

What Is a Good Caption? A Comprehensive Visual Caption Benchmark for Evaluating Both Correctness and Coverage of MLLMs

Zhihang Liu^{1*}, Chen-Wei Xie², Bin Wen², Feiwu Yu², Jixuan Chen²,
Boqiang Zhang^{1,2}, Nianzu Yang^{2,3}, Pandeng Li^{1,2}, Yun Zheng², Hongtao Xie^{1†}

¹ University of Science and Technology of China

² Alibaba Group ³ Shanghai Jiao Tong University

{liuzhihang, cyril, lpd}@mail.ustc.edu.cn, yangnianzu@sjtu.edu.cn, htjie@ustc.edu.cn
{eniaticxcw, leiang.wb, feiwu.yfw, chenjixuan.cjx, zhengyun.zy}@alibaba-inc.com

Abstract

Recent advancements in Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) have rendered traditional visual captioning benchmarks obsolete, as they primarily evaluate short descriptions with outdated metrics. While recent benchmarks address these limitations by decomposing captions into visual elements and adopting model-based evaluation, they remain incomplete—overlooking critical aspects, while providing vague, non-explanatory scores. To bridge this gap, we propose CV-CapBench, a Comprehensive Visual Caption Benchmark that systematically evaluates caption quality across 6 views and 13 dimensions. CV-CapBench introduces precision, recall, and hit rate metrics for each dimension, uniquely assessing both correctness and coverage. Experiments on leading MLLMs reveal significant capability gaps, particularly in dynamic and knowledge-intensive dimensions. These findings provide actionable insights for future research. The code and data will be released.

1. Introduction

Visual captioning, which translates visual content into textual descriptions, is a fundamental task for both image and video understanding [13, 36], and is a significant basis for image and video generation. To assess the capabilities of this task, several caption benchmarks were established by researchers in earlier years [1, 7, 34, 35].

However, with the rapid development of recent MLLMs [8, 17, 18, 21, 23, 26, 28, 39, 42], these traditional benchmarks have become outdated. This can be attributed to two main reasons: 1) The ground truths of traditional benchmarks often contain short sentences, missing

many details. In contrast, recent MLLMs can produce much more detailed and fine-grained captions than the ground truths. 2) Traditional benchmarks use rule-based metrics, such as BLEU [25] and CIDER [29], to directly compare the similarity between generated captions and ground-truth sentences, which are highly sensitive to sentence style and make evaluations unreliable.

Recently, new visual caption benchmarks have been introduced to update the outdated ones. Inspired by scene graphs, DetailCaps [11] and CompreCap [22] focus on evaluating modern image MLLMs by extracting objects, attributes, and relations from image captions and proposing new model-based evaluation metrics. Dream-1K [6] emphasizes evaluating video events by dividing video captions into several events. VDC [6] extracts objects, background, and camera elements from both candidate and human-annotated captions, then compares these elements for scoring. Compared to traditional benchmarks, these new approaches change the ground truths from complete sentences to visual elements and update evaluation methods from rule-based to model-based, improving the reliability of benchmarking.

However, the evaluation of these benchmarks remains incomplete. They focus on limited visual elements, inadequately covering the captions. For instance, they often overlook aspects like scene, text, and style. Their evaluation methods tend to assign vague scores, resulting in weak explainability and limited guidance on the model’s capabilities in various aspects. For example, though VDC [6] considers three aspects, its evaluation methods only calculate accuracy, neglecting the significance of visual element coverage in captions. We believe that considering both the accuracy and coverage of visual elements offers a better principle for visual captioning. In this paper, we introduce a new **Comprehensive Visual Caption Benchmark** (CV-CapBench) with 6 views and 13 dimensions, evaluat-

*Interns at Alibaba Group

†Corresponding author




Figure 1. An example of image caption (left) and video caption (right). By analyzing the components of captions. We conclude 9 static dimensions and 4 dynamic dimensions, which all contribute to a detailed and comprehensive caption. The static dimensions are shared on both image and video. For video data, there are additional dynamic dimensions as they need to be judged with temporal relations.

ing both accuracy and coverage with 3 metrics for each dimension. To our knowledge, we are the first to heuristically highlight the accuracy and coverage capability gap of MLLMs in different views, guiding researchers to enhance these capabilities across dimensions.

To assess caption capabilities from various aspects, we have designed 9 static and 4 dynamic dimensions, which together contribute to a complete visual caption, as illustrated in Fig. 1. We classify dimensions as dynamic or static based on the following principle: descriptions obtainable from a single frame are static, while those requiring the entire video are dynamic. We analyze that all these dimensions contribute to a comprehensive caption across various data types. We gather nearly 1,000 images/videos for each dimension, pre-annotate them using state-of-the-art MLLMs with our proposed *one represents all* strategy, and subsequently manually correct each sample. Since a caption cannot capture everything in an image or video, we calculate precision and recall, introducing a new hit rate metric for each dimension, thereby benchmarking not only accuracy but also the comprehensiveness of visual content coverage. We evaluate several popular MLLMs using our CV-CapBench and find that they still struggle in some dimensions, indicating future directions for improved visual captioning.

2. Related Work

Multi-modal large language models. Based on the significant development of Large Language Models (LLMs) among various linguistic tasks [4, 10, 12, 37], many works try to extend the powerful capabilities into multi-modal understanding. By integrating visual content into LLMs, Multi-modal Large Language Models (MLLMs) also gain

huge achievements [2, 9, 18–20, 23, 42]. Apart from image content, recent MLLMs shift attention to expanding video understanding capabilities based on the pre-trained weights from image models [8, 17, 21, 28, 31, 39–41]. With rapid development, recent MLLMs are powerful enough to describe both the image and video content in detail, which makes the traditional benchmarks with short captions outdated. More and more methods even try to produce re-captioned detailed descriptions by models rather than existing short captions to train their model [17, 39]. Therefore, it is urgent to propose a new visual caption benchmark that adapts to nowadays MLLMs.

Visual caption benchmarks. Visual Caption is a fundamental task in computer vision. Early visual caption benchmarks, such as MS-COCO [7], NoCaps [1], MSR-VTT [35], and VATEX [34], usually contain a short sentence with limited visual information as the ground truth. They also use metrics like BLEU [25], CIDER [29], and METEOR [3] to calculate the matching score directly between two sentences, which is easy to be affected by the sentence style. To overcome these issues, DetailCaps [11] and CompreCap [22] explore evaluating the objects, attributes, and relations in image captions, and they calculate the matching score using MLLMs, making scores more reliable. Dream-1K [30] evaluates the events in video captions and calculates the precision and recall between the ground truth and candidates. VDC [6] evaluates the video captions from the object, background, and camera level, with subsequently calculating the accuracy. However, all of their evaluations are incomplete, and still give vague scores for captions. On the contrary, we are the first time to propose a comprehensive visual caption benchmark covering both image and video data with 6 views and 13 dimensions, evalu-




Figure 2. The data source count and distribution of each dimension. We collect nearly 1,000 images/videos for each dimension, crawl parts of data by ourselves, and sample some data from existing datasets to ensure diversity.




Figure 3. The pipeline of our data annotation for each dimension.

ating not only correctness but also coverage of captions.

3. CV-CapBench

3.1. Multiple Dimension Data Annotation

Design of dimensions. As shown in Fig. 1, we design 9 static dimensions for both video and image, and 4 dynamic dimensions for video, covering most of what makes up a visual caption. For image data, or if only a specific frame is needed for video data to complete the corresponding description in the caption, it can be regarded as a static dimension. For descriptions that cannot be described with single frame, which usually related to temporal information, we take them as dynamic dimensions, which are harder than static ones. We can also classify the dimensions based on the view of caption, as shown in Tab. 1.

Data collection. For convenience and problem simplification, we only collect image data for static dimensions and video data for dynamic dimensions. This is based on the common sense that the video understanding capabilities for MLLMs are usually built upon sufficient image understanding capabilities [8, 39–41]. Since an image or a video cannot cover all these dimensions of information, we directly collect nearly 1,000 images or videos for each dimension independently, and evaluate each dimension separately as sub-tasks. For static dimensions, we mainly collect images from SA-1B [16], COYO-700M [5], Wukong [14], Wikipaintings [15], and we also crawl some data from multiple websites by ourselves. We also borrow parts of image data and annotations from CompreCap [22] for spatial rela-

tion dimension. For dynamic dimensions, we also crawl and cut videos from multiple websites for camera movement dimension, borrow videos from Dream-1K [30] for action and event dimensions, and borrow videos from VSI-Bench [38]. Fig. 2 shows our data sources for each dimension and their proportion.

The one represents all pre-annotation strategy. For object-related dimensions, it is extremely hard to annotate all objects within an image or a video, as the categories of objects can be divided by almost infinite granularity [27, 32, 33]. Therefore, we do not pursue the most comprehensive annotation possible for each single sample, but randomly select an object from the objects in the image and reflect the accuracy and coverage through the evaluation of a large number of samples. We name this strategy as *One Represents All*. According to the law of large numbers, the distribution of randomly selected objects can approximate the expectation of covering different granularities of the entire image with a large amount of samples, thus ensuring the unbiased nature of the benchmark. Therefore, the key of this annotation strategy is to keep the selection of objects as random as possible. To avoid human’s random bias on selecting objects, we ask the most three SOTA MLLMs, *i.e.*, GPT-4o [24], Gemini-1.5-pro [26], and Qwen-VL-Max [31] to list all objects at the granularity they deem appropriate in an image. We finally use Qwen2.5-Max [37] to merge the object results together and randomly select one from the merged list to obtain the pre-annotated results of object category dimension. For other object-related dimensions, we follow the strategy to randomly select objects, and further pre-annotate other attributes, *e.g.*, number, color, spatial relations. For other dimensions, we also pre-annotate them with models for convenience and simplicity of further human annotations and data balance.

Human annotation. For different dimensions, we design different tasks for human annotators. For example, human annotators are asked to only judge right or wrong for object category since we need to keep the randomness. As

Table 1. Views of our designed dimensions. We can treat a caption from the listed six views, and then split each of them into several dimensions.

Views	Dimensions
Object-Related	Object Category, Object Color, (Dynamic) Object Number, Spatial Relation
Global-Related	Scene, Style
Text-Related	OCR
Camera-Related	Camera Angle, Camera Movement
Temporal-Related	Action, Event
Knowledge-Related	Character Identification

for other dimensions, we ask annotators to check the pre-annotations one-by-one, and correct them if there are any mistakes. We pre-define fixed categories for the style, camera angle, and camera movement dimensions, which needs annotators to select the correct option. For other dimensions, we keep the annotation open-set to ensure diversity, which need annotators to modify the annotation by themselves.

Data balance. After the annotation and validation, the data of some dimensions (*e.g.*, the number and color) shows a long-tailed distribution. We further suppress the data of head categories, and sample more from tail categories, making the distribution more balanced. The final distribution of each dimension is shown in ??.

3.2. Multiple Dimension Evaluation

For the same caption, we evaluate it within each dimension separately, which can be considered as 14 different sub-tasks. Different from matching the similarity between the caption and annotations, we use GPT-4 Turbo to take scores for each dimension. We use a similar prompt template for all pre-defined dimension, (*i.e.*, style, camera angle, and camera movement) and use another similar prompt template open-set dimension. In Fig. 4, we take the object number dimension and camera movement dimension as examples, to show our prompts for evaluation. Specifically, we ask GPT-4 Turbo to judge the caption into the following three situations:

- Miss, which means the caption does not mention the corresponding content about the dimension.
- Positive, which means the caption mentions the corresponding content, and describes correctly.
- Negative, which means the caption mentions the corresponding content, but gives a wrong description.

As all data can be judged into these three situations, we can then calculate these three metrics: 1) **Precision**, which represents the accuracy on all mentioned samples. 2) **Recall**, which represents the accuracy on all samples. 3) **Hit rate**, which represents the referring ratio about the dimension in visual caption. They can be calculated by:

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{N(\text{Postive})}{N(\text{All}) - N(\text{Miss})}, \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{N(\text{Postive})}{N(\text{All})}, \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Hit Rate} = \frac{N(\text{All}) - N(\text{Miss})}{N(\text{All})}. \quad (3)$$

4. Experiments

4.1. Experimental Setups

For comprehensively evaluating the state-of-the-art (SOTA) models, we both choose several popular open-source and close-source MLLMs. For open-source models, we evaluate InternVL2.5 [8], LLaVA-OneVision [17], NVILA [21], VideoLLaMA3 [39], and Qwen2.5VL [28] with their different LLM sizes. For all models, we use the prompt "Please describe the image in detail" for image dimension, the prompt "Please describe the video in detail" for video dimension. We temporarily use Qwen2.5-72B [37] to take scores for generated captions to complete our evaluation.

4.2. Evaluation Analysis

Precision and recall. As shown in Table 2, our comprehensive evaluation reveals critical insights into MLLMs' captioning capabilities across static and dynamic dimensions. First, while all models achieve strong precision in static dimensions like OCR (93.39–97.68%) and Object Category (67.44–75.66%), their recall rates in these categories remain modest (69.18–77.91% for OCR; 66.90–75.66% for Object Category), indicating a trade-off between accuracy and coverage: models prioritize describing fewer elements correctly rather than comprehensively capturing all relevant details. Second, dynamic dimensions expose significant weaknesses. For instance, Camera Movement yields alarmingly low recall (0.40–10.37%) and F1-scores (0.77–13.14%), suggesting models largely fail to interpret temporal or motion-related visual cues. Similarly, Dynamic Object Number achieves sub-20% precision for most models (*e.g.*, 18.69% for NVILA-8B), revealing their inability to track object quantity changes over time. Third, we observe notable performance variance across models. Qwen2.5VL-7B leads in average precision (66.11%) due to its strength in Spatial Relation (89.39%) and OCR (97.68%), while LLaVA-OneVision-7B excels in recall (42.32%) and F1-score (50.63%), attributed to its balanced performance in Scene (76.58% precision, 75.78% recall) and Action (34.66% precision, 33.40% recall). However, even top-performing models struggle with Character Identification (recall: 2.75–9.73%), highlighting a critical gap in recognizing nuanced entity relationships. Finally, the weak correlation between precision and recall across

```

Object Number
object_number_user_prompt = "Given an image caption and the number of an object with format {object: number} as follows:\n"
f"Image Caption: {caption}\n"
f"Object Number: {{{object_category}: {object_number}}}\n"
f"Please analyze the image caption. Determine whether the provided object number is correctly described in the caption, and explain why. You may need to count in the caption to determine how many the provided objects it describes.\n"
"Give score of 0 if the caption does not mention the specific number of provided object (including the use of words such as 'some' and 'various' in the caption rather than giving specific numbers) or not mention the provided object. Give score of 1 if the caption describes the object number correctly. Give score only of -1 if the caption gives the wrong number.\n"
"Output a JSON formed as:\n"
"{\"object_number\": \"copy the provided {object: number} here\", \"score\": \"put your score here\", \"reason\": \"give your reason here\"}\n"
"DO NOT PROVIDE ANY OTHER OUTPUT TEXT OR EXPLANATION. Only output the JSON. Do not add Markdown syntax. Output:"

Camera Movement
camera_movement_category_explains = [
"left: the camera angle swings left (pan left), or the camera moves left (track left)",
"right: the camera angle swings right (pan right), or the camera moves right (track right)",
"up: the camera angle swings up (tilt up), or the camera moves up (boom up)",
"down: the camera angle swings down (tilt down), or the camera moves down (boom down)",
"in: camera pushes toward the subject (dolly in), or enlarges the frame (zoom in)",
"out: camera moves away the subject (dolly out), or expands the visible area, making the subject appear smaller (zoom out)",
"fixed: camera is almost fixed and does not change",
]
camera_movement_categories = [c.split(":")[0] for c in camera_movement_category_explains]
camera_movement_user_prompt = "Given a video caption, your task is to determine which kind of camera movement is included in the caption.\n"
f"Video Caption: {caption}\n"
f"Please analyze the video caption and classify the descriptions of camera movement into the following categories: {camera_movement_categories}\n"
f"Here are the explanations of each category: " + "\n".join(camera_movement_category_explains) + "\n"
f"If the caption explicitly mentions one of the above camera movement categories, write the result of the category into the 'pred' value of the json string. Note do not infer the camera movement categories from the whole caption. You should only search the descriptions about the camera movement. If there is no description of the camera movement in the video caption or the description does not belong to any of the above categories, write 'N/A' into the 'pred' value of the json string.\n"
"Output a JSON formed as:\n"
"{\"pred\": \"put your predicted category here\", \"reason\": \"give your reason here\"}\n"
"DO NOT PROVIDE ANY OTHER OUTPUT TEXT OR EXPLANATION. Only output the JSON. Do not add Markdown syntax. Output:"

```

Figure 4. Two prompt examples for different types of evaluation sub-tasks. The example of object number represents the open-set matching sub-tasks, and the example of camera movement represents the close-set classification sub-tasks.

Table 2. The precision, recall, and F1-score of 7B methods on all dimensions. The precision represents the accuracy of what the models have described. The recall shows how many visual elements in the image can be described correctly. F1-Score is the harmonic mean of precision and recall.

	Methods	Object Category	Object Number	Object Color	Spatial Relation	Scene	Camera Angle	OCR	Style	Character Identification	Dynamic Object Number	Action	Camera Movement	Average
Precision	InternVL2.5-8B	67.44	54.21	76.65	87.22	66.60	46.00	95.83	78.08	77.42	20.97	21.99	22.86	59.61
	LLaVA-OneVision-7B	75.66	58.02	73.53	83.57	76.58	36.78	93.39	78.77	81.08	45.98	34.66	17.94	63.00
	NVILA-8B	71.39	51.35	74.42	83.11	69.43	50.86	96.00	74.37	85.00	18.69	25.44	10.81	59.24
	VideoLLaMA3-7B	73.98	53.64	74.30	84.67	76.53	51.28	97.01	76.20	70.37	23.16	28.42	23.77	61.11
	Qwen2.5VL-7B	70.85	56.97	75.00	89.39	68.95	55.07	97.68	79.45	86.27	37.18	34.04	42.50	66.11
Recall	InternVL2.5-8B	66.90	19.90	45.57	42.43	65.55	2.58	75.83	76.75	2.75	6.90	20.34	3.22	35.73
	LLaVA-OneVision-7B	74.60	32.06	52.82	52.56	75.78	3.59	69.18	78.38	6.86	18.23	33.40	10.37	42.32
	NVILA-8B	71.10	25.57	51.81	43.43	69.00	6.62	73.11	73.62	9.73	9.56	23.58	0.40	38.13
	VideoLLaMA3-7B	72.95	29.59	53.58	52.06	75.57	6.73	72.92	75.90	4.36	3.89	26.52	5.35	39.95
	Qwen2.5VL-7B	70.50	24.43	46.78	48.14	68.37	4.27	77.91	78.50	5.05	20.53	32.29	6.85	40.30
F1-Score	InternVL2.5-8B	67.17	29.11	57.16	57.09	66.07	4.89	84.66	77.41	5.31	10.38	21.13	5.64	44.68
	LLaVA-OneVision-7B	75.13	41.30	61.48	64.53	76.18	6.54	79.48	78.57	12.65	26.11	34.02	13.14	50.63
	NVILA-8B	71.24	34.14	61.09	57.05	69.21	11.72	83.01	73.99	17.46	12.65	24.47	0.77	46.39
	VideoLLaMA3-7B	73.46	38.14	62.26	64.48	76.05	11.90	83.26	76.05	8.21	6.66	27.44	8.73	48.32
	Qwen2.5VL-7B	70.67	34.20	57.62	62.58	68.66	7.93	86.68	78.97	9.54	26.45	33.14	11.80	50.08

Table 3. The hit rate of 7B methods on all dimensions, which shows how much information of each dimension can be described in the caption. It represents the absolute coverage of the caption in each dimension, without considering whether the caption is correct or not.

Methods	Object Category	Object Number	Object Color	Spatial Relation	Scene	Camera Angle	OCR	Style	Character Identification	Dynamic Object Number	Action	Camera Movement	Average
InternVL2.5-8B	99.20	36.70	59.46	48.65	98.43	5.61	79.13	98.30	3.55	32.92	92.51	14.08	55.71
LLaVA-OneVision-7B	98.60	55.26	71.83	62.89	98.96	9.76	74.07	99.50	8.47	39.65	96.36	57.80	64.43
NVILA-8B	99.60	49.79	69.62	52.26	99.37	13.02	76.16	99.00	11.44	51.15	92.71	3.72	59.82
VideoLLaMA3-7B	98.60	55.15	72.10	61.48	98.75	13.13	75.17	99.60	6.20	16.81	93.32	22.50	59.40
Qwen2.5VL-7B	99.50	42.89	62.37	53.86	99.16	7.75	79.76	98.80	5.86	55.22	94.84	16.11	59.68

dimensions underscores the necessity of evaluating both metrics: high precision does not guarantee comprehensive coverage. For example, InternVL2.5-8B achieves 95.83% OCR precision but only 75.83% recall, failing to detect

nearly a quarter of text instances. These findings validate CV-CapBench’s ability to diagnose multifaceted capability gaps, guiding future research toward improving temporal reasoning, entity disambiguation, and coverage robustness.

Hit rate. Table 3 reveals a pronounced disparity in models’ coverage tendencies across dimensions. While static dimensions like Object Category (98.60–99.60%) and Scene (98.43–99.37%) achieve near-perfect hit rates—indicating models consistently attempt to describe these elements—dynamic dimensions such as Camera Movement (3.72–57.80%) and Character Identification (3.55–11.44%) suffer severe under-coverage. Notably, LLaVA-OneVision-7B attains the highest average hit rate (64.43%), driven by its aggressive coverage of Action (96.36%) and Camera Movement (57.80%), yet this contrasts with its moderate precision/recall in these categories (Table 2), suggesting a quantity-over-accuracy strategy. Conversely, models like InternVL2.5-8B exhibit conservative coverage (average hit rate: 55.71%), prioritizing fewer but potentially accurate descriptions. The starkly low hit rates for Dynamic Object Number (16.81–55.22%) and Camera Angle (5.61–13.13%) across all models further validate the need for improved temporal and spatial awareness in MLLMs.

4.3. More Results

More experimental results with more robust evaluation methods are coming soon.

5. Conclusion

The rapid advancement of MLLMs has rendered traditional visual captioning benchmarks inadequate, as they focus on short captions and simplistic rule-based metrics. While recent benchmarks address partial limitations by decomposing captions into elements like objects and relations, they still overlook critical dimensions (e.g., scene context, text, temporal dynamics) and fail to systematically evaluate both accuracy and coverage. To bridge this gap, we propose CV-CapBench, the first comprehensive benchmark for MLLMs that evaluates caption quality across 6 views and 13 dimensions. By introducing precision (accuracy of described elements), recall (coverage of ground-truth elements), and hit rate (coverage attempt rate), CV-CapBench provides fine-grained insights into models’ captioning capabilities. Our experiments on leading 7B-scale MLLMs reveal significant shortcomings: (1) Models prioritize static elements (e.g., object categories, OCR) but neglect dynamic dimensions like camera movement (F1-score: 0.77–13.14%) and action (F1-score: 21.13–34.02%); (2) Coverage attempts (hit rate) for entity-centric dimensions (character identification: 3.55–11.44%) remain alarmingly low despite high precision in simpler tasks; (3) No single model dominates all dimensions, exposing trade-offs between accuracy (Qwen2.5VL-7B leads) and coverage (LLaVA-OneVision-7B excels). CV-CapBench not only diagnoses current limitations but also guides future research directions: improving temporal reasoning for dynamic scenes, enhancing rare entity recognition, and balancing accuracy-coverage trade-offs. We will

release the benchmark dataset and evaluation toolkit to foster community progress toward holistic visual understanding.

References

- [1] Harsh Agrawal, Karan Desai, Yufei Wang, Xinlei Chen, Rishabh Jain, Mark Johnson, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, Stefan Lee, and Peter Anderson. Nocaps: Novel object captioning at scale. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 8948–8957, 2019. 1, 2
- [2] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-vl: A frontier large vision-language model with versatile abilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12966*, 2023. 2
- [3] Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. Meteor: An automatic metric for mt evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the acl workshop on intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation measures for machine translation and/or summarization*, pages 65–72, 2005. 2
- [4] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020. 2
- [5] Minwoo Byeon, Beomhee Park, Haecheon Kim, Sungjun Lee, Woonhyuk Baek, and Saehoon Kim. Coyo-700m: Image-text pair dataset. <https://github.com/kakaobrain/coyo-dataset>, 2022. 3
- [6] Wenhao Chai, Enxin Song, Yilun Du, Chenlin Meng, Vashisht Madhavan, Omer Bar-Tal, Jeng-Neng Hwang, Saining Xie, and Christopher D Manning. Auroracap: Efficient, performant video detailed captioning and a new benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.03051*, 2024. 1, 2
- [7] Xinlei Chen, Hao Fang, Tsung-Yi Lin, Ramakrishna Vedantam, Saurabh Gupta, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco captions: Data collection and evaluation server. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.00325*, 2015. 1, 2
- [8] Zhe Chen, Weiyun Wang, Yue Cao, Yangzhou Liu, Zhangwei Gao, Erfei Cui, Jinguo Zhu, Shenglong Ye, Hao Tian, Zhaoyang Liu, et al. Expanding performance boundaries of open-source multimodal models with model, data, and test-time scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.05271*, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 4
- [9] Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhao Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Muyan Zhong, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 24185–24198, 2024. 2
- [10] Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality. <https://lmsys.org/blog/2023-03-30-vicuna/>, 2023. 2

- [11] Hongyuan Dong, Jiawen Li, Bohong Wu, Jiacong Wang, Yuan Zhang, and Haoyuan Guo. Benchmarking and improving detail image caption. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19092*, 2024. 1, 2
- [12] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024. 2
- [13] Hao Fang, Saurabh Gupta, Forrest Iandola, Rupesh K Srivastava, Li Deng, Piotr Dollár, Jianfeng Gao, Xiaodong He, Margaret Mitchell, John C Platt, et al. From captions to visual concepts and back. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1473–1482, 2015. 1
- [14] Jiayi Gu, Xiaojun Meng, Guansong Lu, Lu Hou, Niu Minzhe, Xiaodan Liang, Lewei Yao, Runhui Huang, Wei Zhang, Xin Jiang, et al. Wukong: A 100 million large-scale chinese cross-modal pre-training benchmark. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:26418–26431, 2022. 3
- [15] Sergey Karayev, Matthew Trentacoste, Helen Han, Aseem Agarwala, Trevor Darrell, Aaron Hertzmann, and Holger Winnemoeller. Recognizing image style. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.3715*, 2013. 3
- [16] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, et al. Segment anything. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4015–4026, 2023. 3
- [17] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Dong Guo, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Yanwei Li, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-onevision: Easy visual task transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03326*, 2024. 1, 2, 4
- [18] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *NeurIPS*, 36, 2023. 1, 2
- [19] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. In *CVPR*, pages 26296–26306, 2024.
- [20] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Sheng Shen, and Yong Jae Lee. Llava-next: Improved reasoning, ocr, and world knowledge. <https://llava-vl.github.io/blog/2024-01-30-llava-next/>, 2024. 2
- [21] Zhijian Liu, Ligeng Zhu, Baifeng Shi, Zhuoyang Zhang, Yuming Lou, Shang Yang, Haocheng Xi, Shiyi Cao, Yuxian Gu, Dacheng Li, et al. Nvila: Efficient frontier visual language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.04468*, 2024. 1, 2, 4
- [22] Fan Lu, Wei Wu, Kecheng Zheng, Shuailei Ma, Biao Gong, Jiawei Liu, Wei Zhai, Yang Cao, Yujun Shen, and Zheng-Jun Zha. Benchmarking large vision-language models via directed scene graph for comprehensive image captioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.08614*, 2024. 1, 2, 3
- [23] OpenAI. Gpt-4v(ision) system card. https://cdn.openai.com/papers/GPTV_System_Card.pdf, 2023. 1, 2
- [24] OpenAI. Gpt-4o(mini) system card. <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>, 2024. 3
- [25] K Papines. Bleu: A method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proc. 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, 2002, pages 311–318, 2002. 1, 2
- [26] Machel Reid, Nikolay Savinov, Denis Teplyashin, Dmitry Lepikhin, Timothy Lillicrap, Jean-baptiste Alayrac, Radu Soricut, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, Julian Schrittwieser, et al. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*, 2024. 1, 3
- [27] Chufeng Tang, Lingxi Xie, Xiaopeng Zhang, Xiaolin Hu, and Qi Tian. Visual recognition by request. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 15265–15274, 2023. 3
- [28] Qwen Team. Qwen2.5-vl. <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwen2.5-vl/>, 2025. 1, 2, 4
- [29] Ramakrishna Vedantam, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. Cider: Consensus-based image description evaluation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4566–4575, 2015. 1, 2
- [30] Jiawei Wang, Liping Yuan, Yuchen Zhang, and Haomiao Sun. Tarsier: Recipes for training and evaluating large video description models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.00634*, 2024. 2, 3
- [31] Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, et al. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*, 2024. 2, 3
- [32] Weiyun Wang, Min Shi, Qingyun Li, Wenhai Wang, Zhenhang Huang, Linjie Xing, Zhe Chen, Hao Li, Xizhou Zhu, Zhiguo Cao, et al. The all-seeing project: Towards panoptic visual recognition and understanding of the open world. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01907*, 2023. 3
- [33] Weiyun Wang, Yiming Ren, Haowen Luo, Tiantong Li, Chenxiang Yan, Zhe Chen, Wenhai Wang, Qingyun Li, Lewei Lu, Xizhou Zhu, et al. The all-seeing project v2: Towards general relation comprehension of the open world. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 471–490. Springer, 2024. 3
- [34] Xin Wang, Jiawei Wu, Junkun Chen, Lei Li, Yuan-Fang Wang, and William Yang Wang. Vatex: A large-scale, high-quality multilingual dataset for video-and-language research. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 4581–4591, 2019. 1, 2
- [35] Jun Xu, Tao Mei, Ting Yao, and Yong Rui. Msr-vtt: A large video description dataset for bridging video and language. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5288–5296, 2016. 1, 2
- [36] Kelvin Xu. Show, attend and tell: Neural image caption generation with visual attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.03044*, 2015. 1
- [37] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, et al. Qwen2.5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*, 2024. 2, 3, 4

- [38] Jihan Yang, Shusheng Yang, Anjali W Gupta, Rilyn Han, Li Fei-Fei, and Saining Xie. Thinking in space: How multimodal large language models see, remember, and recall spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.14171*, 2024. [3](#)
- [39] Boqiang Zhang, Kehan Li, Zesen Cheng, Zhiqiang Hu, Yuqian Yuan, Guanzheng Chen, Sicong Leng, Yuming Jiang, Hang Zhang, Xin Li, et al. Videollama 3: Frontier multimodal foundation models for image and video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.13106*, 2025. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [4](#)
- [40] Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, haotian Liu, Yong jae Lee, Liangke Gui, Di Fu, Jiashi Feng, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-next: A strong zero-shot video understanding model. <https://llava-vl.github.io/blog/2024-04-30-llava-next-video/>, 2024.
- [41] Yuanhan Zhang, Jinming Wu, Wei Li, Bo Li, Zejun Ma, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Video instruction tuning with synthetic data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02713*, 2024. [2](#), [3](#)
- [42] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigpt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592*, 2023. [1](#), [2](#)