

---

# VideoGPT+ : Integrating Image and Video Encoders for Enhanced Video Understanding

---

Muhammad Maaz<sup>1</sup>, Hanoona Rasheed<sup>1</sup>, Salman Khan<sup>1,2</sup>, Fahad Shahbaz Khan<sup>1,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Mohamed bin Zayed University of AI, UAE

<sup>2</sup>Australian National University, Australia <sup>3</sup>Linköping University, Sweden

## Abstract

Building on the advances of language models, Large Multimodal Models (LMMs) have contributed significant improvements in video understanding. While the current video LMMs utilize advanced Large Language Models (LLMs), they rely on either image or video encoders to process visual inputs, each of which has its own limitations. Image encoders excel at capturing rich spatial details from frame sequences but lack explicit temporal context, which can be important in videos with intricate action sequences. On the other hand, video encoders provide temporal context but are often limited by computational constraints that lead to processing only sparse frames at lower resolutions, resulting in reduced contextual and spatial understanding. To this end, we introduce VideoGPT+, which combines the complementary benefits of the image encoder (for detailed spatial understanding) and the video encoder (for global temporal context modeling). The model processes videos by dividing them into smaller segments and applies an adaptive pooling strategy on features extracted by both image and video encoders. Our architecture showcases improved performance across multiple video benchmarks, including VCGBench, MVBench and Zero-shot question-answering. Further, we develop 112K video-instruction set using a novel semi-automatic annotation pipeline which further improves the model performance. Additionally, to comprehensively evaluate video LMMs, we present VCGBench-Diverse, covering 18 broad video categories such as lifestyle, sports, science, gaming, and surveillance videos. This benchmark with 4,354 question-answer pairs evaluates the generalization of existing LMMs on dense video captioning, spatial and temporal understanding, and complex reasoning, ensuring comprehensive assessment across diverse video types and dynamics. Code: <https://github.com/mbzuai-oryx/VideoGPT-plus>.

## 1 Introduction

Existing methods for video understanding often rely solely on either image encoders or video encoders [1, 2, 3]. Most works focus on image encoders, which encode multiple frames and either fuse the information or concatenate the embeddings before passing them to the LLM. When fusing the information, spatial or temporal pooling is typically used [1]. Spatial pooling has shown minimal effectiveness in capturing video information, whereas temporal pooling retains some spatial information but lacks explicit temporal context. On the other hand, concatenating embeddings without pooling [2, 3, 4] can rapidly increase computational complexity due to the extended context length required by the LLM, limiting the number of frames that can be processed. While this approach provides better spatial representation, the overall context is still limited to few frames. The limited context results in a poor understanding of the video, especially if a uniform sampling strategy is employed, as it only captures small segments of the video, missing important temporal dynamics.

In order to address these challenges, we propose VideoGPT+ which effectively combines the merits of both image and video encoders (see Fig. 2). By leveraging an image encoder for rich spatial details and a video encoder for global temporal context, our model achieves improved video understanding. To model finegrained temporal dynamics in VideoGPT+, we use a segment-wise sampling strategy. Unlike uniform sampling used in existing video LLMs [1], which may miss important temporal dynamics, our approach divides the video into smaller segments and applies segment-wise sampling. This ensures that the model captures representative information from different segments of the video, enabling a more comprehensive understanding.

To facilitate the integration of image and video features, VideoGPT+ introduces a visual adapter module that combines their complimentary benefits. This module performs projection and pooling operations, mapping both image and video features to a common space while reducing computational complexity. By aligning the features in this manner, the model can effectively utilize the combined spatial and temporal information for improved video understanding.

We demonstrate the effectiveness of VideoGPT+ across multiple video-conversation benchmarks, including VCGBench [1], MVBench [7], and Zero-shot question-answering [1], where it outperforms previous SoTA approaches (see Fig. 1). Further, we develop VCG+ 112K using a novel semi-automatic annotation pipeline (see Fig. 3), which provides dense video captions along with spatial understanding and reasoning-based question-answer (QA) pairs, further enhancing the model’s performance. We also propose VCGBench-Diverse, extending VCGBench [1] by including videos from 18 different domains to extensively evaluate the video-based conversation models in diverse domains (see Fig. 4).

Our work has three main contributions:

- We present VideoGPT+, the first video-conversation model that benefits from a dual-encoding scheme based on both image and video features. These complimentary sets of features offer rich spatiotemporal details for improved video understanding (Sec. 3).
- Addressing the limitations of existing VideoInstruct100K dataset [1], we develop VCG+ 112K with a novel semi-automatic annotation pipeline, offering dense video captions along with spatial understanding and reasoning-based QA pairs, further improving the model performance (Sec. 4).
- Recognizing the lack of diverse benchmarks for video-conversation task, we propose VCGBench-Diverse, which provides 4,354 human annotated QA pairs across 18 video categories to extensively evaluate the performance of a video-conversation model (Sec. 5).

## 2 Related Works

Building on advances in language models, LLMs offer a flexible interface for various multimodal applications. Early efforts in image-based conversation models such as BLIP-2 [8], MiniGPT-4 [9] and LLaVA [10, 11] project image features into the language space through a learnable module and perform instruction tuning for visual conversations capabilities. Other efforts extend these models to visual grounding tasks [12, 13, 14], exploring the potential of LLMs in complex vision tasks.

**Video Conversation Models:** Initial works like Video-ChatGPT [1] and Video-LLaMA [15] extend image-based models to the video domain by introducing components to encode temporal features, where frame-level visual features are fed to the LLM. However, this is computationally expensive and quickly fills its context window. To address this issue, Video-ChatGPT [1] employs spatial and temporal pooling. LLaMA-Vid [16] proposes representing a single image with two tokens, context and content. IG-VLM [17] treats a video as a grid of images, while LITA [18] employs slow-fast




Figure 1: Performance comparison of VideoGPT+ with various SoTA models across multiple video benchmarks. VideoGPT+ demonstrates better performance compared to various models [5, 2, 6, 1] on video conversation benchmarks: VCGBench [1] and MVBench [5], Zero-shot video question answering: MSVD-QA, MSRVTT-QA, ActivityNet-QA. We also evaluate on VCGBench-Diverse that covers 18 broad video categories (across dense captioning, spatial understanding, and reasoning).




Figure 2: **Overview of VideoGPT+.** VideoGPT+ is a large multimodal model for video understanding. It uses a dual-encoder design that combines the complementary strengths of an image encoder and a video encoder. The image encoder captures detailed spatial features, while the video encoder captures temporal dynamics across multiple frames. To retain fine-grained temporal details while ensuring efficiency, we use segment-wise frame sampling instead of random sparse sampling. Both sets of features are then projected into a unified space through Vision-Language (V-L) projection layers and the resulting tokens are pooled and concatenated before being processed by a Large Language Model to generate comprehensive responses to video-based questions. Symbols ❄️ indicates frozen components, 🔥 indicates trainable components, and the 🔥 indicates LoRA-training.

token pooling to reduce the number of visual features. Chat-UniVi [2] uses clustering in both spatial and temporal dimensions to merge tokens, and VideoChat [5] uses Q-Former [8] to learn a fixed number of queries by cross-attending to the visual features. MobileVLM [19, 20] utilize a lightweight CNN to reduce the spatial dimensions. Other notable methods include [21, 6, 22, 23, 24].

Alternatively, methods such as VideoChat2 [7] use pretrained video encoders. Although video encoders provide temporal context, they are limited by computational constraints, operating with limited frames at lower resolutions, restricting temporal context and spatial understanding. Our VideoGPT+ model addresses these issues by using segment-wise sampling and effectively combining the merits of image and video encoders to capture rich spatial and temporal details (see Fig. 2).

**Video Instruction Tuning Datasets:** VideoChat [5] builds a video-instruction tuning dataset consisting of 7K instructions using videos from WebVid-10M [25]. Video-ChatGPT [1] introduces a semi-automatic annotation pipeline to generate VideoInstruct100K using videos from ActivityNet [26]. VideoChat2 [7] combines multiple existing image and video datasets to develop a 1.9M joint image-video instruction tuning dataset. In our experiments, we use VideoInstruct100K and a subset of the dataset from VideoChat2. Additionally, addressing the limitations of the VideoInstruct100K dataset [1], we develop VCG+ 112K through a novel semi-automatic annotation pipeline, which provides dense video captions along with 112K QA pairs targeting reasoning, spatial and temporal understanding, which further improves model’s understanding of video content (see Fig. 3).

**Video Conversation Benchmarks:** Video-ChatGPT [1] introduces VCGBench and Zero-shot QA benchmarks, where VCGBench includes 500 videos with 3000 QA pairs, evaluated using GPT-3.5 across various metrics. Despite its comprehensive evaluation, it only contains videos from the ActivityNet dataset. The Zero-shot evaluation covers MSVD-QA [27], MSR-VTT-QA [27], TGIF-QA [28], and ActivityNet-QA [26]. MVBench [7] consists of 4K QA pairs evaluating 20 temporal tasks, though it mostly includes short videos averaging 5-40 seconds. Considering the limitation of existing benchmarks, which often lack focus on generalization and diversity, we propose VCGBench-Diverse, featuring 4,354 QA pairs from 877 videos across 18 domains (see Fig. 4).

### 3 Method

For effective video understanding, combining detailed spatial information with explicit temporal context is crucial. To achieve this, we propose VideoGPT+, which features a dual encoder design that leverages the complementary strengths of an image encoder and a video encoder.

**Overall Architecture:** The overall architecture consists of (i) segment-wise sampling, (ii) dual visual encoder, (iii) vision-language adapters that project vision features to the language domain and (iv) a large language model. Frames selected through a segment-wise sampling strategy are encoded through a dual encoder consisting of an image and a video encoder. Both sets of features are projected to language space using vision-language (V-L) adapters, and the resulting tokens are pooled through adaptive token pooling and concatenated before being fed to the LLM (see Fig. 2).

**Segment-wise Sampling:** To extract fine-grained temporal cues, we use a segment-wise frame sampling strategy. Given an input video  $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times H \times W \times C}$ , we divide it into  $K$  segments, where each segment consists of  $n = \frac{T}{K}$  frames. Thus, the video can be represented as  $\mathbf{V} = [\mathbf{V}_k]_{k=1}^K$ . Each segment  $\mathbf{V}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times H \times W \times C}$  can be described as a sequence of frames,  $\mathbf{X}_i$ , where  $\mathbf{V}_k = [\mathbf{X}_{i,j}]_{j=1}^n$ . The video segments are downsampled to a lower resolution of  $n \times h \times w \times c$  for video encoding.

Compared to a uniform sampling, segment-wise sampling better aligns with our dual encoder design. Video encoders often face computational constraints, limiting them to processing only sparse frames. Uniform sampling increases the self-attention computation complexity as it requires attending to features of all frames. Additionally, video encoders are typically trained with sparse frames, and providing more frames can hinder their ability to accurately capture temporal information. In contrast, the segment-wise sampling strategy divides the video into smaller, manageable segments, enabling the video encoder to efficiently capture rich temporal cues within each segment.

**Dual Vision Encoder:** Our design leverages the complementary strengths of an image encoder that captures detailed spatial features and a video encoder that provides explicit temporal context. The image encoder  $g$ , processes  $T$  frames,  $g(\mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times H_g \times W_g \times D_g}$ , producing local features that provide frame-level context. Meanwhile, the video encoder  $h$ , operates on low-resolution video segments  $\mathbf{V}_k$ , yielding global features that provide segment-wise context,  $h(\mathbf{V}_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times h_h \times w_h \times D_h}$ .

The primary goal of VideoGPT+ is to leverage the capabilities of a pre-trained LLM alongside visual modalities from both a pre-trained image encoder and a pre-trained video encoder. Specifically, we utilize the pre-trained CLIP model, ViT-L/14 (336 × 336) [29] as the image encoder, and InternVideo-v2 (224 × 224) [30] as the video encoder. These models are selected for their robust performance and their ability to complement each other in capturing both spatial and temporal information. Both encoders are pre-trained on large-scale datasets in a multimodal setting using contrastive loss, facilitating their integration within our architecture.

**Visual Adapter:** The output embeddings from the second last layer of both image and video encoders are passed through separate V-L projection layers,  $W_g$  and  $W_h$ , respectively. These Multi-Layer perceptrons (MLPs) project the visual features into the language space. The projection layers are trainable, while the visual encoders remain frozen, preserving the rich, pre-trained representations. The projected embeddings are reshaped back into their grid forms and subjected to a  $2 \times 2$  adaptive token pooling, which operates on the spatial dimensions of the local and global features. This pooling reduces the token length by a factor of 4, thereby allowing to fit in larger visual context within the same LLM context window. The pooled embeddings from the local features form  $\mathbf{E}^{img} \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times h_g \times w_g \times D_t}$ , while the pooled embeddings from the global features of each segment form  $\mathbf{E}^{vid} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times h_h \times w_h \times D_t}$ .

**Large Language Model:** We obtain the final representation by concatenating the embeddings  $\mathbf{E}^{img}$  with  $K$  segment-wise embeddings  $\mathbf{E}^{vid}$ , such that we have detailed spatial representation across all segments followed by their global temporal context. We then concatenate the text embeddings  $\mathbf{E}^{text} \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times D_t}$  of the user text query with the visual embeddings,

$$\mathbf{E} = [\mathbf{E}^{img}, \mathbf{E}_1^{vid}, \dots, \mathbf{E}_K^{vid}, \mathbf{E}^{text}]. \quad (1)$$

This integration ensures that the LLM receives a sequence of embeddings that include detailed spatial features from the image encoder and comprehensive temporal context from the video encoder, allowing for robust video understanding. The LLM is fine-tuned using LoRA [31] in an auto-regressive manner with a next-token prediction loss. Refer to Fig. 2 for detailed illustration.

## 4 Dataset

Video-ChatGPT [1] introduces the VideoInstruct100K dataset, which employs a semi-automatic annotation pipeline to generate 75K instruction-tuning QA pairs. To address the limitations of this annotation process, we present VCG+ 112K dataset developed through an improved annotation




Figure 3: Illustration of the semi-automatic annotation process in VCG+ 112K. The figure shows how we use ground-truth video captions and frame-level descriptions to generate a detailed video description. GPT-4 is used to remove irrelevant and conflicting noisy information in the frame-level descriptions to produce a high-quality video description. The semi-automatic annotation process integrates **spatial**, **temporal** and **event**, and **reasoning** details into the brief information we start with. This dense video description is then used to generate instruction-tuning QA pairs using GPT-3.5. We provide detailed prompts used in both stages in Appendix 11 (see Figs. 8 and 9). We also compare the video description in the VideoInstruct100K [1] dataset to show the improvement in quality achieved by our new annotation pipeline.


pipeline. Our approach improves the accuracy and quality of instruction tuning pairs by improving keyframe extraction, leveraging SoTA large multimodal models (LMMs) for detailed descriptions, and refining the instruction generation strategy.

**Keyframe Extraction:** VideoInstruct100K uses a fixed number of video keyframes, regardless of video length or dynamics, to generate frame-level dense captions. This often results in both insufficient and redundant information. We address this by first extracting scenes from videos [32], and then selecting one keyframe/scene. Consequently, we obtain detailed information for videos with rich content and reduce redundancy for videos with less content. It provides better visual context by extracting more stable keyframes, thus offering a more accurate video representation.

**Frame-Level Descriptions:** After extracting keyframes, we use a SoTA image LMM, LLaVA-v1.6 [33], to generate dense descriptions for each keyframe. These descriptions encompass comprehensive visual details, including spatial attributes, scene context, and object characteristics, which are often absent in concise ground truth captions. While ground truth captions are precise, they lack the granularity to capture intricate visual and spatial information. To address this, we augment them captions with detailed but noisy information from the frame-level descriptions, thus enhancing the quality and accuracy of the subsequent video descriptions.

**Detailed Video Descriptions:** VideoInstruct100K [1] prompts GPT-3.5 directly with frame-level descriptions and concise ground truth captions to generate QA pairs, imposing a significant cognitive load on the model to verify frame-level descriptions with the ground truth. We improve this process by first creating a coherent and detailed video description. We prompt GPT-4 to integrate the detailed frame-level descriptions with the ground truth captions by comparing information and removing any inconsistencies. The resulting detailed descriptions include a timeline of events, actions, object attributes, and scene settings, providing a thorough representation of the video content. This structured input simplifies the task for LLM, thereby enhancing the generated QA pairs quality.

**Improved Instruction Tuning Data:** Using the ground truth captions and detailed video descriptions, we generate two types of high-quality QA pairs using GPT-3.5: descriptive and concise. For **descriptive** instruction pairs, we focus on three categories: (i) *dense captioning*, which provides descriptions of the video covering the entire sequence of events and visual details; (ii) *detailed temporal information*, which addresses the sequence of events and their dependency to learn temporal relationships; and (iii) *generic question answering*, which involves in-depth questions about different actions, their consequences, and other detailed aspects of the video. For **concise** instruction pairs, we target (i) *spatial reasoning*, focusing on understanding and describing spatial details such as scene settings, number of objects, attire, and locations; (ii) *reasoning* of events, covering the causal



Category	Description	#	Domains
<b>5 Video Capturing Methods</b>			
Stable Settings	Videos shot in stable, predictable environments with minimal camera movement.	1200	Cooking, How-to, Education
Dynamic Settings	Videos with significant camera movement requiring adaptation to rapid context shifts.	448	Sports, Traffic, Travel
Fixed Cameras	Videos recorded from stationary cameras, providing consistent viewpoints for monitoring purposes.	124	Surveillance, Automobile
Professional Quality	Professionally produced videos with high visual and audio quality, and controlled lighting.	1608	News, Film
Variable Quality	Informal videos with varying quality, often using handheld devices, captured in spontaneous settings.	124	Lifestyle, Pets
<b>6 Reasoning Complexities</b>			
Sequential Understanding	Requires comprehension and following of a series of steps or actions in order.	828	Cooking, How-to, Education
Predictive Reasoning	Involves understanding and predicting outcomes of dynamic, intricate action sequences.	180	Sports, Gaming
World Knowledge	Demands integration of broader contextual information and world knowledge to interpret video content.	848	Science, News
Causal Reasoning	Focuses on understanding cause-and-effect relationships within the video.	340	Surveillance, Activism
Emotional Reasoning	Involves interpreting stories, character motivations, and emotional subtexts.	1080	Entertainment, Film, Comedy
Analytical Reasoning	Requires critical analysis and interpretation of complex information or situations.	228	Traffic, Automobile

Figure 4: **Illustration of VCGBench-Diverse video conversational benchmark.** VCGBench-Diverse comprehensive benchmark is designed to evaluate video LMMs across 18 broad video categories. With 4,354 QA pairs, VCGBench-Diverse tests generalization on dense video captioning, spatial and temporal understanding, and complex reasoning. It covers five video-capturing methods, ensuring diversity and robust generalization and six reasoning complexities, assessing various analytical and comprehension skills.

relationships between events; and (iii) *short temporal questions*, addressing specific moments or sequences, such as what happened at the beginning or end.

## 5 Proposed Benchmark

Recognizing the limited diversity in existing video conversation benchmarks, we introduce VCGBench-Diverse to comprehensively evaluate the generalization ability of video LMMs. While VCG-Bench [1] provides an extensive evaluation protocol, it is limited to videos from the ActivityNet200 [26] dataset. Our benchmark comprises a total of 877 videos, 18 broad video categories and 4,354 QA pairs, ensuring a robust evaluation framework. The detailed breakdown of VCGBench-Diverse is illustrated in Fig. 4, showcasing the distribution of videos across content domains, video capturing methods, and reasoning complexities.

We collect videos from *18 distinct domains*, including lifestyle, how-to, science and technology, news, travel, entertainment, film, sports, comedy, activism, gaming, education, surveillance, pets, cooking, music, automobile, and traffic (see Fig. 4). These categories encompass a broad spectrum of real-world scenarios, ensuring that models are evaluated on a diverse set of challenges. In addition to content diversity, VCGBench-Diverse includes a variety of *video capture methods*, which ensures a comprehensive assessment of robustness to different filming techniques, camera movements, quality levels and lighting. The benchmark covers *five* video capture methods including static and controlled settings, dynamic and unpredictable settings, fixed camera perspectives, professional and high-quality videos, and uncontrolled and variable quality. Further, the benchmark evaluates models across *six reasoning complexities*, including sequential understanding, complex action and predictive reasoning, contextual and world knowledge reasoning, causal reasoning, narrative and emotional reasoning, and analytical and critical reasoning, which is crucial for understanding diverse video content.

The videos in VCGBench-Diverse are sourced from HDVILA [34], MPII [35], YouCook2 [36], UCF Crime [37], and STUD Traffic [38]. The video durations range from 29 sec to 471 sec, with an average of 217 sec. Human annotators are tasked with writing detailed descriptions based on their understanding of both audio and visual elements of the videos. This comprehensive annotation process involves a set of annotators who are provided with an initial set of ten videos each. These annotations undergo a meta-review stage where feedback is provided, and necessary corrections are made to meet the required standards. Following this, annotators receive additional batches, with random samples being selected for quality checks by the meta-reviewer. The final human annotations are utilized to generate QA pairs using GPT-3.5, based on prompts detailed in Fig. 10.

Following VCG-Bench [1], the evaluation is computed over five different aspects: (i) correctness of information (ii) detail orientation (iii) contextual understanding (iv) temporal understanding and (v) consistency. Additionally, VCGBench-Diverse provides a breakdown of performance across three key aspects: (i) dense video captioning, which assesses the ability to generate detailed and accurate descriptions of the video content, (ii) spatial understanding, which evaluates the capability

to understand and describe the spatial relationships and settings within the video, and (iii) reasoning, which tests the adeptness in inferring and explaining causal relationships and actions within the video.

## 6 Experiments

We perform quantitative evaluation of VideoGPT+ on four standard benchmarks: i) VCGBench [1], ii) VCGBench-Diverse, iii) MVBench [7] and iv) Zero-shot QA.

**Implementation Details:** We use CLIP-L/14 [29] as our image encoder, InternVideo-v2 [30] stage-2 1B model as our video encoder in conjunction with Phi-3-Mini-3.8B [39] based LLM with 4K context window in our experiments. The image encoder operates at  $336 \times 336$ , while the video encoder operates at  $224 \times 224$  resolution. Our training consists of two pretraining stages and one instruction-tuning stage. In the pretraining stage, we train with only the image encoder and only the video encoder on the CC-595K dataset [40], with only the visual adapters being learned while the rest of the model is kept frozen. During the instruction-tuning stage, we use LoRA [41] with  $r = 64$  for LLM, while visual adapters are fully trained and vision encoders are kept frozen. The LR is set to  $1e^{-3}$  during pretraining and  $2e^{-4}$  during instruction tuning.

For experiments on VCGBench, VCGBench-Diverse and Zero-shot QA, we sample 16 frames from videos, while for MVBench which consists of relatively shorter videos, we sample 8 frames. We keep the same sampling strategy during inference. For VCGBench and VCGBench-Diverse, the model is trained on VideoInstruct100K [1], VCG+ 112K, conversation and caption data from VideoChat [5] and VQA dataset from WebVid [25], that combines to approximately 260K single turn conversations. For MVBench, the model is trained on Kinetics-710 [42], Something-Something-v2 [43], conversations from VideoChat [5], CLEVRER [44], VQA dataset from WebVid [25] and NEXt-QA [45] datasets, which combines to approximately 330K single turn conversations. We run all trainings for one epoch. Following previous approaches [1, 2, 3], we employ GPT-3.5-Turbo-0613 for VCGBench and Zero-shot QA evaluation. However, for our proposed VCGBench-Diverse, we employ the latest GPT-3.5-Turbo-0125 for evaluation.

**VCGBench:** The benchmark consists of approximately 3000 QA pairs generated using 500 human-annotated videos from ActivityNet [26]. The benchmark evaluates the responses on five different aspects: i) Correctness of Information (CI), which assesses the correctness of the response to ensure it aligns with the video contents, ii) Detail Orientation (DO), which evaluates the depth of the response, iii) Contextual Understanding (CU), which assesses if the response aligns with the overall context of the video, iv) Tempo-

Method	CI	DO	CU	TU	CO	Avg.
Video-ChatGPT [1]	2.40	2.52	2.62	1.98	2.37	2.38
BT-Adapter [21]	2.68	2.69	3.27	2.34	2.46	2.69
VTimeLLM [24]	2.78	<u>3.10</u>	3.40	2.49	2.47	2.85
Chat-UniVi [2]	2.89	2.91	3.46	<b>2.89</b>	2.81	2.99
LLAMA-VID [16]	2.96	3.00	<u>3.53</u>	2.46	2.51	2.89
Video-LLaVA [6]	2.84	2.86	3.44	2.46	2.57	2.81
VideoChat2 [7]	3.02	2.88	3.51	2.66	2.81	2.98
IG-VLM [17]	<u>3.11</u>	2.78	3.51	2.44	3.29	<u>3.03</u>
VideoGPT+ (ours)	<b>3.27</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>3.74</b>	<u>2.83</u>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>3.28</b>

Table 1: **Performance of VideoGPT+ on VCGBench [1].** All models use 16 frames except Video-ChatGPT and Chat-UniVi which use 100 and 64 frames respectively.

ral Understanding (TU), which assesses the model’s ability to identify temporal sequences accurately, and v) Consistency (CO), which evaluates the consistency in the model response to similar questions. Table 1 compares our model with previous SoTA approaches. VideoGPT+ achieves an average score of 3.28 surpassing previous best method by a margin of 0.25 (5%).

**VCGBench-Diverse:** We provide a quantitative comparison of VideoGPT+ against previous SoTA approaches on VCGBench-Diverse, which contains 4,354 QA pairs from 877 videos. Following [1], we evaluate the Correctness of Information (CI), Detail Orientation (DO), Contextual Understanding (CU), Temporal Understanding (TU), and Consistency (CO). Additionally, we provide results for dense captioning, spatial understanding, and visual reasoning abilities. The results are presented in Table 2. VideoGPT+ achieves an average score of 2.47 surpassing all previous methods. Further, VideoGPT+ achieves a score of 1.38, 2.80, and 3.63 on dense captioning, spatial understanding, and visual reasoning, respectively. Notably, VideoGPT+ achieves improvements in spatial and temporal understanding, surpassing previous best models by 0.37 (7.4%) and 0.23 (4.6%), respectively. This is attributed to the dual encoder architecture, where the high-resolution image encoder enhances spatial understanding and the video encoder improves temporal accuracy.

Method	CI	DO	CU	TU	CO	Avg.	Caption	Spatial	Reasoning
Video-ChatGPT (ACL 2024) [1]	2.07	2.42	2.46	1.39	2.06	2.08	0.89	2.25	3.60
BT-Adapter (CVPR 2024) [21]	2.20	<u>2.62</u>	2.59	1.29	2.27	2.19	1.03	2.35	<u>3.62</u>
VTimeLLM (CVPR 2024) [24]	2.16	2.41	2.48	1.46	2.35	2.17	1.13	2.29	3.45
Chat-UniVi (CVPR 2024) [2]	<u>2.29</u>	2.56	<u>2.66</u>	1.56	<u>2.36</u>	<u>2.29</u>	<u>1.33</u>	2.36	3.59
VideoChat2 (CVPR 2024) [7]	2.13	2.42	2.51	1.66	2.27	2.20	1.26	2.43	3.13
VideoGPT+ (ours)	<b>2.46</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>1.78</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>2.47</b>	<b>1.38</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>3.63</b>

Table 2: **Performance of VideoGPT+ on VCGBench-Diverse.** All models use 16 frames except Video-ChatGPT and Chat-UniVi, which use 100 and 64 frames, respectively. The good performance of our model on VCGBench-Diverse shows its generalization to diverse scenarios.

Model	AS	AP	AA	FA	UA	OE	OI	OS	MD	AL	ST	AC	MC	MA	SC	FP	CO	EN	ER	CI	Avg.
Random	25.0	25.0	33.3	25.0	25.0	33.3	25.0	33.3	25.0	25.0	33.3	25.0	33.3	33.3	25.0	33.3	25.0	20.0	30.9	27.3	
GPT-4V [46]	55.5	63.5	72.0	46.5	73.5	18.5	59.0	29.5	12.0	40.5	83.5	39.0	12.0	22.5	45.0	47.5	52.0	31.0	59.0	11.0	43.5
Otter-V [47]	23.0	23.0	27.5	27.0	29.5	53.0	28.0	33.0	24.5	23.5	27.5	26.0	28.5	18.0	38.5	22.0	22.0	23.5	19.0	19.5	26.8
mPLUG-Owl-V [48]	22.0	28.0	34.0	29.0	29.0	40.5	27.0	31.5	<u>27.0</u>	23.0	29.0	31.5	27.0	40.0	44.0	24.0	31.0	26.0	20.5	29.5	29.7
Video-ChatGPT [1]	23.5	26.0	62.0	22.5	26.5	54.0	28.0	40.0	23.0	20.0	31.0	30.5	25.5	39.5	<b>48.5</b>	29.0	33.0	<u>29.5</u>	26.0	35.5	32.7
VideoLLaMA [15]	27.5	25.5	51.0	29.0	39.0	48.0	40.5	38.0	22.5	22.5	43.0	34.0	22.5	32.5	45.5	32.5	40.0	30.0	21.0	37.0	34.1
VideoChat [5]	33.5	26.5	56.0	33.5	40.5	53.0	40.5	30.0	25.5	<u>27.0</u>	48.5	35.0	20.5	42.5	46.0	26.5	41.0	23.5	23.5	36.0	35.5
VideoChat2 [7]	<u>66.0</u>	47.5	<b>83.5</b>	<b>49.5</b>	<u>60.0</u>	<u>58.0</u>	<u>71.5</u>	<b>42.5</b>	23.0	23.0	<u>88.5</u>	<u>39.0</u>	<u>42.0</u>	<u>58.5</u>	44.0	49.0	36.5	<b>35.0</b>	<u>40.5</u>	<b>65.5</b>	<u>51.1</u>
VideoGPT+ (ours)	<b>69.0</b>	<b>60.0</b>	<u>83.0</u>	<u>48.5</u>	<b>66.5</b>	<b>85.5</b>	<b>75.5</b>	36.0	<b>44.0</b>	<b>34.0</b>	<b>89.5</b>	<b>39.5</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>90.5</b>	45.0	<b>53.0</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<u>29.5</u>	<b>44.0</b>	<u>60.0</u>	<b>58.7</b>

Table 3: **Performance of VideoGPT+ on MVBench.** Following [7], we evaluate on 20 tasks including AS: Action Sequence, AP: Action Prediction, AA: Action Antonym, FA: Fine-grained Action, UA: Unexpected Action, OE: Object Existence, OI: Object Interaction, OS: Object Shuffle, MD: Moving Direction, AL: Action Localization, ST: Scene Transition, AC: Action Count, MC: Moving Count, MA: Moving Attribute, SC: State Change, FP: Fine-grained Pose, CO: Character Order, EN: Egocentric Navigation, ER: Episodic Reasoning and CI: Counterfactual Inference.

**MVBench:** We evaluate VideoGPT+ on MVBench [7], which provides 4,000 QA pairs from 11 video datasets covering a broad spectrum of scenes, ranging from first-person to third-person and from indoor to outdoor environments. The tasks are categorized into 20 fine-grained temporal understanding tasks. The results presented in Table 3 compare VideoGPT+ with previous methods, indicating an overall improvement of 7.6% compared to the previous best, VideoChat2. Specifically, VideoGPT+ achieves SoTA results in 14 out of 20 tasks and comes second in 4 out of 20 tasks, obtaining an average score of 58.7% across the 20 tasks. Additionally, VideoGPT+ shows significant improvements in the Action Prediction (+12.5%), Object Existence (OE) (+27.5%), Moving Direction (MD) (+17%), Moving Count (MC) (+29%) and Moving Attributes (MA) (+32%) indicating the rich spatial information and temporal context achieved by our model.

**Zero-shot Question-Answering:** We provide a quantitative comparison of our method on the zero-shot QA task across four open-ended QA datasets, including MSVD-QA [27], MSRVT-QA [27], TGIF-QA [28], and ActivityNet-QA [26]. Results presented in Table 4 show VideoGPT+ achieves superior performance compared to previous methods, indicating its ability to adapt effectively to unseen videos and generate accurate contextually relevant responses in challenging settings.

Model	MSVD-QA		MSRVT-QA		TGIF-QA		ActivityNet-QA	
	Accuracy	Score	Accuracy	Score	Accuracy	Score	Accuracy	Score
FrozenBiLM [49]	32.2	–	16.8	–	41.0	–	24.7	–
VideoChat [5]	56.3	2.8	45.0	2.5	34.4	2.3	26.5	2.2
LLaMA Adapter [50]	54.9	3.1	43.8	2.7	-	-	34.2	2.7
Video-LLaMA [15]	51.6	2.5	29.6	1.8	-	-	12.4	1.1
Video-ChatGPT [1]	64.9	3.3	49.3	2.8	51.4	3.0	35.2	2.8
ChatUniVi [2]	65.0	3.6	54.6	3.1	60.3	3.4	45.8	3.2
LLaMA-VID [16]	70.0	<u>3.7</u>	58.9	3.3	–	–	47.5	<u>3.3</u>
Video-LLaVA [6]	<u>70.7</u>	<b>3.9</b>	<u>59.2</u>	<u>3.5</u>	<u>70.0</u>	<u>4.0</u>	45.3	<u>3.3</u>
VideChat2 [7]	70.0	<b>3.9</b>	54.1	3.3	–	–	<u>49.1</u>	<u>3.3</u>
VideoGPT+ (ours)	<b>72.4</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>60.6</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>74.6</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>50.6</b>	<b>3.6</b>

Table 4: **Performance of VideoGPT+ on Zero-shot QA.** We evaluate accuracy and score on four commonly used datasets. All the models are evaluated in zero-shot setting where none of the videos were included in the training set. VideoGPT+ achieves good results on all datasets.



	Vision Encoder Type			Image Pooling			Video Pooling		VCG+ 112K	
	Image	Video	Dual	CNN	$4 \times 4$	$2 \times 2$	Time	Space	$\times$	$\checkmark$
Correctness (CI)	3.14	3.22	<b>3.27</b>	3.24	3.24	<b>3.27</b>	3.21	<b>3.27</b>	3.20	<b>3.27</b>
Detail (DO)	3.09	3.10	<b>3.18</b>	3.13	3.18	<b>3.18</b>	3.13	<b>3.18</b>	3.08	<b>3.18</b>
Context (CU)	3.68	3.70	<b>3.74</b>	3.70	3.73	<b>3.74</b>	3.70	<b>3.74</b>	3.66	<b>3.74</b>
Temporal (TU)	2.69	2.70	<b>2.83</b>	2.74	2.73	<b>2.83</b>	2.72	<b>2.83</b>	2.66	<b>2.83</b>
Consistency (CO)	3.26	3.31	<b>3.39</b>	3.41	3.39	<b>3.39</b>	3.36	<b>3.39</b>	3.28	<b>3.39</b>
Average	3.17	3.20	<b>3.28</b>	3.25	3.25	<b>3.28</b>	3.23	<b>3.28</b>	3.17	<b>3.28</b>

Table 5: **Ablation on Vision Encoder type, Image feature pooling, Video feature pooling, and VCG+ 112K.** We evaluate VideoGPT+ training using only an image encoder, video encoder, and both image and video encoders (dual encoder) on VCGBench. Using a dual encoder provides rich semantic and temporal cues.

**Vision Encoder Type:** We ablate our dual visual encoder design in VideoGPT+ in on VCGBench with results presented in Table 5. We conduct three experiments: using only the image encoder, only the video encoder, and both encoders. The image encoder alone achieves a score of 3.17, while the video encoder alone achieves a better score of 3.20, indicating the benefits of video-based pretraining. The dual encoder design, combining both spatial and temporal information, achieves the highest score of 3.28, demonstrating enhanced performance in video-conversation tasks.

**Pooling Strategy:** We ablate different pooling strategies for the image and video encoders in Table 5. The image encoder outputs a  $24 \times 24$  feature map from a  $336 \times 336$  input. We compare two downsampling methods: a learnable lightweight CNN (LDPv2 from [20]) and a non-learnable adaptive average pooling with a  $2 \times 2$  kernel. Results indicate that adaptive pooling performs better than CNN. A  $4 \times 4$  adaptive pooling was also tested but showed inferior performance.

Similarly, we ablate the pooling choice for the video encoder, which takes an input of size  $T \times 224 \times 224 \times C$  and outputs a feature map of  $T \times 16 \times 16 \times d$ . We compare two pooling strategies: time pooling across the temporal dimension to reduce the feature map to  $1 \times 16 \times 16 \times d$ , and space pooling across the spatial dimension with a  $2 \times 2$  kernel. Table 5 shows that space pooling effectively preserves temporal information and yields better results.

**VCG+ 112K:** To demonstrate the effectiveness of VCG+ 112K, we train VideoGPT+ with and without it. As shown in Table 5, VCG+ 112K improves performance, particularly in detail orientation (DO) and temporal understanding (TU). This improvement can be attributed to our novel semi-automatic annotation pipeline and the enhanced instruction tuning data, which focuses on generating both detailed and concise instruction pairs. Refer to Fig. 3 for qualitative visualization of the data.

LLM	VCGBench					Avg.
	CI	DO	CU	TU	CO	
Phi3-Mini-3.8B	3.27	3.18	3.74	2.83	3.39	3.28
Vicuna-7B	3.22	3.14	3.69	2.65	3.46	3.23
Vicuna-13B	<b>3.30</b>	3.20	<b>3.75</b>	2.77	<b>3.48</b>	<b>3.30</b>
LLaMA3-8B	3.29	<b>3.21</b>	3.73	<b>2.86</b>	3.38	3.29

Table 6: **Ablation on LLM type.** We train and evaluate VideoGPT+ with different LLMs, including vicuna [51] and LLaMA3 [52], which further improves accuracy.

**LLM Type:** We train VideoGPT+ with different LLMs including Vicuna 7B and 13B [51] and LLaMA-3 8B [52] and shows results in Table 6. We observe slight improvements in VCGBench scores when training using better LLMs, including Vicuna 13B and LLaMA-3 8B models.

## 7 Conclusion

In this work, we introduce VideoGPT+, a novel video conversation model that leverages the complementary benefits of image and video encoders to achieve enhanced video understanding. VideoGPT+ demonstrates better performance across multiple video benchmarks, owing to its dual-encoder design, lightweight visual adapters that map image/video features to a common space and a segment-wise sampling strategy that retains fine-grained temporal information. We also develop VCG+ 112K, a 112K video-instruction set using a resource-efficient semi-automated annotation pipeline that delivers further gains. Lastly, we propose VCGBench-Diverse, a diverse benchmark covering 18 video categories, to comprehensively evaluate video LMMs. Despite reported improvements, video LMMs still find challenges in precise action localization, understanding very long videos, and navigating long paths; areas where major improvements can unlock new applications.



Figure 5: **Qualitative comparison of VideoGPT+ with VideoChat2.** Our VideoGPT+ demonstrates superior temporal understanding by correctly identifying multiple events in the video, effective reasoning in generating a creative advertisement, and accurate spatial understanding by identifying the SPF value and brand name of the sunscreen.

## 8 Qualitative Results

We provide a qualitative comparison of our VideoGPT+ with the previous state-of-the-art approach, VideoChat2 [7], in Fig. 5. The example shows an advertisement video for sunscreen, where multiple scene changes are present. The video starts with a close-up view of the sunscreen, followed by a woman applying sunscreen on her hand, then applying sunscreen near a beach. The woman is then seen applying sunscreen on her arms, and finally, the video shows the key ingredients of the sunscreen and ends with the cover of the sunscreen.

As shown in Fig. 5, our VideoGPT+ correctly identifies the events present in the video and provides a detailed and accurate description. On the other hand, VideoChat2 struggles to accurately capture all the events. Further, our model generates an advertisement post highlighting one of the unique features of the sunscreen shown in the video, namely that it functions as both sunscreen and moisturizer. Lastly, our VideoGPT+ correctly identifies the SPF value and brand name of the sunscreen, while VideoChat2 struggles to correctly identify the brand name. We present further comparison in Fig. 7.

## 9 Additional Implementation Details

In this section, we provide additional implementation details regarding our training setup and compute requirements. All of our experiments are conducted using 8xA100 40GB GPUs. The training for VCGBench experiments takes around 12 hours to complete, while the training for MVBench experiments finishes in around 10 hours. We use the model trained for the VCGBench task to evaluate on VCGBench-Diverse and zero-shot question-answering benchmarks. All of our training and evaluation codes, pretrained models and dataset will be publicly released.

## 10 Additional Ablations

**Feature concatenation strategy:** We conduct an ablation study to determine the optimal order in which image and video features should be input to the LLM. Specifically, we perform two experiments. In the first experiment, image and video features are extracted for each video segment and concatenated in an interleaved manner before sending as input to the LLM. For example, the video is divided into segments of equal size, and then the image and video features

from each segment are concatenated and input to the LLM. In the second experiment, we first place all the image features followed by all the video features. The results shown in Table 7, indicate that the sequential design, where the image features are placed first followed by the video features, yields better performance. This can be justified by the fact that we use different visual adapters for image and video features, so interleaving the features from both modalities can create a larger distribution shift, hindering the learning process.

Feature Concatenation	VCGBench					Avg.
	CI	DO	CU	TU	CO	
Interleaved	3.25	3.17	3.72	2.78	3.39	3.26
Sequential	3.27	3.18	3.74	2.83	3.39	3.28

Table 7: **Ablation on Feature Concatenation Strategy.** Performance comparison between interleaved and sequential feature concatenation strategies. The sequential feature concatenation performs better.


## 11 GPT Prompts

In this section, we provide the GPT prompts used for the following tasks: (i) Dense video description generation for VCG+ 112K, (ii) Question-answer generation for VCG+ 112K and (iii) Question-answer generation for VCGBench-Diverse.

**Dense Video Description Generation for VCG+ 112K:** To generate dense video captions, we provide GPT-4 with a concise ground truth caption of the video and detailed frame-level captions of the key-frames generated from LLaVA-v1.6 [33]. GPT-4 is then prompted to combine this information into a detailed caption for the entire video. As illustrated in Fig. 8, the prompt includes clear instructions to eliminate any conflicting information, ensuring an accurate and detailed caption.

**Question-answer generation for VCG+ 112K:** After generating detailed video descriptions using GPT-4, we use GPT-3.5 to create question-answer pairs for instruction tuning. Fig. 9 shows the prompt to generate detailed summary question-answer pair using the ground truth caption and the dense description of the video.

**Question-Answer Generation for VCGBench-Diverse:** We provide prompts used to generate comprehensive question-answer pairs for VCGBench-Diverse. As illustrated in Fig. 10, the questions are generated in three categories: temporal, spatial, and reasoning. Similar prompts are used to generate consistency and summary questions, offering an extensive evaluation protocol for VCGBench-Diverse.




Q: Why did the car with the dashboard camera shift out of the road?

GT Answer: The car with the dashboard camera shifted out of the road because the white pick-up truck tried to change lanes, causing the car to avoid a potential collision.

- The car with the dashboard camera shifted out of the road because it was being driven by a person who was not paying attention.
- The car with the dashboard camera shifted out of the road to avoid a collision with another vehicle.
- The car with the dashboard camera shifted out of the road due to a collision with a white pickup truck.
- The car did not move out of its lane. A white pickup truck attempts to move into the lane, but then brakes to avoid a collision with a large truck in the lane, staying in its lane.

Category: Traffic




Q: Why does the video highlight these specific bodybuilders' cases?

GT Answer: The video highlights these specific bodybuilders' cases to underscore the potential dangers and severe health repercussions associated with the misuse of steroids and hormones within the bodybuilding community, serving as cautionary tales.

- The video highlights these specific bodybuilders' cases to showcase their achievements and success in their respective fields.
- The video highlights these cases to showcase the impact of substance abuse on bodybuilders' health and careers, emphasizing the consequences of such actions.
- The video highlights these specific cases to discuss the extreme measures some individuals have taken for bodybuilding, which have led to significant health risks, reputational damage, and unfortunate events.
- The video highlights the cases of bodybuilders who suffered adverse effects from the use of steroids.

Category: Education



Q: How many men are initially seen walking along the road in the CCTV footage?

GT Answer: Four men are initially seen walking along the road in the CCTV footage.

- There are two men walking along the road in the CCTV footage.
- Initially, four men are seen walking along the road in the CCTV footage.
- In the CCTV footage provided, initially, there are three men seen walking along the road.
- There are five men initially seen walking along the road.

Category: Surveillance









 User
  VideoChat2
  VideoGPT+
  GPT-4V
  Gemini-Pro-V


Figure 6: **Qualitative comparison from VCGBench-Diverse of VideoGPT+.** We show qualitative comparison of VideoGPT+ with VideoChat2 and propriety models GPT-4V and Gemini-1.5-Pro-V from three different categories including traffic, education and surveillance from VCGBench-Diverse.





Q: Which team is participating in the featured match? 

GT Answer: The teams participating in the featured match are Valencia CF and Real Valladolid.


 The teams participating in the featured match are Real Madrid and Atletico Madrid.


 The video shows that the teams playing are Real Valladolid and Valencia CF.

 The teams participating in the featured match are Valencia CF and Real Valladolid.


 The teams participating are Valencia CF and Real Valladolid.


Category: Sports





Q: What significant declaration was made by President Rodrigo Duterte a year ago? 

GT Answer: President Rodrigo Duterte declared martial law in Mindanao in response to the Marawi siege.


 Last year, President Rodrigo Duterte made a significant declaration regarding the Philippines' territorial claims in the South China Sea.


 A year ago, President Rodrigo Duterte declared martial law in Mindanao.

 A year before, President Rodrigo Duterte declared martial law in Mindanao in response to the Marawi siege.


 A year ago, Philippine President Rodrigo Duterte declared martial law in Mindanao, in response to the Marawi siege.


Category: News





Q: What is the color of the self-parking car? 

GT Answer: The self-parking car is black.

 The self-parking car in the video is white.

 The self-parking car is black in color.

 The color of the self-parking car is black and is actively engaging in self-parking maneuvers.

 The color of the self-parking car is black.

Category: Automobile



Figure 7: **Qualitative comparison from VCGBench-Diverse of VideoGPT+.** We show qualitative comparison of VideoGPT+ with VideoChat2 and propriety models GPT-4V and Gemini-1.5-Pro-V from three different categories including sports, news and automobiles videos from VCGBench-Diverse.

Generate a detailed and accurate description of a video based on the given ground-truth video caption and multiple frame-level captions. Use the following details to create a clear and complete narrative:

Ground-truth Video Caption: [Ground-truth caption here]

Frame-level Captions: [Frame-level caption 1]; [Frame-level caption 2]; [Frame-level caption 3]; ..

Instructions for writing the detailed description:

1. Focus on describing key visual details such as appearance, motion, sequence of actions, objects involved, and interactions between elements in the video.
2. Check for consistency between the ground-truth caption and frame-level captions, and prioritize details that match the ground-truth caption. Ignore any conflicting or irrelevant details from the frame-level captions.
3. Leave out any descriptions about the atmosphere, mood, style, aesthetics, proficiency, or emotional tone of the video.
4. Make sure the description is no more than 20 sentences.
5. Combine and organize information from all captions into one clear and detailed description, removing any repeated or conflicting details.
6. Emphasize important points like the order of events, appearance and actions of people or objects, and any significant changes or movements.
7. Do not mention that the information comes from ground-truth captions or frame-level captions.
8. Give a brief yet thorough description, highlighting the key visual and temporal details while keeping it clear and easy to understand. Use your intelligence to combine and refine the captions into a brief yet informative description of the entire video.

Figure 8: **Prompt for Dense Video Captions Generation for VCG+ 112K.** We use GPT-4 to generate detailed video captions using concise ground truth and frame-level detailed captions.

```
# System Prompt
You are an AI assistant tasked with generating questions and answers about video content to create a video instruction tuning dataset. Your goal is to extract detailed visual and temporal information from the video, ensuring the explanations are comprehensive enough for someone to understand the entire sequence of events in the video.

##TASK:
1. Users provide a video ground truth caption and a detailed description.
2. Generate three questions that effectively prompt a detailed description of the entire video content and sequence of events.

-----
##INSTRUCTIONS:
- Ensure each question targets the goal of generating a detailed description of the entire video from start to end.
- Avoid questions that focus on small parts, less relevant details, or abstract concepts such as logical reasoning, attention to subtle details, overall aesthetic.
- Every answer must include all the details from the ground truth caption and integrate additional specifics from the detailed description.
- Focus on visual and temporal details.

##SAMPLE QUESTIONS:
- Can you describe the entire video in detail from start to finish?
- What happens throughout the entire video, including all key actions and events?
- Could you provide a detailed walkthrough of the entire video?

# User Prompt:
The video ground truth caption is: [Ground-truth caption here]. The noisy detailed description is: [Dense description here].

Generate three questions and answers about the entire content and sequence of events in the video. Each question should aim to elicit a comprehensive description of the full sequence of events in the video from start to finish. Each answer must include all the details from the ground truth caption and integrate additional specifics from the detailed description. Format the output as a list of dictionaries in JSON style, with each dictionary containing a 'Q' key for the question and an 'A' key for the answer. For example:

[{'Q': 'Your first question here...', 'A': 'Your first answer here...'}, {'Q': 'Your second question here...', 'A': 'Your second answer here...'}, {'Q': 'Your third question here...', 'A': 'Your third answer here...'}].

Most importantly, every answer must provide a full understanding of the video by incorporating ALL the details from the ground truth caption and additional specifics from the detailed description.
```

Figure 9: **Prompt for Question-answer generation for VCG+ 112K.** We use GPT-3.5 to generate question-answer pairs for instruction tuning using the concise video ground truths and detailed video descriptions.

```

# System Prompt:
You are an AI assistant tasked with generating questions and detailed answers based on a video description. Your goal is to extract important information from the video content, focusing on temporal events, visual details, and reasoning behind actions.

##TASK:
You will receive a video description, and based on it, you must generate a set of questions and answers in three distinct categories:
1. Temporal - These questions should focus on the sequence and timing of events. Use approximate time references where necessary.
2. Spatial - These questions should address visual aspects such as appearance, objects, colors, attire, displayed texts, number of objects or people, location, and other significant visual details.
3. Reasoning - These questions should delve into the actions, motivations, and consequences as depicted in the video description.

##INSTRUCTIONS:
- Each question must directly relate to and be answerable by the provided video description. Avoid assumptions and fabrication of details not present in the description.
- Provide clear, unambiguous questions that allow for definitive answers based on the description.
- If the video description does not contain enough information to formulate a question in any category, do not include a question for that category.

##SAMPLE QUESTIONS:
- Temporal: Describe the entire process the person goes through from start to finish or What happens at the beginning of the video? or What does the person do right after the dog appears?
- Spatial: Can you provide a detailed description of the appearance and activities of all individuals or What is the color of the main character's shirt? or What is the name of the drink on the bottle? How many people are at the table?
- Reasoning: What action does the coach take after the whistle blows? or Why did the player throw the ball? or Who is John Davis in the video?

# User Prompt:
The video description is: [Dense description here].

Format the output as a dictionary in JSON style, with each key representing a question category and containing a sub-dictionary with 'Q' for the question and 'A' for the answer. Example output with all three categories filled:

{'temporal': {'Q': 'Temporal question here...', 'A': 'Answer here...'},
 'spatial': {'Q': 'Spatial question here...', 'A': 'Answer here...'},
 'reasoning': {'Q': 'Reasoning question here...', 'A': 'Answer here...'}}.

If a category cannot be filled:

{'temporal': {'Q': 'Describe the sequence of events in the video.', 'A': 'The video starts with...'},
 'spatial': {'Q': 'What is the main character wearing?', 'A': 'The main character is dressed in...'}} # reasoning omitted due to lack of information

Importantly, the answers MUST extract information DIRECTLY from the given description. Do not include categories that cannot be filled based on the video description alone.

```

Figure 10: Prompt for Question-Answer Generation for VCGBench-Diverse. We use GPT-3.5 to generate temporal, spatial, and reasoning question-answer pairs.

## References

- [1] Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Rasheed, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Video-chatgpt: Towards detailed video understanding via large vision and language models. In *Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2024.
- [2] Peng Jin, Ryuichi Takanobu, Caiwan Zhang, Xiaochun Cao, and Li Yuan. Chat-univi: Unified visual representation empowers large language models with image and video understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024.
- [3] Ruyang Liu, Chen Li, Haoran Tang, Yixiao Ge, Ying Shan, and Ge Li. St-llm: Large language models are effective temporal learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00308*, 2024.
- [4] Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, haotian Liu, Yong jae Lee, Liangke Gui, Di Fu, Jiashi Feng, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-next: A strong zero-shot video understanding model, April 2024.
- [5] Kunchang Li, Yinan He, Yi Wang, Yizhuo Li, Wenhai Wang, Ping Luo, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Videochat: Chat-centric video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06355*, 2023.
- [6] Bin Lin, Bin Zhu, Yang Ye, Munan Ning, Peng Jin, and Li Yuan. Video-llava: Learning united visual representation by alignment before projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10122*, 2023.
- [7] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yinan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Ping Luo, et al. Mvbench: A comprehensive multi-modal video understanding benchmark. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024.
- [8] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. BLIP-2: bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023.
- [9] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [10] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- [11] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. *arXiv:2310.03744*, 2023.
- [12] Zhiliang Peng, Wenhui Wang, Li Dong, Yaru Hao, Shaohan Huang, Shuming Ma, and Furu Wei. Kosmos-2: Grounding multimodal large language models to the world. *ArXiv*, abs/2306, 2023.
- [13] Hanoona Rasheed, Muhammad Maaz, Sahal Shaji, Abdelrahman Shaker, Salman Khan, Hisham Cholakkal, Rao M. Anwer, Eric Xing, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Fahad S. Khan. Glamm: Pixel grounding large multimodal model. *The IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024.
- [14] Haoxuan You, Haotian Zhang, Zhe Gan, Xianzhi Du, Bowen Zhang, Zirui Wang, Liangliang Cao, Shih-Fu Chang, and Yinfei Yang. Ferret: Refer and ground anything anywhere at any granularity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07704*, 2023.
- [15] Hang Zhang, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. Video-llama: An instruction-tuned audio-visual language model for video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02858*, 2023.
- [16] Yanwei Li, Chengyao Wang, and Jiaya Jia. Llama-vid: An image is worth 2 tokens in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17043*, 2023.
- [17] Wonkyun Kim, Changin Choi, Wonseok Lee, and Wonjong Rhee. An image grid can be worth a video: Zero-shot video question answering using a vlm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.18406*, 2024.
- [18] De-An Huang, Shijia Liao, Subhashree Radhakrishnan, Hongxu Yin, Pavlo Molchanov, Zhiding Yu, and Jan Kautz. Lita: Language instructed temporal-localization assistant. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19046*, 2024.
- [19] Xiangxiang Chu, Limeng Qiao, Xinyang Lin, Shuang Xu, Yang Yang, Yiming Hu, Fei Wei, Xinyu Zhang, Bo Zhang, Xiaolin Wei, et al. Mobilevlm: A fast, reproducible and strong vision language assistant for mobile devices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.16886*, 2023.
- [20] Xiangxiang Chu, Limeng Qiao, Xinyu Zhang, Shuang Xu, Fei Wei, Yang Yang, Xiaofei Sun, Yiming Hu, Xinyang Lin, Bo Zhang, et al. Mobilevlm v2: Faster and stronger baseline for vision language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03766*, 2024.
- [21] Ruyang Liu, Chen Li, Yixiao Ge, Ying Shan, Thomas H Li, and Ge Li. One for all: Video conversation is feasible without video instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024.
- [22] Shehan Munasinghe, Rusiru Thushara, Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Abdul Rasheed, Salman Khan, Mubarak Shah, and Fahad Khan. Pg-video-llava: Pixel grounding large video-language models. *ArXiv 2311.13435*, 2023.



- [23] Enxin Song, Wenhao Chai, Guan hong Wang, Yucheng Zhang, Haoyang Zhou, Feiyang Wu, Xun Guo, Tian Ye, Yan Lu, Jenq-Neng Hwang, et al. Moviechat: From dense token to sparse memory for long video understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024.
- [24] Bin Huang, Xin Wang, Hong Chen, Zihan Song, and Wenwu Zhu. Vimellm: Empower llm to grasp video moments. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024.
- [25] Max Bain, Arsha Nagrani, Gül Varol, and Andrew Zisserman. Frozen in time: A joint video and image encoder for end-to-end retrieval. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021.
- [26] Bernard Ghanem Fabian Caba Heilbron, Victor Escorcia and Juan Carlos Niebles. Activitynet: A large-scale video benchmark for human activity understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2015.
- [27] Dejing Xu, Zhou Zhao, Jun Xiao, Fei Wu, Hanwang Zhang, Xiangnan He, and Yueting Zhuang. Video question answering via gradually refined attention over appearance and motion. In *ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2017.
- [28] Yunseok Jang, Yale Song, Chris Dongjoo Kim, Youngjae Yu, Youngjin Kim, and Gunhee Kim. Video Question Answering with Spatio-Temporal Reasoning. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 2019.
- [29] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [30] Yi Wang, Kunchang Li, Xinhao Li, Jiashuo Yu, Yinan He, Guo Chen, Baoqi Pei, Rongkun Zheng, Jilan Xu, Zun Wang, et al. Internvideo2: Scaling video foundation models for multimodal video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15377*, 2024.
- [31] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021.
- [32] Brandon Castellano. Pyscenedetect: Automated video scene detection. <https://github.com/Breakthrough/PySceneDetect>, 2022.
- [33] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Sheng Shen, and Yong Jae Lee. Llava-next: Improved reasoning, ocr, and world knowledge, January 2024.
- [34] Hongwei Xue, Tiankai Hang, Yanhong Zeng, Yuchong Sun, Bei Liu, Huan Yang, Jianlong Fu, and Baining Guo. Advancing high-resolution video-language representation with large-scale video transcriptions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022.
- [35] Mykhaylo Andriluka, Leonid Pishchulin, Peter Gehler, and Bernt Schiele. 2d human pose estimation: New benchmark and state of the art analysis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, June 2014.
- [36] Luwei Zhou, Chenliang Xu, and Jason Corso. Towards automatic learning of procedures from web instructional videos. In *AAAI*, 2018.
- [37] Waqas Sultani, Chen Chen, and Mubarak Shah. Real-world anomaly detection in surveillance videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6479–6488, 2018.
- [38] Li Xu, He Huang, and Jun Liu. Sutr-trafficqa: A question answering benchmark and an efficient network for video reasoning over traffic events. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9878–9888, 2021.
- [39] Marah Abdin, Sam Ade Jacobs, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jyoti Aneja, Ahmed Awadallah, Hany Awadalla, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Harkirat Behl, et al. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14219*, 2024.
- [40] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03744*, 2023.
- [41] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2022.
- [42] Will Kay, Joao Carreira, Karen Simonyan, Brian Zhang, Chloe Hillier, Sudheendra Vijayanarasimhan, Fabio Viola, Tim Green, Trevor Back, Paul Natsev, et al. The kinetics human action video dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.06950*, 2017.

- [43] Raghav Goyal, Samira Ebrahimi Kahou, Vincent Michalski, Joanna Materzynska, Susanne Westphal, Heuna Kim, Valentin Haenel, Ingo Fruend, Peter Yianilos, Moritz Mueller-Freitag, et al. The "something something" video database for learning and evaluating visual common sense. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2017.
- [44] Kexin Yi, Chuang Gan, Yunzhu Li, Pushmeet Kohli, Jiajun Wu, Antonio Torralba, and Joshua B Tenenbaum. Clevrer: Collision events for video representation and reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01442*, 2019.
- [45] Junbin Xiao, Xindi Shang, Angela Yao, and Tat-Seng Chua. Next-qa: Next phase of question-answering to explaining temporal actions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9777–9786, 2021.
- [46] OpenAI. Gpt-4v(ision) system card. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:263218031>, 2023.
- [47] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Liangyu Chen, Jinghao Wang, Jingkang Yang, and Ziwei Liu. Otter: A multi-modal model with in-context instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.03726*, 2023.
- [48] Qinghao Ye, Haiyang Xu, Guohai Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Yiyang Zhou, Junyang Wang, Anwen Hu, Pengcheng Shi, Yaya Shi, et al. mplug-owl: Modularization empowers large language models with multimodality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14178*, 2023.
- [49] Antoine Yang, Antoine Miech, Josef Sivic, Ivan Laptev, and Cordelia Schmid. Zero-shot video question answering via frozen bidirectional language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [50] Renrui Zhang, Jiaming Han, Chris Liu, Peng Gao, Aojun Zhou, Xiangfei Hu, Shilin Yan, Pan Lu, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Qiao. Llama-adapter: Efficient fine-tuning of language models with zero-init attention. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [51] Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%\* chatgpt quality. <https://lmsys.org/blog/2023-03-30-vicuna>, 2023.
- [52] Meta AI. Llama 3. <https://llama.meta.com/llama3>, 2024.