

EAGLE: Exploring The Design Space for Multimodal LLMs with Mixture of Encoders

Min Shi^{2*}, Fuxiao Liu^{3*}, Shihao Wang⁴, Shijia Liao¹, Subhashree Radhakrishnan¹,
De-An Huang¹, Hongxu Yin¹, Karan Sapra¹, Yaser Yacoub³, Humphrey Shi²,
Bryan Catanzaro¹, Andrew Tao¹, Jan Kautz¹, Zhiding Yu^{1†}, Guilin Liu^{1†}

¹NVIDIA ²Georgia Tech ³UMD ⁴HKPU
<https://github.com/NVLabs/Eagle>




Figure 1: **Overview of Eagle.** *Eagle* is a family of multimodal large language models (MLLMs) with a mixture of vision encoders. Left: comparisons between *Eagle* and existing competitive MLLMs with *Vicuna-7B* [15] and *Llama3-8B* [3], with *Eagle* achieving favorable results on all 12 benchmarks. Middle: an evolutionary road map of the design space and advanced training recipes leading to consistent and significant improvements. Right: highlights and core features of *Eagle*.

Abstract

The ability to accurately interpret complex visual information is a crucial topic of multimodal large language models (MLLMs). Recent work indicates that enhanced visual perception significantly reduces hallucinations and improves performance on resolution-sensitive tasks, such as optical character recognition and document analysis. A number of recent MLLMs achieve this goal using a mixture of vision encoders. Despite their success, there is a lack of systematic comparisons and detailed ablation studies addressing critical aspects, such as expert selection and the integration of multiple vision experts. This study provides an extensive exploration of the design space for MLLMs using a mixture of vision encoders and resolutions. Our findings reveal several underlying principles common to various existing strategies, leading to a streamlined yet effective design approach. We discover that simply concatenating visual tokens from a set of complementary vision encoders is as effective as more complex mixing architectures or strategies. We additionally introduce *Pre-Alignment* to bridge the gap between vision-focused encoders and language tokens, enhancing model coherence. The resulting family of MLLMs, *Eagle*, surpasses other leading open-source models on major MLLM benchmarks.

*Equal contribution. Work done during an internship at NVIDIA.

†Equal advising. Corresponding authors: {guilinl, zhidingy}@nvidia.com.

1 Introduction

The success of large language models (LLMs) has triggered significant interest in enabling their visual perception capability, such that they could see, understand, and reason in the real world. At the center of these multimodal large language models (MLLMs) [23] is a typical design where images are converted into a series of visual tokens by the vision encoders and appended with the text embeddings. *CLIP* [63] is often chosen as the vision encoder since its visual representation is align with the text space by pre-training on image-text pairs. Depending on the architectures, training recipes and the way how vision tokens are injected into the language model, there exist various notable families of MLLMs such as *Flamingo* [4], *BLIP* [44, 43, 16], *PaLI* [11], *PaLM-E* [18] and *LLaVA* [54, 52]. Most of these works keep relatively low input resolutions due to the limits on pre-trained vision encoders and LLM sequence length.

Recent studies [47, 53] show that stronger vision encoder design is important for mitigating MLLM hallucinations [50, 77] and improving resolution-sensitive tasks like optical character recognition (OCR). A constellation of works thus focuses on enhancing the capability of the vision encoder. For example, scaling up the pre-training data and parameters of vision encoder [13] or dividing images into low-resolution patches [53, 67]. However, these approaches usually introduce large training resources. An efficient yet powerful strategy is to mixing visual encoders pre-trained with different tasks and input resolutions, either fusing higher resolution encoders with the *CLIP* encoder [59, 45], sequentially appending features from different encoders [20, 49], or adopting more complex fusion and routing strategies to make the best of different encoders [37, 88]. Such a “mixture-of-vision-experts” mode is shown to be effective. However, a detailed study of its design space with rigorous ablation is still lacking, which motivates us to revisiting this area. Questions such as which vision encoder combination to choose, how to fuse different experts together, and how to adjust training strategies with more vision encoders remain to be answered.

To address the above questions, our work systematically investigates the mixture-of-vision-encoders design space for improved MLLM perception. As shown in Fig. 1, our exploration of the design space consists of the following steps: 1) Benchmarking various vision encoders and searching recipes for higher resolution adaptation; 2) “Apples to apples” comparison between vision encoder fusion strategies; 3) Progressive identification of the optimal combination of multiple vision encoders; 4) Improved vision expert pre-alignment and data mixture. Our study covers the performance of vision encoders pre-trained on different tasks and resolutions (e.g., vision-language alignment [31, 14, 63, 66], self-supervised learning [62], detection [22, 21], segmentation [36], and OCR [38]). We use a round-robin approach to incorporate additional vision experts. Starting with the basic *CLIP* [63] encoder, we add one additional expert at a time with the best improvement in each round.

Our work is not the first one to leverage multiple vision encoders in MLLM. However, the systematic study leads to several interesting new findings under this setting:

- Unlocking the vision encoders during MLLM training matters. This is in sharp contrast to the LLaVA [54, 52] family and many works that consider multiple vision encoders or teachers [49, 55, 20, 33, 64, 37], where freezing the vision encoders has been a common choice.
- Some recently proposed fusion strategies [59, 45] do not show significant advantages despite their advanced designs. Instead, we find that straightforward channel concatenation stands out as a simple yet competitive fusion strategy, offering the best efficiency and performance.
- Incorporating additional vision experts leads to consistent gain, making it a promising path to systematic enhance MLLM perception besides scaling up single encoders. The improvement is particularly pronounced when vision encoders are unlocked.
- We propose a pre-alignment stage where non-text-aligned vision experts are individually fine-tuned with a frozen LLM before trained together. This stage is found to enhance the MLLM performance significantly under the mixture-of-vision-encoder design.

We finally conclude our findings into a family of MLLMs termed *Eagle*. *Eagle* is evaluated on a series of benchmarks, including visual question answering, OCR/document related tasks, and benchmarks tailored for MLLMs. Our model attains state-of-the-art performance across different benchmarks and demonstrates obvious advantages on OCR and document understanding tasks. Using the same pre-train and supervised fine-tuning data from *Cambrian-1* [73] - a concurrent family of vision-centric MLLMs sharing similar design spirits, *Eagle* models overall achieve better performance. We




Figure 2: **Overview of the *Eagle* exploration pipeline.** We investigate the MLLM design space with multiple vision encoders, aiming to identify optimized design choices and improve the MLLM perception. We include various types of vision experts pre-trained on different tasks and resolutions. We then systematically compare a series of popular fusion strategies under controlled settings, including *Sequence Append*, *Channel Concatenation*, *LLaVA-HR* [59], *Mini-Gemini* [45], and *Deformable Attention* [86]. Finally, the optimal fusion design is further extended to multiple vision encoders to form a strong MLLM perception.

hope that the *Eagle* can provide a highly performant and easy-to-reproduce MLLM solution to the community.

2 Design space exploration

In this section, we show how to utilize the advantages of different vision encoders via step-by-step investigations, yielding the *Eagle* model family. Unlike previous methods focusing on new fusion strategies or architectures among vision encodes, our goal is to identify a set of minimalistic design to fuse different vision encoders supported with detailed ablations, removing any unnecessary parts. As shown in Fig. 2, we start from extending the basic *CLIP* encoder [63] to a set of vision experts with different architectures, pre-training tasks and resolutions. With these experts, we then compare different fusion architectures and methods, and study how to optimize the pre-training strategies given more encoders. We also give a detailed analysis in how to select the vision encoders to be integrated. Finally, we put all the findings together and further extend to multiple expert vision encoders with different resolutions and domain knowledge.

2.1 Base setup

We adopt LLaVA’s [54] model architecture as the basis, which consists of a large language model, a vision encoder, and a projection layer. The projection layer projects the visual embedding from the vision encoder into the text embedding space. We mainly focus on the vision encoder design.

Base training data. We use the same pre-training data as LLaVA-1.5 [52], which consists of 595k image text pairs. For the supervised fine-tuning stage, we collect data from a series of tasks and convert them into multimodal conversations, including: LLaVA-1.5 [52], Laion-GPT4V [1], ShareGPT-4V [8], DocVQA [61], synDog-EN [35], ChartQA [60], DVQA [32], and AI2D [34], resulting in 934k samples.

Table 1: **Comparison of different high-resolution adaption methods.** *Direct interpolation* is more efficient and effective. “Res” denotes input image resolution. “#Token/s” denotes the inference speed of the whole framework. “#Token (V)” denotes the number of visual feature tokens fed into LLM. “OCR” denotes OCRBench [57]. “Avg” denotes average. Note that *CLIP-448* gets very close to InternVL in terms of performance, despite the significantly smaller model size (300M vs. 6B).

Method	Unfreeze	Res	#Token/s	#Token (V)	GQA	MME	MMMU	OCR	SQA	POPE	Avg
<i>Original</i>	✗	336	47.2	576	62.46	1488	36.1	369	72.79	86.77	615
<i>Original</i>	✓	336	47.2	576	63.68	1496	36.6	369	72.22	85.9	617
<i>Interpolate</i>	✗	448	47.9	1024	62.45	1484	34.4	285	72.27	86.54	598
<i>Interpolate</i>	✓	448	47.9	1024	64.62	1531	35.7	496	72.77	87.88	645
<i>Interpolate</i>	✓	672	44.5	2304	64.51	1492	36.2	492	72.86	87.49	641
<i>Tiled-input</i>	✓	672	44.8	2304	63.59	1455	34.8	445	71.94	87.83	625
<i>InternVL</i> [13]	✓	448	46.2	1024	65.12	1521	36.2	527	72.46	87.13	649

Implementation details. We first pre-train the model with image-text pairs for one epoch with a batch size of 256, where the whole model is frozen and only the projector layer is updated. In the second stage, we further fine-tune the model on the supervised fine-tuning data for one epoch with a batch size of 128. For this exploration, we employ Vicuna-7B as the underlying language model. The learning rates are set to $1e-3$ for the first stage and $2e-5$ for the second stage, respectively.

2.2 Stronger CLIP encoder

We start our exploration with the *CLIP* model since it has become the main choice for many MLLMs. While *CLIP* models are known to benefit multimodal tasks, their drawbacks have also been well-studied. For instance, many existing MLLMs [52] tend to use the pre-trained *CLIP* resolutions (such as 224×224 or 336×336) as their input resolutions. In these cases, the encoders often fail to capture fine-grained details that are important for resolution-sensitive tasks like OCR and document understanding [47].

To handle increased input resolution, a common practice is to use tiling where input images are divided into tiles and encoded separately [53, 47]. Another simpler method is to directly scale up the input resolution and interpolate the position embeddings of the vision transformer model if needed [9, 10, 6]. We compare these two approaches with frozen/unfrozen vision encoders under different resolutions, with the results shown in Table 1. Our findings can be summarized as follows:

- Unfreezing the *CLIP* encoder leads to significant improvement when interpolating to a higher MLLM input resolution that is different from the *CLIP* pre-training resolution. There is also no performance degradation when resolutions remain the same.
- When the *CLIP* encoder is frozen, directly adapting it to a higher MLLM input resolution considerably hurts the performance.
- Among the compared strategies, directly interpolating to 448×448 with an unfrozen *CLIP* encoder is shown to be both effective and efficient in terms of performance and cost.
- The best *CLIP* encoder gets close to *InternVL* in performance despite the significantly smaller model size (300M vs. 6B) and less pre-training data.

It is worth noting that *CLIP-448* allows us to match the setting with *LLaVA-HR* [59] and *InternVL* [13] where the *CLIP* encoders are similarly adapted to take 448×448 input and output 1024 patch tokens³. In the following investigation, we stick to this simple strategy of scaling up the input resolution and unlocking the vision encoder during training.

2.3 Vision experts

To better establish the foundation for multi-vision expert fusion, we extend the toolbox with vision experts pre-trained on different tasks and resolutions, and verify our findings on high-resolution

³The latest *InternVL 1.0* and *InternVL 1.2* models also adopt a pixel shuffle module. We remove it in our experiment to ensure full alignment. See <https://github.com/OpenGVLab/InternVL> for details.

Table 2: Detailed setting of the pre-trained vision experts.

Expert	Category	Resolution	Token Number	Post-Processing	Variant Hyper-links
<i>CLIP</i>	Image-Text Matching	448	1024	None	VIT-L
<i>ConvNeXt</i>	Image Classification	1024	1024	None	ConvNeXt-XXL
<i>EVA-02</i>	Object Detection	1024	1024	Resize	EVA-02-Large
<i>Pix2Struct</i>	Text Recognition	1024	1024	Resize	Pix2Struct-02-Large
<i>DINOv2</i>	Self-supervised	448	1024	None	dinov2_vitl14_reg
<i>SAM</i>	Image Segmentation	1024	1024	Pixel-unshuffle	SAM-Large

Table 3: Comparison between different vision experts as the MLLM encoders. ‘‘Res’’ denotes resolution. ‘‘OCR’’ denotes OCRBench [57].

Category	Vision Tower	Unfreeze	Res	GQA	MME	MMMU	OCR	SQA	POPE	TextVQA
<i>VL Alignment</i>	<i>ConvNeXt</i>	✗	1024	63.71	1473	34.2	402	71.92	87.42	66.95
		✓	1024	63.71	1433	37.0	527	72.01	87.91	71.66
<i>Segmentation</i>	<i>SAM</i>	✗	1024	54.87	1193	34.8	32	70.34	83.31	45.04
		✓	1024	60.05	1305	35.9	38	70.64	86.62	45.71
<i>Object Detection</i>	<i>EVA-02</i>	✗	1024	63.54	1422	35.8	58	70.86	88.50	47.86
		✓	1024	64.93	1474	35.7	387	71.78	88.96	59.79
<i>Text Recognition</i>	<i>Pix2Struct</i>	✗	1024	52.47	1217	35.7	443	69.61	77.54	56.56
		✓	1024	54.05	1220	34.3	425	70.29	79.21	57.05
<i>Self-supervised</i>	<i>DINOv2</i>	✗	448	60.81	1269	34.0	39	70.76	86.42	45.71
		✓	448	64.06	1371	34.2	37	71.35	87.29	46.77

adaptation with these experts. This also helps us identify the distinct advantages of different experts. We collect a set of vision experts, including: (1) *Vision-Language Alignment*: *CLIP* [63] and *ConvNeXt* [76] from *OpenCLIP* [31, 66]. (2) *Object-Centric*: *EVA-02* [22, 21] pre-trained on detection datasets. (3) *OCR*: *Pix2Struct* [38]. (4) *Segmentation*: *SAM* [36]. (5) *Self-supervised*: *DINOv2* [62]. The detailed input resolution and checkpoint of each vision encoder can be found in Table 2. We resize the output 2D feature maps of each vision encoder using bilinear interpolation and pixel shuffle [68] to ensure that the visual token number equals 1024.

The results in Table 3 reveal that **MLLMs with these task-specific vision encoders achieve optimal performance in their pre-training domains**. *EVA-02* excels in the object hallucination evaluation benchmark POPE [46] and general visual question answering benchmark GQA [30]. *CLIP* and *ConvNeXt* perform well across all benchmarks, benefiting from their training on large-scale image-text pairs using contrastive loss. Conversely, while *Pix2Struct* excels in text recognition, it shows limited capability in object recognition and general VQA tasks, like POPE and GQA. *DINOv2* and *SAM*, pre-trained with self-supervised learning and semantic segmentation respectively, struggle with text recognition tasks. Note that the conclusion made in Sec. 2.2 aligns with the results here. Both *ConvNeXt* and *EVA-02* show significant performance gains when the vision encoders are updated during training.

2.4 Fusion strategy

Existing MLLM frameworks have proposed various fusion strategies to ensemble the encoders in Table 3, with the hope that their domain-specific strengths can be leveraged. In all cases, improvements in MLLM performance have been reported with the fusion of vision encoders. However, the roles of the fusion strategies as part of their MLLM architecture innovations, have not been decoupled and clearly studied under an ‘‘apples to apples’’ comparison. It is thus not entirely clear how much improvement is from the fusion strategies themselves versus the improved representations from various encoders.

We notice that existing popular fusion strategies, despite their variations in designs, can be broadly represented by the following several categories: (1) *Sequence Append*: directly appending the visual tokens from different backbones as a longer sequence [20, 33, 55]; (2) *Channel Concatenation*: concatenating the visual tokens along the channel dimension without increasing the sequence length [49];

Table 4: **Comparison of different fusion methods for different vision experts.** SA, CC, LH, MG and DA denote the fusion strategies: *Sequence Append*, *Channel Concatenation*, *LLaVA-HR* [59], *Mini-Gemini* [45] and *Deformable Attention*, respectively. “Token (V)” denotes the number of vision feature tokens fed into LLM. “#Tokens/s” denotes the speed of the whole pipeline. “Avg” denotes average. Note that *Channel Concatenation* achieves both the best performance and better throughput.

Vision Encoder(s)	Fusion	Token (V)	#Tokens/s	GQA	MME	MMMU	OCR	SQA	POPE	TextVQA	Avg
<i>CLIP</i>	–	1024	47.9	64.6	1531	35.7	496	72.8	87.9	64.0	644.4
<i>ConvNeXt</i>	–	1024	46.8	63.7	1433	37.0	527	72.0	87.9	71.7	652.3
<i>CLIP</i> + <i>ConvNeXt</i>	SA	2048	46.1	64.6	1482	35.3	536	72.5	88.3	71.8	657.2
	CC	1024	47.3	64.0	1486	36.0	533	72.7	88.6	71.9	658.2
	LH	1024	47.0	62.9	1488	36.8	521	72.6	88.9	68.7	652.1
	MG	1024	45.2	64.9	1481	36.7	474	72.8	88.2	68.6	646.7
	DA	1024	47.3	63.6	1497	35.3	459	71.9	88.0	69.1	640.9
<i>CLIP</i> + <i>ConvNeXt</i> + <i>SAM</i>	SA	3072	40.3	64.9	1439	35.0	504	72.7	88.2	71.3	649.2
	CC	1024	46.3	64.6	1497	35.2	558	71.7	87.9	72.2	660.4




Figure 3: **The proposed training strategy of Eagle.** It consists of three progressive stages, including *vision-language pre-alignment training*, *joint-project training* and *supervised fine-tuning*. These stages effectively leverage public data from diverse sources, ranging from noisy image-text pairs on the web to high-quality caption, VQA, and multimodal dialogue datasets.

(3) *LLaVA-HR*: injecting high-resolution features into low-resolution vision encoders using mixture-of-resolution adapter [59]; (4) *Mini-Gemini*: using the *CLIP* tokens as the low resolution queries to cross-attend another high-resolution vision encoder in the co-located local windows [45]. (5) *Deformable Attention*: a new baseline we introduce on top of *Mini-Gemini*, where the vanilla window attention is replaced with deformable attention [86]. Fig. 2 gives a detailed illustration of these fusion strategies. To better study them, we choose “*CLIP+ConvNeXt*” and “*CLIP+ConvNeXt+SAM*” as the base multi-encoder combinations to perform comparisons.

Our study in Table 4 shows that *Channel Concatenation* achieves the best average performance while maintaining better throughput compared to sequence append. The “injection-based” methods, such as *LLaVA-HR*, *Mini-Gemini* and *Deformable Attention*, are in general less competitive on TextVQA [69] and OCRBench [57], performing worse than using *ConvNeXt* alone as the vision encoder. A plausible explanation is that the *CLIP* features continue to play a dominant role in the visual tokens. Although sequence append shows comparable performance to channel concatenation, it faces the challenge to handle more vision encoders due to the increasing sequence length. Hence, we choose direct channel concatenation as our fusion strategy considering its performance, expandability, and efficiency.

2.5 Vision-language Pre-Alignment

As shown in Table 3, vision backbones pre-trained exclusively on vision tasks (*e.g.*, detection, OCR, and segmentation) are less competitive compared to encoder pre-trained on vision language alignment. This is possibly due to representational inconsistencies when integrated with large language models. Additionally, when combining different encoders, there is a gap between these encoders, creating difficulties in the training process. To address this feature inconsistency, we propose a *Pre-Alignment* training stage that first aligns each individual vision encoder with the same large language model, fostering better synergy between visual and linguistic capabilities.

Table 5: **Experiments to show the effectiveness of *Pre-Align*.** “OCR” denotes OCRBench [57]. “Avg” denotes average.

<i>CLIP</i>	Vision Expert (X)	Unfreeze	<i>Pre-Align</i>	MME	MMMU	OCR	SQA	POPE	TextVQA	Avg
<i>CLIP-448</i>	<i>SAM-1024</i>	✗	✗	1495	35.1	292	71.8	85.6	59.7	593
		✓	✗	1504	36.9	482	73.5	87.7	63.2	641
		✓	✓	1554	36.7	505	73.8	88.2	62.9	649
<i>CLIP-448</i>	<i>ConvNext-1024</i>	✗	✗	1499	35.1	416	72.3	86.7	67.1	629
		✓	✗	1522	36.6	550	72.7	87.9	71.9	667
		✓	✓	1538	36.3	556	71.9	87.9	71.6	667
<i>CLIP-448</i>	<i>Pix2Struct-1024</i>	✗	✗	1500	35.8	467	71.9	86.1	60.9	627
		✓	✗	1529	36.2	535	73.1	87.1	64.5	651
		✓	✓	1564	35.3	541	73.3	86.6	63.9	652
<i>CLIP-448</i>	<i>EVA-02-L-1024</i>	✗	✗	1484	35.8	305	72.0	86.0	59.9	597
		✓	✗	1537	37.0	474	72.6	87.5	62.6	639
		✓	✓	1586	37.3	495	73.1	88.9	64.2	653

Fig. 3 depicts our pre-alignment strategy. Instead of training a projector to simultaneously align multiple vision experts as in LLaVA’s [54] original pre-training strategy, we first align the representation of each individual expert with a smaller language model (Vicuna-7B in practice) using next-token-prediction supervision. As shown in Fig. 3, with pre-alignment, the whole training process consists of three steps: 1) *training each pre-trained vision expert with their own projector on SFT data, while keeping the language model frozen*; 2) *combining all the vision experts from the first step and training only the projector with image-text pairs data*; 3) *training the whole model on the SFT data*.

To verify the proposed method, we compare the pre-alignment strategy with the normal two-stage training strategy in Table 5, considering both freezing and unfreezing vision experts for comparison. As shown in Table 5, although unfreezing the vision experts during SFT helps improve performance by updating the vision experts to fit the language model, the *Pre-Align* strategy more effectively mitigates the inherent biases of each vision expert and stabilizes the training process, subsequently improving overall performance.

2.6 Extension to multi-experts

With the optimized strategies and training recipes of incorporating individual vision experts, we consider the incorporation of even more vision experts to push the limit. To conduct the searching in a systematic and principled manner, we adopt a step-by-step greedy strategy to incorporate additional vision experts.

We consider the vision experts discussed in Section 2.3 for experiments. We mark *CLIP*, *ConvNeXt*, *SAM*, *DINOv2*, *Pix2Struct*, and *EVA-02-L* as A, B, C, D, E, and F, respectively. A round-robin scheme, as shown in Table 6, is adopted. We first use the two top performing vision encoders, *CLIP* and *ConvNeXt*, as the basis and gradually add one more vision encoder each time. In each round, the best-performing vision encoder combination is retained for the next round.

Table 6 reveals several insights. Generally, **introducing additional vision encoders enhances the performance**. This indicates that the distinct advantages of different encoders can be preserved and utilized; for example, integrating the *EVA-02* encoder improves metrics on the POPE benchmark. Although individual metrics may vary, the aggregated performance shows an upward trend, as evidenced by normalized average metrics, suggesting that the overall efficacy of the system is enhanced with more encoders. Also, Table 6 shows that the best combination of vision experts are *CLIP*, *ConvNeXt*, *SAM*, *Pix2Struct*, and *EVA-02*. We will use this recipe in our final model.

3 Experiments

After meticulously developing our recipes, we have formulated the following principals for our model, *Eagle*: (1) *integrating more vision experts with optimized training recipe*; (2) *combining multiple*

Table 6: **Results of vision expert selection process.** *A, B, C, D, E* and *F* denote *CLIP, ConvNeXt, SAM, DINOv2, Pix2Struct* and *EVA-02-L* models respectively. ‘‘OCR’’ denotes OCRBench [57]. ‘‘Avg’’ denotes average. Under the same number of encoders, the best scores of various combination variants are bold.

#Encoders	Encoder Combination	GQA	MME	MMMU	OCR	SQA	POPE	TextVQA	Avg
2	<i>A + B</i>	64.0	1486	36.0	533	72.7	88.6	71.9	658.3
3	<i>A + B + C</i>	64.6	1497	35.2	558	71.7	87.9	72.2	660.3
	<i>A + B + D</i>	65.7	1506	35.0	509	72.6	87.9	70.1	653.6
	<i>A + B + E</i>	65.5	1459	35.3	565	73.1	87.9	70.8	660.1
	<i>A + B + F</i>	64.7	1506	35.9	562	73.2	88.3	72.1	665.3
4	<i>A + B + F + C</i>	65.9	1498	36.6	540	72.0	88.8	71.6	662.6
	<i>A + B + F + D</i>	65.6	1521	35.8	508	73.0	89.0	70.0	657.5
	<i>A + B + F + E</i>	65.3	1539	37.1	552	73.0	87.4	71.3	666.1
5	<i>A + B + F + E + C</i>	65.7	1511	37.6	548	72.7	88.6	71.6	666.5
	<i>A + B + F + E + D</i>	65.6	1512	36.0	528	72.9	88.4	70.5	660.0
6	<i>A + B + F + E + C + D</i>	65.18	1504	35.3	534	71.9	87.6	70.86	656.3

Table 7: The advanced training data used in the supervised fine-tuning stage.

Note	Data Source
<i>Total Number (1,809k)</i>	LLaVA-1.5 [52] (665k), DocVQA [61] (39k), synDog-EN [35] (50k), ChartQA [60] (28k), DVQA [32] (25k), AI2D [34] (15k), ShareGPT-4V [8] (100k), laion-GPT4V [1] (11k), LVIS-Instruct4V [74] (220k), LRV-Instruct [51] (150k), Geo170k [25] (120k), LLaVAR [84] (20k), Visual7W [87] (70k), Open-Hermes 2.5 [72] (1809k)

vision experts through direct channel concatenation; (3) pre-training the vision experts separately via pre-alignment. In this section, to further show the advantages of the *Eagle* models, we add more training data and compare *Eagle* against the current state-of-the-art MLLMs on different tasks.

3.1 Implementation details

Models. We use Vicuna-v1.5-7B [15], Llama3-8B [3] and Vicuna-v1.5-13B [15] as the language model. For vision encoder, following the results in Sec. 2.6, we denote the model with four vision encoders: *CLIP, ConvNeXt, Pix2Struct* and *EVA-02* as *Eagle-X4* and the model with an additional *SAM* vision encoder as *Eagle-X5*.

Augmented training data. Considering the training cost, we only use 934K data during the investigation and ablations, as listed in Sec. 2.1. In this section, inspired by recent practices [73, 45], we introduce more datasets, including LVIS-INSTRUCT4V [74], LRV [51], Geo170K [25], LLaVAR [84], Visual7w [87], and OpenHermes-2.5 [72], resulting in a total of 1,809k data for the supervised fine-tuning stage. See Table 7 for more details on this data mixture. To better perform an apple-to-apple comparison with recent open-source MLLM projects, we also train *Eagle-X5* with the same data as *Cambrian-1* [73], including 2.5 million and 7 million data for pre-training and supervised fine-tuning.

3.2 Main results

Evaluation on visual question answering tasks. We compare *Eagle* model series across three Visual Question Answering (VQA) benchmarks, including GQA [30], VQAv2 [26] and VizWiz [27]. As shown in Table 8, *Eagle-X5* achieves state-of-the-art performance on GQA and VQAv2, underscoring the advantages of incorporating additional vision experts.

Evaluation on OCR and chart understanding tasks. To evaluate the OCR, document and chart understanding capabilities of *Eagle*, we benchmark our model on OCRBench [57], TextVQA [69], and ChartQA [60]. As illustrated in Table 8, our model significantly surpasses competitors on TextVQA, benefiting from its high-resolution architecture and integration of different vision encoders.

Table 8: **Results with the advanced training data recipe.** SQA¹ denotes ScienceQA-IMG [65].

	Model	MME	MMBench	SEED	MathVista	MMMU	POPE	SQA ¹	GQA	VizWiz	VQAV2	OCRBench	TextVQA	ChartQA
Vicuna-7B & Qwen-7B	<i>LLaVA-1.5</i> [52]	1510	64.3	58.6	-	-	85.9	66.8	62.0*	50.0	78.5*	297	58.2	-
	<i>LLaVA-NeXt</i> [53]	1519	67.4	70.2	34.6	35.8	86.5	70.1	64.2*	57.6	80.0*	490	64.9	-
	<i>InternVL</i> [13]	1525	-	65.4	-	-	86.4	-	62.9*	52.5	79.3*	-	57.0	-
	<i>LLaVA-HR</i> [59]	1554	-	64.2	-	-	87.6	65.1	64.2*	48.7	81.9*	-	67.1	-
	<i>Monkey</i> [47]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60.7*	61.2*	80.3*	514	67.6	65.1
	<i>Mini-Gemini</i> [45]	1523	65.8	-	32.2	36.8	-	71.1	64.5*	-	-	477	65.2	-
	<i>Eagle-X4</i>	1561	67.8	73.4	37.3	34.9	88.4	70.4	64.8*	50.8	83.4*	540	70.9	67.5
	+Pre-Align	1561	68.1	73.4	38.8	36.8	88.7	70.8	64.9*	51.0	83.7*	544	71.9	67.9
	<i>Eagle-X5</i>	1528	68.4	73.9	37.0	36.3	88.8	70.0	64.9*	54.4	83.4*	529	71.2	67.7
	+Pre-Align	1579	68.8	73.5	39.0	36.4	88.5	71.6	64.0*	56.0	83.6*	554	71.9	67.0
Vicuna-13B	<i>LLaVA-1.5</i> [52]	1531	67.7	61.6	-	36.4	85.9	71.6	63.3*	53.6	80.0*	331	61.3	-
	<i>LLaVA-NeXt</i> [53]	1575	70.0	71.9	35.3	36.2	86.2	73.5	65.4*	60.5	82.8*	514	67.1	62.2
	<i>InternVL</i> [13]	1546	-	-	-	-	87.1	-	63.9*	54.6	80.2*	517	58.7	-
	<i>LLaVA-UHD</i> [79]	1535	68.0	-	-	-	89.1	72.0	65.2*	56.1	81.7*	-	67.7	-
	<i>LLaVA-HR</i> [59]	1540	-	64.5	-	-	87.8	68.1	64.8*	57.9	82.6*	-	68.1	-
	<i>Mini-Gemini</i> [45]	1565	68.6	70.6	37.0	37.3	-	71.9	65.8*	-	-	466	65.9	56.6
	<i>Eagle-X4</i>	1627	69.9	74.4	37.6	36.9	87.7	73.1	66.3*	56.2	83.7*	561	73.9	70.5
	+Pre-Align	1621	69.9	74.9	39.4	37.3	89.1	73.5	64.9*	55.9	84.5*	581	74.3	72.2
	<i>Eagle-X5</i>	1609	69.2	74.1	38.8	36.6	87.8	72.7	66.2*	59.3	83.8*	574	74.2	69.9
	+Pre-Align	1604	70.5	74.9	39.7	38.0	88.2	73.1	64.4*	60.9	84.5*	573	73.9	71.0

Notably, *Eagle* maintains a straightforward design, supporting up to 1024 tokens without requiring complex tile decomposition of images.

Fig. 5 shows some examples of OCR and document understanding cases. With high-resolution adaptation and more vision experts, our model can identify small text within images and accurately extract information according to the users’ instructions. To better understand the benefits of introducing experts pre-trained on other vision tasks, we visualize the results of a model with only the *ConvNeXt* and *CLIP* vision encoders, compared to the results of *Eagle-X5* in Fig. 4. With the full set of vision encoders, the model can successfully correct mistakes, showing that even when equipped with high-resolution vision encoders pre-trained on vision-language alignment, the model’s abilities can still be enhanced by integrating additional vision experts pre-trained on diverse vision tasks.

Evaluation on multimodal benchmarks. We evaluate *Eagle* on seven benchmarks for MLLMs to demonstrate its capabilities from different perspectives, including MME [24], MMBench [56], SEED [41], MathVista [58], MMMU [81], ScienceQA [65], and POPE [46]. Specifically, MME, MMBench, and SEED assess the overall performance on various real-world tasks based on reasoning, recognition, knowledge, and OCR. MMMU focuses on challenging problems from diverse domains that require college-level knowledge. POPE evaluates the visual hallucinations of MLLMs. The metrics used in our paper adhere to the default settings of these benchmarks. We report the perception score for MME, the `en_dev` split for MMBench, the `image` split of SEED, the `test-mini` split of MathVista, the `val` split of MMMU, the F1-score of POPE, and the `image` of SQA to align with the reported scores from other models.

From the data presented in Table 8, *Eagle* consistently surpasses existing models across various MLLMs on SEED and MME, demonstrating the comprehensive knowledge and reasoning abilities of *Eagle*. With the help of vision encoders on object-centric tasks, *Eagle* also achieves the best performance on the POPE benchmark. Additionally, the *Pre-Alignment* strategy discussed in Sec. 2.5 has been found to further enhance performance when integrating multiple task-specific vision backbones. This approach not only mitigates the inherent biases of each vision expert and the synergy between different modalities but also establishes a robust framework for the multiple-expert fusion.

Table 9: **Results using Cambrian-1 training data.** The *Eagle-X5* models are trained using the same pre-training and supervised fine-tuning data as *Cambrian-1* [73]. SQA^I denotes ScienceQA-IMG [65]. RWQA denotes RealworldQA [78].

Model	Knowledge					General					OCR and Chart					Vision-Centric		
	Avg	SQA ^I	MMMU	MathVista	A12D	Avg	MME	MMBench	SEED	GQA	Avg	ChartQA	OCRBench	TextVQA	DocVQA	Avg	MMVP	RWQA
<i>Llama3-8B</i>																		
<i>MGM-HD</i>	55.7	75.1	37.3	37.0	73.5	72.7	1606	72.7	73.2	64.5	62.9	59.1	47.7	70.2	74.6	40.4	18.7	62.1
<i>Cambrian-1</i>	61.3	80.4	42.7	49.0	73.0	73.1	1547	75.9	74.7	64.6	71.3	73.3	62.4	71.7	77.8	57.6	51.3	64.2
<i>Eagle</i>	64.2	84.3	43.8	52.7	76.1	73.8	1559	75.9	76.3	64.9	76.6	80.1	62.6	77.1	86.6	69.1	71.6	66.5
<i>Vicuna-13B</i>																		
<i>MGM-HD</i>	54.1	71.9	37.3	37	70.1	70.7	1597	68.6	70.6	63.7	60.8	56.6	46.6	70.2	69.8	38.4	19.3	57.5
<i>Cambrian-1</i>	60.2	79.3	40.0	48.0	73.6	73.7	1610	75.7	74.4	64.3	71.3	73.8	61.9	72.8	76.8	52.2	41.3	63.0
<i>Eagle</i>	63.0	82.0	41.6	54.4	74.0	74.6	1651	75.7	74.8	65.3	75.1	77.6	61.9	75.5	85.4	61.4	58.0	64.8
<i>Yi-34B</i>																		
<i>MGM-HD</i>	62.4	77.7	48	43.4	80.5	76.2	1659	80.6	75.3	65.8	68.1	67.6	51.8	74.1	78.9	52.3	37.3	67.2
<i>Cambrian-1</i>	67.0	85.6	49.7	53.2	79.7	76.8	1689	81.4	75.3	65.8	71.9	75.6	60.0	76.7	75.5	60.3	52.7	67.8
<i>Eagle</i>	68.6	85.5	53.2	57.9	79.1	76.3	1677	81.0	75.6	64.9	75.4	77.2	62.4	78.8	83.0	68.3	67.0	69.5




Figure 4: **Qualitative comparison of different numbers of vision experts.** *Baseline* means *Eagle* with only *CLIP+ConvNext*. *More Vision Experts* denotes the *Eagle-X5* model. We highlight a failure case in **RED**. **BLUE** indicates the correct answers. With more vision experts, *Eagle* can more precisely capture the information in the image and provide the correct answer.

Comparison with Cambrian-1. Using the same pre-training and supervised fine-tuning datasets from *Cambrian-1* [73], *Eagle* demonstrates superior performance across all the evaluated benchmarks without bells and whistles. As shown in Table 9, *Eagle* outperforms the *Cambrian-1* counterparts considerably on the *OCR and Chart* category. Consistent improvements are also observed on the *General, Knowledge* and *Vision-Centric* categories, showing the robustness and generalization ability of the improved perception design in *Eagle*.

4 Related work

4.1 Multimodal large language models

Our work is related to the general architecture design of multimodal large language models. Besides the line of representative open-source research mentioned in the introduction section, other notable



Figure 5: Qualitative samples on OCR and document understanding tasks. Eagle is able to extract useful information from small text.




Figure 6: Qualitative results of Eagle on VQA tasks requiring college-level knowledge or deliberate reasoning.

families of MLLMs include, but are not limited to *MiniGPT-4* [85, 7], *Lynx* [82], *Otter* [40, 39], *Qwen-VL* [5], *CogVLM* [75, 29], *VILA* [48], *GPT-4V* [2], *Gemini* [71], and *Llama 3.1* [19]. Depending on how vision signals are integrated into the language model, MLLMs can be broadly categorized into “cross-modal attention” ones and “prefix-tuning” ones [80]. The former injects visual information into different layers of LLMs using cross-modal attention [4, 40], whereas the latter views the visual tokens as part of the language token sequence and directly append them with text embeddings [54, 44, 43]. Our model belongs to the prefix-tuning family by following a *LLaVA*-styled multimodal architecture. Considering that MLLM is a fast growing field, readers are recommended to refer to more detailed studies and surveys such as [80, 42, 23].

4.2 Vision encoder design for MLLMs

Our work is closely related to research focusing on improved vision encoder designs for MLLM. Early works [54, 44] usually adopted vision encoder pre-trained on vision-language alignment tasks such as *CLIP* [63] and *EVA-CLIP* [70]. Stronger vision encoders such as *SigLIP* [83] and *InternVL* [13] have been proposed to improve vision-language tasks with improved designs, larger model sizes, and

better training recipes. Considering that the models are often pre-trained on low-resolution images and lack the ability to encode fine-grained details, higher resolution adaptation is often performed to increase the MLLM input resolution [9, 10, 6, 12].

Besides higher resolution adaptation, models such as *LLaVA-NeXT* [53], *LLaVA-UHD* [79], *Monkey* [47], *InternLM-XComposer* [17], and *InternVL* [12] use either tiling or adaptive tiling to handle high resolution input, where input images are divided into lower-resolution patches and process them separately. Although the ability to handle higher resolution is similarly made possible with the introduction of additional vision experts, its spirit is slightly orthogonal to the tiling techniques in terms of introducing the diversity of visual representations. Both techniques are compatible and can be combined together.

Our work is most related to existing models using multiple vision encoders for improved perception. *Mini-Gemini* [45] and *LLaVA-HR* [59] propose to fuse high-resolution visual features into the low-resolution visual tokens. Apart from the resolution issue, these pre-trained vision encoders may lack specific abilities such as reading text and localizing objects. Hence, a series of works have integrated vision models pre-trained on various vision tasks to extend the capabilities of vision encoders. For example, *Mousi* [20], and *Brave* [33] fuse visual tokens from different vision encoders by concatenating along the channel or token direction. *RADIO* [64] proposes a multi-teacher distillation method to unify the abilities of different vision encoders into a unified model. *MoAI* [37], *IVE* [28], and *Prismer* [55] further use the output of vision experts, such as OCR, detection, or depth estimation, to supplement more information for MLLM to generate answers. *MoVA* [88] devises a routing network to assign an optimal vision model conditioned on the given image and instructions.

5 Conclusion

We conduct an in-depth analysis study on the design space for integrating vision encoders for multimodal large language models. Unlike previous works that focus on designing novel fusion paradigms, we find systematic design choice matters and discover a series of useful techniques. Step by step, we optimize the training recipe of individual vision encoders, identify an extendable and efficient fusing method, and gradually combine vision encoders with different domain knowledge. The results show the importance of basic design space. We hope our work can serve as a new basis and bring new inspiration for the vision encoder design for MLLM.

References

- [1] LAION-GPT4v dataset. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/laion/gpt4v-dataset>, 2023. 3, 8
- [2] 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:2303.08774*, 2023. 11
- [3] AI@Meta. Llama 3 model card, 2024. 1, 8
- [4] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 2, 11
- [5] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-VL: A frontier large vision-language model with versatile abilities. *arXiv:2308.12966*, 2023. 11
- [6] Lucas Beyer, Andreas Steiner, André Susano Pinto, Alexander Kolesnikov, Xiao Wang, Daniel Salz, Maxim Neumann, Ibrahim Alabdulmohsin, Michael Tschannen, Emanuele Bugliarello, et al. Paligemma: A versatile 3b vlm for transfer. *arXiv:2407.07726*, 2024. 4, 12
- [7] Jun Chen, Deyao Zhu, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, Zechun Liu, Pengchuan Zhang, Raghuraman Krishnamoorthi, Vikas Chandra, Yunyang Xiong, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. MiniGPT-v2: Large language model as a unified interface for vision-language multi-task learning. *arXiv:2310.09478*, 2023. 11
- [8] 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:2311.12793*, 2023. 3, 8
- [9] Xi Chen, Josip Djolonga, Piotr Padlewski, Basil Mustafa, Soravit Changpinyo, Jialin Wu, Carlos Riquelme Ruiz, Sebastian Goodman, Xiao Wang, Yi Tay, et al. PaLI-X: On scaling up a multilingual vision and language model. *arXiv:2305.18565*, 2023. 4, 12

- [10] Xi Chen, Xiao Wang, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Jialin Wu, Paul Voigtlaender, Basil Mustafa, Sebastian Goodman, Ibrahim Alabdulmohsin, Piotr Padlewski, et al. PaLI-3 vision language models: Smaller, faster, stronger. *arXiv:2310.09199*, 2023. 4, 12
- [11] Xi Chen, Xiao Wang, Soravit Changpinyo, AJ Piergiovanni, Piotr Padlewski, Daniel Salz, Sebastian Goodman, Adam Grycner, Basil Mustafa, Lucas Beyer, et al. PaLI: A jointly-scaled multilingual language-image model. In *ICLR*, 2023. 2
- [12] Zhe Chen, Weiyun Wang, Hao Tian, Shenglong Ye, Zhangwei Gao, Erfei Cui, Wenwen Tong, Kongzhi Hu, Jiapeng Luo, Zheng Ma, et al. How far are we to gpt-4v? closing the gap to commercial multimodal models with open-source suites. *arXiv:2404.16821*, 2024. 12
- [13] Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Muyan Zhong, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, Bin Li, Ping Luo, Tong Lu, Yu Qiao, and Jifeng Dai. InternVL: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. *arXiv:2312.14238*, 2023. 2, 4, 9, 11
- [14] Mehdi Cherti, Romain Beaumont, Ross Wightman, Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Cade Gordon, Christoph Schuhmann, Ludwig Schmidt, and Jenia Jitsev. Reproducible scaling laws for contrastive language-image learning. In *CVPR*, 2023. 2
- [15] 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/>, March 2023. 1, 8
- [16] Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale N Fung, and Steven Hoi. InstructBLIP: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning. In *NeurIPS*, 2024. 2
- [17] Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Yuhang Cao, Bin Wang, Linke Ouyang, Songyang Zhang, Haodong Duan, Wenwei Zhang, Yining Li, et al. InternLM-XComposer2-4KHD: A pioneering large vision-language model handling resolutions from 336 pixels to 4k hd. *arXiv:2404.06512*, 2024. 12
- [18] Danny Driess, Fei Xia, Mehdi SM Sajjadi, Corey Lynch, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Brian Ichter, Ayzaan Wahid, Jonathan Tompson, Quan Vuong, Tianhe Yu, et al. PaLM-E: An embodied multimodal language model. *arXiv:2303.03378*, 2023. 2
- [19] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The Llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024. 11
- [20] Xiaoran Fan, Tao Ji, Changhao Jiang, Shuo Li, Senjie Jin, Sirui Song, Junke Wang, Boyang Hong, Lu Chen, Guodong Zheng, et al. MouSi: Poly-visual-expert vision-language models. *arXiv:2401.17221*, 2024. 2, 5, 12
- [21] Yuxin Fang, Quan Sun, Xinggang Wang, Tiejun Huang, Xinlong Wang, and Yue Cao. EVA-02: A visual representation for neon genesis. *arXiv:2303.11331*, 2023. 2, 5
- [22] Yuxin Fang, Wen Wang, Binhui Xie, Quan Sun, Ledell Wu, Xinggang Wang, Tiejun Huang, Xinlong Wang, and Yue Cao. EVA: Exploring the limits of masked visual representation learning at scale. In *CVPR*, 2023. 2, 5
- [23] Hao Fei, Yuan Yao, Zhuosheng Zhang, Fuxiao Liu, Ao Zhang, and Tat-Seng Chua. From multimodal llm to human-level ai: Modality, instruction, reasoning, efficiency and beyond. In *LREC-Coling Tutorials*, 2024. 2, 11
- [24] Chaoyou Fu, Peixian Chen, Yunhang Shen, Yulei Qin, Mengdan Zhang, Xu Lin, Zhenyu Qiu, Wei Lin, Jinrui Yang, Xiawu Zheng, et al. MME: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for multimodal large language models. *arXiv:2306.13394*, 2023. 9
- [25] Jiahui Gao, Renjie Pi, Jipeng Zhang, Jiacheng Ye, Wanjun Zhong, Yufei Wang, Lanqing Hong, Jianhua Han, Hang Xu, Zhenguo Li, and Lingpeng Kong. G-llava: Solving geometric problem with multi-modal large language model. *arXiv:2312.11370*, 2023. 8
- [26] Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Making the V in VQA matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in Visual Question Answering. In *CVPR*, 2017. 8
- [27] Danna Gurari, Qing Li, Abigale J. Stangl, Anhong Guo, Chi Lin, Kristen Grauman, Jiebo Luo, and Jeffrey P. Bigham. Vizwiz grand challenge: Answering visual questions from blind people. In *CVPR*, 2018. 8
- [28] Xin He, Longhui Wei, Lingxi Xie, and Qi Tian. Incorporating visual experts to resolve the information loss in multimodal large language models. *arXiv:2401.03105*, 2024. 12
- [29] Wenyi Hong, Weihang Wang, Qingsong Lv, Jiazheng Xu, Wenmeng Yu, Junhui Ji, Yan Wang, Zihan Wang, Yuxiao Dong, Ming Ding, et al. CogAgent: A visual language model for gui agents. In *CVPR*, 2024. 11

- [30] Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning. GQA: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering. In *CVPR*, 2019. 5, 8
- [31] Gabriel Ilharco, Mitchell Wortsman, Ross Wightman, Cade Gordon, Nicholas Carlini, Rohan Taori, Achal Dave, Vaishaal Shankar, Hongseok Namkoong, John Miller, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Ali Farhadi, and Ludwig Schmidt. Openclip, July 2021. If you use this software, please cite it as below. 2, 5
- [32] Kushal Kafle, Scott Cohen, Brian Price, and Christopher Kanan. DVQA: Understanding data visualizations via question answering. In *CVPR*, 2018. 3, 8
- [33] Oğuzhan Fatih Kar, Alessio Tonioni, Petra Poklukar, Achin Kulshrestha, Amir Zamir, and Federico Tombari. BRAVE: Broadening the visual encoding of vision-language models. *arXiv:2404.07204*, 2024. 2, 5, 12
- [34] Aniruddha Kembhavi, Michael Salvato, Eric Kolve, Minjoon Seo, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ali Farhadi. A diagram is worth a dozen images. *arXiv:1603.07396*, 2016. 3, 8
- [35] 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 *ECCV*, 2022. 3, 8
- [36] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, et al. Segment anything. In *ICCV*, 2023. 2, 5
- [37] Byung-Kwan Lee, Beomchan Park, Chae Won Kim, and Yong Man Ro. MoAI: Mixture of all intelligence for large language and vision models. *arXiv:2403.07508*, 2024. 2, 12
- [38] Kenton Lee, Mandar Joshi, Iulia Raluca Turc, Hexiang Hu, Fangyu Liu, Julian Martin Eisenschlos, Urvashi Khandelwal, Peter Shaw, Ming-Wei Chang, and Kristina Toutanova. Pix2Struct: Screenshot parsing as pretraining for visual language understanding. In *ICML*, 2023. 2, 5
- [39] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Liangyu Chen, Jinghao Wang, Fanyi Pu, Jingkang Yang, Chunyuan Li, and Ziwei Liu. MIMIC-IT: Multi-modal in-context instruction tuning. *arXiv:2306.05425*, 2023. 11
- [40] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Liangyu Chen, Jinghao Wang, Jingkang Yang, and Ziwei Liu. Otter: A multi-modal model with in-context instruction tuning. *arXiv:2305.03726*, 2023. 11
- [41] Bohao Li, Rui Wang, Guangzhi Wang, Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, and Ying Shan. Seed-Bench: Benchmarking multimodal llms with generative comprehension. *arXiv:2307.16125*, 2023. 9
- [42] Chunyuan Li, Zhe Gan, Zhengyuan Yang, Jianwei Yang, Linjie Li, Lijuan Wang, Jianfeng Gao, et al. Multimodal foundation models: From specialists to general-purpose assistants. *Foundations and Trends® in Computer Graphics and Vision*, 2024. 11
- [43] 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 *ICML*, 2023. 2, 11
- [44] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. BLIP: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *ICML*, 2022. 2, 11
- [45] Yanwei Li, Yuechen Zhang, Chengyao Wang, Zhisheng Zhong, Yixin Chen, Ruihang Chu, Shaoteng Liu, and Jiaya Jia. Mini-Gemini: Mining the potential of multi-modality vision language models. *arXiv:2403.18814*, 2024. 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12
- [46] Yifan Li, Yifan Du, Kun Zhou, Jinpeng Wang, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen. Evaluating object hallucination in large vision-language models. *arXiv:2305.10355*, 2023. 5, 9
- [47] Zhang Li, Biao Yang, Qiang Liu, Zhiyin Ma, Shuo Zhang, Jingxu Yang, Yabo Sun, Yuliang Liu, and Xiang Bai. Monkey: Image resolution and text label are important things for large multi-modal models. In *CVPR*, 2024. 2, 4, 9, 12
- [48] Ji Lin, Hongxu Yin, Wei Ping, Yao Lu, Pavlo Molchanov, Andrew Tao, Huizi Mao, Jan Kautz, Mohammad Shoeybi, and Song Han. VILA: On pre-training for visual language models. *arXiv:2312.07533*, 2023. 11
- [49] Ziyi Lin, Chris Liu, Renrui Zhang, Peng Gao, Longtian Qiu, Han Xiao, Han Qiu, Chen Lin, Wenqi Shao, Keqin Chen, et al. SPHINX: The joint mixing of weights, tasks, and visual embeddings for multi-modal large language models. *arXiv:2311.07575*, 2023. 2, 5
- [50] Fuxiao Liu, Tianrui Guan, Zongxia Li, Lichang Chen, Yaser Yacoob, Dinesh Manocha, and Tianyi Zhou. HallusionBench: You see what you think? or you think what you see? an image-context reasoning benchmark challenging for gpt-4v (ision), llava-1.5, and other multi-modality models. *arXiv:2310.14566*, 2023. 2
- [51] Fuxiao Liu, Kevin Lin, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Yaser Yacoob, and Lijuan Wang. Aligning large multi-modal model with robust instruction tuning. *arXiv:2306.14565*, 2023. 8
- [52] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. *arXiv:2310.03744*, 2023. 2, 3, 4, 8, 9

- [53] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Sheng Shen, and Yong Jae Lee. LLaVA-NeXT: Improved reasoning, ocr, and world knowledge. <https://llava-vl.github.io/blog/2024-01-30-llava-next/>, January 2024. 2, 4, 9, 12
- [54] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. In *NeurIPS*, 2023. 2, 3, 7, 11
- [55] Shikun Liu, Linxi Fan, Edward Johns, Zhiding Yu, Chaowei Xiao, and Anima Anandkumar. Prism: A vision-language model with an ensemble of experts. *TMLR*, 2024. 2, 5, 12
- [56] Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhang, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, Kai Chen, and Dahua Lin. MMBench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player? *arXiv:2307.06281*, 2023. 9
- [57] Yuliang Liu, Zhang Li, Biao Yang, Chunyuan Li, Xucheng Yin, Cheng lin Liu, Lianwen Jin, and Xiang Bai. On the hidden mystery of ocr in large multimodal models. *arXiv:2305.07895*, 2023. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
- [58] 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. In *ICLR*, 2024. 9
- [59] Gen Luo, Yiyi Zhou, Yuxin Zhang, Xiawu Zheng, Xiaoshuai Sun, and Rongrong Ji. Feast your eyes: Mixture-of-resolution adaptation for multimodal large language models. *arXiv:2403.03003*, 2024. 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 12
- [60] Ahmed Masry, Do Xuan Long, Jia Qing Tan, Shafiq Joty, and Enamul Hoque. ChartQA: A benchmark for question answering about charts with visual and logical reasoning. *arXiv:2203.10244*, 2022. 3, 8
- [61] Minesh Mathew, Dimosthenis Karatzas, and C. V. Jawahar. DocVQA: A dataset for vqa on document images. In *WACV*, 2021. 3, 8
- [62] Maxime Oquab, Timothée Darcet, Théo Moutakanni, Huy Vo, Marc Szafraniec, Vasil Khalidov, Pierre Fernandez, Daniel Haziza, Francisco Massa, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, et al. DINOv2: Learning robust visual features without supervision. *arXiv:2304.07193*, 2023. 2, 5
- [63] 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 *ICML*, 2021. 2, 3, 5, 11
- [64] Mike Ranzinger, Greg Heinrich, Jan Kautz, and Pavlo Molchanov. AM-RADIO: Agglomerative vision foundation model reduce all domains into one. In *CVPR*, 2024. 2, 12
- [65] Tanik Saikh, Tirthankar Ghosal, Amish Mittal, Asif Ekbal, and Pushpak Bhattacharyya. ScienceQA: A novel resource for question answering on scholarly articles. *International Journal on Digital Libraries*, 2022. 9, 10
- [66] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade W Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, Patrick Schramowski, Srivatsa R Kundurthy, Katherine Crowson, Ludwig Schmidt, Robert Kaczmarczyk, and Jenia Jitsev. LAION-5B: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. In *NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2022. 2, 5
- [67] Baifeng Shi, Ziyang Wu, Maolin Mao, Xin Wang, and Trevor Darrell. When do we not need larger vision models? *arXiv:2403.13043*, 2024. 2
- [68] Wenzhe Shi, Jose Caballero, Ferenc Huszar, Johannes Totz, Andrew P. Aitken, Rob Bishop, Daniel Rueckert, and Zehan Wang. Real-time single image and video super-resolution using an efficient sub-pixel convolutional neural network. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1874–1883, 2016. 5
- [69] Amanpreet Singh, Vivek Natarajan, Meet Shah, Yu Jiang, Xinlei Chen, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Marcus Rohrbach. Towards VQA models that can read. In *CVPR*, 2019. 6, 8
- [70] Quan Sun, Yuxin Fang, Ledell Wu, Xinlong Wang, and Yue Cao. EVA-CLIP: Improved training techniques for clip at scale. *arXiv:2303.15389*, 2023. 11
- [71] 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:2312.11805*, 2023. 11
- [72] Teknium. OpenHermes 2.5: An open dataset of synthetic data for generalist LLM assistants. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/teknium/OpenHermes-2.5>, 2023. 8
- [73] Shengbang Tong, Ellis Brown, Penghao Wu, Sanghyun Woo, Manoj Middepogu, Sai Charitha Akula, Jihan Yang, Shusheng Yang, Adithya Iyer, Xichen Pan, Austin Wang, Rob Fergus, Yann LeCun, and Saining Xie. Cambrian-1: A fully open, vision-centric exploration of multimodal llms. *arXiv:2406.16860*, 2024. 2, 8, 10

- [74] 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:2311.07574*, 2023. [8](#)
- [75] Weihan 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:2311.03079*, 2023. [11](#)
- [76] Sanghyun Woo, Shoubhik Debnath, Ronghang Hu, Xinlei Chen, Zhuang Liu, In So Kweon, and Saining Xie. ConvNeXt V2: Co-designing and scaling convnets with masked autoencoders. In *CVPR*, 2023. [5](#)
- [77] Xiyang Wu, Ruiqi Xian, Tianrui Guan, Jing Liang, Souradip Chakraborty, Fuxiao Liu, Brian Sadler, Dinesh Manocha, and Amrit Singh Bedi. On the safety concerns of deploying llms/vlms in robotics: Highlighting the risks and vulnerabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10340*, 2024. [2](#)
- [78] xAI. Grok-1.5 Vision Preview. <https://x.ai/blog/grok-1.5v>, 2024. [10](#)
- [79] 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:2403.11703*, 2024. [9](#), [12](#)
- [80] Shukang Yin, Chaoyou Fu, Sirui Zhao, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Tong Xu, and Enhong Chen. A survey on multimodal large language models. *IEEE Trans. PAMI*, 2024. [11](#)
- [81] 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. In *CVPR*, 2024. [9](#)
- [82] Yan Zeng, Hanbo Zhang, Jiani Zheng, Jiangnan Xia, Guoqiang Wei, Yang Wei, Yuchen Zhang, and Tao Kong. What matters in training a gpt4-style language model with multimodal inputs? *arXiv:2307.02469*, 2023. [11](#)
- [83] Xiaohua Zhai, Basil Mustafa, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. Sigmoid loss for language image pre-training. In *ICCV*, 2023. [11](#)
- [84] Yanzhe Zhang, Ruiyi Zhang, Jiuxiang Gu, Yufan Zhou, Nedim Lipka, Diyi Yang, and Tong Sun. LLaVAR: Enhanced visual instruction tuning for text-rich image understanding. *arXiv:2306.17107*, 2023. [8](#)
- [85] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. MiniGPT-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. *arXiv:2304.10592*, 2023. [11](#)
- [86] Xizhou Zhu, Weijie Su, Lewei Lu, Bin Li, Xiaogang Wang, and Jifeng Dai. Deformable DETR: Deformable transformers for end-to-end object detection. In *ICLR*, 2021. [3](#), [6](#)
- [87] Yuke Zhu, Oliver Groth, Michael Bernstein, and Li Fei-Fei. Visual7W: Grounded Question Answering in Images. In *CVPR*, 2016. [8](#)
- [88] Zhuofan Zong, Bingqi Ma, Dazhong Shen, Guanglu Song, Hao Shao, Dongzhi Jiang, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Liu. MoVA: Adapting mixture of vision experts to multimodal context. *arXiv:2404.13046*, 2024. [2](#), [12](#)