

HIPPO : Enhancing the Table Understanding Capability of Large Language Models through Hybrid-Modal Preference Optimization

Zhenghao Liu¹, Haolan Wang¹, Xinze Li¹, Qiushi Xiong¹, Xiaocui Yang¹,
Yu Gu¹, Yukun Yan^{2*}, Qi Shi², Fangfang Li¹, Ge Yu¹, and Maosong Sun^{2*}

¹Department of Computer Science and Technology, Northeastern University, China

²Department of Computer Science and Technology, Institute for AI, Tsinghua University, China
Beijing National Research Center for Information Science and Technology, China

Abstract

Tabular data contains rich structural semantics and plays a crucial role in organizing and manipulating information. To better capture these structural semantics, this paper introduces the **HybrId-modal Preference oPtimizatiOn** (HIPPO) model, which represents tables using both text and image, and optimizes MLLMs to effectively learn more comprehensive table information from these multiple modalities. Specifically, HIPPO samples model responses from hybrid-modal table representations and designs a modality-consistent sampling strategy to enhance response diversity and mitigate modality bias during DPO training. Experimental results on table question answering and table fact verification tasks demonstrate the effectiveness of HIPPO, achieving a 4% improvement over various table reasoning models. Further analysis reveals that HIPPO not only enhances reasoning abilities based on unimodal table representations but also facilitates the extraction of crucial and distinct semantics from different modal representations. All data and codes are available at <https://github.com/NEUIR/HIPPO>.

1 Introduction

Tabular data is pervasive in our daily lives, appearing in formats such as databases, scientific articles, web pages, and spreadsheets (Chen et al., 2000; HURST, 2000; Hu et al., 2023). The structured nature of tabular data enables the systematic organization of information into rows and columns, facilitating efficient sorting, querying, and manipulation (Pujara et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2020a). Consequently, table understanding and reasoning have emerged as a significant area of interest in NLP, garnering much attention from researchers (Bao et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2022).

Thrived on the logical reasoning capabilities of Large Language Models (LLMs), using LLMs for

*indicates corresponding author.




Figure 1: Illustration of the Effectiveness of Text-Based and Image-Based Table Representations in Question Answering. We present the answers generated by the MLLM () based on both text-based () and image-based () table representations.

dealing with table-related tasks has become a mainstream research direction (Chen, 2023; Zhang et al., 2022; Dong and Wang, 2024). Existing table understanding methods convert tables into linear text sequences and focus on designing prompts or instructions to stimulate LLMs to conduct effective reasoning over tables (Chen, 2023; Wang et al., 2024). However, they typically provide a fixed text representation of the tabular format for reasoning. Recent studies have also shown that LLMs are sensitive to the text representation of tables (Liu et al., 2024b), motivating researchers to explore the most suitable text-based tabular formats for different table understanding scenarios (Zhang et al., 2024b; Sui et al., 2024; Singha et al., 2023).

Besides text-based table representations, many

works use the screenshot of table as its image-based representation during reasoning to explore the effectiveness of Multi-modal Large Language Models (MLLMs) in understanding table images (Deng et al., 2024; Zheng et al., 2024). As shown in Figure 1, both text-based and image-based table representations potentially play distinct roles in enhancing the table reasoning abilities of MLLMs. Specifically, in the first case, the question asks, “What is the total number of wins listed for the United States?”, which requires the model to identify the wins of the United States, namely “18”, “2” and “2”, and then sum them to obtain the correct answer, “22”. The text-based table representation enables LLMs to produce the correct answer because the question relies more on the arithmetic ability of language models. In contrast, the image-based table representation allows MLLMs to correctly answer the question in the second case. This is enabled by the visual annotation of teams with different colors to represent the win-loss situation. Both the color and cell position in the image provide crucial semantics to help MLLMs accurately answer the question. Despite these advantages, existing works (Deng et al., 2024; Zheng et al., 2024) mainly focus on investigating the table understanding capabilities of MLLMs using unimodal representations, leaving room for further exploration of multi-modal representations to enable more effective table reasoning.

This paper introduces the **HybrId-modal Preference oPtimizatiOn** (HIPPO) model, which integrates both text-based and image-based table representations for enhancing the table understanding capability of MLLMs. Specifically, HIPPO proposes a Hybrid-Modal Preference Optimization method to guide MLLMs in answering questions by leveraging more comprehensive information from different modalities of table representations. HIPPO prompts the MLLM to generate responses based on both unimodal and multi-modal representations of the table. Then, it selects the most representative negative responses using the self-consistency (Liu et al., 2024b) of MLLMs when answering questions based on different modalities, thereby mitigating unnecessary modality bias during training. These negative responses are subsequently collected to optimize the MLLMs using the DPO method (Rafailov et al., 2023), helping the model to assign higher probabilities to ground truth answers over negative responses.

Our experiments demonstrate the effectiveness

of our HIPPO model by achieving more than a 4% improvement over different table understanding models, which underscores the importance of incorporating both text-based and image-based representations in table understanding tasks. Additionally, HIPPO significantly enhances the performance of MLLMs even with unimodal table representations, illustrating the generalization ability of our training method. Our further analyses show that HIPPO optimizes MLLMs to better extract semantic information, generate more consistent answers, and engage in diverse reasoning processes based on table representations of different modalities, thereby enabling more accurate predictions based on multi-modal table representations.

2 Related Work

Large Language Models (LLMs), *e.g.* GPT-4 (OpenAI, 2023) and LLaMA (Touvron et al., 2023), have shown strong emergent ability and demonstrate their effectiveness in table understanding through prompts and instructions (Chen, 2023; Wang et al., 2024). Inspired by the Chain-of-Thought (CoT) reasoning (Wei et al., 2022), the work decomposes the questions into sub-problems to help LLMs solve complex problems more effectively, thereby benefiting the table understanding and reasoning abilities of LLMs (Zhou et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024; Cheng et al., 2023). Furthermore, some models also ask LLMs to generate SQL or Python programs and then leverage the program executors to produce the code execution outcomes, making LLMs produce more accurate answers (Cheng et al., 2023; Ye et al., 2023b; Gao et al., 2023; Ni et al., 2023).

Even though these table reasoning methods exhibit strong capabilities in tabular understanding, they often underestimate the impact of text-based tabular formats on table reasoning and operations (Sui et al., 2024; Singha et al., 2023). Specifically, table understanding tasks demonstrate varying performance across different tabular formats (Sui et al., 2024), and these formats display differing levels of robustness to various noise operations (Singha et al., 2023). Moreover, Zhang et al. (2024b) propose a more effective method to choose a tailored text-based table representation to help LLMs answer the question. Specifically, they explore table representations using Markdown, Dict, List, Pandas, and Database formats, designing distinct mechanisms to aggregate responses across

these diverse text modalities.

With the rapid advancements in Multi-modal Large Language Models (MLLMs) (Yao et al., 2024; Bai et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024a), many studies have focused on image-grounded table question answering tasks (Kim et al., 2024; Zheng et al., 2024), enabling table understanding and reasoning over images from practical scenarios, such as scanned documents and web pages. Deng et al. (2024) individually investigate the effectiveness of text-based and image-based table representations in facilitating the table reasoning capability of LLMs and MLLMs. Their findings reveal that language models exhibit robust performance with image-based table representations, and in some cases, these representations even outperform text-based ones. However, these studies have not yet explored how to effectively combine the strengths of both image and text modalities to further improve the table reasoning capabilities of MLLMs.

3 Methodology

As illustrated in Figure 2, this section introduces our **Hybrid-modal Preference Optimization (HIPPO)** model. We begin with a detailed explanation of the multi-modal table representation method (Sec. 3.1). Then, HIPPO leverages a hybrid-modal preference optimization approach, enabling MLLMs to effectively utilize the semantics derived from different modalities (Sec. 3.2).

3.1 Table Understanding Using Image-Based and Text-Based Representations

Given a table T and a question Q , we prompt the MLLM to generate response y to answer the question based on the information provided in the table.

To effectively capture both the textual semantics and the visual structural semantics of the table T , we utilize a combination of text-based and image-based table representations as inputs to the MLLM (\mathcal{M}), such as MiniCPM-V (Yao et al., 2024). The response y , which answers the question, is then generated as follows:

$$y = \mathcal{M}(\text{Instruct}_{\mathcal{Z}}, Q, L(T), V(T)), \quad (1)$$

where $\text{Instruct}_{\mathcal{Z}}$ represents the instruction specifically designed for table understanding tasks \mathcal{Z} , including table question answering and table fact verification tasks. Next, we detail the process of constructing both text-based representation $L(T)$ and image-based table representation $V(T)$.

Text-Based Table Representation. To conduct text-based table representations for MLLMs, existing methods typically verbalize a table into its textual form, denoted as $L(T)$.

These methods employ various data formats to convert tables into text sequences, such as Markdown, Dict, List, Pandas, and Database formats, before feeding the text-based representations into LLMs (Zhang et al., 2024b). Existing works show that different table input formats will lead to different results (Wang et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024b). For constructing the text-based representation $L(T)$ of a given table T , we adopt Markdown, one of the most widely used data formats for tables. However, text-based table representations often encounter difficulties in fully capturing the layout semantics of tables. Thus some approaches incorporate additional cell location information, such as the number of rows and columns (Liu et al., 2021).

Image-Based Table Representation. In contrast to the table conversion process required for text-based representations, image-based methods directly represent a table using its screenshot, denoted as $V(T)$ (Zheng et al., 2024).

A table image inherently preserves its layout, formatting, and stylistic features, providing an alternative to an intermediate textual table (Sui et al., 2024). By leveraging the multi-modal capabilities of MLLMs, these models can efficiently perform OCR and parse table layouts, thereby enhancing document-level comprehension (Luo et al., 2024; Yu et al., 2025). The image modality captures richer structural semantics, including cell positions, borders, and background colors, which significantly aid in table understanding and reasoning. Nonetheless, image-based approaches face inherent challenges when conducting complex table operations, such as lookup and sum, during reasoning.

3.2 Optimizing MLLMs via Hybrid-Modal Preference Optimization

HIPPO utilizes both text-based ($L(T)$) and image-based ($V(T)$) representations to enhance the semantics of the table T . While each modality has its unique strengths and limitations, it is critical to teach MLLMs to capture more appropriate semantics from different modalities to generate accurate responses. To achieve this, HIPPO proposes the Hybrid-Modal Preference Optimization method, which optimizes MLLMs using the hybrid-modal sampling based DPO method.

Hybrid-Modal Sampling Based DPO. The




Figure 2: The Framework of Our HIPPO Method.

hybrid-modal sampling based DPO method initiates by inputting both unimodal and multi-modal table representations into the MLLM (\mathcal{M}). For each kind of table representation, the responses are sampled from the MLLM to construct the preference pairs for DPO training:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{y}_l &\sim \mathcal{M}(\text{Instruct}_{\mathcal{Z}}, Q, L(T)), \\ \tilde{y}_v &\sim \mathcal{M}(\text{Instruct}_{\mathcal{Z}}, Q, V(T)), \\ \tilde{y} &\sim \mathcal{M}(\text{Instruct}_{\mathcal{Z}}, Q, L(T), V(T)). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

After sampling, the generated responses from hybrid-modalities are collected into a set $\tilde{Y} = \{\tilde{y}_l^1, \dots, \tilde{y}_l^K, \tilde{y}_v^1, \dots, \tilde{y}_v^K, \tilde{y}^1, \dots, \tilde{y}^K\}$, where K is the hyperparameter that denotes the number of responses that sampled from different modalities.

Then the positive response \tilde{y}^+ and the negative response \tilde{y}^- are selected from this set of sampled responses \tilde{Y} . The quadruples $(Q, T, \tilde{y}^+, \tilde{y}^-)$ are then collected from each table understanding task, thereby constructing the training set \mathcal{D} . Finally, the MLLM is optimized on the collected dataset \mathcal{D} using the Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2023) method:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & -\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\log \sigma(\beta \log \frac{\mathcal{M}(\tilde{y}^+ | Q, T)}{\mathcal{M}^{\text{ref}}(\tilde{y}^+ | Q, T)} \\ & - \beta \log \frac{\mathcal{M}(\tilde{y}^- | Q, T)}{\mathcal{M}^{\text{ref}}(\tilde{y}^- | Q, T)})], \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where β is a hyperparameter and σ denotes the Sigmoid function. \mathcal{M}^{ref} represents the reference model, which remains fixed throughout the training process. \mathcal{M} is the table understanding model that can be optimized. Since these responses \tilde{Y} are sampled from both unimodal and multi-modal representations of tables, we propose the modality-

consistency based response sampling method to find more typical negatives for DPO training.

DPO Sampling via Modality-Consistency. To effectively construct the DPO training dataset \mathcal{D} , it is crucial to carefully select both the positive response \tilde{y}^+ and the negative response \tilde{y}^- from the sampled response set \tilde{Y} . Instead of randomly sampling negative examples across varying modalities, HIPPO employs a modality-consistency strategy. This approach prioritizes the selection of representative negative responses for training, thereby minimizing the introduction of spurious signals that could inadvertently bias the modality preference during optimization.

More concretely, the DPO loss, as defined in Eq. 3, is derived from the Bradley-Terry model:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[\log \sigma(r(Q, T, \tilde{y}^+) - r(Q, T, \tilde{y}^-))], \quad (4)$$

where $r(\cdot)$ calculates the reward for the generated responses. If the generated response \tilde{y} matches the ground truth answer y^* , then $r(\tilde{y}) = 1$; otherwise, $r(\tilde{y}) = 0$. By minimizing the DPO loss \mathcal{L} , the model \mathcal{M} learns to assign higher probabilities to the positive response (\tilde{y}^+) while reducing the probabilities of the negative response (\tilde{y}^-). To ensure the effectiveness of DPO training, HIPPO enhances the diversity of sampled responses by incorporating responses from different modalities (Eq. 2). However, suppose the negative response \tilde{y}^- is consistently sampled from a specific modality. In that case, the model may develop a preference bias for the other modality to reduce the loss (Eq. 4), which has been observed in multi-modal contrastive training scenarios (Liu et al., 2023). To address this issue, we sample modality-consistent responses as negatives to better optimize the model.

Dataset	Train	Test
Question Answering		
TABMWP (Lu et al., 2023)	30,745	7,686
WTQ (Pasupat and Liang, 2015)	17,689	4344
HiTab (Cheng et al., 2022)	8,941	1,586
TAT-QA (Zhu et al., 2021)	5,920	772
FeTaQA (Nan et al., 2022)	8,327	2,003
Fact Verification		
TabFact (Chen et al., 2020b)	31,321	6,845
InfoTabs (Gupta et al., 2020)	18,383	5,400

Table 1: Data Statistics.

Specifically, we retain the query Q that contains a ground truth answer within the set of LLM-generated responses and designate the ground truth answer y^* as the positive response \tilde{y}^+ . From the hybrid-modality sampled responses \tilde{Y} , we collect all incorrect responses to construct the negative response set \tilde{Y}_{Neg} . Among these, we select the most frequent response as the negative response \tilde{y}^- for DPO training:

$$\tilde{y}^- = \arg \max_{\tilde{y} \in \tilde{Y}_{\text{Neg}}} \text{Freq}(\tilde{y}), \quad (5)$$

where $\text{Freq}(\tilde{y})$ calculates the occurrence frequency of the response \tilde{y} across the whole set \tilde{Y}_{Neg} .

4 Experimental Methodology

In this section, we describe the datasets, evaluation metrics, baselines, and implementation details used in our experiments.

Datasets. Following Zheng et al. (2024), we use Table Question Answering (TQA) and Table Fact Verification (TFV) tasks for training and evaluation. All data statistics are shown in Table 1.

The TQA task consists of five evaluation benchmarks, including: TABMWP (Lu et al., 2023), WikiTQ (Pasupat and Liang, 2015), HiTab (Cheng et al., 2022), TAT-QA (Zhu et al., 2021) and FeTaQA (Nan et al., 2022). For TFV tasks, TabFact (Chen et al., 2020b) and InfoTabs (Gupta et al., 2020) are used.

Evaluation Metrics. For TQA, we evaluate model performance using Accuracy (Acc.) on WTQ, TABMWP, TAT-QA, and HiTab, while the BLEU score (Papineni et al., 2002) is used for FeTaQA. In TFV, we use the binary classification accuracy for TabFact (true/false outputs) and multi-class accuracy for InfoTabs (entail/contradict/neutral outputs). All experiment settings are the same as Zheng et al. (2024).

Baselines. In our experiments, we keep the same experimental setting with Zheng et al. (2024)

that compares open-sourced LLMs and MLLMs regarding tables in the experiments. We compare HIPPO against three categories of models: (1) LLMs with text-based table representations, (2) MLLMs with image-based table representations, and (3) MLLMs with the combination of text-based and image-based table representations.

LLMs (Text): We represent tables using text-based representations by converting tables into Markdown formats and evaluate three LLMs, Llama2 (Touvron et al., 2023), TableLlama (Zhang et al., 2024a), and Llama3 (Dubey et al., 2024).

MLLMs (Image): In this category, tables are provided as image-based representations to MLLMs for question answering. We compare HIPPO with MiniGPT-4 (Zhu et al., 2024), Qwen-VL (Bai et al., 2023), InternLM-XComposer (Zhang et al., 2023), mPLUG-Owl (Ye et al., 2023a), mPLUG-Owl2 (Ye et al., 2024), LLaVA v1.5 (Liu et al., 2024a), Varytoy (Wei et al., 2024), Monkey (Li et al., 2024), Table-LLaVA (Zheng et al., 2024), and MiniCPM-V-2.6 (Yao et al., 2024).

MLLMs (Image & Text): For MLLMs (Image & Text), MLLMs are fed with the multi-modal representation which combines both the text-based and image-based representations of the table for answering questions. We compare HIPPO Table-LLaVA-13B and MiniCPM-V-2.6.

Implementation Details. For DPO training, we use the Swift (Zhao et al., 2024) framework and set the learning rate to $1e-4$, and batch size to 1. During training, we use the AdamW (Kingma and Ba, 2015) optimizer. We apply LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) to train the model for 1 epoch. During the DPO data generation phase, tables are provided as inputs in three categories: text-based representation, image-based representation, and multi-modal representation. The temperature is set to 1.0, with ten samples taken for each input format. During evaluation, we leverage the VLLM (Kwon et al., 2023) framework for efficient inference and configure the MLLMs to employ beam search decoding and set the maximum token limit of 8,192. More experimental details and prompt templates are shown in Appendix A.5 and Appendix A.6, respectively.

5 Evaluation Results

In this section, we first present the overall performance of HIPPO. We then investigate the effectiveness of various training strategies and examine the role of table representations across different modal-

Method	Parameters	Question Answering					Fact Verification	
		TABMWP (Acc.)	WTQ (Acc.)	HiTab (Acc.)	TAT-QA (Acc.)	FeTaQA (BLEU)	TabFact (Acc.)	InfoTabs (Acc.)
<i>LLM (Text)</i>								
Llama2	7B	22.82	16.39	10.72	13.73	10.93	9.20	38.92
TableLlama	7B	10.10	24.97	46.57	19.04	38.38	79.37	46.57
Llama3-Instruct	8B	42.01	21.24	6.97	13.08	12.66	73.89	54.00
<i>MLLM (Image)</i>								
MiniGPT-4	7B	0.22	0.90	0.20	0.13	0.39	0	0.10
Qwen-VL	7B	3.30	0.09	0.06	0.13	0.45	1.12	0.65
InternLM-XComposer	7B	0.06	0.05	0.12	0.26	2.62	1.19	1.11
mPLUG-Owl	7B	1.76	0.62	0.25	0.13	7.42	7.46	5.53
mPLUG-Owl2	7B	6.83	0.67	0.13	0.39	11.91	8.21	26.19
LLaVA v1.5	7B	6.05	1.24	2.03	2.97	8.24	18.9	28.31
Vary-toy	1.8B	4.42	7.96	3.42	8.81	2.44	6.33	6.98
Monkey	7B	13.26	19.07	6.41	12.31	3.41	22.56	22.11
Table-LLaVA	7B	57.78	18.43	10.09	12.82	25.60	59.85	65.26
Table-LLaVA	13B	59.77	20.41	10.85	15.67	28.03	65.00	66.91
MiniCPM-V-2.6	8B	83.68	47.97	56.53	51.55	32.68	78.48	73.03
<i>MLLM (Image & Text)</i>								
Table-LLaVA	13B	84.58	39.89	46.00	29.27	33.50	69.93	74.88
MiniCPM-V-2.6	8B	<u>86.06</u>	52.30	58.56	52.46	32.96	79.31	73.18
w/ Vanilla SFT	8B	<u>76.69</u>	<u>55.54</u>	<u>62.88</u>	<u>58.91</u>	16.92	82.54	76.22
w/ HIPPO	8B	87.50	55.77	63.00	60.75	33.18	<u>82.27</u>	<u>75.74</u>

Table 2: Overall Performance on TQA and TFV Tasks. The **best** results are marked in bold, while the second-best results are underlined. We establish baselines using LLM (Text) and MLLM (Image) by feeding unimodal table representations to language models. Next, we use image-based and text-based table representations as inputs to train various MLLM (Image & Text) models, demonstrating the effectiveness of our HIPPO.

ities in HIPPO. Finally, case studies are shown.

5.1 Overall Performance

In this experiment, we evaluate the table understanding effectiveness of HIPPO and baseline models on both the TQA and TFV tasks. Specifically, we assess LLMs by feeding text representation of tables and evaluate the capabilities of MLLMs by providing either images or a combination of both texts and images.

As shown in Table 2, these LLM based baselines typically exhibit comparable performance to the MLLMs that only use images to represent the table, highlighting the importance of both text and image modalities in table understanding. Among all the unimodal-based table understanding models, MiniCPM-V-2.6 achieves the best performance, demonstrating its strong ability to perform effective reasoning over the images of tables. In addition to images, we further incorporate a text representation of the table as the input for the MLLMs to assess their effectiveness in table understanding. The experimental results on both Table-LLaVA and MiniCPM-V-2.6 show performance improvements, indicating that the text representation aids MLLMs in conducting necessary reasoning.

Next, we implement multi-modal table understanding models based on the MiniCPM-V-2.6

model and compare both vanilla SFT and HIPPO models to evaluate the effectiveness of different training strategies. Overall, HIPPO shows its effectiveness by achieving an improvement of more than 4% over LLM (Text) and MLLM (Image) baselines. The evaluation results show that the vanilla SFT method yields inconsistent performance across different datasets and reduces the performance of the zero-shot model on the TQA task, demonstrating that fine-tuning on ground truth labels leads to overfitting. In contrast, HIPPO consistently improves performance on both TQA and TFV tasks, achieving 3.6% and 2.8% improvements over the zero-shot model, respectively. These results demonstrate the effectiveness of HIPPO in training MLLMs to perform more effective reasoning on tables by leveraging both text and image modalities.

5.2 Ablation Study

The ablation studies are conducted to demonstrate the effectiveness of different training strategies used in our HIPPO model.

As shown in Table 3, we compare DPO, HIPPO (Random), and HIPPO models to evaluate the effectiveness of different training strategies. Specifically, the DPO method directly samples responses based on the multi-modal table representations for optimization. Both HIPPO and HIPPO (Random) em-

Method	TQA		TFV	
	WTQ	TAT-QA	TabFact	InfoTabs
<i>Zero-Shot</i>				
Only Image	47.97	51.55	78.48	72.03
Only Text	50.20	50.90	74.22	69.48
Multi-Modality	52.30	52.46	81.69	73.18
<i>Finetuning</i>				
DPO	55.31	58.16	81.38	75.50
HIPPO (Random)	55.93	59.32	81.69	73.12
HIPPO	55.77	60.75	82.27	75.74

Table 3: Ablation Study. All models are implemented by using MiniCPM-V-2.6 as the backbone model.

ploy a hybrid-modality sampling approach for DPO training, sampling responses from both unimodal and multi-modal table representations. The key distinction between HIPPO (Random) and HIPPO is that HIPPO uses the modality-consistent sampling method, whereas HIPPO (Random) employs the random selection strategy.

By using our hybrid-modality sampling approach to generate preferences for DPO training, the performance of MLLM on the TQA task is improved, highlighting the effectiveness of the hybrid-modality sampling strategy. The primary reason for this improvement lies in the fact that the hybrid-modality sampling method increases the diversity of sampled responses, enabling MLLM to learn more signals from different modalities during DPO training. Furthermore, HIPPO introduces a modality-consistent sampling method for selecting negatives to construct preference pairs, which helps prevent the model from learning modality bias. As a result, HIPPO achieves an improvement of over 1%, demonstrating its ability to generate higher-quality negatives for DPO training.

5.3 Exploring the Role of Multi-Modal Table Representations in HIPPO

In this experiment, we sample 500 examples from TAT-QA and TabFact datasets respectively to investigate the roles of different modalities in table understanding. Specifically, we analyze the output similarity of MLLMs based on unimodal and multi-modal table representations and then evaluate the effectiveness of HIPPO based on unimodal table representations.

Output Similarity. As shown in Figure 3, we assess the similarities of sampled answers and Chain-of-Thought (Wei et al., 2022) produced by different models using unimodal and multi-modal table representations. The prompt templates are shown in Appendix A.7. Three training strategies are




Figure 3: Output Similarity of Models Between Unimodal and Multi-Modal Table Representations. The TAT-QA dataset is used for evaluation.




Figure 4: Performance of Different Models Based on Unimodal Table Representations.

compared in this experiment, including Zero-Shot, DPO, and HIPPO.

First, we ask each model to generate several answers based on both unimodal and multi-modal representations, then calculate the Jaccard similarity to estimate the output similarity, as shown in Figure 3(a). HIPPO demonstrates higher Jaccard similarity than DPO, highlighting its effectiveness in helping the model generate more consistent responses based on both unimodal and multi-modal table representations. This suggests that HIPPO enables MLLMs to better leverage semantic information from different modalities, rather than overfitting to a particular modality.

Then, we prompt models to generate Chain-of-Thought (Wei et al., 2022) for solving the question and use the BGE model (Chen et al., 2024) to evaluate the reasoning similarity of the models based on unimodal and multi-modal table representations. The evaluation results show that HIPPO typically exhibits a lower similarity score compared to Zero-Shot and DPO, indicating that HIPPO encourages MLLMs to adopt more distinct reasoning mechanisms across different modalities.

Table Understanding with Unimodal Representations. Next, we further analyze the effectiveness of our modality-consistent sampling method




Figure 5: Case Study. The correct reasoning, incorrect reasoning, and final answer are highlighted.

within HIPPO by providing MLLMs with either text-based or image-based table representations and then evaluating their table understanding performance on both TQA and TFV tasks.

In this experiment, we compare HIPPO and HIPPO (Random). Different from HIPPO (Random), HIPPO employs a modality-consistent sampling approach during DPO training. As shown in Figure 4, HIPPO significantly outperforms HIPPO (Random) when provided with either text-based or image-based table representations. This demonstrates that HIPPO is more effective in capturing key information from each modality to answer the question, thereby extending its applicability to various scenarios where only text-based or image-based table representations are available. Furthermore, by enhancing accuracy within each modality, HIPPO generates more precise and consistent predictions when combining both modalities.

5.4 Case Studies

As shown in Figure 5, we randomly select two cases to analyze the effectiveness of HIPPO by prompting MLLMs to generate Chain-of-Thought (Wei et al., 2022) to answer the question.

In the first case, we compare HIPPO with the SFT method. As shown in this case, the SFT method performs an incorrect reasoning process by stating, “The United States has 1 gold medal”, indicating that the SFT model fails to perform the comparison needed to identify the country with 1

gold medal. In contrast, HIPPO correctly identifies that “Hungary earned 1 gold medal”, demonstrating its effectiveness in training MLLMs to generate more reliable reasoning results. By utilizing preference pairs, HIPPO contrastively optimizes the MLLM, guiding it to produce the correct answer.

In the second case, we feed text-based, image-based, and multi-modal table representations to HIPPO in order to analyze the role of different modalities. While both the text-based and image-based representations produce the correct intermediate reasoning step—“find the entries labeled 1990 World Cup qualifying games”—they incorrectly identify “Canada” and “Costa Rica” as the entries. This illustrates that table representations from different modalities may lead MLLMs to generate different incorrect answers. However, when both modalities are combined, the correct answer “Jamaica” is produced, demonstrating that both modalities contribute crucial semantic information to support the correct answer. This further underscores the important roles that different modalities play in the reasoning process of table understanding.

6 Conclusion

This paper proposes HIPPO to optimize the ability of MLLMs to effectively leverage the semantics from multi-modal table representations for more accurate table understanding. Our experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of HIPPO in enabling MLLMs to learn richer semantics across table rep-

representations of different modalities.

Limitations

Despite HIPPO demonstrating its effectiveness on the TQA and TFV tasks, there are several limitations. First, HIPPO relies on multi-modal table representations, which require additional input tokens compared to unimodal representations. Furthermore, it may necessitate an additional table-to-text process compared to models that only use image-based representations. Although we have conducted extensive experiments to demonstrate the effectiveness of both text-based and image-based table representations in table reasoning tasks, further analysis is needed to better understand how MLLMs conduct reasoning based on table inputs of different modalities.

References

- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. [Qwen-vl: A frontier large vision-language model with versatile abilities](#). *ArXiv preprint*.
- Junwei Bao, Duyu Tang, Nan Duan, Zhao Yan, Yuanhua Lv, Ming Zhou, and Tiejun Zhao. 2018. [Table-to-text: Describing table region with natural language](#). In *Proceedings of AAAI*, pages 5020–5027.
- Hsin-Hsi Chen, Shih-Chung Tsai, and Jin-He Tsai. 2000. [Mining tables from large scale HTML texts](#). In *Proceedings of COLING*.
- Jianlv Chen, Shitao Xiao, Peitian Zhang, Kun Luo, Defu Lian, and Zheng Liu. 2024. [Bge m3-embedding: Multi-lingual, multi-functionality, multi-granularity text embeddings through self-knowledge distillation](#). *ArXiv preprint*.
- Wenhu Chen. 2023. [Large language models are few \(1\)-shot table reasoners](#). In *Findings of EACL*, pages 1120–1130.
- Wenhu Chen, Ming-Wei Chang, Eva Schlinger, William Yang Wang, and William W Cohen. 2020a. [Open question answering over tables and text](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- Wenhu Chen, Hongmin Wang, Jianshu Chen, Yunkai Zhang, Hong Wang, Shiyang Li, Xiyong Zhou, and William Yang Wang. 2020b. [Tabfact: A large-scale dataset for table-based fact verification](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- Zhoujun Cheng, Haoyu Dong, Zhiruo Wang, Ran Jia, Jiaqi Guo, Yan Gao, Shi Han, Jian-Guang Lou, and Dongmei Zhang. 2022. [HiTab: A hierarchical table dataset for question answering and natural language generation](#). In *Proceedings of ACL*, pages 1094–1110.
- Zhoujun Cheng, Tianbao Xie, Peng Shi, Chengzu Li, Rahul Nadkarni, Yushi Hu, Caiming Xiong, Dragomir Radev, Mari Ostendorf, Luke Zettlemoyer, Noah A. Smith, and Tao Yu. 2023. [Binding language models in symbolic languages](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- Naihao Deng, Zhenjie Sun, Ruiqi He, Aman Sikka, Yulong Chen, Lin Ma, Yue Zhang, and Rada Mihalcea. 2024. [Tables as texts or images: Evaluating the table reasoning ability of llms and mllms](#). In *Findings of ACL*, pages 407–426.
- Haoyu Dong and Zhiruo Wang. 2024. [Large language models for tabular data: Progresses and future directions](#). In *Proceedings of SIGIR*, pages 2997–3000.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#). *ArXiv preprint*.
- Luyu Gao, Aman Madaan, Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Pengfei Liu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. 2023. [Pal: program-aided language models](#). In *Proceedings of ICML*, pages 10764–10799.
- Vivek Gupta, Maitrey Mehta, Pegah Nokhiz, and Vivek Srikumar. 2020. [INFOTABS: Inference on tables as semi-structured data](#). In *Proceedings of ACL*, pages 2309–2324.
- Chenxu Hu, Jie Fu, Chenzhuang Du, Simian Luo, Junbo Zhao, and Hang Zhao. 2023. [Chatdb: Augmenting llms with databases as their symbolic memory](#). *ArXiv preprint*.
- Edward J Hu, yelong shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- M HURST. 2000. [The interpretation of tables in texts](#). *PhD thesis, University of Edinburgh*.
- Yoonsik Kim, Moonbin Yim, and Ka Yeon Song. 2024. [Tablevqa-bench: A visual question answering benchmark on multiple table domains](#). *ArXiv preprint*.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2015. [Adam: A method for stochastic optimization](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. [Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, pages 611–626.

- Zhang Li, Biao Yang, Qiang Liu, Zhiyin Ma, Shuo Zhang, Jingxu Yang, Yabo Sun, Yuliang Liu, and Xiang Bai. 2024. [Monkey: Image resolution and text label are important things for large multi-modal models](#). In *Proceedings of CVPR*, pages 26763–26773.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. 2024a. [Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning](#). In *Proceedings of CVPR*, pages 26296–26306.
- Qian Liu, Bei Chen, Jiaqi Guo, Morteza Ziyadi, Zeqi Lin, Weizhu Chen, and Jian-Guang Lou. 2021. [Tapex: Table pre-training via learning a neural sql executor](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- Tianyang Liu, Fei Wang, and Muhao Chen. 2024b. [Re-thinking tabular data understanding with large language models](#). In *Proceedings of NAACL*, pages 450–482.
- Zhenghao Liu, Chenyan Xiong, Yuanhuiyi Lv, Zhiyuan Liu, and Ge Yu. 2023. [Universal vision-language dense retrieval: Learning a unified representation space for multi-modal retrieval](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- Pan Lu, Liang Qiu, Kai-Wei Chang, Ying Nian Wu, Song-Chun Zhu, Tanmay Rajpurohit, Peter Clark, and Ashwin Kalyan. 2023. [Dynamic prompt learning via policy gradient for semi-structured mathematical reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- Chuwei Luo, Yufan Shen, Zhaoqing Zhu, Qi Zheng, Zhi Yu, and Cong Yao. 2024. [Layoutlm: Layout instruction tuning with large language models for document understanding](#). In *Proceedings of CVPR*, pages 15630–15640.
- Linyong Nan, Chiachun Hsieh, Ziming Mao, Xi Victoria Lin, Neha Verma, Rui Zhang, Wojciech Kryściński, Hailey Schoelkopf, Riley Kong, Xiangru Tang, Mutethia Mutuma, Ben Rosand, Isabel Trindade, Renusree Bandaru, Jacob Cunningham, Caiming Xiong, and Dragomir Radev. 2022. [Fetaqa: Free-form table question answering](#). *Proceedings of TACL*, pages 35–49.
- Ansong Ni, Srini Iyer, Dragomir Radev, Ves Stoyanov, Wen-tau Yih, Sida I Wang, and Xi Victoria Lin. 2023. [Lever: learning to verify language-to-code generation with execution](#). In *Proceedings of ICML*, pages 26106–26128.
- R OpenAI. 2023. [Gpt-4 technical report](#). *ArXiv preprint*.
- Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. 2002. [Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation](#). In *Proceedings of ACL*, pages 311–318.
- Panupong Pasupat and Percy Liang. 2015. [Compositional semantic parsing on semi-structured tables](#). In *Proceedings of ACL*, pages 1470–1480.
- Jay Pujara, Pedro Szekely, Huan Sun, and Muhao Chen. 2021. [From tables to knowledge: Recent advances in table understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Minin*, pages 4060–4061.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. [Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model](#). In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*.
- Ananya Singha, José Cambronero, Sumit Gulwani, Vu Le, and Chris Parnin. 2023. [Tabular representation, noisy operators, and impacts on table structure understanding tasks in llms](#). In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*.
- Yuan Sui, Mengyu Zhou, Mingjie Zhou, Shi Han, and Dongmei Zhang. 2024. [Table meets llm: Can large language models understand structured table data? a benchmark and empirical study](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining*, pages 645–654.
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. 2023. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#). *ArXiv preprint*.
- Zilong Wang, Hao Zhang, Chun-Liang Li, Julian Martin Eisenschlos, Vincent Perot, Zifeng Wang, Lesly Miculicich, Yasuhisa Fujii, Jingbo Shang, Chen-Yu Lee, and Tomas Pfister. 2024. [Chain-of-table: Evolving tables in the reasoning chain for table understanding](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- Haoran Wei, Lingyu Kong, Jinyue Chen, Liang Zhao, Zheng Ge, En Yu, Jianjian Sun, Chunrui Han, and Xiangyu Zhang. 2024. [Small language model meets with reinforced vision vocabulary](#). *ArXiv preprint*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. 2022. [Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#). *Proceedings of NeurIPS*, pages 24824–24837.
- Yuan Yao, Tianyu Yu, Ao Zhang, Chongyi Wang, Junbo Cui, Hongji Zhu, Tianchi Cai, Haoyu Li, Weilin Zhao, Zihui He, et al. 2024. [Minicpm-v: A gpt-4v level mllm on your phone](#). *ArXiv preprint*.
- Qinghao Ye, Haiyang Xu, Guohai Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Yiyang Zhou, Junyang Wang, Anwen Hu, Pengcheng Shi, Yaya Shi, et al. 2023a. [mplug-owl: Modularization empowers large language models with multimodality](#). *ArXiv preprint*.
- Qinghao Ye, Haiyang Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Anwen Hu, Haowei Liu, Qi Qian, Ji Zhang, and Fei Huang. 2024. [mplug-owl2: Revolutionizing multi-modal large language model with modality collaboration](#). In *Proceedings of CVPR*, pages 13040–13051.

- Yunhu Ye, Binyuan Hui, Min Yang, Binhua Li, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. 2023b. [Large language models are versatile decomposers: Decomposing evidence and questions for table-based reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of SIGIR*, pages 174–184.
- Shi Yu, Chaoyue Tang, Bokai Xu, Junbo Cui, Junhao Ran, Yukun Yan, Zhenghao Liu, Shuo Wang, Xu Han, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2025. [Vis-RAG: Vision-based retrieval-augmented generation on multi-modality documents](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- Pan Zhang, Xiaoyi Dong, Bin Wang, Yuhang Cao, Chao Xu, Linke Ouyang, Zhiyuan Zhao, Haodong Duan, Songyang Zhang, Shuangrui Ding, et al. 2023. [Internlm-xcomposer: A vision-language large model for advanced text-image comprehension and composition](#). *ArXiv preprint*.
- Tianshu Zhang, Xiang Yue, Yifei Li, and Huan Sun. 2024a. [TableLlama: Towards open large generalist models for tables](#). In *Proceedings of NAACL*, pages 6024–6044.
- Xuanliang Zhang, Dingzirui Wang, Longxu Dou, Baoxin Wang, Dayong Wu, Qingfu Zhu, and Wanxiang Che. 2024b. [Flextaf: Enhancing table reasoning with flexible tabular formats](#). *ArXiv preprint*.
- Xuanliang Zhang, Dingzirui Wang, Longxu Dou, Qingfu Zhu, and Wanxiang Che. 2022. [A survey of table reasoning with large language models](#). *ArXiv preprint*.
- Yuze Zhao, Jintao Huang, Jinghan Hu, Daoze Zhang, Zeyinzi Jiang, Zhikai Wu, Baole Ai, Ang Wang, Wenmeng Zhou, and Yingda Chen. 2024. [Swift: A scalable lightweight infrastructure for fine-tuning](#). *ArXiv preprint*.
- Mingyu Zheng, Xinwei Feng, Qingyi Si, Qiaoqiao She, Zheng Lin, Wenbin Jiang, and Weiping Wang. 2024. [Multimodal table understanding](#). In *Proceedings of ACL*, pages 9102–9124.
- Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc V Le, et al. 2023. [Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. 2024. [MiniGPT-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models](#). In *Proceedings of ICLR*.
- Fengbin Zhu, Wenqiang Lei, Youcheng Huang, Chao Wang, Shuo Zhang, Jiancheng Lv, Fuli Feng, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2021. [TAT-QA: A question answering benchmark on a hybrid of tabular and textual content in finance](#). In *Proceedings of ACL*, pages 3277–3287.

Dataset	HIPPO	Only Image	Only Text
TABMWP	87.50	76.86	85.71
WTQ	55.77	51.47	48.84
HiTab	63.00	62.18	57.36
TAT-QA	60.75	57.38	55.95
FeTaQA	33.18	29.50	32.31
TabFact	82.27	79.88	80.14
InfoTabs	75.74	76.16	72.75

Table 4: Performance of HIPPO Using the Table Representation of Different Modalities. All models are implemented with MiniCPM-V-2.6.

A Appendix

A.1 License

This study uses MMTab (Apache-2.0 License¹), TABMWP (MIT License²), WTQ (MIT License), HiTab (C-UDA License³), TAT-QA (MIT License), FeTaQA (CC-BY-SA 4.0 License⁴), TabFact (CC-BY-SA 4.0 License), and InfoTabs (Apache-2.0 License) in experiments. All of these licenses and agreements allow the use of their data for academic purposes.

A.2 Performance of HIPPO Using Table Representations of Different Modalities

This section shows the performance of HIPPO using various table representations: text-based, image-based, and multi-modal table representations.

As shown in Table 4, HIPPO with a multi-modal table representation outperforms both text-based and image-based representations across most TQA and TFV datasets. Specifically, on average, the multi-modal representation yields a significant improvement of over 3.5% across all datasets, compared to both image-based and text-based representations. The superior performance underscores HIPPO’s ability to effectively learn and integrate semantic information from both text-based and image-based representations, leading to more comprehensive table understanding.

A.3 Effectiveness of Different Training Strategies


This experiment evaluates the effectiveness of table understanding by examining the prediction consistency across table understanding models trained using different strategies.

¹<https://www.apache.org/licenses/LICENSE-2.0>

²<https://opensource.org/licenses/MIT>

³<https://cdla.dev/computational-use-of-data-agreement-v1-0/>

⁴<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>



(a) TAT-QA.

(b) TabFact.

Figure 6: The Consistency of Different Models for Ground Truth Label Prediction.

Method	Table Size		
	Small	Medium	Large
Zero-Shot	56.20	45.20	35.65
HIPPO	59.94	46.98	43.94

Table 5: Performance of Zero-Shot and HIPPO Models on the WTQ dataset.

As shown in Figure 6, we evaluate the consistency of Zero-Shot, SFT, DPO, and HIPPO methods in predicting the golden labels. Specifically, we randomly sample 500 cases and ask each model to generate 10 outputs for consistency evaluation. A higher consistency score indicates that the model produces more confident predictions aligned with the ground truth. Overall, DPO-based optimization methods improve the consistency of MLLM predictions with respect to the ground truth, suggesting that DPO assigns a higher probability than SFT for generating the correct answer by learning from preference pairs. Notably, HIPPO further enhances its prediction consistency on both datasets, demonstrating that the training strategy of HIPPO helps MLLMs make more confident and accurate predictions. HIPPO enhances the DPO training process by sampling more diverse responses from the table representations of different modalities.

A.4 Performance of HIPPO on Tables of Different Scales

In this section, we analyze the performance of HIPPO and Zero-Shot on tables of varying scales.

In our experiments, we categorize tables into three groups: Small, Medium, and Large. Specifically, Small refers to tables with fewer than 1,000 tokens, Medium includes tables with 1,000 to 2,000 tokens, and Large encompasses tables with more than 2,000 tokens. The distribution is as follows: Small tables (70.28%), Medium tables (19.45%), and Large tables (10.27%).

As shown in Table 5, both models exhibit a decrease in accuracy as table size increases, highlight-

Image Representation	Text Representation	Multi-Modal Representation
<p>[Task]: WTQ, TAT-QA, HiTab [Instruction]: Analyze the table image and write a brief answer to the question that follows. Show your answer in the JSON format {"answer": ["<a list of answer strings>"]}. Question:{Question}</p> <p>[Task]: FeTaQA [Instruction]: Based on the table image. Answer this question. Question:{Question}</p> <p>[Task]: TabFact [Instruction]: Analyze the table image and write a brief answer to verify the statement that follows. Show your answer in the JSON format {"answer": ["True/False"]}. Question:{Question}</p> <p>[Task]: InfoTabs [Instruction]: Analyze the table image and write a brief answer to verify the statement that follows. Show your answer in the JSON format {"answer": ["Entail/Contradict/Neutral"]}. Question:{Question}</p>	<p>[Task]: WTQ, TAT-QA, HiTab [Instruction]: Markdown Table: {Markdown Table} Analyze the Markdown table and write a brief answer to the question that follows. Show your answer in the JSON format {"answer": ["<a list of answer strings>"]}. Question:{Question}</p> <p>[Task]: FeTaQA [Instruction]: Markdown Table: {Markdown Table} Based on the Markdown table. Answer this question. Question:{Question}</p> <p>[Task]: TabFact [Instruction]: Markdown Table: {Markdown Table} Analyze the Markdown table and write a brief answer to verify the statement that follows. Show your answer in the JSON format {"answer": ["True/False"]}. Question:{Question}</p> <p>[Task]: InfoTabs [Instruction]: Markdown Table: {Markdown Table} Analyze the Markdown table and write a brief answer to verify the statement that follows. Show your answer in the JSON format {"answer": ["Entail/Contradict/Neutral"]}. Question:{Question}</p>	<p>[Task]: WTQ, TAT-QA, HiTab [Instruction]: Markdown Table: {Markdown Table} Analyze the table image and its Markdown table and write a brief answer to the question that follows. Show your answer in the JSON format {"answer": ["<a list of answer strings>"]}. Question:{Question}</p> <p>[Task]: FeTaQA [Instruction]: Markdown Table: {Markdown Table} Based on the table image and its Markdown table. Answer this question. Question:{Question}</p> <p>[Task]: TabFact [Instruction]: Markdown Table: {Markdown Table} Analyze the table image and its Markdown table and write a brief answer to verify the statement that follows. Show your answer in the JSON format {"answer": ["True/False"]}. Question:{Question}</p> <p>[Task]: InfoTabs [Instruction]: Markdown Table: {Markdown Table} Analyze the table image and its Markdown table and write a brief answer to verify the statement that follows. Show your answer in the JSON format {"answer": ["Entail/Contradict/Neutral"]}. Question:{Question}</p>

Figure 7: Prompt Templates Used in HIPPO.

ing the challenge of capturing and reasoning with complex information from larger tables. Notably, HIPPO consistently outperforms Zero-Shot across all table scales, particularly for large tables, demonstrating its superior robustness in handling larger tables. This performance advantage suggests that HIPPO remains effective even as the complexity and scale of the tabular data increase.

A.5 Additional Experimental Details

In this section, we provide a detailed description of the steps to construct the DPO training data.

The training data is sourced from Zheng et al. (2024). The inputs are categorized into three types: text-based table representations ($L(T)$), image-based table representations ($V(T)$), and multi-modal table representations, which are formed by concatenating the text-based and image-based representations ($L(T), V(T)$). The construction of the DPO training dataset utilized TABMWP, WTQ, TAT-QA, TabFact, and InfoTabs. We exclude FeTaQA due to its evaluation metric being BLEU, which does not focus on the accuracy of question answering. Additionally, the HiTab dataset is excluded because it involves multi-level tables, which present formatting challenges when converted to Markdown. This

conversion can lead to formatting inconsistencies, making it less suitable for training. From each of the chosen datasets, we extract 2,000 instances, resulting in a combined dataset of 10,000 training instances.

For data sampling, we use the MiniCPM-V-2.6 model with a temperature setting of 1 to generate 10 candidate responses for each modality. These responses are rigorously evaluated against ground truth answers to assess their accuracy. For DPO training, the ground truth is labeled as the positive response y^+ , while the most frequent incorrect response is designated as the negative one y^- for DPO training (Eq. 3).

A.6 Prompt Templates Used in HIPPO

We follow the approach of previous work (Zheng et al., 2024) modifying the prompt templates to better align with our objectives for multi-modal table representations. The prompt templates used in our experiments are shown in Figure 7.

A.7 Prompt Templates Used to Generate Chain-of-Thought

In this section, we represent the CoT (Chain of Thought) prompt we used in Figure 8. For each

CoT Prompt

[Table Representation]: Image
[Instruction]: Analyze the table image and based on the answer to write the thinking step.
 Question: {*Question*}
 Answer: {Image Representation Answer}

[Table Representation]: Text
[Instruction]: Markdown Table:
 {*Markdown Table*}
 Analyze the Markdown table and based on the answer to write the thinking step.
 Question: {*Question*}
 Answer: {Text Representation Answer}

[Table Representation]: Multi Modal
[Instruction]: Markdown Table:
 {*Markdown Table*}
 Analyze the table image and its Markdown table and based on the answer to write the thinking step.
 Question: {*Question*}
 Answer: {Multi-Modal Representation Answer}

Figure 8: CoT Prompt Templates Used in HIPPO.

table representation: image, text, and multi-modal, we provide the model with both the table representation and its corresponding answer. The model is then instructed to generate a modality-specific thinking step.