LLMs, even with the ability to reflect, their knowledge internalization ability still cannot be effectively stimulated under the premise of only providing atomic facts without inputting images; while there is a large mismatch between the literacy ability and knowledge internalization ability of MLLMs, and the model’s ability to store knowledge is slightly better in relation to visual comprehension, but there is still a lot of room for improvement; and MLLMs answering the atomic questions The performance of MLLMs in answering atomic questions also reflects that there is some potential for optimizing literacy using the SFT approach.

5. Related Works

Multimodal Benchmarks. Recent vision-language benchmarks have been developed to assess models’ capabilities in integrating visual and textual information across various tasks [Wu et al., 2024a,b, Zhang et al., 2024], including OCR [Cheng et al., 2024b], spatial awareness [Li et al., 2025], multimodal information retrieval [Cheng et al., 2024a], and reasoning skills. For example, MMBench [Liu et al., 2023] employs multiple-choice tasks in both Chinese and English, covering a wide range of domains. MMMU [Yue et al., 2024a] focuses on complex vision-language tasks, particularly those requiring advanced multimodal reasoning. MMStar [Chen et al., 2024] utilizes multi-task evaluations to test models’ ability to fuse different modalities.

Factuality Benchmarks. Factuality refers to their ability to generate content that follow facts, including commonsense, world knowledge, and domain-specific information. This capability is

Models	Origin	Atomic	Atomic-Given
o1-preview	-	-	62.74%
o1-mini	-	-	51.49%
DeepSeek-R1	-	-	55.01%
Qwen-Max	-	-	54.83%
GPT-4o	56.24%	56.94%	61.69%
Qwen2.5-VL-72B-Instruct	51.67%	59.58%	64.15%
InternVL2.5-78B-MPO	55.36%	55.71%	69.95%

Table 5. Accuracy of CFQ experiments in SimpleVQA, where “Origin” denotes the CO of original Q&A, “Atomic” denotes the CO of atomic Q&A, and “Atomic-Given” denotes the CO of original Q&A given the atomic facts.

typically assessed by comparing model outputs to authoritative sources such as Wikipedia or academic textbooks. Recently, Various benchmarks have been developed to evaluate factuality in LLMs [Zhong et al., 2023, Huang et al., 2023, Li et al., 2023a, Srivastava et al., 2023, Yang et al., 2018, Lin et al., 2022, Yang et al., 2024a,b, Tan et al., 2024]. For example, MMLU [Hendrycks et al., 2021] assesses multitask accuracy across 57 diverse tasks. HaluEval [Li et al., 2023b] explores the propensity of LLMs to produce hallucinations or false information. SimpleQA [Wei et al., 2024] and Chinese SimpleQA [He et al., 2024a] have been proposed to measure the short-form factuality in LLMs.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce the first bilingual visual question-answering benchmark, SimpleVQA, designed to evaluate the fact-based quizzing capabilities of existing MLLMs. SimpleVQA encompasses 7 key features: Chinese-English bilingual support, multi-task and multi-scene adaptability, high quality, challenging content, static design, and ease of evaluation. Utilizing SimpleVQA, we conduct a comprehensive assessment of 18 MLLMs and 8 LLMs, analyzing their performance in fact-based queries to highlight the advantages and necessity of our benchmark. Building on prior research in neural network calibration, we develop a novel methodology to calibrate the visual comprehension and visual-linguistic information alignment abilities of MLLMs, identifying error sources by testing key atomic questions derived from original factual queries. We hope that SimpleVQA will serve as a valuable tool for assessing factuality and inspire the development of more trustworthy and reliable MLLMs.

References

- AI@Meta. Llama 3 model card. 2024. URL https://github.com/meta-llama/llama3/blob/main/MODEL_CARD.md.
- L. Chen, J. Li, X. Dong, P. Zhang, Y. Zang, Z. Chen, H. Duan, J. Wang, Y. Qiao, D. Lin, et al. Are we on the right way for evaluating large vision-language models? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.20330*, 2024.
- Q. Cheng, T. Sun, W. Zhang, S. Wang, X. Liu, M. Zhang, J. He, M. Huang, Z. Yin, K. Chen, et al. Evaluating hallucinations in chinese large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03368*, 2023.
- X. Cheng, H. Zhang, J. Yang, X. Li, W. Zhou, K. Wu, F. Liu, W. Zhang, T. Sun, T. Li, et al. Xformparser: A simple and effective multimodal multilingual semi-structured form parser. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17336*, 2024a.
- X. Cheng, W. Zhou, X. Li, J. Yang, H. Zhang, T. Sun, W. Zhang, Y. Mai, T. Li, X. Chen, et al. Sviptr: Fast and efficient scene text recognition with vision permutable extractor. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 365–373, 2024b.
- Y. He, S. Li, J. Liu, Y. Tan, W. Wang, H. Huang, X. Bu, H. Guo, C. Hu, B. Zheng, Z. Lin, X. Liu, D. Sun, S. Lin, Z. Zheng, X. Zhu, W. Su, and B. Zheng. Chinese simpleqa: A chinese factuality evaluation for large language models, 2024a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.07140>.
- Y. He, S. Li, J. Liu, Y. Tan, W. Wang, H. Huang, X. Bu, H. Guo, C. Hu, B. Zheng, et al. Chinese simpleqa: A chinese factuality evaluation for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.07140*, 2024b.
- Y. He, S. Li, J. Liu, Y. Tan, W. Wang, H. Huang, X. Bu, H. Guo, C. Hu, B. Zheng, et al. Chinese simpleqa: A chinese factuality evaluation for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.07140*, 2024c.
- D. Hendrycks, C. Burns, S. Basart, A. Zou, M. Mazeika, D. Song, and J. Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.
- Y. Huang, Y. Bai, Z. Zhu, J. Zhang, J. Zhang, T. Su, J. Liu, C. Lv, Y. Zhang, J. Lei, Y. Fu, M. Sun, and J. He. C-eval: A multi-level multi-discipline chinese evaluation suite for foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08322*, 2023.
- A. Hurst, A. Lerer, A. P. Goucher, A. Perelman, A. Ramesh, A. Clark, A. Ostrow, A. Welihinda, A. Hayes, A. Radford, et al. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*, 2024.
- B. Li, Y. Ge, Y. Ge, G. Wang, R. Wang, R. Zhang, and Y. Shan. Seed-bench: Benchmarking multimodal large language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13299–13308, 2024.
- H. Li, Y. Zhang, F. Koto, Y. Yang, H. Zhao, Y. Gong, N. Duan, and T. Baldwin. Cmmlu: Measuring massive multitask language understanding in chinese, 2023a.
- H. Li, J. Chen, Z. Wei, S. Huang, T. Hui, J. Gao, X. Wei, and S. Liu. Llava-st: A multimodal large language model for fine-grained spatial-temporal understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.08282*, 2025.

- J. Li, X. Cheng, W. X. Zhao, J.-Y. Nie, and J.-R. Wen. Halueval: A large-scale hallucination evaluation benchmark for large language models, 2023b.
- S. Lin, J. Hilton, and O. Evans. TruthfulQA: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3214–3252, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.acl-long.229. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-long.229>.
- Y. Liu, H. Duan, Y. Zhang, B. Li, S. Zhang, W. Zhao, Y. Yuan, J. Wang, C. He, Z. Liu, et al. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06281*, 2023.
- Y. Liu, H. Duan, Y. Zhang, B. Li, S. Zhang, W. Zhao, Y. Yuan, J. Wang, C. He, Z. Liu, et al. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player? In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 216–233. Springer, 2024.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. *PREPRINT*, 2023.
- A. Srivastava, A. Rastogi, A. Rao, A. A. M. Shoeb, A. Abid, A. Fisch, A. R. Brown, A. Santoro, A. Gupta, A. Garriga-Alonso, et al. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=uyTL5Bvosj>.
- Y. Tan, B. Zheng, B. Zheng, K. Cao, H. Jing, J. Wei, J. Liu, Y. He, W. Su, X. Zhu, and B. Zheng. Chinese safetyqa: A safety short-form factuality benchmark for large language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.15265>.
- S. Tonmoy, S. Zaman, V. Jain, A. Rani, V. Rawte, A. Chadha, and A. Das. A comprehensive survey of hallucination mitigation techniques in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01313*, 2024.
- J. Wei, N. Karina, H. W. Chung, Y. J. Jiao, S. Papay, A. Glaese, J. Schulman, and W. Fedus. Measuring short-form factuality in large language models. 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID/273877483>.
- J. Wei, N. Karina, H. W. Chung, Y. J. Jiao, S. Papay, A. Glaese, J. Schulman, and W. Fedus. Measuring short-form factuality in large language models. 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:273877483>.
- S. Wu, Y. Li, K. Zhu, G. Zhang, Y. Liang, K. Ma, C. Xiao, H. Zhang, B. Yang, W. Chen, et al. Scimmir: Benchmarking scientific multi-modal information retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.13478*, 2024a.
- S. Wu, K. Zhu, Y. Bai, Y. Liang, Y. Li, H. Wu, J. Liu, R. Liu, X. Qu, X. Cheng, et al. Mmra: A benchmark for multi-granularity multi-image relational association. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.17379*, 2024b.
- A. Yang, B. Xiao, B. Wang, B. Zhang, C. Bian, C. Yin, C. Lv, D. Pan, D. Wang, D. Yan, et al. Baichuan 2: Open large-scale language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10305*, 2023.
- J. Yang, J. Yang, K. Jin, Y. Miao, L. Zhang, L. Yang, Z. Cui, Y. Zhang, B. Hui, and J. Lin. Evaluating and aligning codellms on human preference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.05210*, 2024a.

- J. Yang, J. Zhang, J. Yang, K. Jin, L. Zhang, Q. Peng, K. Deng, Y. Miao, T. Liu, Z. Cui, et al. Execre-pobench: Multi-level executable code completion evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.11990*, 2024b.
- Z. Yang, P. Qi, S. Zhang, Y. Bengio, W. W. Cohen, R. Salakhutdinov, and C. D. Manning. Hotpotqa: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering, 2018.
- W. Yu, Z. Yang, L. Li, J. Wang, K. Lin, Z. Liu, X. Wang, and L. Wang. Mm-vet: Evaluating large multimodal models for integrated capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02490*, 2023.
- X. Yue, Y. Ni, K. Zhang, T. Zheng, R. Liu, G. Zhang, S. Stevens, D. Jiang, W. Ren, Y. Sun, et al. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9556–9567, 2024a.
- X. Yue, T. Zheng, Y. Ni, Y. Wang, K. Zhang, S. Tong, Y. Sun, B. Yu, G. Zhang, H. Sun, et al. Mmmu-pro: A more robust multi-discipline multimodal understanding benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.02813*, 2024b.
- G. Zhang, X. Du, B. Chen, Y. Liang, T. Luo, T. Zheng, K. Zhu, Y. Cheng, C. Xu, S. Guo, H. Zhang, X. Qu, J. Wang, R. Yuan, Y. Li, Z. Wang, Y. Liu, Y.-H. Tsai, F. Zhang, C. Lin, W. Huang, W. Chen, and J. Fu. Cmmmu: A chinese massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding benchmark. *ArXiv*, abs/2401.11944, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:267068665>.
- Y. Zhang, Y. Li, L. Cui, D. Cai, L. Liu, T. Fu, X. Huang, E. Zhao, Y. Zhang, Y. Chen, et al. Siren’s song in the ai ocean: a survey on hallucination in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01219*, 2023.
- W. Zhong, R. Cui, Y. Guo, Y. Liang, S. Lu, Y. Wang, A. Saied, W. Chen, and N. Duan. Agieval: A human-centric benchmark for evaluating foundation models, 2023.
- C. Zou, X. Guo, R. Yang, J. Zhang, B. Hu, and H. Zhang. Dynamath: A dynamic visual benchmark for evaluating mathematical reasoning robustness of vision language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.00836*, 2024.

A. Human Annotation cost.

We paid all the annotators the equivalent of \$1 per question and provided them with a comfortable working environment, free meals, and souvenirs. We also provided the computer equipment and GPT-4o interface required for labeling. We labeled about 2,025 questions in total and employed them to check the quality of the questions/answers, and the total cost was about \$5202 in US dollars. The annotators checked the derived tasks, including multilingual Q&A explanation and code completion.

B. Nine task categories SimpleVQA Samples of SimpleVQA.

Nine task categories SimpleVQA samples of SimpleVQA are Figure 5.

<p>Logic & Science</p> <p>Chinese Question: 图中哪对磁铁之间的磁力更强? Entity: Magnet, Physics Applications Domain: Natural Science</p> 	<p>Object Identification Recognition</p> <p>Chinese Question: 请问图中的文物是什么? Entity: Cultural relics, Antiques Domain: Chinese History & Culture</p> 	<p>Time & Event</p> <p>Chinese Question: 图中描绘的是哪一场战役? Entity: Historical Events, Battles Domain: Euro-America History and Culture</p> 
<p>English Question: What plant disease is shown in the picture? Entity: Plant Diseases, Phytopathology Domain: Natural Science</p> 	<p>English Question: which part of plant can be specialized to form thorns in the picture? Entity: Plants, Identification Domain: Life</p> 	<p>English Question: Which year has the highest growth rate of median house price? Entity: Housing Market, Price Domain: Contemporary Society</p> 
<p>Person & Emotion</p> <p>Chinese Question: 图中的人物是谁? Entity: Chinese Culture, Historical Figures Domain: Chinese History & Culture</p> 	<p>Location & Building</p> <p>Chinese Question: 图中这个湖是位于哪个市? Entity: Scene, Geography Domain: Natural Science</p> 	<p>Text Processing</p> <p>Chinese Question: 这张图片上显示的口号是? Entity: Software, Logo, Slogan Domain: Film, Television & Media</p> 
<p>English Question: Who is the director of this movie? Entity: Film Director, Movie Domain: Film, Television & Media</p> 	<p>English Question: What is the building in this picture? Entity: Landmark, Architecture Domain: Western History and Culture</p> 	<p>English Question: What is the answer to the arithmetic question in the image? Entity: Basic Arithmetic, Mathematics, Division Domain: Literature, Education and Sport</p> 
<p>Quantity & Position Relationship</p> <p>Chinese Question: 这张图片中有多少人可见? Entity: Baseball Game, Sports Domain: Literature, Education and Sport</p> 	<p>Art & Culture</p> <p>Chinese Question: 图中脸谱对应角色来自于哪部作品? Entity: Opera, Face Makeup, Role Domain: Chinese History & Culture</p> 	<p>Object Attributes Recognition</p> <p>Chinese Question: 图上的美食叫什么名字? Entity: Cooking, Food Culture, Cuisine Domain: Chinese History & Culture</p> 
<p>English Question: What is the spatial relation between the frisbee and the man? Entity: Sports, Frisbee, Dog Domain: Literature, Education & Sport</p> 	<p>English Question: What type does this artwork belong to? Entity: Painting, Artistic style Domain: Euro-American History and Culture</p> 	<p>English Question: What color is the bicycle with white handlebars in the image? Entity: Bicycles, Transportation, Streets Domain: Life</p> 

Figure 5. Nine task categories SimpleVQA samples of SimpleVQA.

C. Results of Mainstream LLMs

The CO, NA, IN, and CGA results for 8 LLMs across simpleVQA are presented in Table 6.

D. Results of Task Categories

The CO, 1-NA, IN, and CGA results for eight models across nine task categories are presented in Figure 6, 7, 8 and 9.




Figure 6. CO results for eight different models across nine task categories.




Figure 7. 1-NA results for eight different models across nine task categories.




Figure 8. IN results for eight different models across nine task categories.

Models	CO	IN	NA	CGA
o1-preview	3.65%	22.12%	74.22%	14.16%
o1-mini	4.1%	19.51%	76.4%	17.36%
DeepSeek-R1	10.08%	53.6%	36.32%	15.82%
Qwen-Max	7.6%	70.77%	21.63%	9.69%
GPT-4o	5.23%	31.6%	63.16%	14.2%
GPT-4o-mini	6.47%	47.65%	45.88%	11.95%
Claude-3.5-Sonnet2	2.02%	7.21%	90.77%	21.88%
Gemini-2.0-flash	7.06%	61.33%	31.6%	10.32%

Table 6. The CO, NA, IN, and CGA results for 8 LLMs across simpleVQA without image input.




Figure 9. CGA results for eight different models across nine task categories.

E. Results of Domain Categories

The CO, 1-NA, IN, CGA and F-Score results for eight models across nine domain categories are presented in Figure 10, 11, 12 and 13.




Figure 10. CO results for eight different models across nine domain categories.




Figure 11. 1-NA results for eight different models across nine domain categories.




Figure 12. IN results for eight different models across nine domain categories.




Figure 13. CGA results for eight different models across nine domain categories.




Figure 14. F-Score results for eight different models across nine domain categories.

F. Model Lists

Models adopted in our experiments are presented in Table 7 and 8.

Close-Sourced Model	API Entry
OpenAI o1-Preview	https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/o1
OpenAI o1-mini	https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/o1
GPT 4o	https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-4o
GPT 4o-mini	https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-4o-mini
Doubao-vision-pro-32k	https://www.volcengine.com/product/ark
Doubao-vision-pro-128k	https://www.volcengine.com/product/ark
Gemini-2.0-flash	https://deepmind.google/technologies/gemini/flash/
Claude-3.5-Sonnet	https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-5-sonnet
Qwen-Max	https://huggingface.co/spaces/Qwen/Qwen-Max
ERNIE-VL	https://yiyan.baidu.com/

Table 7. Close-sourced models (APIs) adopted in our experiments.

Open-Sourced Model	Model Link
InternVL2.5-78B-MPO	https://huggingface.co/OpenGVLab/InternVL2_5-78B-MPO
InternVL2.5-78B	https://huggingface.co/OpenGVLab/InternVL2_5-78B
InternVL2-Llama3-76B	https://huggingface.co/OpenGVLab/InternVL2-Llama3-76B
InternVL2.5-38B-MPO	https://huggingface.co/OpenGVLab/InternVL2_5-38B-MPO
InternVL2.5-26B-MPO	https://huggingface.co/OpenGVLab/InternVL2_5-26B-MPO
InternVL2.5-8B-MPO	https://huggingface.co/OpenGVLab/InternVL2_5-8B-MPO
Qwen2.5-VL-72B-Instruct	https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2.5-VL-72B-Instruct
Qwen2-VL-72B-Instruct	https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2-VL-72B-Instruct
Qwen2.5-VL-7B-Instruct	https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2.5-VL-7B-Instruct
Janus-pro-7B	https://huggingface.co/deepseek-ai/Janus-Pro-7B
DeepSeek-R1	https://huggingface.co/deepseek-ai/DeepSeek-R1

Table 8. Open-sourced models adopted in our experiments.

G. Prompts

SimpleVQA Refine Prompt Example for MMEBENCH

You are a data annotator in the field of multimodal domains, responsible for organizing image question-answer annotation data in the task, which will be used to optimize a multimodal automatic question-answering system. In this data annotation task, you are given an image, two true/false judgment questions, and two answers (including one "Yes" indicating a correct judgment). You are required to rewrite the questions and answers according to the given requirements, transforming the judgment-type question-answer into an interrogative question-answer about a specific object or subject. Please note not to change the original language of the questions and answers, and do not include the answer in the question.

Question 1 [<question1>]

Answer 1 [<answer1>]

Question 2 [<question2>]

Answer 2 [<answer2>]

Rewriting Requirements

1. ****First****, compare the two provided questions, determine the target question format, and rewrite a question. Extract the answer to the target question from the question whose answer is "Yes". The answer should not appear in the question.

Example

```
‘ ‘ ‘json
```

```
{  
  "question1": "Does this artwork belong to the type of religious? Please answer yes or no.",  
  "answer1": "Yes",  
  "question2": "Does this artwork belong to the type of landscape? Please answer yes or no.",  
  "answer2": "No"  
}
```

```
‘ ‘ ‘
```

Rewritten Question and Answer

```
‘ ‘ ‘json
```

```
{  
  "question": "What type does this artwork belong to?",  
  "answer": "Religious"  
}
```

```
‘ ‘ ‘
```

2. ****Determine whether the rewritten "question" is valid****. Below are several types of invalid questions:

- The question must be rewritten from the original questions and should be in the style of a visual question-answering prompt.

- The semantics of the question are not smooth, with obvious grammatical errors.

- The question is too simple or demonstrates a misunderstanding of the image, leading to an unreasonable question.

- The question can be correctly answered even without viewing the image, rendering the image information valueless.

- The question cannot be answered based on the existing image.

3. ****Then judge whether the selected "answer" is reasonable****. Below are several types of invalid answers:

- The answer is not extracted from the original question judged as "Yes".

- The answer is irrelevant; the content does not match what is asked in the rewritten question.

- The answer is empty, meaningless, or demonstrates a misunderstanding of the image, leading to an unreasonable answer.

4. ****Only if both the rewritten "question" and "answer" are valid, is it considered a qualified data entry.****

Please return the result in the following format:

```
‘ ‘ ‘json {
  "question": "Do not change the original language of the questions, and do not include
the answer in the content.",
  "answer": "Keep the original language, ensure it is correctly extracted from the
original question.",
  "qualified": "Indicate whether it is qualified; if not qualified, provide the reason."
}
‘ ‘ ‘
```

Please strictly follow the above format when generating your response.

SimpleVQA Refine Prompt Example for MMBENCH

You are a data annotator in the field of multimodal data, responsible for organizing annotated data for image question-answering tasks to optimize a multimodal automatic Q&A system. In this data annotation task, you are given an image, a description of the image content (Hint), and the original question of a task (query). Now, based on the provided information, you need to generate a new set of questions and answers. The questions and answers must strictly follow the requirements given below. Note that you should not change the original language of the Q&A, and the answer should not appear in the question.

Description (Hint) [<Hint>]

Original Question (query) [<query>]

Image (uploaded) [<image>]

Requirements for the Question and Answer 1. First, understand and combine the provided Hint, query, and image information to generate a question. Extract or infer an answer that can correctly respond to the question from the content of the Hint or query. The answer should not appear in the question.

Example 1 (assuming an image is provided)

‘ ‘ ‘

{

```

    "Hint": "Image: Preparing for a concrete slump test.",
    "query": "Which of the following might Laura and Isabella's test show?",
}
'''
## Generated Q&A
'''json
{
    "question": "What test are Laura and Isabella performing?",
    "answer": "Concrete slump test"
}
'''
## Example 2 (assuming an image is provided)
'''json
{
    "Hint": "The diagram demonstrates how the solution changes over time during
diffusion.",
    "query": "Complete the text to describe the graph. Solute particles move in both
directions across a permeable membrane. However, more solute particles move through
the membrane towards ( ). When the concentration on both sides is equal, particles reach
equilibrium.",
}
'''
## Generated Q&A
'''json
{
    "question": "Fill in the parentheses to describe the graph. Solute particles move in
both directions across a permeable membrane. However, more solute particles move
through the membrane towards . When the concentration on both sides is equal, particles
reach equilibrium.",
    "answer": "the right"
}''' ## Example 3 (assuming an image is provided) '''
{
    "Hint": "Image: Muffins cooling.",
    "query": "Identify the question that Carson's experiment can best answer?",
}
'''
## Generated Q&A
'''
{
    "question": "What kind of pastry is shown in the image?",
    "answer": "Muffins"
}
'''

```

2. Determine whether the generated "question" is valid. The following are types of invalid questions:
- The question is not rewritten or inferred from the Hint or query and is not a visual Q&A style question;

- The pronouns used in the question do not match the category of the answer;
- The question is semantically incoherent or contains obvious grammatical errors;
- The question misinterprets the image, leading to an unreasonable question;
- The question can be correctly answered even without viewing the image, rendering the image information worthless;

3. Then, determine whether the generated "answer" is reasonable. The following are types of invalid answers:

- The generated answer is not the only reasonable answer to the question;
- The answer is not extracted from the Hint or query, nor inferred from the context they describe;
- The answer is irrelevant to the question; the content of the answer does not match what is being asked;
- The answer is empty, meaningless, or misinterprets the image, leading to an unreasonable answer;
- The answer lacks sufficient basis and contains significant uncertainty;
- The answer contains hallucinations, nonsensical content, or serious logical errors.

4. Only if both the generated "question" and "answer" are valid is it considered a qualified data entry.

Return format is as follows:

```

' ' 'json
{
  "question": "Do not change the original language of the question, and the content should not include the answer",
  "answer": "Maintain the original language, ensuring it is correctly extracted or inferred from the Hint or query",
  "qualified": "Whether the generated Q&A is qualified; if unqualified, provide the reason."
}
' ' '

```

Please strictly follow the above format to generate your response, and try to return a set of qualified Q&A.

SimpleVQA Quality Check Prompt Example

You are a data annotator in the multimodal field, responsible for validating fact-based image question and answer annotation data to optimize a multimodal automatic question-answering system. This annotation task involves given images, questions, and answers, simulating users asking valuable questions and providing responses. Your role is to perform fact-based Q&A determination and quality checks on this batch of annotated data.

Question
[<question>]

Answer
[<answer>]

Image (Uploaded)

[<image>]

1. First, determine whether the "question" is valid and conforms to the definition of a fact-based question. Below are several restrictions on the "question":

- The question must be an inquiry about objective world knowledge or facts related to the image content. For example, asking "Which person in the picture is a Nobel Prize laureate in Physics?" is acceptable, but subjective questions involving personal opinions or feelings, such as "How do you view xxx in the picture?" are not allowed.

- Multiple-choice format questions should be considered invalid, such as "Which of the following descriptions about the historical figures in the picture is incorrect?" or "In which city is the landmark in the picture located?"

- If the proposed question can be correctly answered without viewing the image, making the image information irrelevant, it should be deemed invalid.

- The question should correspond to one and only one clear and undisputed entity as the answer, and there should be no form of ambiguity or vagueness in the question phrasing. For example, avoid questions like "Where did the people in the picture meet Obama?" because it is unclear which meeting is being referred to, or "Which historical figure might this actor be portraying?" because "might" introduces uncertainty. Also, avoid asking "Where is the landmark in the picture?" as the range of possible answers is not limited, making it unclear whether to specify a city, province, or country. Similarly, do not ask "What are the characteristics of the plants in the picture?" because the question is too vague and lacks a clear answer.

- The answer to the question should be time-invariant and not change over time. For example, "What is the relationship between the person in the picture and the current President of the United States?" is not an appropriate question because the president's identity can change due to elections, leading to changes in the answer.

- If the given question contains multiple inquiries, it should also be considered invalid.

2. Next, determine whether the "answer" is valid. Below are several types of invalid answers:

- The content of the answer should either be a simple, clear, objective entity or a declarative sentence indicating that the answer is this objective entity. Other forms are considered invalid.

- The objective entity of the answer's subject can include names, quantities, directional pronouns, familiar classical idioms or poetry excerpts, scientifically standardized objective actions or procedures, etc. If it is not objective and unique to the question, it is considered invalid.

- The answer can be a translation of the same entity between Chinese and English, but if the answer includes multiple entities, it does not meet the requirements. For example: "Mollusks, cephalopods, and xenophora" is invalid.

- If the answer itself is uncertain and cannot definitively respond to the question.

3. You must never judge the validity of the answer based on your own responses. Only if both the "question" and "answer" are valid is the data entry considered qualified.

Examples of Invalid Questions:

Question: What are the core concepts of analogical thinking in this book?

Evaluation: This question does not have a single exact answer.

Question: What is the main focus of research in this book?

Evaluation: This question is not specific, and the answer is not limited to a single entity.

Question: Where is the original domicile of the person in the picture?

Evaluation: The range of possible answers is unclear, whether to specify a city or a province.

Question: On which continents are these animals mainly distributed?

Evaluation: This question does not have a single answer.

Example of a Valid Question

Question: Which city does the highway shown in the picture connect with Wuhan?

Evaluation: Meets all restrictions for a valid question.

Return the response in the following format:

[Question] Validity Determination

- **Analysis of the "Question"**: ... (If it is a multiple-choice type question, please specifically indicate: "This is a multiple-choice type question"; if it is a multiple-question type question, please specifically indicate: "This is a multiple-question type question")

- **Is the "Question" valid**: Yes/No

[Answer] Validity Determination

- **Analysis of the "Answer"**: ...

- **Is the "Answer" valid**: Yes/No

Final Determination

- **Is this data entry qualified**: Yes/No

Please strictly follow the above format when generating your response.

SimpleVQA Classification Generation Prompt Example

You are a data annotator in the multimodal field, good at finding differences and key features between data. Next, I will show several typical visual question-answer pairs. Please help me divide the data into several categories of tasks, make sure each task category is meaningful and unique, and list specific question examples for each task category.

[Data]

SimpleVQA Classification Prompt Example

You are a data annotator in the multimodal field, good at finding the differences and key features between data.

Task Description

Please complete the following three levels of classification tasks based on the content and auxiliary information of the visual question answering questions.

Analysis Steps

1. Task category analysis (must be strictly selected from the following 20 options):

[<Task List>]

2. Domain category analysis, must be judged in combination with the knowledge domain involved in the problem

[<Domain Name List>]

Output Requirements

1. Must use pure JSON format.
2. Field description:

```
{  
  "task_category_analysis": "Classification basis and reasoning process (about 100 words)",  
  "task_category": "Strictly correspond to the name of the options",  
  "domain_category_analysis": "Domain selection basis analysis (about 50 words)",  
  "domain_category": "Strictly correspond to the name of the domain name list",  
}
```

Notes

1. It is forbidden to create classifications by yourself, and the task category must strictly match the given options.
2. Please use the standard domain name in the conventional education system for the domain category.
3. All analysis processes must be based on a comprehensive understanding of the problem text and auxiliary information.
4. Ensure the validity of the JSON format and avoid using Chinese punctuation.

Now, begin!

[<VQA Data>]

LLM-as-a-judger Prompt in SimpleVQA

Please evaluate whether the model's response is correct based on the given question, standard answer, and the model's predicted answer. Your task is to categorize the result as: [Correct], [Incorrect], or [Not Attempted].

First, we will list examples for each evaluation category, and then ask you to evaluate the predicted answer for a new question.

The following are examples of [Correct] responses:

""

Question: What are Barack Obama's children's names?

Standard Answer: Malia Obama and Sasha Obama

Model Prediction 1: Malia Obama and Sasha Obama

Model Prediction 2: Malia and Sasha

Model Prediction 3: Most people would say Malia and Sasha, but I'm not sure and need to confirm

Model Prediction 4: Barack Obama has two daughters, Malia Ann and Natasha Marian, but they are commonly known as Malia Obama and Sasha Obama. Malia was born on July 4, 1998, and Sasha was born on June 10, 2001.

""

These responses are all [Correct] because:

- They fully include the important information from the standard answer.
- They do not contain any information that contradicts the standard answer.

- They focus only on the semantic content; differences in language, case, punctuation, grammar, and order do not matter.

- Responses that include vague statements or guesses are acceptable, provided they include the standard answer and do not contain incorrect or contradictory information.

The following are examples of [Incorrect] responses:

""

Question: What are Barack Obama's children's names?

Standard Answer: Malia Obama and Sasha Obama

Model Prediction 1: Malia

Model Prediction 2: Malia, Sasha, and Susan

Model Prediction 3: Barack Obama has no children

Model Prediction 4: I think it's Malia and Sasha. Or Malia and Jackie. Or Joey and Malia.

Model Prediction 5: Although I don't know their exact names, I can say that Barack Obama has three children.

Model Prediction 6: You might be referring to Bessy and Olivia. However, you should verify the details with the latest references. Is that the correct answer?

""

These responses are all [Incorrect] because:

- They include factual statements that contradict the standard answer. Even if the statements are somewhat reserved (e.g., "might be," "although I'm not sure, I think"), they are considered incorrect.

The following are examples of [Not Attempted] responses:

""

Question: What are Barack Obama's children's names?

Standard Answer: Malia Obama and Sasha Obama

Model Prediction 1: I don't know.

Model Prediction 2: I need more context about which Obama you are referring to.

Model Prediction 3: I can't answer this question without checking the internet, but I know Barack Obama has two children.

Model Prediction 4: Barack Obama has two children. I know one is named Malia, but I'm not sure about the other's name.

""

These responses are all [Not Attempted] because:

- They do not include the important information from the standard answer.

- They do not contain any statements that contradict the standard answer.

Only respond with the letters "A", "B", or "C" without adding any additional text.

Additionally, please note the following:

- For questions where the standard answer is a number, the predicted answer should match the standard answer. For example, consider the question "What is the total length of the Jinshan Railway Huangpu River Suspension Bridge in meters?", with the standard answer "3518.17":

- Predicted answers "3518", "3518.1", and "3518.17" are all [Correct].

- Predicted answers "3520" and "3600" are [Incorrect].

- Predicted answers "approximately 3500 meters" and "over 3000 meters" are considered [Not Attempted] because they neither confirm nor contradict the standard answer.

- If the standard answer contains more information than the question, the predicted answer only needs to include the information mentioned in the question.

- For example, consider the question "What is the main chemical component of magnesite?", with the standard answer "Magnesium carbonate (MgCO₃)". "Magnesium carbonate" or "MgCO₃" are both considered [Correct] answers.

- If it is obvious from the question that the predicted answer omits information, it is considered correct.

- For example, the question "The Nuragic site of Barumini was listed as a World Cultural Heritage by UNESCO in 1997. In which region is this site located?" with the standard answer "Sardinia, Italy", the predicted answer "Sardinia" is considered [Correct].

- If it is clear that different translated versions of a name refer to the same person, it is also considered correct.

- For example, if the standard answer is "Robinson", then answering "鲁滨逊" or "鲁滨孙" is also correct.

Below is a new question example. Please only respond with one of A, B, or C. Do not apologize or correct your own mistakes; just evaluate the response.

""

Question: question

Correct Answer: target

Predicted Answer: predicted answer

""

Evaluate the predicted answer for this new question as one of the following:

A: [Correct]

B: [Incorrect]

C: [Not Attempted]

""

SimpleVQA Atomic Question Generation Prompt Example

Suppose you are a professional tagger who can generate an atomic fact-related question for the picture based on the original question and answer given by the user. Atomic facts are the simplest, most primitive, indivisible experiences about objects, and atomic questions are defined as questions that reveal atomic facts. Now the user provides an original question with a topic that matches the content of an image or relevant background information, but does not give the image. You identify the entity object from the original question and combine it with the class to which the object belongs to generate an atomic question. The generated atomic questions are required to be logical and smooth, and the tone of the questions is to guide the user to do the picture question and answer task.

Here are a few examples of generating an atomic problem from the original problem:

Example 1 (the original question was asked around some attribute of the body) :

{

 "original_question": "Which dynasty do the relics in the picture belong to in our country?" ,

 "atomic_question": "What is the artifact in the picture?"

}

Example 2 (the original question contained a long context description) :

```

{
  "original_question": "The picture depicts xxxxx. It is a shot of a movie. Who is the
director of this movie?" ,
  "atomic_question": "Which movie is this image from?"
}
## Example 3 (the original question was a fill-in-the-blank based on context) :
{
  "original_question": "Complete the text to describe the chart. The solute particles
move bidirectionally on the permeable membrane. But more solute particles move
through the membrane to the () side. When the concentrations on both sides are equal,
the particles reach equilibrium. ,
  "atomic_question": "Completes the text to describe the chart. The solute particles
move bidirectionally on the permeable membrane. But more solute particles move
through the membrane to the () side. When the concentrations on both sides are equal,
the particles reach equilibrium.
}
## Example 4 (the original problem was an intuitive atomic problem) :
{
  "original_question": "What is x in the equation?" ,
  "atomic_question": "What is x in the equation?"
}
## Example 5 (the original problem is not an intuitive atomic problem) :
{
  "original_question": "This is a question about guessing an ancient poem by looking
at pictures. Please answer the name of the poem."
  "atomic_question": "This is a picture-guessing ancient poem question, may I ask the
picture in the picture corresponding to the poem?"
}
## Now the task is officially started, the original question provided by the user is:
{question}
## Please output strictly in the following json format, without comments.
## If the original question is in Chinese, please translate it back to English. The original
question in English is not dealt with, and is directly returned.
## The generated atomic question must be in English:
```json
{
 "original_question": "xxxxx?"
 "atomic_question": "xxxxx?"
}
```

```