

i-SRT: Aligning Large Multimodal Models for Videos by Iterative Self-Retrospective Judgment

Daechul Ahn^{1,3,*} Yura Choi^{1,3,*} San Kim^{1,3}
Youngjae Yu¹ Dongyeop Kang² Jonghyun Choi^{3,†}

¹Yonsei University ²University of Minnesota ³Seoul National University
{dcahn,yoorachoi,nasmik419,yjy}@yonsei.ac.kr dongyeop@umn.edu jonghyunchoi@snu.ac.kr

Abstract

Aligning Video Large Multimodal Models (VLMMs) face challenges such as modality misalignment and verbose responses. Although iterative approaches such as self-rewarding or iterative direct preference optimization (DPO) recently showed a significant improvement in language model alignment, particularly on reasoning tasks, self-aligned models applied to large video-language models often result in lengthy and irrelevant responses. To address these challenges, we propose a novel method that employs self-retrospection to enhance both response generation and preference modeling, and call iterative self-retrospective judgment (i-SRT). By revisiting and evaluating already generated content and preference in loop, i-SRT improves the alignment between textual and visual modalities, reduce verbosity, and enhances content relevance. Our empirical evaluations across diverse video question answering benchmarks demonstrate that i-SRT significantly outperforms prior arts. We are committed to open-sourcing our code, models, and datasets to encourage further investigation.

1 Introduction

Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) (Rafailov et al., 2023), an alternative to reinforcement learning for preference optimization (Ouyang et al., 2022), has become integral in training advanced Large Language Models (LLMs) (Rafailov et al., 2023) and Video Large Multimodal Models (VLMMs) (Zhang et al., 2024a). On top of DPO, recent work (Yuan et al., 2024) has proposed a self-rewarding approach that *iteratively* utilizes a single LLM for both response generation and preference generation (*i.e.*, LLM-as-a-judge) and optimization using DPO. This approach has shown promising results in aligning LLMs by iteratively constructing more informative preference datasets.

*: equal contribution. †: corresponding author. Code: <https://github.com/snumprlab/SRT>




Figure 1: **Illustration of the proposed i-SRT.** During iterative direct preference optimization (DPO) in VLMM, we select preferences from responses based on not only video content but also visual context c_t , *i.e.*, detailed video description, to ensure preferences are grounded in video information. Specifically, we enhance the context on the self-retrospective manner by leveraging previously generated context c_{t-1} , a process we call *self-retrospective* preference modeling.

However, the adaptation of self-rewarding strategies to VLMMs presents different challenges than those in LLMs. VLMMs often face modality misalignment during both response generation and preference modeling. This misalignment leads to self-generated preferences that are linguistically plausible but not grounded in the visual content of the associated video (Ahn et al., 2024). Moreover, it is well known that preference fine-tuning methods such as RLHF, RLAIFF, and DPO tend to produce responses that are longer than those generated prior to preference optimization (Prasann Singhal and Durrett, 2023). Although somewhat longer responses might enhance the quality of the predicted response, excessively long responses can introduce




Figure 2: **Example of naively applying self-rewarding to VLMMs.** (a) The average length of generated responses increases steadily as the number of DPO iterations rise in the video question answering benchmark (Xu et al., 2017). (b) Example of hallucination in longer responses. At the 1st iteration, the response is concise and directly addresses the question. By the 5th iteration, the response becomes more detailed, referencing explicit text overlays in the video. By the 10th iteration, however, the response starts to include excessive details and assumptions, leading to irrelevant content. This figure highlights how self-rewarding for VLMM can initially enhance detail but eventually cause overly verbose responses and hallucinations.

irrelevant content to the actual video or question, *i.e.*, *hallucination*, without necessarily enhancing quality. The iterative nature of self-rewarding could further exacerbate this verbosity, increasing the hallucination, which we term *length bias* within *self-rewarding cycle*.

We empirically examine the effect of applying self-rewarding in VLMMs on response length, as illustrated in Fig. 2. As the iterative training progresses, we observe that the response length increases, resulting in detailed but increasingly redundant explanations, as shown in Fig. 1-(b). This verbosity phenomenon is due to a bias in the prefer-

ence data favoring longer responses (Prasann Singhal and Durrett, 2023; Park et al., 2024). Despite minimal differences in length between preferred and rejected responses, the increase in verbosity is statistically significant (Park et al., 2024).

To address these challenges of multimodal alignment in VLMMs using self-rewarding, we introduce i-SRT: an iterative Self-Retrospective judgment approach that generates responses and performs preference modeling (*i.e.*, VLMM-as-a-judge) based on self-retrospection, as illustrated in Fig. 1. In contrast to the naive application of self-rewarding in VLMM, we enhance our model’s ability to select preferences by conditioning not only on the video content – the primary visual and audio elements of the video – but also on the visual context. This context includes detailed video descriptions generated by the VLMM itself and serves a critical role similar to attention or focusing within diverse content. During iterative preference modeling, this dual conditioning on both video content and visual context improves the model’s understanding and interpretation of video.

Moreover, we employ an iterative self-retrospective method to refine visual context. By reviewing previously generated video description, *i.e.*, visual context, we generate more accurate and fine-grained descriptions in the current iteration, thus deepening the understanding of visual content during preference selection process, a process we refer to *self-retrospective* preference modeling.

Our empirical studies demonstrate that our i-SRT exhibits superior performance compared to state-of-the-art VLMMs on various video question answering benchmarks, as discussed in Sec. 4.2.

We summarize our contributions as follows:

- We propose a novel modality alignment method for video large multimodal models (VLMMs), utilizing iterative direct preference optimization (DPO) to align video-text modalities effectively.
- We enhance AI’s feedback by proposing self-retrospective preference modeling, which improves clarity and comprehension in video through the use of iteratively refined visual context for preference selection.
- We demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed i-SRT on various video question answering benchmarks by a noticeable margin.




Figure 3: **Overview of iterative self-retrospective judgment.** Our i-SRT consists of three steps (Sec. 3.1): 1) At time t , the current VLMM (π_{θ^t}) generates responses y_1 and y_2 for the given video V and question x . In addition, a visual description, *i.e.*, visual context, is generated by a self-retrospective manner (Sec. 3.2), providing the necessary input for the next stage as indicated in black dotted line, 2) Using the input from the previous stage, the VLMM (π_{θ^t}) classifies the preferred response y_w and rejected response y_l from generated responses. This preference data D_t^{pref} is recorded for use in the subsequent stage, 3) Then, the VLMM at time t is optimized using DPO to update the parameters to $\pi_{\theta^{t+1}}$.

2 Related Work

Aligning large multimodal models for videos.

Video Large Multimodal Models (VLMs) (Maaz et al., 2024; Liu et al., 2023a; Lin et al., 2023) have achieved notable success in capabilities, such as video temporal understanding (Liu et al., 2023c), question answering (Lin et al., 2023), and instruction-following (Maaz et al., 2024). These models integrate publicly available Large Language Models (LLMs) (Touvron et al., 2023a,b) with visual encoders (Radford et al., 2021) and additional learnable parameters (Hu et al., 2022), undergoing Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) and, more recently, preference optimization (Rafailov et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2024a; Ahn et al., 2024).

Self-rewarding for alignment. Recent efforts to align LLMs with human intentions adopt self-rewarding (Yuan et al., 2024; Lee et al., 2024; Pang et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024), where a model judges its own outputs to build feedback data and then trains on this data using the DPO pipeline, known as iterative DPO or self-rewarding. This iterative process of training and generating feedback with a single model enhances the model’s ability to produce better responses, leading to increasingly informative preference datasets and showing promising results in aligning LLMs.

3 Iterative Self-Retrospective Judgment

To effectively align the multimodalities between video and text, we propose to use an iterative approach that combines direct preference optimization (DPO) with self-retrospective preference mod-

eling. Figure 3 illustrates the overall training pipeline of our proposed i-SRT, which iteratively executes three stages: 1) generating context and responses, 2) selecting preferences, and 3) optimization (Sec. 3.1).

Throughout this iterative process, we enhance our model’s ability to select preferences by conditioning not only the video content but also on the visual context. This visual context, consisting of detailed video descriptions generated by the VLMM, functions like an attention mechanism, indicating which parts of diverse video content to focus on. This integration enhances the focus on relevant visual details, thereby improving the relevance of responses by grounding them in the video content. It also mitigates the bias toward lengthy responses, producing shorter, concise, yet accurate answers (see Sec. 4.3.1). Additionally, our approach utilizes previously generated visual context to construct a more comprehensive visual context at time t , a process we call *self-retrospective judgment* (Sec.3.2).

3.1 Iterative Direct Preference Optimization in VLMM

For notation, we denote the current VLMM at the t -th iteration as π_{θ^t} . This model generates responses and selects preferences from those responses, thereby generating preference data denoted as D_t^{pref} . Using generated preference data D_t^{pref} , we train the subsequent iterative VLMM, denoted as $\pi_{\theta^{t+1}}$, at the $t + 1$ -th iteration.

Initial model. Given a seed of preference data annotated in Zhang et al. (2024a), we conduct preference fine-tuning using DPO, starting from the

SFT model provided from previous work (Zhang et al., 2024a). This preference fine-tuned model is referred to as the initial model π_{θ^1} .

Preference modeling. Given the current VLMM π_{θ^t} , we generate two different responses for the input video V and question x using a high temperature hyper-parameter value (e.g., 0.7). This high temperature flattens the token sampling probability distribution, producing varied responses from the same input in the current VLMM π_{θ^t} :

$$y_1 \sim \pi_{\theta^t}(V, x), y_2 \sim \pi_{\theta^t}(V, x).$$

We then select the better response between two responses by leveraging the current VLMM to evaluate its own responses, *i.e.*, VLMM-as-a-judge. In particular, we provide the VLMM with the visual context c_t for enhanced visual clarity (more detailed in Sec. 3.2). We can present this preference selection procedure as follows:

$$(y_w, y_l) \sim \pi_{\theta^t}(V, x, c_t, y_1, y_2),$$

where y_1 and y_2 are two sampled responses, y_w is the chosen response, and y_l is the rejected response.

After constructing the preference data at t -th iteration as $D_t^{\text{pref}} = \{V, x, y_w, y_l\}$, we use this dataset to perform preference optimization on the current VLMM π_{θ^t} using DPO. The DPO objective for the current VLMM π_{θ^t} is represented as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{DPO}}(\pi_{\theta^t}; \pi_{\text{ref},t}) = & \\ - \mathbb{E}_{(V,x,y_w,y_l) \sim \mathcal{D}_{t-1}^{\text{pref}}} & \left[\log \sigma \left(\beta \log \frac{\pi_{\theta^t}(y_w | V, x)}{\pi_{\text{ref},t}(y_w | V, x)} \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. - \beta \log \frac{\pi_{\theta^t}(y_l | V, x)}{\pi_{\text{ref},t}(y_l | V, x)} \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi_{\text{ref},t}$ is the current base reference model, β is a hyper-parameter controlling the deviation from the current base reference model and σ is the sigmoid function.

Iterative training. Our overall iterative training procedure follows previous work (Yuan et al., 2024), where a series of models $\pi_{\theta^1}, \dots, \pi_{\theta^X}$ is trained sequentially. Each successive model at iteration of $t + 1$ uses preference data D_t^{pref} generated by the VLMM at iteration t , defined as follows:

$$\pi_{\theta^{t+1}} : \text{Training with } D_t^{\text{pref}} \text{ initialized from } \pi_{\theta^t},$$

where the t -th model π_{θ^t} generates preference data D_t^{pref} through self-judgment.

3.2 Self-Retrospective Judgment

A key aspect of iterative direct preference optimization in VLMMs involves leveraging a pre-trained VLMM to iteratively select preferences, *i.e.*, VLMM-as-a-judge. These preferences need to be visually grounded in the input video and accurately answer the posed questions (Ahn et al., 2024). To ensure this, we provide the VLMM with detailed visual descriptions, *i.e.*, visual context, generated by the VLMM itself at each iteration, in addition to the video content. This dual conditioning enhances the understanding and interpretation of the video during preference selection.

Furthermore, inspired by how humans refine their written text, we introduce self-retrospective judgment to refine the quality of visual context during the iterative process. Retrospection allows humans to make better decisions by reflecting on past experiences (Simon, 1962; Madaan et al., 2023). Similarly, we leverage previously generated visual context to enhance the current visual context, improving the accuracy and relevance of the preference selection process, defined as follows:

$$c_t \sim \pi_{\theta^t}(V, c_{t-1}),$$

where c_{t-1} is the previously generated visual context at time $t - 1$.

Using the generated context c_t , question x , video V , and responses $\{y_1, y_2\}$, we classify the chosen y_w and rejected data y_l from responses using the current aligned VLMM π_{θ^t} , a process we call *self-retrospective judgment*, thereby constructing preference data $D_t^{\text{pref}} = \{V, x, y_w, y_l\}$ at time t .

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

Dataset details. For iterative direct preference optimization, we utilize only the open-source video-text preference dataset (16k) proposed in Zhang et al. (2024a), in contrast to previous work (Yuan et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024) that incorporated additional data at each iteration. Except for the initial VLMM π_{θ^1} , we generate preference datasets D_t^{pref} at each iteration using questions x and videos V from the provided preference dataset (16k) (Zhang et al., 2024a). Generated preference dataset is then used to train the subsequent VLMM $\pi_{\theta^{t+1}}$ using DPO training pipeline.

For evaluation, we employ two types of video question answering datasets across seven video

Methods	ActivityNet-QA		VIDAL-QA		WebVid-QA	
	Acc.	Score	Acc.	Score	Acc.	Score
Video-ChatGPT (Maaz et al., 2024)	34.17	2.19	29.35	2.10	38.88	2.27
LLaMA-VID (Li et al., 2023b)	36.54	2.27	30.58	2.15	36.99	2.24
Chat-UniVi (Jin et al., 2023)	39.35	2.32	31.40	2.16	40.05	2.31
Video-LLaVA (Lin et al., 2023)	41.35	2.38	34.30	2.24	42.47	2.39
VLM-RLAIF (Ahn et al., 2024)	53.27	2.56	44.82	2.40	53.69	2.62
PLLaVA [†] (Xu et al., 2024)	48.44	2.50	42.45	2.39	53.55	2.59
LLaVA-NeXT-DPO [†] (Zhang et al., 2024b)	68.05	2.88	61.52	2.72	73.35	3.00
LLaVA-Hound-DPO [†] (Zhang et al., 2024a)	<u>76.62</u>	<u>3.18</u>	<u>70.06</u>	<u>3.04</u>	<u>79.82</u>	<u>3.29</u>
i-SRT	82.99	3.26	79.00	3.13	88.11	3.40

Table 1: **Quantitative comparison between different VLMMs on *in-domain* video question answering with detailed captions as supporting evidence proposed in Zhang et al. (2024a).** i-SRT consistently outperforms all other models in both accuracy and score across these benchmarks, demonstrating its superior performance in in-domain video question answering task. The best results are **bold** and the second-best results are underlined. †: reproduced by the authors’ implementation. All results except † are directly sourced from Zhang et al. (2024a).

Methods	MSVD-QA		MSRVTT-QA		TGIF-QA		SSV2-QA	
	Acc.	Score	Acc.	Score	Acc.	Score	Acc.	Score
Video-ChatGPT (Maaz et al., 2024)	34.06	2.20	25.65	1.98	31.35	2.09	19.36	1.75
LLaMA-VID (Li et al., 2023b)	34.14	2.21	25.02	1.99	27.18	2.00	22.16	1.84
Chat-UniVi (Jin et al., 2023)	35.61	2.23	25.89	2.01	33.23	2.13	20.59	1.79
Video-LLaVA (Lin et al., 2023)	39.46	2.37	30.78	2.15	32.95	2.18	24.31	1.90
VLM-RLAIF (Ahn et al., 2024)	51.16	2.55	41.44	2.30	46.52	2.41	29.78	1.94
PLLaVA [†] (Xu et al., 2024)	48.92	2.53	38.26	2.28	43.83	2.40	30.92	2.07
LLaVA-NeXT-DPO [†] (Zhang et al., 2024b)	65.08	2.82	59.12	2.65	60.80	2.70	40.14	2.24
LLaVA-Hound-DPO [†] (Zhang et al., 2024a)	<u>73.64</u>	<u>3.12</u>	<u>68.29</u>	<u>2.98</u>	<u>74.00</u>	<u>3.12</u>	<u>48.89</u>	<u>2.53</u>
i-SRT	80.36	3.20	75.42	3.05	78.58	3.12	54.66	2.59

Table 2: **Quantitative comparison between different VLMMs on *out-domain* video question answering with detailed captions as supporting evidence proposed in Zhang et al. (2024a).** i-SRT consistently outperforms all other models in both accuracy and score across these benchmarks, demonstrating its superior performance in out-domain video question answering task. The best results are **bold** and the second-best results are underlined. †: reproduced by the authors’ implementation. All results except † are directly sourced from Zhang et al. (2024a).

datasets (Maaz et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024a). The first type requires brief sentences or keywords, providing concise responses, while the second type demands detailed sentences, necessitating comprehensive and elaborate answers, as specified in Maaz et al. (2024) and Zhang et al. (2024a), respectively.

Training details. During training, we conduct full-parameter fine-tuning, using DPO. We set the number of total iteration N to 9, three times compared to previous self-rewarding approach in LLMs alignment (Yuan et al., 2024). All generative processes, *i.e.*, context, response, and preference as illustrated in Fig. 3, entail their own prompts, as further detailed in Appendix Sec. A. All models are trained using $8 \times$ NVIDIA A100 GPUs (80G). We used a 7B-sized model and compared results with other 7B models for fair comparison.

4.2 Quantitative Analysis

For quantitative evaluation, we use various video question answering benchmarks (Xu et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2024a) that require both concise and detailed responses, providing a comprehensive assessment of the model’s capabilities in handling multimodalities of video and text. We use the 9-th iteration of the VLMM (*i.e.*, $N = 9$) for our evaluation unless otherwise specified.

In-domain video question answering. We evaluate our model using three in-domain video question answering benchmarks (Zhang et al., 2024a). As shown in Tab. 1, our proposed method, i-SRT, outperforms all existing models across these benchmarks in both accuracy and score by a noticeable margin. We attribute this performance improvement to the better modality alignment provided by the proposed components.

Methods	MSVD-QA		MSRVTT-QA		TGIF-QA	
	Acc.	Score	Acc.	Score	Acc.	Score
VideoLLaMA (Zhang et al., 2023a)	51.6	2.5	29.6	1.8	-	-
LLaMA-Adapter (Zhang et al., 2023b)	54.9	3.1	43.8	2.7	-	-
VideoChat (Li et al., 2023a)	56.3	2.8	45.0	2.5	34.4	2.3
Valley (Luo et al., 2023)	60.5	3.3	51.1	2.9	-	-
BT-Adapter (Liu et al., 2023b)	67.5	3.7	57.0	3.2	-	-
Video-ChatGPT (Maaz et al., 2024)	68.6	3.8	58.9	3.4	47.8	3.2
Chat-UniVi (Jin et al., 2023)	70.0	3.9	53.1	3.1	46.1	3.1
VideoChat2 (Li et al., 2024)	70.0	3.9	54.1	3.3	-	-
Video-LLaVA (Lin et al., 2023)	71.8	3.9	59.0	3.4	48.4	3.2
LLaMA-VID (Li et al., 2023b)	72.6	3.9	58.7	3.4	49.2	3.3
PLLaVA [†] (Xu et al., 2024)	78.8	4.0	65.6	3.4	57.9	3.5
LLaVA-NeXT-DPO [†] (Zhang et al., 2024b)	78.6	4.0	63.4	3.1	58.2	3.4
VLM-RLAIF [†] (Ahn et al., 2024)	<u>81.0</u>	<u>4.2</u>	69.2	3.7	<u>62.3</u>	3.5
LLaVA-Hound-DPO (Zhang et al., 2024a)	80.7	4.1	<u>70.2</u>	<u>3.7</u>	61.4	3.5
i-SRT	85.8	4.3	78.7	3.9	67.8	3.5

Table 3: **Quantitative comparison between different VLMs on *out-domain* video question answering benchmark proposed in Maaz et al. (2024).** i-SRT outperforms previous work across three video question answering datasets. The best results are **bold** and the second-best results are underlined. †: reproduced by the authors’ implementation. All results except † are directly sourced from Zhang et al. (2024a).




Figure 4: **Length analysis of preference dataset during iterative DPO.** (a) Average (Avg.) length of chosen response $|y_w|$ in preference dataset D_t^{pref} across DPO iterations. The naive application of self-rewarding results in longer responses compared to the i-SRT. (b) Ratio of the lengths of chosen responses ($|y_w|$) to rejected responses ($|y_l|$). i-SRT consistently maintains a lowered ratio compared to the self-rewarding, indicating reduced response length after optimized. ‘# DPO iteration’ means the number of DPO iterations.

Out-domain video question answering. For evaluating out-domain video question answering, we use two types of datasets. The first requires long, complex answers to questions, while the second requires concise answers in the form of keywords or short phrases. Tables 2 and 3 show the comparative results for datasets requiring both complex answers and concise keyword answers, respectively. i-SRT outperforms previous work by a large margin in both cases, demonstrating its effectiveness in generating detailed and precise responses.

Moreover, the performance improvements ob-

served during the iteration DPO training are available in Appendix Sec. 10, exhibiting consistent enhancement in performance.

4.3 Detailed Analysis

To evaluate the effectiveness of i-SRT, we address the following research questions, specifically exploring the effect and design of visual context:

- **RQ1:** What are the effects and benefits of visual context during iterative DPO? (Sec. 4.3.1)
- **RQ2:** How should the visual context be designed? (Sec. 4.3.2)

4.3.1 Effect of visual context during iterative direct preference optimization

Length analysis. Figure 4 compares the average length of chosen responses and the ratio of chosen responses to rejected responses. As shown in Fig.4-(a), i-SRT generates shorter chosen responses compared to the naive application of self-rewarding as training iterations progress. Similarly, Fig. 4-(b) shows a lower ratio of the lengths of chosen responses to rejected responses in i-SRT. We believe that dual conditioning on video content and context during preference selection enables the VLM to choose preferences based on video information rather than length bias, resulting in relatively shorter chosen responses than with the naive application of self-rewarding. Consequently,




Figure 5: Comparison of average (Avg.) response length between self-rewarding (Yuan et al., 2024) and i-SRT on various video question answering benchmarks. i-SRT yields more compact and concise responses at the same iteration compared to self-rewarding.

Context Design	Out-of-domain Video QA Benchmark								In-domain Video QA Benchmark					
	MSVD		MSRVTT		TGIF		SSV2		ActivityNet		VIDAL		WebVid	
	Acc.	Score	Acc.	Score	Acc.	Score	Acc.	Score	Acc.	Score	Acc.	Score	Acc.	Score
N/A	78.73	3.14	73.42	3.00	77.10	3.09	54.34	2.56	81.96	3.23	76.71	3.09	87.24	3.39
Fixed	79.17	3.15	74.35	3.02	77.88	3.09	54.29	2.57	82.25	3.24	77.90	3.12	87.49	3.39
Renew	79.49	3.19	74.04	3.04	77.63	3.12	53.03	2.56	82.03	3.26	77.73	3.12	86.68	3.38
Self-retro.	80.36	3.20	75.42	3.05	78.58	3.12	54.66	2.59	82.99	3.26	79.00	3.13	88.11	3.40

Table 4: Quantitative comparison of various designs for generating visual context. ‘N/A’ indicates no context, ‘Fixed’ uses context generated in the first iteration for all subsequent iterations, ‘Renew’ generates new context each iteration, and ‘Self-retro.’ employs self-retrospective context.




Figure 6: Head-to-head performance comparison with and without visual context for iterative DPO. We use the same 9-th iteration’s model on both i-SRT and self-rewarding, and i-SRT overall outperforms the naive application of self-rewarding.

as shown in Fig. 5, i-SRT generates more concise responses than naive self-rewarding.

Performance analysis. Following Yuan et al. (2024), we compare the 9-th iteration models of naive self-rewarding and our i-SRT for both, using GPT-4 as the evaluator on video question answering benchmarks. GPT-4 assesses performance by selecting the response closer to the ground truth, *i.e.*, evaluating win-rate with ground-truth reference (details in Appendix Sec. C). Figure 6 shows the percentage gap between self-rewarding and




Figure 7: Visualization of predicted context over iteration. We visualize generated context of our i-SRT over DPO iteration. Red indicates irrelevant responses, while blue indicates well-grounded responses.

i-SRT across all benchmarks, demonstrating the effectiveness of i-SRT.

Quality comparison of preference dataset. Following Lee et al. (2023), We compare human labeler alignment accuracy for preference dataset quality between self-rewarding and i-SRT as shown in Tab. 5. i-SRT shows higher alignment accu-




Figure 8: **Qualitative comparison of self-rewarding vs. i-SRT at multiple iterations.** The figure contrasts descriptions generated without visual context, i.e., naive self-rewarding (left), against those with visual context, i.e., i-SRT (right), at the 5th and 9th iterations. Visual context results in more accurate, concise, and relevant descriptions. **Red** indicates irrelevant responses, while **blue** indicates well-grounded responses.

Task	Human Alignment Accuracy (%)	
	Self-rewarding	i-SRT
Preference selection	59.0	75.0

Table 5: **Human labeler alignment accuracy for preference selection.** We measure human alignment accuracy to evaluate the amount of correlation between human and aligned models, i.e., self-rewarding vs. i-SRT.

racy (75.0 %) compared to self-rewarding (59.0 %), indicating a stronger correlation with human preferences. We believe that by considering visual context in addition to video content, i-SRT achieves a deeper understanding of the video, enabling the model to select visually grounded preferences, similar to human judgment. More details are in Appendix Sec. B.

4.3.2 Various design choices for visual context

We compare different designs for context generation, as shown in Tab. 4: 1) without context (‘N/A’), 2) using fixed context generated in the first iteration for all subsequent iterations (‘Fixed’), 3) generating new context at each iteration without any condition (‘Renew’) and 4) self-retrospective context (‘Self-retro.’). ‘Self-retro.’ performs best, likely because it leverages previously generated context to refine the current one, leading to a better understanding of the video and demonstrating its efficacy.

4.4 Qualitative Analysis

Enhanced visual context over iteration. Figure 7 shows visual contexts generated during the iterative DPO training. As training iterations progress, the context includes more detailed visual information about the video, such as specific species of goldfish. This improved context enhances the overall understanding of the video’s content and aids preference selection process.

Comparison of self-rewarding vs. i-SRT. Figure 8 compares the performance of the naive application of self-rewarding and i-SRT, highlighting their multimodal understanding capabilities over multiple iterations during iterative DPO. This comparison demonstrates i-SRT’s advantage in generating better-grounded responses to visual input, whereas naive self-rewarding falls short as training iterations progress. More examples are in the Appendix Fig. 11 for the space sake.

5 Conclusion

We propose a novel alignment strategy for VLMMs that addresses modality misalignment and verbosity issues through an iterative self-retrospective judgment (i-SRT) method. Our empirical validations demonstrate that i-SRT significantly outperforms previous models across various video ques-

tion answering benchmarks. This indicates a robust improvement in the instruction-following ability of multimodal video-text models.

Limitations

Given that our approach, iterative self-retrospective judgement (i-SRT), utilizes feedback generated by the AI model, the effectiveness of i-SRT largely depends on the quality of AI responses. Recent studies (Koo et al., 2023; Das et al., 2024) have highlighted the challenges in enhancing the quality of synthetically generated data, which is critical for reliable RL framework. Additionally, our method’s performance can also be limited by the computational resources required for processing and analyzing large-scale video data. The iterative nature of i-SRT, while beneficial for improving model alignment, also increases the computational overhead, potentially limiting its scalability and practicality for real-time applications. Moreover, the current implementation of i-SRT may not adequately address the nuances of different languages and cultural contexts, which can affect the model’s performance in global applications. The predominantly English-centric data used in training may not generalize well to other languages or dialects, potentially limiting the effectiveness of the model in non-English speaking regions. Addressing these cultural and linguistic variations is another critical area for future development to ensure the global applicability of our approach.

Ethical Considerations

Bias and fairness. The iterative self-retrospective judgment (i-SRT) used in Video Large Multimodal Models (VLMs) risks inheriting and amplifying biases present in their training datasets. Although the iterative nature of i-SRT may make it less susceptible to these biases, they can still skew model performance and decision-making, potentially leading to unfair outcomes for specific user groups or scenarios. To mitigate this risk, it is crucial to regularly conduct bias audits and employ fairness algorithms that adjust the model’s outputs. Continuous monitoring for emergent biases as the model interacts with real-world data is also essential.

Explainability. The inherent complexity of multimodal models such as the iterative self-retrospective judgment (i-SRT) often categorizes

them as "black box" systems, characterized by non-transparent decision-making processes. This lack of transparency can render the models challenging for users to comprehend and trust, which might impede their effective management and broader acceptance, particularly in applications where a clear understanding of AI decisions is critical. Nonetheless, i-SRT mitigates some of these transparency issues by generating intermediate results during each iteration, which provide incremental insights into its decision-making process. This feature of i-SRT contributes to a reduced “black box” perception by offering users greater visibility into how conclusions are incrementally built, thereby enhancing both the trustworthiness and manageability of the system in its practical applications.

References

- Daechul Ahn, Yura Choi, Youngjae Yu, Dongyeop Kang, and Jonghyun Choi. 2024. Tuning large multimodal models for videos using reinforcement learning from ai feedback. In *ACL*.
- Zixiang Chen, Yihe Deng, Huizhuo Yuan, Kaixuan Ji, and Quanquan Gu. 2024. [Self-play fine-tuning converts weak language models to strong language models](#).
- Debarati Das, Karin De Langis, Anna Martin-Boyle, Jaehyung Kim, Minhwa Lee, Zae Myung Kim, Shirley Anugrah Hayati, Risako Owan, Bin Hu, Ritik Parkar, Ryan Koo, Jonginn Park, Aahan Tyagi, Libby Ferland, Sanjali Roy, Vincent Liu, and Dongyeop Kang. 2024. [Under the surface: Tracking the artificiality of llm-generated data](#).
- Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Peng Jin, Ryuichi Takanobu, Caiwan Zhang, Xiaochun Cao, and Li Yuan. 2023. Chat-univi: Unified visual representation empowers large language models with image and video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08046*.
- Ryan Koo, Minhwa Lee, Vipul Raheja, Jong Inn Park, Zae Myung Kim, and Dongyeop Kang. 2023. [Benchmarking cognitive biases in large language models as evaluators](#).
- Harrison Lee, Samrat Phatale, Hassan Mansoor, Thomas Mesnard, Johan Ferret, Kellie Lu, Colton Bishop, Ethan Hall, Victor Carbune, Abhinav Rastogi, and Sushant Prakash. 2023. [Rlaif: Scaling reinforcement learning from human feedback with ai feedback](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.00267*.

- Sangkyu Lee, Sungdong Kim, Ashkan Yousefpour, Minjoon Seo, Kang Min Yoo, and Youngjae Yu. 2024. Aligning large language models by on-policy self-judgment. In *ACL*.
- KunChang Li, Yanan He, Yi Wang, Yizhuo Li, Wenhai Wang, Ping Luo, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. 2023a. Videochat: Chat-centric video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06355*.
- Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yanan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Ping Luo, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. 2024. [Mvbench: A comprehensive multi-modal video understanding benchmark](#). *arXiv*.
- Yanwei Li, Chengyao Wang, and Jiaya Jia. 2023b. Llama-vid: An image is worth 2 tokens in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17043*.
- Bin Lin, Bin Zhu, Yang Ye, Munan Ning, Peng Jin, and Li Yuan. 2023. Video-llava: Learning united visual representation by alignment before projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10122*.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. 2023a. Visual instruction tuning. In *NeurIPS*.
- Ruyang Liu, Chen Li, Yixiao Ge, Ying Shan, Thomas H. Li, and Ge Li. 2023b. [One for all: Video conversation is feasible without video instruction tuning](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15785*.
- Ruyang Liu, Chen Li, Haoran Tang, Yixiao Ge, Ying Shan, and Ge Li. 2023c. St-llm: Large language models are effective temporal learners. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.00308>.
- Ruipu Luo, Ziwang Zhao, Min Yang, Junwei Dong, Minghui Qiu, Pengcheng Lu, Tao Wang, and Zhongyu Wei. 2023. [Valley: Video assistant with large language model enhanced ability](#).
- Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Rasheed, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. 2024. Video-chatgpt: Towards detailed video understanding via large vision and language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2024)*.
- Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhunoye, Yiming Yang, Shashank Gupta, Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Katherine Hermann, Sean Welleck, Amir Yazdanbakhsh, and Peter Clark. 2023. [Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, John Schulman, Jacob Hilton, Fraser Kelton, Luke Miller, Maddie Simens, Amanda Askell, Peter Welinder, Paul F Christiano, Jan Leike, and Ryan Lowe. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pages 27730–27744. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Weizhe Yuan, Kyunghyun Cho, He He, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, and Jason Weston. 2024. [Iterative reasoning preference optimization](#).
- Ryan Park, Rafael Rafailov, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2024. [Disentangling length from quality in direct preference optimization](#).
- Jiacheng Xu Prasann Singhal, Tanya Goyal and Greg Durrett. 2023. A long way to go: Investigating length correlations in rlhf. *arXiv*.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. 2021. [Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision](#). In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. [Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model](#). In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Herbert A. Simon. 1962. The architecture of complexity. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 106(6):467–482.
- Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. 2023a. [Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models](#).
- Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrutu Bhosale, Dan Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel Kloumann, Artem Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, Ranjan Subramanian, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zheng Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas

- Scialom. 2023b. [Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models](#).
- Dejing Xu, Zhou Zhao, Jun Xiao, Fei Wu, Hanwang Zhang, Xiangnan He, and Yueting Zhuang. 2017. Video question answering via gradually refined attention over appearance and motion. In *ACM Multimedia*.
- Lin Xu, Yilin Zhao, Daquan Zhou, Zhijie Lin, See Kiong Ng, and Jiashi Feng. 2024. [Pllava : Parameter-free llava extension from images to videos for video dense captioning](#).
- Weizhe Yuan, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Kyunghyun Cho, Xian Li, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Jing Xu, and Jason Weston. 2024. [Self-rewarding language models](#).
- Hang Zhang, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. 2023a. [Video-llama: An instruction-tuned audio-visual language model for video understanding](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02858*.
- Renrui Zhang, Jiaming Han, Chris Liu, Peng Gao, Aojun Zhou, Xiangfei Hu, Shilin Yan, Pan Lu, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Qiao. 2023b. [Llama-adapter: Efficient fine-tuning of language models with zero-init attention](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16199*.
- Ruohong Zhang, Liangke Gui, Zhiqing Sun, Yihao Feng, Keyang Xu, Yuanhan Zhang, Di Fu, Chunyuan Li, Alexander Hauptmann, Yonatan Bisk, and Yiming Yang. 2024a. [Direct preference optimization of video large multimodal models from language model reward](#).
- Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, haotian Liu, Yong jae Lee, Liangke Gui, Di Fu, Jiashi Feng, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. 2024b. [Llava-next: A strong zero-shot video understanding model](#).

A Input Prompts for Generating Preference Dataset

We leverage three types of input prompts to generate preference dataset, *i.e.*, 1) response generation, 2) self-retrospective context generation and 3) preference judgment, as discussed in Sec. 3.1 and Sec. 4.1. The upper part of Figure 9 presents a designed input prompt given to our method, resulting in two responses. Also, the center part of Figure 9 illustrates the prompt to generate a context based on the previous context. Lastly, the bottom part of Figure 9 demonstrates the prompt for preference judgment using the current VLMM.

B Details on Human Evaluation for Human Preference Alignment

Following (Lee et al., 2023), we conduct a human evaluation to measure how well the AI-generated preferences align with human preferences, similar to the method used in the previous study. We recruit 15 annotators for each of the 100 questions using the Amazon Mechanical Turk platform. Specifically, we randomly sample 100 questions from the dataset used in the previous study (Xu et al., 2017). Specific instructions and examples for the questions can be found in Fig. 12.

C Details on Measuring Win Ratio with GPT-4

To assess the head-to-head comparison of generated responses between self-rewarding (Yuan et al., 2024) and i-SRT, we prompted GPT-4 to decide which of the two responses is better, across in-domain and out-domain video question answering benchmarks, as shown in Fig. 13. Here, we also introduced ‘Tie’ where it is hard to determine the preference between two responses.

Prompt (response)

A chat between a curious human and an artificial intelligence assistant.
The assistant gives helpful, detailed, and polite answers to the human's questions.

Prompt (context)

Given the provided video and the previously predicted description of the video, your task is to generate an enhanced description of the video clip. The generated description should provide a comprehensive understanding of the video's content while forming a coherent story.

Note that the previous description might include irrelevant or inappropriate words. Thus, you don't have to include all the contents in the previous description. Focus on generating new description with improved accuracy and detail, while it concise as possible and comprehensive.

Consider the following aspects while generating the description:

- (1) Unwavering Accuracy: The AI must consistently provide accurate and verifiable information in its responses.
- (2) Consistent Calibration: The AI should ensure that its confidence assertions align with its actual accuracy, reflecting genuine knowledge estimation.
- (3) Transparent Uncertainty Expression: When uncertain, the AI should transparently express its level of uncertainty, ensuring users are never misled by vague or overly confident statements.
- (4) Honest Self-representation: The AI must be forthright about its own capabilities and should not feign expertise or knowledge it doesn't possess.
- (5) Additional guidelines:
 - 1) Clarify the predicted answer by avoiding issues such as repetition, unclear descriptions, or any grammatical errors that could hinder understanding.
 - 2) Address inconsistencies to ensure accuracy and alignment with the video's content.
 - 3) Generate a description concisely.

Previous description:

<PREVIOUS CONTEXT>

Now, generate the improved description below.

Improved description:

Prompt (judge)

Considering given video, question and description about the video, select the most preferred (least wrong) answer for the question.

Inputs:

1. Question, the question queried to the AI system
2. Answer1, the first answer prediction from the AI system
3. Answer2, the second answer prediction from the AI system
4. Video description, the overall description about the given video in the form of a paragraph

Based on the provided definition, please select the preferred answer (Answer1 or Answer2) for the given instruction (Question) and provide a concise explanation for choosing it as the correct one. When generating the explanation, please provide valid justifications without simply mentioning the answer itself.

Your answer should be formatted as:

Choice:

Explanation:

Now provide your answer in this situation:

Question: <QUESTION>

Answer1: <PREDICTION A>

Answer2: <PREDICTION B>

Description: <RETRO CONTEXT>

When generating output, you should consider the visual situation provided and include either 'Answer1' or 'Answer2' in your generated output.

Figure 9: **Various input prompts for constructing preference dataset.** This shows various input prompts: the upper part for generating two responses, the center part for context generation based on previous context, and the bottom part for preference judgment using the current VLMM..




Figure 10: **Accuracy of i-SRT over iteration on video question answering benchmarks.** Our i-SRT consistently improves its performance over DPO iteration.



Question: What is the attire of the teams playing in the beach soccer match?



Ground-Truth

The teams are wearing two distinct kits, with one team in blue and the other in orange.

Self-Rewarding (Yuan et al., 2024)

The teams playing in the beach soccer match are dressed in **distinctive attire that contrasts with each other**, making it easy to distinguish between the two sides. The players are wearing team uniforms that are typically **shorts and jerseys, suitable for the beach environment** and the physical nature of the sport. The colors of the uniforms are vibrant and likely represent their respective teams, with one team wearing lighter colors and the other in darker hues. **The attire is appropriate for the sport and the setting, allowing for ease of movement and comfort during the match.**

i-SRT (Ours)

The teams playing in the beach soccer match are dressed in distinctive team colors, with **one team wearing blue and the other in orange**. Their attire is appropriate for beach sports, consisting of **shorts and T-shirts or jerseys**, which allow for agility and comfort during the game. The players' uniforms are vibrant and **contrasting**, making it easy to distinguish between the two teams.



Question: What is the weight of the discus being thrown?



Ground-Truth

The weight of the discus being thrown is 1.5kg according to visible text annotations.

Self-Rewarding (Yuan et al., 2024)

The weight of the discus being thrown is prominently **displayed in the video**, with text overlays indicating the weight of the discus at various points during the throw. The discus is thrown with a specific weight in mind, which is crucial for the performance and technique of the athlete. **The weight of the discus being thrown is 5 kg, 5.5 kg, and 6 kg, as shown in the text overlays in the video.** These weights are significant as they provide context for the athlete's strength and the technical requirements of the throw.

i-SRT (Ours)

The weight of the discus being thrown is **indicated by text overlays in the video, which specify the weight of the discus as "1.5kg"**. These details provide viewers with information about the weight of the discus being used in the throw.



Question: What kind of chips are arranged on the white round plate in the video?



Ground-Truth

Triangular yellow tortilla chips are arranged in a circular pattern on the white round plate in the video.

Self-Rewarding (Yuan et al., 2024)

The chips arranged on the white round plate in the video are **yellow corn chips**, which are commonly known for their crisp texture and mildly salty flavor. They are typically made from cornmeal and appear to be of a standard size and shape, commonly found in snack bags or served at casual dining establishments. **The chips are arranged in a way that suggests they are ready to be dipped or eaten with the cheese sauce.**

i-SRT (Ours)

The chips arranged on the white round plate in the video appear to be **tortilla chips**, which are commonly used as a dipping medium for such sauces. They have a **triangular shape and a golden-yellow hue**, indicative of being fried and seasoned. These chips are typically made from cornmeal and are a popular accompaniment to dips and sauces.



Question: What kind of protective gear is the individual wearing in the video?



Ground-Truth

The individual in the video is wearing a welding helmet and gloves as protective gear.

Self-Rewarding (Yuan et al., 2024)

The individual in the video is wearing **protective gear appropriate for welding, including a helmet** with a darkened visor to shield their face from the intense light and sparks, **gloves** to protect their hands, and a long-sleeved shirt to safeguard their skin from burns. The gear is designed to protect the welder from the hazards of the welding process. **The protective clothing is primarily dark in color, likely chosen for its durability and ability to absorb heat.** The helmet is also equipped with a face shield to ensure the welder's face is fully protected.

i-SRT (Ours)

The individual in the video is wearing **protective gear, including a welding helmet and gloves, which are essential for safety** during such operations. The protective gear suggests that the individual is taking necessary precautions to shield themselves from the intense **light and potential hazards of the welding process**. The gear is typical for welding tasks, ensuring the individual's safety while performing the work.

Figure 11: **More qualitative example of prediction from self-rewarding vs. i-SRT.** We compare responses generated at the 9-th iteration for both models. Integrating visual context leads to more accurate, concise, and relevant descriptions that align more closely with the ground-truth answer. **Red** indicates irrelevant or wrong responses, while **blue** indicates well-grounded responses.

Task:
As an annotator, your task is to evaluate two AI-generated responses to a question related to a specific video and its caption. You must choose the response in relation to the question asked and the information available in the video, that better fulfills the criteria described below. Use the information available in the visualized video frames and the provided ground-truth answer to assess the response.

Criteria for Evaluation:

- 1. Accuracy:** Assess whether the response accurately answers the question, adhering closely to the content and context provided by the video. The ideal response should precisely reflect the intent and factual content of the ground-truth answer. Avoid selecting responses that introduce information not present in the video and ground-truth. The response should not speculate, assume, or create unfounded details, regardless of their plausibility. Conciseness
- 2. Relevance:** The response should directly address the question without including unnecessary sentences or digressions. Check that the response maintains relevance to the question throughout. Responses should not only start relevantly but should also maintain this focus until the end. - e.g.) If the question concerns "What is the man's attire?", penalize responses that wander into discussing irrelevant details such as the overall atmosphere of the video, weather conditions, etc., unless these elements are quite relevant to the question.
- 3. Sentence Structure:** The response should be well-structured and easy to understand. It should use clear language and logical sequencing of ideas. Avoid responses that are ambiguous or poorly constructed, as these can lead to misinterpretation of the information.

Procedure (FYI):

- Read the question provided.
- Read the ground-truth answer and understand the specific focus of the question.
- Review both AI-generated responses.
- If there are additional information that is hard to fact-check with ground-truth caption, check the visualized video frames to decide whether the information is correct.
- Review both AI-generated responses.
- Select the response that best meets the criteria overall.

Notes:
In cases where both responses seem equally valid, consider subtle differences in tone, the precision of language, and the logical flow of ideas. Remember that the ultimate goal is to select the response that best serves a user seeking information about the video and question posed, reflecting both the content and spirit of the source material. Your careful analysis and selections are crucial in helping improve the accuracy and usability of AI-generated content. Thank you for your diligent efforts in this task.

⋮

*


Question: What is the location and date of the "NIGHT OF THE PROMS" event mentioned in the video?

Ground-truth Answer: According to the video caption, the "NIGHT OF THE PROMS" event will occur for the first time in Poland on the 22nd of March in the city of Łódź.

Response 1: The "NIGHT OF THE PROMS" event mentioned in the video is taking place on March 22, 2019, at the "Lodz" location, as indicated by the text overlays in the video. The setting suggests that this is a live stage event, and the location and date are provided to contextualize the setting and timing of the event.

Response 2: The event mentioned in the video is the "NIGHT OF THE PROMS," which is a televised singing competition or concert. The text overlays in the video indicate that the event took place in Poland, with specific dates mentioned for different stages or rounds of the competition. The text overlays also provide the location and date, suggesting that the event was a televised singing competition or concert that took place in Poland, with various stages or rounds indicated by the dates. The event was broadcasted or took place in 2016.

<https://drive.google.com/uc?export=view&id=1FGN1NXD5i8hsuocCoMFaVj82szfDEgil>



Response 1

Response 2

Figure 12: Evaluation criteria provided to Amazon MTechnical Turk annotators. We carefully instructed the annotators to penalize the outputs that includes unaligned contents with the provided video, or the answer that contains overly verbose sentences that deviates from the question's purposes.

Given the following inputs:

1. **Question Related to the Caption**: {Question}
2. **Ground Truth Answer**: {Answer}
3. **Response1**: {Prediction1}
4. **Response2**: {Prediction2}

Your task is to evaluate which of two model's outputs is better, based on the ground truth answer and the question. Consider the following criteria for evaluation:

You must choose either Response1 or Response2 as better than the other.

- **Relevance**: Does the predicted answer directly address the question posed? The response should not contain uncorrelated sentences with respect to the question. For example, if the question asks about the man in the video, only describe about the object and not the background, atmosphere, etc.

- **Accuracy**: Compare the predicted answer to the ground truth answer. Does the prediction accurately reflect the information given in the ground truth answer without introducing factual inaccuracies?

Note: For answering Choice, you should respond with either Response1, Response2 or Tie. DO NOT PROVIDE ANY EXPLANATION. Except when unavoidable, please avoid using Tie and choose either Response1 or Response2.

Output Format:

Choice: <choice of better response: 1 for Response1, 2 for Response2 and 3 for Tie>

Figure 13: **Evaluation criteria provided to GPT-4.** To compare the generated responses of method without context and with context in Fig. 6, we prompted GPT-4 to choose better response regarding three criteria: Relevance, Accuracy, and Conciseness.