

☕ CREMA: Multimodal Compositional Video Reasoning via Efficient Modular Adaptation and Fusion

Shoubin Yu^{*1} Jaehong Yoon^{*1} Mohit Bansal¹

Abstract

Despite impressive advancements in multimodal compositional reasoning approaches, they are still limited in their flexibility and efficiency by processing fixed modality inputs while updating a lot of model parameters. This paper tackles these critical challenges and proposes CREMA, an efficient and modular modality-fusion framework for injecting any new modality into video reasoning. We first augment multiple informative modalities (such as *optical flow*, *3D point cloud*, *audio*) from given videos without extra human annotation by leveraging existing pre-trained models. Next, we introduce a query transformer with multiple parameter-efficient modules associated with each accessible modality. It projects diverse modality features to the LLM token embedding space, allowing the model to integrate different data types for response generation. Furthermore, we propose a fusion module designed to compress multimodal queries, maintaining computational efficiency in the LLM while combining additional modalities. We validate our method on video-3D, video-audio, and video-language reasoning tasks and achieve better/equivalent performance against strong multimodal LLMs, including BLIP-2, 3D-LLM, and SeViLA while using 96% fewer trainable parameters. We provide extensive analyses of CREMA, including the impact of each modality on reasoning domains, the design of the fusion module, and example visualizations.¹

1. Introduction

We humans understand the world through various senses, such as sight, sound, touch, and heat, allowing us to understand our environment and act accordingly. This concept has inspired the field of multimodal learning that connects vari-

^{*}Equal contribution ¹UNC-Chapel Hill. Correspondence to: Shoubin Yu <shoubin@cs.unc.edu>, Jaehong Yoon <jhyoon@cs.unc.edu>, Mohit Bansal <mbansal@cs.unc.edu>.

¹Project Page: <https://CREMA-VideoLLM.github.io/>.




Figure 1: We present CREMA, an efficient and modular modality-fusion framework. We utilize a single multimodal Q-Former with a set of lightweight modality-specific adapters, hence allowing video frames, optical flow, 3D, etc.

ous perceptions, including vision-language (Alayrac et al., 2022; Li et al., 2023b; Zang et al., 2023; Radford et al., 2021), audio-video (Han et al., 2020; Tang et al., 2022), and 2D-3D joint vision (Li et al., 2020; Hou et al., 2021; 2023). In particular, recent Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) (Yu et al., 2023b; Li et al., 2023b; Liu et al., 2023a; Tang et al., 2023) have shown promising versatility in handling multiple forms of input data, such as vision, audio, and text. These models are crucial in real-world applications that require a comprehensive understanding of multiple modalities to make decisions in various contexts. For example, autonomous vehicles rely on road signs, sirens, and LIDAR for navigation and safe driving. Similarly, educational AI enhances the learning experience by integrating diverse information, such as videos, speech, and textbooks.

Despite their recent advancements, deploying a generic MLLM that handles multiple diverse modalities is still very challenging in terms of *cost* and *flexibility*. For different types of inputs, MLLMs have required extremely large computational budgets to update the LLM with individual encoders for modalities (Fig. 1 top left). Alternatively, recent efficient MLLMs using separate projection modules (Zhang

et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2023a; Li et al., 2023b) (Fig. 1 top right) provide a more efficient and flexible way for multimodal reasoning. However, as each modality module contains hundreds of millions of parameters for training, this approach is still computationally intensive, and balancing as well as fusing various types of inputs becomes even more complex and costly when more modalities are introduced. Such challenges also exist in very recent pioneering works (Liu et al., 2023c; Panagopoulou et al., 2023; Lu et al., 2023); these models aim to integrate more diverse sensory data for compositional understanding via partial updates to the models, yet still require notable training resources to adapt to different modalities (7B for Unified-IO 2 (Lu et al., 2023)). Moreover, they focus primarily on fixed modality pairs (like 3D-text and visual-text), limiting their adaptability to new data forms and broader applications.

To overcome these limitations, our work presents *Multimodal Compositional Video Reasoning via Efficient Modular Adaptation and Fusion (CREMA)*, a highly efficient yet effective multimodal LLM framework for video reasoning that extends existing vision-language models to adapt to any new set of modalities, including *video*, *depth map*, *optical flow*, *surface normals*, *audio*, *3D point cloud*, notably with very few trainable parameters (< 5M for each new modality) as compared to BLIP-2 (Li et al., 2023b), 3D-LLM (Hong et al., 2023) (~188M) and SeViLA (Yu et al., 2023a) (~376M). Given a frozen pre-trained vision-language backbone, our approach introduces modality-adaptive modules on top of the Q-Former (Li et al., 2023b) architecture, including linear projectors, low-rank adapters (Hu et al., 2022), and learnable queries. Our parameter-efficient modular design ensures that the pre-trained backbone remains unchanged and enables updates with new modalities and more advanced LLMs in the future without complex architecture changes. To enrich the input modalities, we utilize public pre-trained models to extract features from raw videos, such as depth map, optical flow, and surface normals.

Furthermore, despite the usefulness of our compositional video reasoning framework for multimodal data, dealing with numerous modalities is not always beneficial, because some modality features may be redundant to each other or unrelated to the target reasoning tasks. Besides, the LLM needs to receive longer input contexts, which include token embeddings from all modality queries, resulting in increased computations to produce responses. Hence, to address these remaining concerns, we introduce a lightweight modality fusion module, dubbed *CREMA-Espresso*, that effectively combines various modality tokens through a novel self-gated attention. As a result, we enable the model to maintain GFLOPs while still achieving competitive performance, even when the LLM processes a larger number of modality inputs.

We validate CREMA on various video reasoning benchmarks, including conventional VideoQA (NExT-QA (Xiao et al., 2021)), as well as compositional VideoQA including 3D-QA (SQA3D (Ma et al., 2023)) and Audio-QA (MUSIC-AVQA (Li et al., 2022)) that require additional modalities beyond video and text, such as *3D point cloud* or *audio*. CREMA surpasses other modality-specific baselines, improving fine-tuning performance by **+3.3%** on SQA3D, **+1.9%** on MUSIC-AVQA, and **+0.9%** on NExT-QA with just **2~4% of the trainable parameters and more modalities**. CREMA also outperforms general-purpose baselines in the zero-shot setting. We further provide comprehensive analyses of varying sets of modalities, different modality fusion strategies, benefits of adding more modality, and qualitative analysis with input/response visualizations to highlight the efficiency and effectiveness of our CREMA framework in compositional video reasoning.

We summarize our contributions as 4-fold:

- We propose a highly efficient and generalizable modality-extensible learning framework, coined *CREMA*, which learns multiple modality-adaptive modules to understand given data through augmented senses.
- CREMA’s design allows easy embracing of new modalities by adding additional modality-adaptive modules without any need to modify the existing framework.
- We present a trainable modality fusion module that efficiently weighs modalities, integrating useful modality features into response generation.
- We demonstrate the efficacy of our CREMA on multiple video reasoning datasets by achieving better/equivalent performance while reducing about 96% of trainable parameters than BLIP-2, 3D-LLM, and SeViLA.

2. Related Works

Learning with Multiple Modalities. Beyond conventional unimodal learning, leveraging additional modalities, such as visual and audio, in learning models is increasingly popular and has demonstrated remarkable success in solving diverse tasks (Zhu et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2023b; Lu et al., 2023; Moon et al., 2023). Vision Language Models (Huang et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023a; Gong et al., 2023) are the most prevalent branch of *multimodal learning* that combine vision and language by training on massive data to understand and generate outputs involving visual and text-based information. Audio-Language Models (Chuang et al., 2020; Castellon et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2023) have been proposed for various audio-associated language tasks, *e.g.*, spoken question answering and speech synthesis. Also, 2D-3D Joint Vision Models (Li et al., 2020; Hou et al., 2021; 2023) aim to combine features of both two-dimensional

(2D) and three-dimensional (3D) data to interpret and analyze both modalities, allowing for a more comprehensive understanding of visual information. However, these approaches are not scalable to other tasks involving different modality inputs since they focus on handling fine-grained problems with pre-defined modalities.

Multimodal Large Language Model. Very recently, several works propose integrated pipelines using more than two different data sources for general-purpose reasoning (Zellers et al., 2022; Han et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023b; Girdhar et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023c). MERLOT-REVERSE (Zellers et al., 2022) introduces a new training objective that learns from audio, subtitles, and video frames. Given modality-specific features extracted from the encoder/tokenizer for these inputs, the joint transformer learns to predict the masked text and audio. Prismer (Liu et al., 2023c) is an adapter-based vision-language model that adopts unified adapter layers to integrate multiple vision features, extracted from task-specific pre-trained models like object detection, segmentation, and OCR. Therefore, incorporating new types of inputs can be challenging since it requires new pre-training steps for all other modalities. X-InstructBLIP (X-BLIP) (Panagopoulou et al., 2023) integrates various modalities into a framework using frozen LLMs, employing modality-specific Q-Formers as adapters to connect different encoders. However, this method needs to train the individual Q-Former for each modality to enable modality-aligned instruction tuning, which is still resource-intensive. OneLLM (Han et al., 2023) presents a universal encoder and projection module to align various modalities with language, its flexibility is limited in adapting new modalities, as the pre-trained projection may be impaired with unseen input format. On the other hand, our proposed CREMA method adopts an efficient and modular approach, using parameter-efficient adapters for each modality, and enhances flexibility in integrating any new modalities into the existing model.

3. Method

We first provide a preliminary of the Q-Former framework for connecting multimodal inputs with the LLM in Sec. 3.1. Next, we define the problem for compositional VideoQA and introduce our CREMA method for efficient multimodal compositional video reasoning in Sec. 3.2. Finally, we describe the training and inference process in Sec. 3.3.

3.1. Preliminaries: Q-Former

To connect various types of sensory inputs with the LLM, we adopt the Q-Former architecture originally proposed in BLIP-2 (Li et al., 2023b), a transformer (Vaswani et al., 2017) module that bridges the modality encoder and the LLM, similar to Perceiver (Jaegle et al., 2021). It receives

modality features \mathbb{Z} from the encoder along with learnable queries v and produces fixed-length tokens q as output. This design enables the Q-Former to extract the most informative features from the input modality and remove any irrelevant information. It further projects obtained tokens q into the LLM’s embedding space via a fully connected layer to make them compatible. In the end, q serves as soft visual prompts (Jia et al., 2022) for the LLM. CREMA method adopts several lightweight form-adaptive modules on top of the Q-Former to integrate knowledge from different data types (e.g., video frames, audio, 3D point cloud, etc.) efficiently.

3.2. Multimodal Compositional Video Reasoning via Efficient Modular Adaptation and Fusion

Multimodal Encoders. Our proposed method, CREMA, illustrated in Fig. 2, aims to generate responses using both language (i.e., questions) and various multimodal inputs (e.g., images, audio, depth data), denoted as $\mathbb{M} = [M_1, M_2, \dots, M_n]$, where n represents the number of accessible modalities. Throughout this paper, our CREMA method handles six modalities: video RGB frames, audio, 3D point cloud, optical flow, surface normals, and depth map, in total (up to four different modalities at once), but we note that our approach is able to process a larger number of different data types if needed. We first encode input data for each modality using the corresponding encoder. Here, we adopt several classes of publicly available pre-trained encoders for modalities, which are kept frozen, to improve training efficiency and learning generalization. *Universal encoder* (Girdhar et al., 2023; Han et al., 2023) can be employed as well, but it lacks the flexibility to other new modalities which are not pre-trained before. Next, we add a fully connected layer (*dashed box* in Fig. 2) for each data type when dimension misalignment happens. It maps different modality representations into a unified feature space while avoiding incompatibilities between varying encoder architectures. We then obtain a set of multimodal features, and in the next step, the Q-Former will extract informative features in \mathbb{Z} into query embeddings. More multimodal encoder details are discussed in Sec. 4.1 and Appendix Sec. A.2.

Multimodal Q-Former. Previous studies (Panagopoulou et al., 2023; Yu et al., 2023b; Zhang et al., 2023; Hong et al., 2023) have shown Q-Former architecture’s capability in integrating various modalities with LLMs. However, they necessitate the individual Q-former for each modality, leading to significant parameter demands. While Q-Formers are moderately scaled at ~ 188 million parameters, which is less than the billions in LLMs, this size becomes substantial with increasing modalities. For example, processing five different modalities would require about one billion of parameters, highlighting the cost and complexity of scaling modality with additional Q-Formers.




Figure 2: **Overview of the CREMA method.** The multimodal encoders, Q-former, and LLM are kept frozen in the process. For each modality input, we extract tokens using a corresponding modality-specific adaptation module. Then, we can employ the *optional* fusion module to blend and compact the obtained tokens. In the end, the LLM can leverage multimodal or modality-fusion tokens, which contain rich representations of different input modalities, to generate responses.

Hence, to deploy a lightweight, universal module capable of integrating various sensory representations, we introduce *Multimodal Q-Former*. This architecture integrates a Modality-specific Multi-Query Adapter (MMQA) for each modality. As illustrated in the middle of Fig. 2, MMQA consists of Low-Rank Adaptation (LoRA) (Hu et al., 2022) modules², learnable queries, and linear projections. The intuitive design of our approach enables efficient and flexible adaptation to any specific modalities. Let \mathbb{Z}_m be extracted features from the data M_m of the m^{th} modality. The multimodal Q-Former propagates \mathbb{Z}_m with the corresponding MMQA module to capture the relevant information, producing query embeddings q_m . Given input learnable queries $v_m = v_m^0$, we compute a linear projection at layer i containing the modality-specific LoRA as follows:

$$v_m^{i+1} = W v_m^i + \Delta W_m, \quad (1)$$

$$\Delta W_m = B_m A_m \quad B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}, A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d}, \quad (2)$$

where W^3 represents the original linear projection parameters of the Q-Former. ΔW indicates a low-rank adapter for W with the rank $r \ll d$. Here, d is the feature size of the Q-Former. With the hidden dimension $r = 64$, updating only a small number of parameters of ΔW for each modality while freezing the Q-Former backbone is sufficient for the model to capture rich modality-specific representation. In addition, the proposed approach can effortlessly integrate new modalities. Upon the arrival of a new modality, our

²We implement LoRA modules at the *query* and *value* linear projections for each self-attention layer.

³For the rest of the paper, unless otherwise stated, we omit the layer index for readability.

method can simply append appropriate MMQA modules without modifying the existing architecture, ensuring sustained support for previously integrated modalities.

Cross-Modality Reasoning With LLM. To conduct cross-modal reasoning, we aggregate multimodal query embeddings with language query l via simple concatenation. This aggregated information is fed into the Large Language Model (LLM) to get the final response a , such that $a = LLM(\text{concat}(q_1, \dots, q_n, l))$ ⁴. The LLM is always kept frozen for efficient learning purposes.

Espresso: Self-gated Multimodal Query Fusion. Our approach, which concatenates modality-adaptive queries from lightweight MMQA modules, efficiently manages multimodal reasoning tasks. However, the LLM faces increased training/inference time and computational costs due to extra input tokens proportional to the number of modalities. To prevent the query token size from growing linearly with each new modality, we introduce a novel self-gated multimodal query fusion module. We define the token embedding of video queries $q_V = q_1$ as a major and others $q_{\setminus V} = \{q_i\}_{i=2}^n$ to be supportive ones. Next, we merge supportive query embeddings through a linear projection layer $\pi(\cdot; \theta)$ to match the dimension with q_V . Motivated by Ramachandran et al. (2017); Kiela et al. (2018), we then perform attention on the merged query embeddings $\bar{q}_{\setminus V}$ via self-gated operation and fuse them with q_V , which we call

⁴To let the LLM be aware of the difference of each modality, we insert modal-specific prefix tokens before modality queries. We omit the notations from the equation for simplicity.

CREMA-*espresso*:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{q}_{\setminus V} &= \pi([q_2; \dots; q_n]; \theta), \\ \hat{q} &= q_V \oplus (\text{sigmoid}(\bar{q}_{\setminus V}) \cdot \bar{q}_{\setminus V}), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $[\cdot; \dots; \cdot]$ denotes a channel-wise concatenation, and \oplus stands for an element-wise sum. In the end, CREMA-*espresso* obtains the response $a = LLM(\text{concat}(\hat{q}, l))$. Notably, when injecting new modalities, it successfully reduces computational costs while achieving comparable performance with CREMA without *espresso*. This method mirrors human perception in video reasoning tasks, where visual cues are primary but are supplemented by other modalities for richer understanding.

3.3. Training and Inference with CREMA

To enhance CREMA’s multimodal adaptation, we implement a lightweight pre-training stage using diverse modality inputs. It aims to quickly probe a good initialization of a few trainable parameters (several million) corresponding to the relevant modalities and brings better zero-shot performance on downstream tasks. We only update the MMQA modules for each modality using external modality-specific datasets (e.g., Audio-Text, 3D-Text) and then integrate these updated parameters into our framework. During fine-tuning and inference, each modality input will only be passed into the corresponding MMQA module. We employ standard cross-entropy loss for training. More details of the MMQA initialization are in Sec. 4.1 and the Appendix (Sec. A.3).

4. Experiments

In this section, we first outline the overall experimental setup in Sec. 4.1 and show the results of the proposed CREMA on various cross-modal Video QA & reasoning tasks in Sec. 4.2. We further provide more insights on the design of the fusion module, and the impact of new modalities across tasks in Sec. 4.3. More experiments on the impact of LoRA rank and MMQA initialization are included in Appendix (Sec. B).

4.1. Experimental Setup

Pre-training Data. Following X-instructBLIP (X-BLIP) (Panagopoulou et al., 2023), we pre-trained to initialize our MMQA module for audio modality on AudioCap (Kim et al., 2019). We adopt the same data resource released in (Hong et al., 2023) for a MMQA module on 3D data. More pre-training details are included in the Appendix (Sec. A.3).

Downstream Datasets & Benchmark. We evaluate the CREMA framework on three video reasoning and QA tasks, focusing on both conventional and compositional VideoQA. These include: **SQA3D** (Ma et al., 2023), **MUSIC-AVQA** (Li et al., 2022), and **NEX-T-QA** (Xiao et al.,

2021). See Appendix (Sec. A.1) for more details.

Implementation Details. (1) **Pre-trained Visual Experts:** We employ frozen pre-trained visual experts to extract diverse modalities features from raw videos. Specifically, we use ZoeDepth (Bhat et al., 2023), Unimatch (Xu et al., 2023), and NLL-AngMF (Bae et al., 2021) for depth, flow, and normals estimation respectively. (2) **Modality Encoder:** We use frozen modality-specific encoders to encode each modality to embedding space. We adopt ViT-G (Sun et al., 2023b) for visual (frames, depth, norm, and flow), BEATS (Chen et al., 2023) for audio, and follow data extraction in 3D-LLM (Hong et al., 2023) and ConceptFusion (Jatavallabhula et al., 2023) for 3D point cloud. See Appendix (Sec. A.2) for details. (3) **Baselines & Model Implementation:** We extend 3D-LLM and BLIP-2 with multiple individual Q-Formers for each new modality as our baseline. We fully fine-tune these Q-Formers. In CREMA, our Multimodal Q-Former is initialized from BLIP-2 image pre-trained one. We set 64 LoRA rank and 32 query tokens for all MMQA modules. See Appendix (Sec. A.4 & Sec. A.5) for more details.

4.2. Main Experimental Results

SQA3D: Our method is significantly efficient yet outperforms publicly available, strong MLLM baselines on 3D-associated video reasoning. As shown in Tab. 1, we evaluate the fine-tuning performance on SQA3D, and CREMA with video frame inputs (**V**) obtains improved accuracy compared to baselines on single modality inputs, MCAN, ClipBERT, and ScanQA, by **+9.6% p**, **+9.7% p**, and **+5.3% p**, respectively. We also measure the performance of 3D-LLM, a strong multimodal learning method that shares almost all of its structures with BLIP-2, except for the 3D encoder. Although 3D-LLM enhances its performance by integrating multiple modalities, this brings a considerable increase in parameters to update multiple Q-Formers for each modality. Meanwhile, our CREMA method with **V**, **P**, **D** modalities surpasses all baselines, achieving the best average accuracy by updating only proposed MMQA modules, which uses **~97.9%** fewer parameters (12M) for training than 3D-LLM (564M) per modality. In addition, CREMA-*espresso* method delivers competitive performance and further enhances our efficiency by merging query tokens from all accessible modality inputs through the proposed fusion module, showing a substantial reduction in FLOPs of the LLM (**~59% ↓**), highlighting the significance of selective compositional reasoning with relevant modalities.

We note that our CREMA exhibits improved compositional reasoning abilities using more diverse modalities, evident in a higher average performance. We expect that the model benefits from following reasons: 1) the effect of data augmentation, 2) we mitigate overfitting by recognizing inputs

Table 1: **Fine-tuning Results on 3D Situated Question Answering (SQA3D)**. Input modalities are abbreviated as: **V**: Video RGB frames, **V***: Bird-Eye View image, **P**: 3D Point cloud, and **D**: Depth. We **bold** the best numbers and underline the second-best numbers.





Method	Modality	What	Is	How	Can	Which	Others	Avg.	Trainable Params.	GFLOPs
MCAN (Yu et al., 2019)	V*	28.8	59.6	44.0	68.3	40.7	40.4	43.4	56M	-
ClipBERT (Lei et al., 2021)	V	30.2	60.1	38.7	63.3	42.4	42.7	43.3	135M	-
ScanQA (Azuma et al., 2022)	P	31.6	63.8	46.2	69.5	43.8	45.3	46.5	38M	-
3D-LLM (Hong et al., 2023)	P	37.0	65.1	45.8	67.4	51.0	49.8	49.7	188M	0.60K
	V	45.1	62.7	48.6	63.3	45.8	49.8	51.4	188M	1.30K
	V, P	47.7	61.0	49.0	63.6	49.0	49.6	52.3	376M	1.67K
	V, P, D	45.2	62.4	49.4	66.8	44.1	50.3	52.5	564M	3.61K
 CREMA (Ours)	P	37.5	59.2	44.0	62.4	49.8	45.5	47.3	4M	0.60K
	V	44.9	62.1	48.1	67.7	48.4	49.8	51.8	4M	1.30K
	V, P	46.2	63.6	46.4	63.0	48.7	50.1	52.1	8M	1.69K
	V, P, D	<u>46.0</u>	67.3	<u>47.7</u>	61.2	49.8	<u>52.4</u>	53.0	12M	3.63K
 CREMA- <i>espresso</i> (Ours)	V, P, D	45.7	<u>63.8</u>	47.3	<u>65.3</u>	<u>49.3</u>	52.8	<u>52.7</u>	20M	1.49K

 Table 2: **Fine-tuning Results on Audio-Video Question Answering (MUSIC-AVQA)**. We report simple notations for each modality and question type: **V**: Video RGB frames, **A**: Audio, **F**: optical Flow, **Cnt.**: Counting, **Com.**: Comparative, **Loc.**: Location, **Ext.**: Existential, and **Tem.**: Temporal. We **bold** the best numbers and underline the second-best numbers.

Method	Modality	Audio			Visual			Audio-Visual				Avg.	Trainable Params.	GFLOPs		
		Cnt.	Com.	Avg.	Cnt.	Loc.	Avg.	Ext.	Loc.	Cnt.	Com.				Tem.	Avg.
AVQA (Li et al., 2022)	V, A	80.3	60.0	77.3	74.5	77.8	76.1	81.4	68.7	69.9	64.6	67.1	70.9	73.5	18M	-
LAVISH (Lin et al., 2023)	V, A	85.6	65.9	81.4	80.2	81.1	80.6	84.6	69.2	78.8	65.6	69.1	73.8	76.9	21M	-
BLIP-2 (Li et al., 2023b)	A	79.1	64.8	73.8	73.0	66.6	69.8	84.1	62.0	66.0	62.5	58.1	66.8	68.8	188M	0.62K
	V	86.7	58.5	76.3	87.2	93.7	90.5	81.5	72.0	81.3	64.3	70.1	74.2	78.9	188M	1.30K
	V, A	86.3	58.4	76.0	87.6	93.0	90.3	80.4	68.3	82.6	63.8	69.8	73.5	78.4	376M	1.78K
	V, A, F	86.0	59.9	76.4	84.9	92.5	88.8	81.8	71.4	79.7	65.1	68.4	73.6	78.1	564M	3.21K
 CREMA (ours)	A	79.0	64.3	75.8	68.8	68.6	68.7	84.9	61.3	63.3	58.4	56.5	65.4	68.0	5M	0.63K
	V	88.3	60.6	82.3	84.4	85.2	84.8	84.8	71.7	80.8	63.8	70.6	74.6	78.7	4M	1.30K
	V, A	89.0	61.4	83.0	<u>84.7</u>	85.0	84.8	84.4	73.2	84.8	63.2	<u>71.3</u>	75.6	79.4	9M	1.78K
	V, A, F	88.1	58.6	81.7	85.3	90.5	87.9	85.0	72.7	85.3	<u>65.5</u>	74.6	76.9	80.8	13M	3.23K
 CREMA- <i>espresso</i> (ours)	V, A, F	89.1	<u>63.1</u>	83.5	83.3	<u>91.0</u>	<u>87.1</u>	84.4	<u>73.1</u>	<u>84.8</u>	66.9	<u>71.3</u>	<u>76.5</u>	<u>80.6</u>	21M	1.39K

through an extensive set of modalities, and 3) we compel a regularization effect on the model through parameter-efficient updates, often leading to a stable and better generalization (Zhao et al., 2021; Ding et al., 2022; Fu et al., 2023) than fine-tuning large models (Zhao et al., 2021).

MUSIC-AVQA: CREMA method achieves superior audio-video reasoning ability. In Tab. 2, recent parameter-efficient approaches, AVQA and LAVISH, perform reasonably well on audio and video QA tasks (MUSIC-AVQA), but are less impactful due to their restricted language capability. BLIP-2 achieves higher accuracy than these baselines by training modality-specific Q-Formers with a powerful language model, FLAN-T5XL. However, it fails to incorporate multiple modality information, and degrades audio-video reasoning ability when combining V modality with A or A, F. On the other hand, our method constantly improves average accuracy with more modality, outperforming LAVISH

(+3.9%*p*) and BLIP-2 (+2.7%*p*), by using only 61.9% and 2.3% number of parameters, respectively. In addition, we show that our CREMA-*espresso* reduces GFLOPs significantly (3.23K → 1.39K) while maintaining the same level of performance, compared to our CREMA with V, A, F.

NeXT-QA: CREMA method achieves superior performance against strong vision-language reasoning methods on the NeXT-QA dataset. As shown in Tab. 3, LLAMA-VQA with 13B and 33B parameters perform well with a small number of trainable parameters as it equips powerful LLAMA (Touvron et al., 2023) models as an LLM, on the other hand, SeViLA, BLIP-2, and CREMA method adopt Flan-T5XL, which has 3B parameters but achieves reasoning capabilities comparable to the LLAMA-7B model. CREMA with V obtains a slightly lower fine-tuning performance compared to BLIP-2 since they perform fine-tuning of the entire Q-Former framework. But, the ability of our proposed frame-

Table 3: **Fine-tuning Results on Video Question Answering (NeXT-QA)**. Modalities and question types are abbreviated as: **V**: Video RGB frames, **D**: Depth, **F**: optical Flow, **N**: surface Normalization, **P.&N.**: Prev & Next, **Pre.**: Present, **Cnt.**: Count, **Loc.**: Location, and **Otr.**: Other. We **bold** the best numbers and underline the second-best numbers.

Methods	Modality	Causal			Temporal			Descriptive			Avg.	Trainable Params.	GFLOPs	
		How	Why	All	P.&N.	Pre.	All	Cnt.	Loc.	Otr.				Avg.
LLaMA-VQA (33B) (Ko et al., 2023)	V	-	-	76.2	-	-	72.6	-	-	-	78.8	75.5	9M	-
LLaMA-VQA (13B) (Ko et al., 2023)	V	-	-	75.3	-	-	71.7	-	-	-	75.9	74.2	6M	-
LLaMA-VQA (7B) (Ko et al., 2023)	V	-	-	72.7	-	-	69.2	-	-	-	75.8	72.0	5M	-
SeViLA (Yu et al., 2023a)	V	71.3	75.3	74.2	67.8	71.7	69.4	67.2	91.8	85.2	81.3	73.8	376M	-
BLIP-2 (Li et al., 2023b)	V	69.9	73.9	72.9	65.4	71.9	68.1	64.9	91.8	80.3	81.2	72.6	188M	1.30K
	V, F	68.8	74.0	72.6	65.8	71.1	68.0	64.9	92.8	81.3	81.9	72.6	376M	2.21K
	V, F, D	70.8	74.2	73.3	65.0	71.4	67.6	61.5	93.2	81.6	81.4	72.7	564M	5.03K
	V, F, D, N	71.7	74.2	73.5	65.7	72.6	68.5	65.5	92.5	81.9	82.1	73.3	752M	6.12K
☕ CREMA (Ours)	V	67.3	73.9	72.1	63.0	70.2	65.9	64.9	93.2	80.3	81.6	71.6	4M	1.30K
	V, F	69.3	74.1	72.8	64.4	70.5	66.9	67.2	92.8	80.9	82.2	72.4	8M	2.22K
	V, N	68.0	73.9	72.3	63.8	70.5	66.6	<u>66.6</u>	93.2	<u>81.3</u>	<u>82.4</u>	72.1	8M	2.22K
	V, D	68.6	73.8	72.4	64.2	70.8	66.9	66.1	92.2	79.6	81.3	72.0	8M	2.22K
	V, F, D	<u>68.9</u>	74.5	73.0	65.4	72.2	68.2	64.9	91.8	80.9	81.3	72.8	12M	5.04K
	V, F, D, N	69.3	<u>74.7</u>	<u>73.2</u>	67.2	72.2	69.3	65.5	<u>93.5</u>	82.2	82.6	73.5	16M	6.14K
☕ CREMA-espresso (Ours)	V, F, D, N	68.8	74.9	73.3	<u>66.0</u>	<u>71.8</u>	<u>68.4</u>	<u>66.6</u>	93.7	79.9	82.1	<u>73.0</u>	28M	1.46K

Table 4: **Zero-shot Evaluation** on Multimodal Compositional QA tasks (SQA3D and MUSIC-AVQA).

Method	Modality	Acc.	Total Params.
SQA3D			
Unified QA (Khashabi et al., 2020)	P	41.0	11.0B
GPT-3 (Brown et al., 2020)	P	41.0	175.0B
3D-LLM (Hong et al., 2023)	P	36.9	3.1B
OneLLM (Han et al., 2023)	P	34.5	7.8B
	V	39.4	7.8B
	V, P	37.9	7.8B
☕ CREMA (Ours)	P	37.3	3.1B
	V	39.6	4.1B
	V, P	<u>40.0</u>	4.1B
MUSIC-AVQA			
X-BLIP (Panagopoulou et al., 2023)	A	22.7	13.2B
	V	43.5	14.1B
	V, A	44.5	14.4B
OneLLM (Han et al., 2023)	A	34.8	7.8B
	V	48.4	7.8B
	V, A	42.3	7.8B
☕ CREMA (Ours)	A	31.0	3.2B
	V	<u>51.0</u>	4.1B
	V, A	52.6	4.2B

work to incorporate a variety of new modalities enhances its compositional understanding: CREMA with **V, F, D, N** competes (SeViLA) or even surpasses (BLIP-2) strong baselines while requiring **96~98% less parameters** for training. However, inserting new modalities into the model is not always advantageous, as this increases computational costs during LLM generations. Our CREMA-espresso prevents this via a self-gated token fusion module and delivers competitive performance with a substantial reduction of FLOPs during LLM inference, highlighting the significance of selective compositional reasoning with relevant modalities.

Zero-shot Evaluation: In addition to the fine-tuning evaluation, CREMA method also achieves superior zero-shot performance on compositional video reasoning. We perform the zero-shot evaluation on SQA3D and MUSIC-AVQA in Tab. 4. Note that Unified QA and GPT-3⁵ with caption generated from 3D point cloud inputs perform well, attributed to their considerable model size and pre-trained data. 3D-LLM is a 3D-specific model that fails to handle **V** with its Q-Former in a zero-shot manner. We also test OneLLM, a universal multimodal reasoning framework equipped Llama2-7B (Touvron et al., 2023) for the LLM backbone. We re-implement OneLLM compositional reasoning by concatenating features from different modalities based on publicly released code. According to Tab. 4, the OneLLM is less effective on compositional performance with **V, P** than when using only video inputs. We show that our CREMA also demonstrates a distinct advantage in zero-shot compositional reasoning across modalities, enhancing the performance when combining video frames and 3D point cloud (**V, P**). We further compare with X-InstructBLIP (X-BLIP), a strong reasoning framework integrating various modalities with modality-specific Q-Formers as adapters to connect different encoders, and OneLLM on audio-video reasoning tasks. Following the evaluation setting of X-BLIP, our method remarkably outperforms both X-BLIP (13B), obtaining gains by **+7.3%p (A)**, **+7.5%p (V)**, and **+8.1%p (V, A)**, with only 4.1B parameters. OneLLM (7.8B) has 2.44× more parameters than ours, but it shows less effective compositional reasoning ability again, which decreases the performance when integrating both modality inputs. In the end, CREMA method surpasses OneLLM on audio-video reasoning, improving zero-shot performance by **+2.6%p**

⁵We borrow the results of GPT-3 from the official technical report in Ma et al. (2023).

Table 5: Average accuracy & GFLOPs (on NeXT-QA) of our method with different modality fusion strategies. We use V, F, D, N on NeXT-QA and V, P, D on SQA3D. *Concat* indicates that we concatenate multimodal query tokens.

Fusion	NeXT-QA	SQA3D	GFLOPs
Video-Only (V)	71.6	51.8	1.30K
Concat	73.5 (+1.9)	53.0 (+1.2)	6.14K
Cross-Attention	70.5 (-1.1)	49.8 (-2.0)	2.33K
Linear	71.1 (-0.5)	51.3 (-0.5)	1.87K
MoE	72.0 (+0.4)	51.1 (-0.7)	1.02K
Self-Gated (<i>espresso</i>)	<u>73.0 (+1.4)</u>	<u>52.7 (+0.9)</u>	1.46K

(V) and **+10.3%*p*** (V, A).

4.3. Quantitative Analysis

Ablations for the modality fusion module in CREMA-*espresso*. Our proposed self-gated multimodal query fusion module is designed to combine sets of token embeddings for different modality queries and prevent the token embedding from growing in size as new modality inputs are added to the framework. This allows LLMs to generate responses without increasing computational costs. As the architectural design of this module affects the fusion quality of token embeddings, we investigate our CREMA-*espresso* with different fusion strategies: given a concatenated multimodal token embedding \mathbb{Q} obtained by a multimodal Q-Former (i.e., *concat*), *Linear* reduces token size of \mathbb{Q} through a linear projection, *Mixture-of-Experts (MoE)* adopts a MoE layer inside Q-Former to extract a few token embeddings, and *Cross-Attention* adopts extra prompts as an input and computes the cross-attention with \mathbb{Q} . As shown in Tab. 5, our proposed *self-gated* fusion module achieves competitive performance with *Concat*, while other variants decrease the average accuracy despite incorporating additional modalities besides *video*. Also, it performs efficiently compared to *Cross-attention* and *Linear*, requiring more computationally expensive operations to combine modality.

The impact of new modalities on easy/hard questions.

We further delve into how adding extra modalities beyond video RGB frames (V) can enhance video reasoning problems. Following the previous work (Buch et al., 2022), which splits the dataset into the easy/hard groups based on the performance of the reference model to find subsets requiring less/more modality information, we classify question inputs in compositional video reasoning tasks (SQA3D and MUSIC-AVQA) based on the zero-shot performance of CREMA method with only V; i.e., if the model predicts correctly \rightarrow *easy*, otherwise \rightarrow *hard*, indicating that input examples in *hard* may need additional knowledge to find appropriate answers. After that, we fine-tune our CREMA and test on obtained subsets. As shown in Tab. 6, adding new

Table 6: Accuracy of CREMA method on easy and hard questions across datasets and modalities.

Modality	Easy Acc.	Hard Acc.
SQA3D		
V	75.0	37.2
V, P	75.8 (+0.8)	37.3 (+0.1)
V, P, D	75.2 (+0.2)	39.0 (+1.8)
MUSIC-AVQA		
V	85.7	71.2
V, A	87.2 (+1.5)	71.4 (+0.2)
V, A, F	86.8 (+1.1)	74.5 (+3.4)
NeXT-QA		
V	90.6	41.5
V, D	90.2 (-0.4)	43.1 (+1.6)
V, F, D	90.5 (-0.1)	44.7 (+3.2)
V, F, D, N	89.9 (-0.7)	48.1 (+6.6)

modalities brings improvement over both *easy* and *hard* subsets. However, performance gain on the *easy* subset is less effective as it is already dominant to the video frame inputs, whereas information from additional modalities benefits the prediction of the *hard* (+1.8%*p* on SQA3D and +3.4%*p* on MUSIC-AVQA). In the conventional video QA task (NeXT-QA), adding new modalities marginally decreases the *easy* subset, but significantly boosts the *hard* (+6.6%*p*). It indicates that leveraging extra modalities can be an effective data augmentation strategy, mitigating overfitting in downstream tasks. Furthermore, CREMA method can be a flexible and efficient tool to determine modality importance for future compositional video reasoning benchmark designs.

4.4. Qualitative Analysis

Beyond the numerical comparison of the effect integrating different sets of modalities for our CREMA method, we investigate our model’s generated responses according to different types of input examples. In Fig. 3 Left, CREMA with 3D point cloud inputs (P) fails to find the chair and respond to the color of the wall, brown, as its 2D scene image features are incorporated in 3D point cloud features. CREMA with Video (V) and V, P also predict inaccurate chair color, black. However, with the assistance of depth information, the method can capture objects accurately and find the designated chair as well. Similarly, in Fig. 3 Right, optical flow inputs help to find musicians with their poses playing instruments, so our CREMA method can tell the middle instrument is not being played at the beginning, but from the left. More examples are in Appendix (Sec. B.4).

5. Conclusion

This paper introduces CREMA, an efficient and powerful framework for multimodal compositional video reasoning.




Figure 3: **Qualitative examples for multimodal compositional video reasoning** from SQA3D (Left) and MUSIC-AVQA (Right). The correct predictions are marked by green check marks. We provide more examples in the Appendix (Sec. B.4).

We introduce parameter-efficient modality-adaptive modules atop a multimodal Q-former to seamlessly incorporate any new modalities like video, optical flow, audio, 3D point cloud, etc. Since our CREMA method does not require modifying the backbone architectures, we can easily upgrade our framework with new and stronger language models in the future without damaging its ability on existing modalities. We demonstrate the efficacy of our method on various multimodal QA benchmarks, surpassing baselines’ performance with a notable reduction in trainable parameters. Furthermore, we present a multimodal fusion module to avoid the increase in query tokens when integrating more modalities, so we keep low computational costs in LLM generations while still achieving competitive performance.

Broader Impacts

The CREMA framework leverages a pre-trained vision-language model backbone with the proposed adapter modules to integrate multiple modality inputs through a universal framework. Similar to most works leveraging pre-trained vision-language models, this might occasionally yield unexpected or inappropriate responses, potentially reflecting societal biases related to gender, race, or sexuality. More studies of vision-language models are needed to evaluate and mitigate these negative biases, and toxic output.

Acknowledgement

We thank Jaemin Cho, Abhay Zala, Han Lin, Yi-Lin Sung, and Ziyang Wang for their valuable feedback and input for the paper. This work was supported by ARO Award W911NF2110220, DARPA KAIROS Grant FA8750-19-2-1004, ONR Grant N00014-23-1-2356, DARPA ECOLE Program No. HR00112390060, DARPA MCS Grant N66001-19-2-4031, and NSF-AI Engage Institute DRL211263. The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this article are those of the authors and not of the funding agency.

References

Alayrac, J.-B., Donahue, J., Luc, P., Miech, A., Barr, I., Hasson, Y., Lenc, K., Mensch, A., Millican, K., Reynolds, M., et al. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.

Azuma, D., Miyanishi, T., Kurita, S., and Kawanabe, M. Scanqa: 3d question answering for spatial scene understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022.

Bae, G., Budvytis, I., and Cipolla, R. Estimating and exploiting the aleatoric uncertainty in surface normal estimation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 13137–13146, 2021.

Bhat, S. F., Birkl, R., Wofk, D., Wonka, P., and Müller, M. Zoedepth: Zero-shot transfer by combining relative and metric depth. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12288*, 2023.

Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J. D., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., et al. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.

Buch, S., Eyzaguirre, C., Gaidon, A., Wu, J., Fei-Fei, L., and Niebles, J. C. Revisiting the "video" in video-language understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022.

Castellon, R., Donahue, C., and Liang, P. Codified audio language modeling learns useful representations for music information retrieval. In *ISMIR*, 2021.

Chen, S., Wu, Y., Wang, C., Liu, S., Tompkins, D., Chen, Z., Che, W., Yu, X., and Wei, F. BEATs: Audio pre-training with acoustic tokenizers. In *Proceedings of the*

- International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2023.
- Chuang, Y.-S., Liu, C.-L., Lee, H.-Y., and Lee, L.-s. Speechbert: An audio-and-text jointly learned language model for end-to-end spoken question answering. In *Interspeech*, 2020.
- Dai, A., Chang, A. X., Savva, M., Halber, M., Funkhouser, T., and Nießner, M. Scannet: Richly-annotated 3d reconstructions of indoor scenes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2017.
- Ding, N., Qin, Y., Yang, G., Wei, F., Yang, Z., Su, Y., Hu, S., Chen, Y., Chan, C.-M., Chen, W., et al. Delta tuning: A comprehensive study of parameter efficient methods for pre-trained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.06904*, 2022.
- Fu, Z., Yang, H., So, A. M.-C., Lam, W., Bing, L., and Collier, N. On the effectiveness of parameter-efficient fine-tuning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, 2023.
- Girdhar, R., El-Nouby, A., Liu, Z., Singh, M., Alwala, K. V., Joulin, A., and Misra, I. Imagebind: One embedding space to bind them all. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2023.
- Gong, T., Lyu, C., Zhang, S., Wang, Y., Zheng, M., Zhao, Q., Liu, K., Zhang, W., Luo, P., and Chen, K. Multimodal-gpt: A vision and language model for dialogue with humans. *2305.04790*, 2023.
- Han, J., Gong, K., Zhang, Y., Wang, J., Zhang, K., Lin, D., Qiao, Y., Gao, P., and Yue, X. Onellm: One framework to align all modalities with language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03700*, 2023.
- Han, T., Xie, W., and Zisserman, A. Self-supervised co-training for video representation learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- Hong, Y., Zhen, H., Chen, P., Zheng, S., Du, Y., Chen, Z., and Gan, C. 3d-llm: Injecting the 3d world into large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023.
- Hou, J., Xie, S., Graham, B., Dai, A., and Nießner, M. Pri3d: Can 3d priors help 2d representation learning? In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2021.
- Hou, J., Dai, X., He, Z., Dai, A., and Nießner, M. Mask3d: Pre-training 2d vision transformers by learning masked 3d priors. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2023.
- Hu, E. J., Shen, Y., Wallis, P., Allen-Zhu, Z., Li, Y., Wang, S., Wang, L., and Chen, W. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022.
- Huang, J., Gu, S. S., Hou, L., Wu, Y., Wang, X., Yu, H., and Han, J. Large language models can self-improve. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2023.
- Jaegle, A., Gimeno, F., Brock, A., Vinyals, O., Zisserman, A., and Carreira, J. Perceiver: General perception with iterative attention. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2021.
- Jatavallabhula, K. M., Saryazdi, S., Iyer, G., and Paull, L. gradslam: Automagically differentiable slam. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.10672*, 2019.
- Jatavallabhula, K. M., Kuwajerwala, A., Gu, Q., Omama, M., Chen, T., Li, S., Iyer, G., Saryazdi, S., Keetha, N., Tewari, A., et al. Conceptfusion: Open-set multimodal 3d mapping. In *Robotics: Science and Systems (RSS)*, 2023.
- Jia, M., Tang, L., Chen, B.-C., Cardie, C., Belongie, S., Hariharan, B., and Lim, S.-N. Visual prompt tuning. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2022.
- Khashabi, D., Min, S., Khot, T., Sabharwal, A., Tafjord, O., Clark, P., and Hajishirzi, H. Unifiedqa: Crossing format boundaries with a single qa system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00700*, 2020.
- Kiela, D., Grave, E., Joulin, A., and Mikolov, T. Efficient large-scale multi-modal classification. In *Proceedings of the AAAI National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, 2018.
- Kim, C. D., Kim, B., Lee, H., and Kim, G. Audiocaps: Generating captions for audios in the wild. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, 2019.
- Ko, D., Lee, J. S., Kang, W., Roh, B., and Kim, H. J. Large language models are temporal and causal reasoners for video question answering. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2023.

- Krishna, R., Zhu, Y., Groth, O., Johnson, J., Hata, K., Kravitz, J., Chen, S., Kalantidis, Y., Li, L.-J., Shamma, D. A., et al. Visual genome: Connecting language and vision using crowdsourced dense image annotations. *International journal of computer vision*, 123:32–73, 2017.
- Lei, J., Li, L., Zhou, L., Gan, Z., Berg, T. L., Bansal, M., and Liu, J. Less is more: Clipbert for video-and-language learning via sparse sampling. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2021.
- Li, B., Zhang, Y., Chen, L., Wang, J., Yang, J., and Liu, Z. Otter: A multi-modal model with in-context instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03726*, 2023a.
- Li, G., Wei, Y., Tian, Y., Xu, C., Wen, J.-R., and Hu, D. Learning to answer questions in dynamic audio-visual scenarios. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 19108–19118, 2022.
- Li, J., Li, D., Savarese, S., and Hoi, S. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2023b.
- Li, Y.-L., Liu, X., Lu, H., Wang, S., Liu, J., Li, J., and Lu, C. Detailed 2d-3d joint representation for human-object interaction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2020.
- Lin, T.-Y., Maire, M., Belongie, S., Hays, J., Perona, P., Ramanan, D., Dollár, P., and Zitnick, C. L. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6-12, 2014, Proceedings, Part V 13*, pp. 740–755. Springer, 2014.
- Lin, Y.-B., Sung, Y.-L., Lei, J., Bansal, M., and Bertasius, G. Vision transformers are parameter-efficient audio-visual learners. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2023.
- Liu, H., Li, C., Li, Y., and Lee, Y. J. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03744*, 2023a.
- Liu, H., Li, C., Wu, Q., and Lee, Y. J. Visual instruction tuning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023b.
- Liu, S., Fan, L., Johns, E., Yu, Z., Xiao, C., and Anandkumar, A. Prism: A vision-language model with an ensemble of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.02506*, 2023c.
- Lu, J., Clark, C., Lee, S., Zhang, Z., Khosla, S., Marten, R., Hoiem, D., and Kembhavi, A. Unified-io 2: Scaling autoregressive multimodal models with vision, language, audio, and action. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.17172*, 2023.
- Ma, X., Yong, S., Zheng, Z., Li, Q., Liang, Y., Zhu, S.-C., and Huang, S. Sqa3d: Situated question answering in 3d scenes. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023.
- Moon, S., Madotto, A., Lin, Z., Nagarajan, T., Smith, M., Jain, S., Yeh, C.-F., Murugesan, P., Heidari, P., Liu, Y., et al. Anymal: An efficient and scalable any-modality augmented language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16058*, 2023.
- Ordonez, V., Kulkarni, G., and Berg, T. Im2text: Describing images using 1 million captioned photographs. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.
- Panagopoulou, A., Xue, L., Yu, N., Li, J., Li, D., Joty, S., Xu, R., Savarese, S., Xiong, C., and Niebles, J. C. X-instructblip: A framework for aligning x-modal instruction-aware representations to llms and emergent cross-modal reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.18799*, 2023.
- Radford, A., Kim, J. W., Hallacy, C., Ramesh, A., Goh, G., Agarwal, S., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Mishkin, P., Clark, J., et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2021.
- Ramachandran, P., Zoph, B., and Le, Q. V. Swish: a self-gated activation function. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.05941*, 2017.
- Schuhmann, C., Vencu, R., Beaumont, R., Kaczmarczyk, R., Mullis, C., Katta, A., Coombes, T., Jitsev, J., and Komatsuzaki, A. Laion-400m: Open dataset of clip-filtered 400 million image-text pairs. In *NeurIPS Workshop*, 2021.
- Sharma, P., Ding, N., Goodman, S., and Soricut, R. Conceptual captions: A cleaned, hypernymed, image alt-text dataset for automatic image captioning. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 2556–2565, 2018.
- Sun, G., Yu, W., Tang, C., Chen, X., Tan, T., Li, W., Lu, L., Ma, Z., and Zhang, C. Fine-grained audio-visual joint representations for multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05863*, 2023a.
- Sun, Q., Fang, Y., Wu, L., Wang, X., and Cao, Y. Evalclip: Improved training techniques for clip at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15389*, 2023b.

- Tang, Z., Cho, J., Nie, Y., and Bansal, M. Tvlvt: Textless vision-language transformer. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- Tang, Z., Yang, Z., Zhu, C., Zeng, M., and Bansal, M. Any-to-any generation via composable diffusion. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023.
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, Ł., and Polosukhin, I. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2017.
- Wang, C., Chen, S., Wu, Y., Zhang, Z., Zhou, L., Liu, S., Chen, Z., Liu, Y., Wang, H., Li, J., et al. Neural codec language models are zero-shot text to speech synthesizers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.02111*, 2023.
- Xiao, J., Shang, X., Yao, A., and Chua, T.-S. Next-qa: Next phase of question-answering to explaining temporal actions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2021.
- Xu, H., Zhang, J., Cai, J., Rezatofighi, H., Yu, F., Tao, D., and Geiger, A. Unifying flow, stereo and depth estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2023.
- Yu, S., Cho, J., Yadav, P., and Bansal, M. Self-chained image-language model for video localization and question answering. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023a.
- Yu, W., Tang, C., Sun, G., Chen, X., Tan, T., Li, W., Lu, L., Ma, Z., and Zhang, C. Connecting speech encoder and large language model for asr. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.13963*, 2023b.
- Yu, Z., Yu, J., Cui, Y., Tao, D., and Tian, Q. Deep modular co-attention networks for visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2019.
- Zang, Y., Li, W., Han, J., Zhou, K., and Loy, C. C. Contextual object detection with multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18279*, 2023.
- Zellers, R., Lu, J., Lu, X., Yu, Y., Zhao, Y., Salehi, M., Kusupati, A., Hessel, J., Farhadi, A., and Choi, Y. Merlot reserve: Neural script knowledge through vision and language and sound. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022.
- Zhang, H., Li, X., and Bing, L. Video-llama: An instruction-tuned audio-visual language model for video understanding. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2023.
- Zhao, Z., Wallace, E., Feng, S., Klein, D., and Singh, S. Calibrate before use: Improving few-shot performance of language models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2021.
- Zhu, D., Chen, J., Shen, X., Li, X., and Elhoseiny, M. Minigt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024.

Appendix

In this Appendix, we present the following:

- Additional information about our experimental setup (Sec. A), including benchmarks details (Sec. A.1), details of multimodal encoder and visual expert models (Sec. A.2), MMQA module pre-training data preprocessing (Sec. A.3), baseline implementation details (sec. A.4), and CREMA implementation details (sec. A.5).
- Additional experiments (Sec. B), including zero-shot per-task performance on MUSIC-AVQA (Sec. B.1), the impact of MMQA pre-training (Sec. B.2), the impact of LoRA rank (Sec. B.3), and more qualitative visualization (Sec. B.4).
- License information (Sec. C) for the datasets, codes, and models that we used in this paper.

A. Experimental Setup

In this section, we present additional information on the used datasets/benchmarks (sec. A.1), multimodal encoder and visual expert models (Sec. A.2), baseline implementation (sec. A.4), and CREMA implementation details (sec. A.5).

A.1. Benchmark and Dataset

We evaluate the CREMA framework on three video reasoning and QA tasks, focusing on both conventional VideoQA (requires video and language) and compositional VideoQA (requires video, language and other modalities). These include: (1) **SQA3D** (Ma et al., 2023): Another compositional Video QA task, requiring the understanding of video, 3D scenes, and text. Designed for 3D situated QA, it includes 33K questions and 650 3D scenes corresponding to ego-centric videos. We apply extra depth maps to it and report results on the test part following (Hong et al., 2023). (2) **MUSIC-AVQA** (Li et al., 2022): A compositional Video QA benchmark that involves reasoning across video, audio, and text. This dataset contains 9288 videos and 45K questions. We follow X-InstructBLIP (Alayrac et al., 2022) to evaluate our CREMA and on other baselines on the high-quality real video part. We enhance it with optical flow as an extra input and report our findings on the test set. (3) **NeXT-QA** (Xiao et al., 2021): A conventional Video QA benchmark for causal and temporal reasoning with video and text inputs. It consists of 5440 videos and 52K questions. We include optical flow, depth map, and surface normals extracted from raw videos as additional modalities. Our results are based on the validation partition following previous work (Yu et al., 2023a).

A.2. Multimodal Encoders and Visual Expert Models

We apply multiple encoders to encode multimodal raw input as discussed in Sec. 3.2. For visual inputs (video RGB frames, depth map, optical flow, and surface normals), we follow BLIP-2 (Li et al., 2023b) and X-InstructBLIP (Panagopoulou et al., 2023) to utilize ViT-G (Sun et al., 2023b) to encode visual information. As depth map, optical flow, and surface normals raw data are with different channel numbers to the ViT model required, We transform those extra visual information to the RGB domain first to adapt the ViT model. For audio, we use the same BEATS_{ITER3+} (Chen et al., 2023) encoder as in X-InstructBLIP (Panagopoulou et al., 2023). For the 3D point cloud, we follow data preprocessing in 3D-LLM (Hong et al., 2023) and ConceptFusion (Jatavallabhula et al., 2023) that first extract pixel-aligned dense features for rendered images features and then fuse 2D features into 3D maps using gradslam (Jatavallabhula et al., 2019).

We employ plug-and-play frozen experts to extract diverse modalities features, including depth map, optical flow, and surface normals, from raw videos. For optical flow estimation, we utilize the SotA Unimatch (Xu et al., 2023) model (GMFlow-scale2-regrefine6-mixdata). For depth map estimation, we leverage the SotA ZoeDepth-NK (Bhat et al., 2023) model. For surface normals estimation, we follow Prismr (Liu et al., 2023c) to use NLL-AngMF (Bae et al., 2021) that pre-trained on ScanNet (Dai et al., 2017). We decode video into frames to extract per-frame depth map/optical flow/surface normals. We set 3 fps, 1 fps, and 3 fps to decode SQA3D, MUSIC-AVQA, and NeXT-QA videos respectively.

A.3. MMQA Pre-training Details

As discussed in Sec. 3.3, we conduct extra lightweight pre-training for MMQA module to obtain a good initialization. We follow audio-pertaining settings in X-InstructBLIP (Panagopoulou et al., 2023) with AudioCaps (Kim et al., 2019), but excluded caption data as our work is more focusing video reasoning. In this case, we obtained a QA-related subset from AudioCaps for MMQA-QA pre-training. Similarly, we utilized the 3D data released from 3D-LLM (Hong et al., 2023) and also took the QA format part for MMQA-3D pretraining. We pre-trained with $1e^{-5}$ learning rate and 1 epoch for efficient initialization.

A.4. Baseline Model Implementation

We conduct experiments with $4 \times 48GB$ A6000 GPUs, we report baseline model training hyperparameters in Tab. 7. We follow hyperparameter settings that have been searched to yield the best performance in SeViLA (Yu et al., 2023a) with the same backbone model. To prompt LLM, we de-

Table 7: Baseline models fine-tuning hyperparameters.

Model (Dataset)	Modality	# Frames	Batch Size per GPU	Learning Rate	Warmup Epoch	Epoch	Gradient Accumulation Step
3D-LLM (SQA3D)	V	4	16	3e-05	1000	20	2
	V, P	4	16	3e-05	1000	20	2
	V, P, D	4	16	3e-05	1000	20	2
BLIP-2 (MUSIC-AVQA)	A	4	8	3e-05	1000	20	2
	V	4	8	3e-05	1000	20	2
	V, A	4	8	3e-05	1000	20	2
	V, A, F	4	8	3e-05	1000	20	2
BLIP-2 (NeXT-QA)	V	4	16	3e-05	1000	10	1
	V, F	4	8	3e-05	1000	10	2
	V, F, D	4	4	3e-05	1000	10	4
	V, F, D, N	4	4	3e-05	1000	10	4

sign different prompts for open-ended QA tasks (SQA3D, MUSIC-AVQA) and multi-choice QA (NeXT-QA) following previous works (Yu et al., 2023a; Han et al., 2023). For open-ended QA, we let LLM generate responses without extra constraints and then compare the generated answers with ground-truth answers for accuracy calculation. We list prompts design for each dataset in Tab. 9

A.5. CREMA Implementation Details

CREMA framework adopts BLIP-2 (Li et al., 2023b), an image-language model with 4.1B parameters and pre-trained on 129M images in total, including COCO (Lin et al., 2014), Visual Genome (Krishna et al., 2017), CC12M (Sharma et al., 2018), SBU (Ordonez et al., 2011), and 115M images from LAION400M (Schuhmann et al., 2021). See Appendix for details. we also report our CREMA framework training hyperparameters in Tab. 8. The experiments are conducted on the same $4 \times 48\text{GB}$ A6000 GPUs machine.

B. Extra Experiments

In this section, we provide additional experiments and analysis, including zero-shot per-task performance on MUSIC-AVQA (Sec. B.1), the impact of MMQA pre-training (Sec. B.2), the impact of LoRA rank (Sec. B.3), and more qualitative visualization (Sec. B.4).

B.1. Extra Zero-shot Result on MUSIC-AVQA

As listed in Tab. 10, we report extra zero-shot performance on MUSIC-AVQA by more fine-grained task/question types. It shows that video (V) combined with audio (A) brings notable and consistent improvement across most question types, highlighting the compositional video reasoning ability of our proposed CREMA.

B.2. The impact of MMQA Pre-training.

As listed in Tab. 11, we demonstrate the impact of MMQA module pre-training on SQA3D and MUSIC-AVQA datasets. It shows that such an efficient MMQA pre-training brings a significant boost (+1.2% on SQA3D with 3D point cloud (P), +2.9% on MUSIC-AVQA with audio (A)) to the zero-shot performance for each single modality. It demonstrates the effectiveness of our MMQA and the pre-training process.

B.3. Rank of LoRA Module.

We investigate the impact of the rank r of our modality-adaptive LoRA modules in CREMA. As shown in Tab. 12, adjusting the rank size within a reasonable range brings an insignificant change in the number of trainable parameters (e.g., $\pm 1 \sim 2$ M). We also find that a larger rank size does not guarantee improved performance. For MUSIC-AVQA, we fine-tuned the model on audio inputs (A), and it always outperforms the best-performing baseline (AVQA, 64.2%) by a significant margin. CREMA trained on 3d point cloud data performs similarly with the rank size of 32 and 64 on SQA3D. We set $r = 64$ as the default for all experiments, showing the robustness of our MMQA module in selecting r over diverse modality inputs and evaluation tasks. But, we believe our CREMA method with proper r can further improve its reasoning ability.

B.4. Visualization

In Fig. 4, we present additional visual examples from SQA3D and MUSIC-AVQA, demonstrating how the integration of multiple input modalities enhances model predictions. For instance, depth maps in the top left example reveal the distance of objects, enabling the model to discern that the clock is closer than the pillow. Similarly, in the middle left, depth maps indicate an open door through depth of field analysis, aiding in question answering. In

Table 8: CREMA fine-tuning hyperparameters.

Dataset	Modality	# Frames	Batch Size per GPU	Learning Rate	Warmup	Epoch	Gradient Accumulation Step
SQA3D	P	4	16	2e-4	1000	20	1
	V	4	16	2e-4	1000	20	1
	V, P	4	16	2e-4	1000	20	1
	V, P, D	4	16	2e-4	1000	20	1
MUSIC-AVQA	A	4	24	2e-4	1000	20	1
	V	4	24	2e-4	1000	20	1
	V, A	4	24	2e-4	1000	20	1
	V, A, F	4	24	2e-4	1000	20	1
NeXT-QA	V	4	16	1e-4	1000	10	1
	V, F	4	16	1e-4	1000	10	1
	V, D	4	16	1e-4	1000	10	1
	V, N	4	16	1e-4	1000	10	1
	V, F, D	4	16	1e-4	1000	10	1
	V, F, D, N	4	8	1e-4	1000	10	2

Table 9: Prompt designs for each dataset.

Dataset	LLM Prompt
SQA3D	Based on the frames and 3D Model information, answer the question using a single word or phrase.
MUSIC-AVQA	Based on the frames and audio information, answer the question using a single word or phrase.
NeXT-QA	Considering the information presented in the frame, select the correct answer from the options

Table 10: **Zero-shot Per-task Results of CREMA method on Audio-Video Question Answering (MUSIC-AVQA).** We report simple notations for each modality and question type: **V**: Video RGB frames, **A**: Audio, **F**: optical Flow, **Cnt.:** Counting, **Com.:** Comparative, **Loc.:** Location, **Ext.:** Existential, and **Tem.:** Temporal.

Modality	Audio Question			Visual Question			Audio-Visual Question						Avg.
	Cnt.	Com.	Avg.	Cnt.	Loc.	Avg.	Ext.	Loc.	Cnt.	Com.	Tem.	Avg.	
A	50.4	53.2	51.0	29.1	18.5	23.9	39.9	13.0	27.1	49.6	4.3	29.1	31.0
V	73.4	51.2	<u>68.6</u>	<u>51.4</u>	44.4	<u>48.0</u>	76.4	<u>43.5</u>	38.7	47.1	<u>26.3</u>	<u>47.7</u>	<u>51.0</u>
A,V	75.5	51.6	70.4	55.5	<u>42.6</u>	49.2	<u>76.2</u>	44.2	45.1	48.2	<u>26.3</u>	49.5	52.6

Table 11: The impact of Modality-Specific LoRA Pre-training. We report zero-shot performance.

Dataset	Modality	w/o PT	w PT
MUSIC-AVQA (Avg.)	A	28.1	31.0
SQA3D (Avg.)	P	36.1	37.3

Table 12: **The impact of the rank r of modality-adaptive LoRA module in CREMA.**

#Rank	Music-AVQA (A)	SQA3D (P)	Trainable Params. (A) / (P)
32	69.4	47.0	3.8 M / 2.7 M
64	68.0	47.3	5.0 M / 3.9 M
128	67.7	46.3	7.4 M / 6.3 M

MUSIC-AVQA examples on the right, optical flow captures motion, essential for deducing which instrument is being played. Specifically, the bottom right illustration shows that initial static behavior of the left people implies the right instrument is not played initially. This evidence highlights the benefit of incorporating diverse modalities for improved model reasoning ability.

C. License

We will make our code and models publicly accessible. We use standard licenses from the community and provide the following links to the licenses for the datasets, codes, and models that we used in this paper. For further information, please refer to the specific link.




Figure 4: Qualitative examples for multimodal compositional video reasoning from SQA3D (Left) and MUSIC-AVQA (Right). The correct predictions are marked by green checks.

SQA3D: Apache

MUSIC-AVQA: MIT

NExT-QA: MIT

AudioCaps: MIT

3D-LLM: MIT

LAVIS: BSD 3-Clause

PyTorch: BSD-style

Huggingface Transformers: Apache

Torchvision: BSD 3-Clause