
Generative Visual Instruction Tuning

Jefferson Hernandez¹, Ruben Villegas², Vicente Ordonez¹

¹Rice University ²Google DeepMind

Abstract

We propose to use machine-generated instruction-following data to improve the zero-shot capabilities of a large multimodal model with additional support for generative and image editing tasks. We achieve this by curating a new multimodal instruction-following set using GPT-4V and existing datasets for image generation and editing. Using this instruction set and the existing LLaVA-Finetune instruction set for visual understanding tasks, we produce GenLLaVA, a Generative Large Language, and Visual Assistant. GenLLaVA is built through a strategy that combines three types of large pretrained models through instruction finetuning: LLaMA for language modeling, SigLIP for image-text matching, and StableDiffusion for text-to-image generation. Our model demonstrates visual understanding capabilities on par with LLaVA and additionally demonstrates competitive results with native multimodal models such as Unified-IO 2, paving the way for building advanced general-purpose visual assistants by effectively re-using existing multimodal models. We open-source our dataset, codebase, and model checkpoints to foster further research and application in this domain¹.

1 Introduction

Large multimodal models have become increasingly popular in the research community as they are one of the key building blocks for general-purpose assistants [1, 40, 2]. The recently proposed LLaVA [25] model is among the latest wave of works that have demonstrated the effectiveness of instruction tuning for multimodal models [23, 51, 41, 14]. There has been a considerable amount of work building on top of the LLaVA model ranging from image generation [17, 36, 35], grounding [44], image editing [7] to video understanding [20]. These works share the same principles; they extend the ideas of visual instruction tuning to one or more capabilities. However, after adding a new capability (i.e., image generation), the resulting models often lose some, if not most, of their visual and language understanding capabilities. This contrasts with the original visual instruction tuning in which the models retained their language capabilities after training for visual understanding.

In this paper, we present the *generative visual instruction tuning*, in which we teach a Large Multimodal Model (LMM) image understanding, image generation, and image editing tasks without significantly diminishing the performance of each individual capability. (See Fig. 1 for an overview of our method). To our knowledge, this is the first time such capability has been achieved, and our findings pave the way for building a general-purpose visual assistant. Our contributions are the following:

- *Generative multimodal instruction-following data.* Inspired by previous work [25], we curate a multimodal instruction tuning set that combines image understanding, image generation, and image editing data.
- *New improved training recipe.* We empirically design a single-phase training recipe to teach the LMM the necessary capabilities, unlike its predecessor, which requires multi-phase training recipes.

¹<https://github.com/jeffhernandez1995/GenLlaVA.git>




Figure 1: Comparison of GenLLaVA compared to recent architectures, unlike BLIP-2 [19], we use a Linear projector similar to the LLaVA architecture [25]. Generation capabilities are added using a diffusion model, but unlike GILL [17], we use a Q-former as the generation head. Finally, our model benefits from using a stronger visual encoder, namely SigLIP[49]; a stronger LLM, namely Mistral-7b [12]; and a stronger diffuser, namely SDv1.4 [33]. * L stands for Linear projection, and Q stands for Q-former resampler.

- *Open source.* We release the following assets to the public: the generated multimodal instruction data, the codebase, the model checkpoints, and a visual chat demo.

2 Related Work

Large Multimodal Models (LMMs) Large Multimodal Models (LMMs) refer to large language models that can understand various modalities beyond human language. Some research efforts are focused on combining image, audio, video, and other modalities with language [50, 27], while others aim to enhance the fusion of vision knowledge and language. For example, BLIP-2 [19] created a large-scale image captioning dataset and paired a language model with a vision encoder to produce a robust multimodal model. Following this, LLaVA [25] developed a cost-effective approach to train an advanced LLM through visual instruction tuning. Although LLaVA-Next [24] improved performance for single-image tasks, it required over 2,000 tokens per image, which is about four times more than the original LLaVA. More recent models such as QwenVL[2], CogVLM[42], and Yi-VL[45] follow architectures similar to those of LLaVA. Our proposed method does not only focus on models for multimodal understanding, but also on adding generative capabilities to such models.

Generation with LMMs In recent years, the design of methods that aim to adapt LLMs and LMMs for generative tasks has become an active research direction. For instance, GILL [17] translates the hidden representations of an LLM into embeddings that correspond to a text-to-image model by learning a neural network to perform efficient mapping using the text encoder of the diffusion model. AnyGPT [50] discretizes data from multiple modalities, extends the existing LLM vocabulary to add the extra modalities, and incorporates new randomly initialized parameters that enable additional input embeddings and prediction outputs. MGIE [7] adapts the text embedder, image input adapter, and LM head output parameters of an LMM jointly with a diffusion model for image editing from instructions. Codi-2 [38] follows a similar line and adds multiple decoders for image, audio, and video generation to condition an LLM to generate interleaved outputs from different modalities. CM3leon [46] proposes a token-based decoder-only LMM based on the CM3 architecture that is capable of both text and image generation and editing. Unified-IO 2 [27] and Chameleon [39] and GPT-4o take the early-fusion fully multimodal approach training the model from scratch to be able to expand the number of supported tasks and modalities.

3 Method

3.1 Background: Large Multimodal Models

Large language models (LLMs) excel in natural language generation. Large Multimodal Models enhance LLMs with the ability to interpret images and respond accordingly. Built upon a pre-trained




Figure 2: Editing capabilities of our model. GPT4 currently uses a version of the DALLE text-to-image model as a tool and hence is not directly able to edit images. GPT4o instead uses tools through Python generated code to accomplish the requested action. Our model, GenLLaVA, connects input features obtained from CLIP to a language model that also produces output embeddings for a text-to-image StableDiffusion model, achieving an end-to-end editing task with a multimodal model.

LLM, the LMM incorporates a visual encoder (e.g., CLIP/L [31]) to derive visual features f , along with an adapter \mathcal{W} that maps f into the language domain. Following the training methodology of LLaVA [25], this process is encapsulated in the equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{C} &= \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l\}, \\
 f &= \text{Enc}_{\text{vis}}(\mathcal{V}), \\
 x_t &= \text{LMM}(\{x_1, \dots, x_{t-1}\} \mid \mathcal{W}(f)),
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{1}$$

where l represents the length of the word tokens within \mathcal{C} . The set \mathcal{C} can represent an image caption (Features Alignment) or multimodal instruction-following data (Instruction Tuning). The LMM employs the standard autoregressive method for next-token prediction, allowing it to function as a visual assistant across diverse tasks such as visual question answering and complex reasoning. Despite gaining visual perceptible abilities through this training, its responses are currently constrained to text.

3.2 Visual Generation in Large Multimodal Models

We append N visual tokens [IMG] after the instruction, with their word embeddings being trainable. The LMM learns to generate these tokens through its language modeling (LM) head. These visual tokens represent visual-related instruction comprehension within \mathcal{E} and form a bridge between the language and vision modalities. We follow the same visual generation framework of GILL [17] and MGIE [7] in extracting visual features, which we summarize here for succinctness.

We employ a generation head \mathcal{T} to convert [IMG] into concrete visual guidance. The model \mathcal{T} is a sequence-to-sequence model that translates the sequential visual tokens from the LMM into the semantically meaningful latent set $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_L\}$ for visual guidance:

$$u_t = \mathcal{T}(\{u_1, \dots, u_{t-1}\} \mid \{e_{[\text{IMG}]} + h_{[\text{IMG}]}\}),
 \tag{2}$$

where e denotes the word embedding and h is the hidden state (from the final layer of the LMM before the LM head) of [IMG]. Specifically, the transformation applied to e serves as a broad visual representation, while h provides an instance-specific visual latent that reflects both the original image and the text conditioning the generation.

To guide image generation with the visual latent information \mathcal{U} , we employ a latent diffusion model [32], incorporating a variational autoencoder (VAE) for handling denoising diffusion in the latent space. First, we encode the desired visual output via the diffusion model encoder $o =$

Table 1: **Main result.** Comparison of various models across advanced knowledge and general understanding. * MGIE was not originally designed for these tasks, and it is purely an editing model; we take the generated caption as the answer for VQA and give a blank image as a prompt when we ask it to generate completely new images. We intend to show that models lose previous capabilities when we add a new one.

Model name	Advanced Knowledge		General Understanding			Editing	Generation	
	MathVista	MMMU	MMVet	SEED-B	MMB	EVR	CC3M	COCO
GILL [17]	18.6	28.8	23.3	52.5	38.2	30.4	15.3	0.67
AnyGPT [50]	24.4	30.6	33.1	44.5	36	40.3	14.3	0.65
MGIE [7]*	15.5	25.6	13	28.8	6.6	71.5	13.6	0.66
Unified-IO 2 [27]	30.7	35	36.6	61.8	71.5	50.2	13.4	0.72
GenLLaVA (Ours)	24.9	29.7	33.1	63.5	65	64.7	14.3	0.71

$\text{Enc}_{\text{VAE}}(O)$; this output may be intended for image generation or editing tasks. The diffusion process progressively introduces noise into o as z_t , increasing the noise level over timesteps t . We then train the UNet ϵ_θ to predict the added noise [10]. The diffusion process is conditioned on the visual latent information \mathcal{U} through a cross-attention layer, defined as $\text{Attention}(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{\text{dim}}}\right) \cdot V$, where:

$$Q = W_Q^{(i)} \cdot \varphi_i(z_t), K = W_K^{(i)} \cdot \{u\}, V = W_V^{(i)} \cdot \{u\}, \quad (3)$$

with φ representing the flattening operation, and $W_Q^{(i)}$, $W_K^{(i)}$, and $W_V^{(i)}$ being learnable attention matrices. We apply classifier-free guidance [11], where the score estimation s_θ is extrapolated to deviate from the unconditional \emptyset , following standard practices in diffusion models.

4 Experiment Settings

Multimodal instruction tuning is a crucial process that equips the model with a wide range of skills and capabilities across different modalities while also enabling it to adapt to novel and unique instructions. We build the multimodal instruction tuning dataset by aggregating a diverse set of supervised datasets and tasks. Each task is provided with a clear prompt, either by using existing prompts or crafting new ones using GPT4-V.

Natural Language. [1.93%] We use the ShareGPT [34] dataset. We filter out invalid conversations, but unlike Vicuna, long conversations that surpass 2048 tokens are truncated rather than split into multiple conversations. This results in $\sim 40\text{K}$ conversations

Image Generation. [26.88%] For image generation, we use the original LLaVA-Pretrain, which we now invert to be an image generation dataset instead of an image caption dataset; this dataset contains $\sim 558\text{K}$ data points collected from the LAION, SBU, and CC3M datasets and captioned by the BLIP-2 model.

Image Editing. [9.63%] We subsample the IPr2Pr [3] dataset as our editing data. We use $\sim 200\text{K}$ CLIP-filtered data, where instructions are extracted by GPT-3, and images are synthesized by the Prompt-to-Prompt model [8].

Image Understanding. [61.56%] We combine the original LLaVA-Finetune dataset with the LVIS-INSTRUCT4V[41], a new visual instruction tuning dataset constructed in the same way as the original LLaVA dataset but using GPT4-V as the captioner instead of BLIP-2. If they exist, we remove duplicates from the LLaVA-Finetune dataset; this results in $\sim 880\text{K}$ samples. We additionally add the following instruction datasets LRV-Instruction [22] ($\sim 80\text{K}$), laion-gpt4v-dataset ($\sim 15\text{K}$), ShareGPT4V[5] ($\sim 100\text{K}$), and the following document understanding datasets DocVQA[30] ($\sim 50\text{K}$), SynDog-EN[16] ($\sim 65\text{K}$), ChartQA[29] ($\sim 23\text{K}$), DVQA[13] ($\sim 50\text{K}$) and AI2D[15] ($\sim 15\text{K}$).




Figure 3: (Left) Results on selected Visual Question answering datasets. (Right) A qualitative example of our model.

4.1 Generative Visual Instruction Data

4.2 Training details.

In this section, we evaluate our model on a broad range of tasks that require visual understanding and generation. **We do not perform task-specific finetuning in any experiments.** The Supplementary section details details about experimental setups, additional results, and additional studies on GenLLaVA’s instruction capabilities.

We adopt LLaVA-v1.5-7B [23] architecture and pre-training weights, then tune it on the constructed GVIT-mix-2076K. We named this model GenLLaVA. Specifically, we replace LLaVA-v1.5-mix-665K with our GVIT-mix-2076K, add the visual generation module, and only perform a single-stage instruction tuning training as this was shown to be superior [14]. The rest of the model training protocol is kept unchanged for fair comparison. Generative Visual instruction tuning takes about 48 hours for both full-parameter tuning and LoRA tuning on 8 NVIDIA Tesla A100 GPUs, each with 80GB memory, with DeepSpeed ZeRO Stage 3.

Visual Understanding We evaluate vision language performance and compare it against other generalist models, i.e., models that can do visual generation and understating. Results on a collection of 8 vision/language benchmarks are shown in Table 1. These benchmarks are designed to probe advanced knowledge and general understanding. MMBench [26] evaluates answer robustness through comprehensive shuffling of multiple-choice options. SEED-Bench [18] tests model performance on images and videos with multiple-choice questions. MM-Vet [47] evaluates the ability to engage in visual conversations and assess the accuracy and helpfulness of responses. Mathvista [28] consolidates mathematical reasoning benchmarks, focusing on logical and algebraic reasoning with puzzle tests. MMMU [48] covers 57 subjects across STEM, humanities, and social sciences, ranging from elementary to advanced professional levels, and tests both world knowledge and problem-solving skills.

Visual generation. For visual generation evaluation, we measured the Fréchet Inception Distance (FID) [9] on the CC3M validation set [4] (which is a measure of image realism) and CLIP Similarity on the MS-COCO dataset [21] (which is a measure of the alignment between the text prompt and the generated image). For image editing, we measured the DINOscore on the 5.7K examples of the EVR dataset [37] following the same protocol of *Fu et.al.* [7].

4.3 Main Result

We compare our model, GenLLaVA, against state-of-the-art models on benchmarks for advanced knowledge, general understanding, visual generation, and editing.




Figure 4: Ablation on the effect of adding extra data to our instruction set.

As shown in Table 1, GenLLaVA consistently outperforms previous models (GILL, AnyGPT, and MGIE) in most tasks. It achieves higher scores on MathVista (24.9 vs. GILL’s 18.6, AnyGPT’s 24.4, MGIE’s 15.5, Unified-IO 2’s 30.7) and MMMU (29.7 vs. GILL’s 28.8, AnyGPT’s 30.6, MGIE’s 25.6, Unified-IO 2’s 35). For general understanding, GenLLaVA excels in SEED-B (63.5 vs. Unified-IO 2’s 61.8, GILL’s 52.5, AnyGPT’s 44.5, MGIE’s 28.8) and MMB (65 vs. Unified-IO 2’s 71.5, GILL’s 38.2, AnyGPT’s 36, MGIE’s 6.6).

In image editing on the EVR dataset, GenLLaVA scores 64.7, behind MGIE’s 71.5 but ahead of Unified-IO 2 (50.2), GILL (30.4), and AnyGPT (40.3). For visual generation, GenLLaVA has a FID score of 14.3 on CC3M, close to Unified-IO 2 (13.4) and matching AnyGPT. On the CLIP Similarity metric for MS-COCO, GenLLaVA scores 0.71, close to Unified-IO 2’s 0.72 and ahead of GILL (0.67), AnyGPT (0.65), and MGIE (0.66).

While GenLLaVA does not surpass Unified-IO 2 in all categories, it shows strong, balanced performance across various tasks, highlighting its versatility and robustness as a generalist vision-language model with less training time.

4.4 Results on selected Visual Question Answering datasets.

We evaluate various models’ performance across diverse visual question-answering datasets, including VQAv2, GQA, VisWiz, TextVQA, and ScienceQA. Our results show that Unified-IO 2 and GenLLaVA consistently perform well across most datasets. Specifically, Unified-IO 2 achieves the highest scores on the ScienceQA (86.2%) and TextVQA (67%), while GenLLaVA demonstrates strong performance on VQAv2 (79.3%) and a competitive score on GQA (62.9%). In contrast, GILL and MGIE exhibit generally lower performance across all datasets, with MGIE notably struggling on VisWiz (20.1%) and TextVQA (26.3%). AnyGPT shows moderate effectiveness, with its best performance on ScienceQA (61%). We used VLMEvalKit [6] to get the results for these datasets, which perform a generation-based evaluation using an LLM judge², the results can be seen in Fig. 3.

4.5 Ablations

We investigate the effect of scaling the data used to train GenLlaVA, the effect of using different image backbones, and the number of visual tokens used for image generation.

Instruction data. We start with the original instruction tuning dataset from LlaVA-1.5, basically reproducing the original results using a one-stage training recipe. We add the textLLaVA-Pretrain and generation head to our model; we notice that adding generation capabilities significantly affects the visual understanding capabilities in the model where all the metrics between 2.3% (MM-Vet) to 7.9% (MathVista) points in performance, to compensate for this loss in performance we modify the ration of image generation to image understanding data in our dataset from approximately $\sim 50\%$ - 50% to $\sim 70\%$ - 30% , by adding more image instruction data from LVIS-INSTRUCT4V, LRV-Instruction and other chart understanding datasets. This results in a model with significant generation capabilities that maintain its image-understanding capabilities. We finally add image-generation capabilities using our selected subset of the IPr2IPr dataset. This reduces the image understanding capabilities, but we

²We used GPT-4 (0409) as the judge.




Figure 5: Qualitative conversational example of our model. The dashed line indicates that the conversation has to be restarted from the beginning due to the model losing track of it.

consider this a small enough change that balances the three tasks while maintaining commendable performance. The results can be seen in Fig. 4a.

Choice of Visual encoder. The quality of the vision encoder can also have big effects on the final LMM performance. We start by using a CLIP/B, which has the lowest performance, then we compare against a stronger visual encoder and create versions of GenLLaVA, which is trained with CLIP [31] and SigLIP [49], respectively. We can see in Fig. 4b that the SigLIP encoder can achieve generally better performance CLIP encoder. This shows that SigLIP is a better vision encoder for LMM development.

Number of visual generation tokens. We experiment with varying the number of visual generation tokens, N . We noticed that we need more visual generation tokens than GILL ($N = 4$) and MGIE ($N = 8$) to achieve the best performance. We find that $N = 16$ is the best choice for our model. We hypothesize that this is because our model has to balance image generation and editing in the same head and thus needs more visual tokens to capture the complexity of the tasks. The results can be seen in Fig. 3c.

4.6 Comparison with SOTA.

When compared with state-of-the-art models, GenLLaVA maintains similar performance to models of the LLaVA family when evaluated using the average of the scores on the MathVista, MMMU, MMVet, SEED-B, and MMB datasets but lags behind bigger and more specialized models. However, some of these models lack the generative capabilities present in GenLLaVA.

When compared with models of similar size and setup (~ 7 b parameters), our model surpasses the original LLaVA1[25] model by 5% points (37.5% vs. 43.2%), but lags behind LLaVA-1.5 by $\sim 2\%$ points (45.3% vs. 43.2%). It is surpassed by the LLaVA-Next [24] family of models by $\sim 7\%$ points; by Idefics2 by $\sim 12\%$ points (55.7% vs. 43.2%) and by the newly released MiniCPM-Llama3 [43] model by $\sim 17\%$ points (60.6% vs. 43.2%). Compared with the absolute state-of-the-art open-source models, GenLLaVA lags behind Yi-VL [45] by $\sim 6\%$ points; Emu2 [35] by $\sim 2\%$ points, LLaVA-Next [24] (34b) by $\sim 15\%$ points; and InternVL 1.5 by $\sim 20\%$ points. Compared with the absolute

state-of-the-art closed models, GenLLaVA lags behind GPT-4o by $\sim 25\%$ points, GPT-4V [1] by $\sim 24\%$ points; and the Gemini family [40] of models by 16% points.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have introduced the Generative Large Language, and Visual Assistant (GenLLaVA), a new approach that enables Large Multimodal Models (LMMs) to simultaneously excel in image understanding, generation, and editing without significant loss in individual task performance. We balanced multimodal capabilities in a single model by curating a comprehensive multimodal instruction dataset and developing an innovative single-phase training methodology. Our work sets a new standard for building visual assistants with extra capabilities, and we hope our open-source contributions, including datasets, codebase, and model checkpoints, will serve as valuable resources for the research community, driving further advancements in the field of multimodal AI.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Google Cloud and the TPU Research Cloud program from Google for providing funding for this research effort. We are also thankful for support from the Department of Computer Science at Rice University.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [2] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*, 2023.
- [3] Tim Brooks, Aleksander Holynski, and Alexei A Efros. Instructpix2pix: Learning to follow image editing instructions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18392–18402, 2023.
- [4] Soravit Changpinyo, Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, and Radu Soricut. Conceptual 12m: Pushing web-scale image-text pre-training to recognize long-tail visual concepts. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3558–3568, 2021.
- [5] Lin Chen, Jisong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Conghui He, Jiaqi Wang, Feng Zhao, and Dahua Lin. Sharegpt4v: Improving large multi-modal models with better captions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12793*, 2023.
- [6] OpenCompass Contributors. Opencompass: A universal evaluation platform for foundation models. <https://github.com/open-compass/opencompass>, 2023.
- [7] Tsu-Jui Fu, Wenze Hu, Xianzhi Du, William Yang Wang, Yinfei Yang, and Zhe Gan. Guiding instruction-based image editing via multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17102*, 2023.
- [8] Amir Hertz, Ron Mokady, Jay Tenenbaum, Kfir Aberman, Yael Pritch, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Prompt-to-prompt image editing with cross attention control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.01626*, 2022.
- [9] Martin Heusel, Hubert Ramsauer, Thomas Unterthiner, Bernhard Nessler, and Sepp Hochreiter. Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [10] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:6840–6851, 2020.
- [11] Jonathan Ho and Tim Salimans. Classifier-free diffusion guidance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.12598*, 2022.
- [12] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.

- [13] Kushal Kafle, Scott Cohen, Brian Price, and Christopher Kanan. Dvqa: Understanding data visualizations via question answering. In *CVPR*, 2018.
- [14] Siddharth Karamcheti, Suraj Nair, Ashwin Balakrishna, Percy Liang, Thomas Kollar, and Dorsa Sadigh. Prismatic vlms: Investigating the design space of visually-conditioned language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07865*, 2024.
- [15] Aniruddha Kembhavi, Mike Salvato, Eric Kolve, Minjoon Seo, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ali Farhadi. A diagram is worth a dozen images. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part IV 14*, pages 235–251. Springer, 2016.
- [16] Geewook Kim, Teakgyu Hong, Moonbin Yim, Jeongyeon Nam, Jinyoung Park, Jinyeong Yim, Wonseok Hwang, Sangdoon Yun, Dongyoon Han, and Seunghyun Park. Ocr-free document understanding transformer. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2022.
- [17] Jing Yu Koh, Daniel Fried, and Russ R Salakhutdinov. Generating images with multimodal language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [18] Bohao Li, Rui Wang, Guangzhi Wang, Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, and Ying Shan. Seed-bench: Benchmarking multimodal llms with generative comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16125*, 2023.
- [19] 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*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR, 2023.
- [20] 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.
- [21] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, Proceedings, Part V 13*, pages 740–755. Springer, 2014.
- [22] Fuxiao Liu, Kevin Lin, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Yaser Yacoob, and Lijuan Wang. Mitigating hallucination in large multi-modal models via robust instruction tuning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023.
- [23] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning, 2023.
- [24] 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.
- [25] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning, 2023.
- [26] Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhang, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, et al. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06281*, 2023.
- [27] Jiasen Lu, Christopher Clark, Sangho Lee, Zichen Zhang, Savya Khosla, Ryan Marten, Derek Hoiem, and Aniruddha Kembhavi. Unified-io 2: Scaling autoregressive multimodal models with vision, language, audio, and action. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.17172*, 2023.
- [28] Pan Lu, Hritik Bansal, Tony Xia, Jiacheng Liu, Chunyuan Li, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Hao Cheng, Kai-Wei Chang, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. Mathvista: Evaluating mathematical reasoning of foundation models in visual contexts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02255*, 2023.
- [29] Ahmed Masry, Do Long, Jia Qing Tan, Shafiq Joty, and Enamul Hoque. ChartQA: A benchmark for question answering about charts with visual and logical reasoning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022*, pages 2263–2279, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [30] Minesh Mathew, Dimosthenis Karatzas, and CV Jawahar. Docvqa: A dataset for vqa on document images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, pages 2200–2209, 2021.
- [31] 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*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021.

- [32] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 10684–10695, June 2022.
- [33] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models, 2021.
- [34] Teams ShareGPT. Sharegpt: Share your wildest chatgpt conversations with one click, 2023.
- [35] Quan Sun, Yufeng Cui, Xiaosong Zhang, Fan Zhang, Qiying Yu, Zhengxiong Luo, Yueze Wang, Yongming Rao, Jingjing Liu, Tiejun Huang, et al. Generative multimodal models are in-context learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.13286*, 2023.
- [36] Quan Sun, Qiying Yu, Yufeng Cui, Fan Zhang, Xiaosong Zhang, Yueze Wang, Hongcheng Gao, Jingjing Liu, Tiejun Huang, and Xinlong Wang. Generative pretraining in multimodality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.05222*, 2023.
- [37] Hao Tan, Franck Deroncourt, Zhe Lin, Trung Bui, and Mohit Bansal. Expressing visual relationships via language. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.07689*, 2019.
- [38] Zineng Tang, Ziyi Yang, Mahmoud Khademi, Yang Liu, Chenguang Zhu, and Mohit Bansal. Codi-2: In-context, interleaved, and interactive any-to-any generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.18775*, 2023.
- [39] Chameleon Team. Chameleon: Mixed-modal early-fusion foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09818*, 2024.
- [40] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
- [41] Junke Wang, Lingchen Meng, Zejia Weng, Bo He, Zuxuan Wu, and Yu-Gang Jiang. To see is to believe: Prompting gpt-4v for better visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07574*, 2023.
- [42] Weihang Wang, Qingsong Lv, Wenmeng Yu, Wenyi Hong, Ji Qi, Yan Wang, Junhui Ji, Zhuoyi Yang, Lei Zhao, Xixuan Song, et al. Cogvlm: Visual expert for pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03079*, 2023.
- [43] Ruyi Xu, Yuan Yao, Zonghao Guo, Junbo Cui, Zanlin Ni, Chunjiang Ge, Tat-Seng Chua, Zhiyuan Liu, and Gao Huang. LLaVA-UHD: an lmm perceiving any aspect ratio and high-resolution images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.11703*, 2024.
- [44] 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.
- [45] Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, Heng Li, Jiangcheng Zhu, Jianqun Chen, Jing Chang, et al. Yi: Open foundation models by 01. ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04652*, 2024.
- [46] Lili Yu, Bowen Shi, Ramakanth Pasunuru, Benjamin Muller, Olga Golovneva, Tianlu Wang, Arun Babu, Binh Tang, Brian Karrer, Shelly Sheynin, Candace Ross, Adam Polyak, Russell Howes, Vasu Sharma, Puxin Xu, Hovhannes Tamoyan, Oron Ashual, Uriel Singer, Shang-Wen Li, Susan Zhang, Richard James, Gargi Ghosh, Yaniv Taigman, Maryam Fazel-Zarandi, Asli Celikyilmaz, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Armen Aghajanyan. Scaling autoregressive multi-modal models: Pretraining and instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.02591*, 2023.
- [47] Weihao Yu, Zhengyuan Yang, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Kevin Lin, Zicheng Liu, Xinchao Wang, and Lijuan Wang. Mm-vet: Evaluating large multimodal models for integrated capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02490*, 2023.
- [48] Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoqi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, et al. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16502*, 2023.
- [49] Xiaohua Zhai, Basil Mustafa, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. Sigmoid loss for language image pre-training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 11975–11986, 2023.

- [50] Jun Zhan, Junqi Dai, Jiasheng Ye, Yunhua Zhou, Dong Zhang, Zhigeng Liu, Xin Zhang, Ruibin Yuan, Ge Zhang, Linyang Li, et al. Anygpt: Unified multimodal llm with discrete sequence modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12226*, 2024.
- [51] Bo Zhao, Boya Wu, and Tiejun Huang. Svit: Scaling up visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04087*, 2023.