MTA: Multimodal Task Alignment for BEV Perception and Captioning

Yunsheng Ma[1,2*] Burhaneddin Yaman[1†] Xin Ye[1]
Jingru Luo[1] Feng Tao[1] Abhirup Mallik[1] Ziran Wang[2] Liu Ren[1]
[1]Bosch Research North America & Bosch Center for Artificial Intelligence (BCAI)
[2]Purdue University

{yunsheng,ziran}@purdue.edu
{burhaneddin.yaman,xin.ye3,jingru.luo,feng.tao2,abhirup.mallik,liu.ren}@us.bosch.com

Abstract

Bird's eye view (BEV)-based 3D perception plays a crucial role in autonomous driving applications. The rise of large language models has spurred interest in BEV-based captioning to understand object behavior in the surrounding environment. However, existing approaches treat perception and captioning as separate tasks, focusing on the performance of only one task and overlooking the potential benefits of multimodal alignment. To bridge this gap between modalities, we introduce MTA, a novel multimodal task alignment framework that boosts both BEV perception and captioning. MTA consists of two key components: (1) BEV-Language Alignment (BLA), a contextual learning mechanism that aligns the BEV scene representations with ground-truth language representations, and (2) Detection-Captioning Alignment (DCA), a cross-modal prompting mechanism that aligns detection and captioning outputs. MTA seamlessly integrates into state-of-the-art baselines during training, adding no extra computational complexity at runtime. Extensive experiments on the nuScenes and TOD3Cap datasets show that MTA significantly outperforms state-of-the-art baselines in both tasks, achieving a 10.7% improvement in challenging rare perception scenarios and a 9.2% improvement in captioning. These results underscore the effectiveness of unified alignment in reconciling BEV-based perception and captioning.

1. Introduction

3D perception is a fundamental and crucial task for embodied AI applications such as robotics and autonomous driving [5, 14]. Among 3D perception methods, bird's eye view (BEV)-based methods have recently gained significant

attention, particularly in the context of autonomous driving tasks [10, 11, 15, 40]. Unlike monocular frameworks which process each camera view separately, BEV provides a unified representation of a given scene by fusing information from multi-view camera images or other sensory inputs such as LiDAR scans [20, 24]. The generated BEV representations serve as the primary source of information for solving downstream autonomous driving tasks such as detection and tracking.

In recent years, transformer-based BEV methods have shown rapid progress, enabling the extraction of spatio-temporally holistic representations of the surrounding environment from multi-view camera images [20, 44]. These rich representations have facilitated achieving state-of-the-art 3D perception performance. The rise of foundation models, such as multimodal large language models (MLLMs) has led to the emergence of research on explainability and understanding of 3D scenes [26, 29, 34, 43]. This task is manifested as a captioning task which aims to describe the localization, context, and behavior of objects in the scene in the form of natural language. 3D captioning has been extensively investigated for various indoor applications [7, 8] and has more recently been extended to outdoor applications such as perception task in autonomous driving [16]. BEV-based 3D captioning extracts information from BEV and task heads such as 3D detection and uses it as the condition for caption generation.

While there is an increasing number of research studies on BEV perception and captioning tasks, the joint alignment between modalities, which aims to enhance the performance of both modality tasks, has not been properly addressed. In particular, one stream of works focuses on BEV-based detection without considering the captioning performance [20], while another stream of works focuses on captioning performance without reporting performance on perception tasks such as 3D detection [16]. However, these two tasks are not disjoint and can complement each other by enforcing multimodal alignment strategies that have the

---

potential to significantly advance the field of 3D perception and captioning in autonomous driving applications.

To bridge this gap, we introduce MTA, a multimodal task alignment approach for BEV perception and captioning. The proposed MTA approach presents two mechanisms for alignment, namely BEV-Language Alignment (BLA) and Detection-Captioning Alignment (DCA). BLA introduces a multimodal contextual learning mechanism that incorporates ground-truth caption representations to learn the alignment between the BEV visual representations of the scene and the natural language-based scene understanding. Rather than relying solely on the language modeling objective, BLA provides additional supervision by aligning the BEV-based contextual object queries with corresponding ground-truth linguistic representations obtained from pre-trained text encoders. DCA, on the other hand, aims to explicitly promote consistency between the perception outputs from the visual branch and captioning outputs from the language branch. It introduces a cross-modal prompting mechanism that encourages the MLLM to generate captions that are coherent with the predicted bounding boxes and class labels. DCA goes beyond relying solely on the gradients from single modality objectives (detection loss or language modeling loss) to optimize the task heads or the MLLM.

MTA is a flexible framework that can be seamlessly integrated into existing BEV-based perception and captioning frameworks. Additionally, the proposed MTA modules are only used during training time to enforce alignment between modalities. Thus, MTA does not require any architectural changes or introduce any additional computational overhead during inference time, which is very critical for downstream tasks such as autonomous driving. In this paper, we evaluate the importance of MTA on the state-of-the-art frameworks using the challenging large-scale nuScenes [2] and TOD3Cap datasets [16]. Experimental results show that MTA outperforms the previous best baseline on both perception and captioning tasks. In particular, MTA provides an improvement of 4.9% and 9.2% in terms of perception and captioning metrics, respectively, over the corresponding state-of-the-art baseline. Moreover, qualitative results further confirm the quantitative findings, demonstrating that MTA not only achieves superior performance metrics but also reduces the occurrence of hallucinated captions, which is a fundamental factor for safety-critical applications like autonomous driving. Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose MTA, a novel multimodal task alignment framework that bridges the gap between BEV-based perception and captioning tasks.
- MTA introduces two novel alignment modules, BEV-Language Alignment (BLA) and Detection-Captioning Alignment (DCA), which enforce alignment through multimodal contextual learning and cross-modal prompt-

ing mechanisms, respectively.
- MTA seamlessly integrates into existing architectures and does not introduce any additional computational overhead during inference, as both of the MTA components are only active during training.
- Extensive experiments on the challenging nuScenes and TOD3Cap datasets demonstrate that MTA consistently outperforms state-of-the-art methods and in both perception and captioning tasks.

2. Related Work

2.1. BEV Perception

In recent years, BEV frameworks have utilized transformer architectures that generate high-quality BEV feature maps [20, 22, 24, 42, 44, 45]. Among these works, BEV-Former has unraveled a new era in BEV perception by fusing information from multi-view camera images both spatially and temporally to acquire a spatio-temporally holistic representation of the scene [20]. Another notable work in this domain is BEVFusion, which presents a framework to fuse BEV feature maps from both camera and LiDAR sensors for efficient and robust BEV perception [24]. These advancements in BEV perception have laid the foundation for a more comprehensive understanding of 3D environments in autonomous driving applications.

2.2. 3D Captioning

3D captioning aims to provide natural language descriptions of the localization and behavior of objects in a given scene. Recently, the field of 3D captioning has witnessed significant progress, thanks to the rapid emergence of multimodal large language models and the release of many public datasets, primarily for indoor applications [6–8]. These advancements have prompted the embodied AI community to collect 3D captioning datasets and develop 3D captioning frameworks for outdoor applications such as autonomous driving [27, 32, 38]. A notable work in this direction is TOD3Cap [16], which has released a large captioning dataset for autonomous driving and proposed a framework for BEV-based 3D dense captioning. This framework utilizes information from BEV and 3D perception outputs as inputs to an MLLM for generating captions.

Despite these advancements in BEV perception and 3D captioning, there remains a significant gap in jointly optimizing and aligning these two modalities to enhance the performance of both tasks, which we aim to address in this study through the proposed MTA framework.

2.3. Vision-Language Models

Vision-language models, trained on massive internet-scale data, have shown strong promise in learning good representations for downstream tasks. Pioneering works such as

Figure 1. **Overview of proposed multimodal task alignment (MTA) framework.** MTA enables joint performance improvement for BEV perception and dense captioning tasks through BEV-Language Alignment (BLA) and Detection-Captioning Alignment (DCA) mechanisms. In particular, BLA is a contextual learning mechanism to reconcile BEV scene representation with language-based scene understanding, and DCA is a cross-modal prompting mechanism to promote consistency between detection and captioning outputs. The MTA is trained end-to-end with a combination of task-specific losses (detection and captioning losses), along with the BLA and DCA objectives.

CLIP [33], ALIGN [13], and Florence [41, 46] pretrain multimodal models on millions to billions of image-text pairs, showing strong zero-shot performance on various tasks like image classification and retrieval. Subsequent works have proposed strategies, such as prompting to efficiently adapt VLMs to new domains and datasets [17, 49]. More recently, VLMs have been explored in BEV-based autonomous driving applications, where they have been either used for scene understanding [4, 21, 30] or for improving the performance of autonomous driving tasks such as perception and planning [12, 18, 28, 35, 36]. Unlike previous methods, MTA emphasizes improving alignment between vision and language modalities to jointly enhance BEV perception and captioning tasks.

3. Methodology

Overview. The overall framework of multimodal task alignment (MTA), which strengthens the alignment between BEV perception and captioning tasks to achieve state-of-the-art performance on both tasks, is illustrated in Fig. 1. The methodology section is outlined as follows. In Sec. 3.1, we provide a background on BEV perception and captioning tasks. In Sec. 3.2 and Sec. 3.3, we provide details of the proposed MTA alignment mechanisms, namely BEV-Language Alignment and Detection-Captioning Alignment. Finally, in Sec. 3.4, we provide the overall loss function for training the MTA framework.

3.1. Preliminaries

BEV Perception Module. The BEV perception module $\mathcal{D}$ processes sensory inputs such as camera, LiDAR, or both, to obtain a unified top-down representation of the surrounding environment. In the context of given camera sensors, multi-view camera images are processed through a backbone to obtain multi-view camera features. Subsequently, the resulting perspective-view features are fed into BEV encoders such as BEVformer, which lift these image features into BEV space by spatio-temporally fusing them [20].

Subsequently, the generated BEV feature maps are fed into a downstream task head, such as a transformer decoder for 3D detection [39]. Due to a lack of ground-truth BEV maps, BEV perception is trained end-to-end with the objective of minimizing the task head loss function. The evaluation performance of the task head serves as a proxy for the quality of BEV perception.

BEV Captioning Module. The BEV captioning module $\mathcal{G}$ aims to generate natural language descriptions of the localization and behavior of objects in the scene. It takes the BEV perception outputs, such as the BEV feature map and object proposals from the task head, as input. A relation query transformer (Q-Former) is generally employed to extract and transfer contextual information from the BEV perception to language space [16, 19, 38]. Formally, the Q-Former maps the embedding for each detected object to the

3

language space as follows:

$$\mathbf{d}_i = \mathcal{Q}_i \left([\mathbf{d}_{i-1}, F_{i-1}^{\text{BEV}}] \right) \quad i = 1, 2, \cdots, L \qquad (1)$$

where $[\cdot, \cdot]$ denotes the concatenation operation, $\mathbf{d}_0$ represents the detection embeddings from the detection head, F_0^{BEV} is the BEV feature map from the BEV encoder, L is the total number of transformer blocks in the Q-Former. The refined object queries are then projected into the latent dimension of the MLLM using a multilayer perceptron (MLP): $\mathbf{q} = \Phi^{\text{L}}(\mathbf{d}_L)$, where $\mathbf{q}$ denotes the projected queries and Φ^{L} is the MLP. The MLLM takes the projected queries $\mathbf{q}$ and a language prompt $\mathbf{p}$ as input and generates captions for each object. Formally, the MLLM models the conditional probability of generating a language output sequence $\mathbf{o}$ given the multimodal input:

$$\Pr(\mathbf{o}|\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \Pr(o_i|o_{<i}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \qquad (2)$$

where n is the number of output tokens, and $o_{<i}$ denotes the previous tokens. The captioning module is efficiently trained by minimizing the language modeling loss $\mathcal{L}_{LM}$ using adapters [48].

3.2. BEV-Language Alignment

Our goal is to bridge the gap between the BEV-based scene representation used for 3D detection and the language-based scene understanding and reasoning capabilities of the MLLM. However, off-the-shelf MLLMs cannot directly comprehend and reason on BEV features, as they have not been exposed to such representations during their pre-training phase. Furthermore, the alignment gap between BEV features and the MLLM's language space is more pronounced compared to the visual tokens used in general-domain MLLMs [9].

To address this challenge, we introduce a novel BEV-Language Alignment (BLA) module that explicitly aligns the BEV perception features, which encompass visual contextual information for each object, with their corresponding ground-truth linguistic representations. By aligning the Q-Former's visual BEV features with ground-truth captioning features, we strengthen the alignment between the BEV perception and captioning modules, enabling the MLLM to better comprehend and reason over the BEV representation.

Formally, the BLA module operates as follows. Given a ground-truth caption $\mathbf{o}$, we compute its text embedding using a pretrained CLIP text encoder $\mathcal{T}$ [33]. We then extract the projected Q-Former features $\Phi^{\text{Q}}(\mathbf{q}_\ell)$, where $\mathbf{q}_\ell$ represents the hidden states from the ℓ-th layer of the Q-Former, and Φ^{Q} is a trainable projection head parameterized as an MLP. The alignment is enforced using a mean squared error loss formulated as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{BLA}}(\Phi^{\text{Q}}, \mathcal{Q}_{1:\ell}) = \left\| \Phi^{\text{Q}}(\mathbf{q}_\ell) - \mathcal{T}(\mathbf{o}) \right\|_2^2 . \qquad (3)$$

Conceptually, the BLA-enhanced Q-Former can be viewed as a two-stage process. In the first stage (before the ℓ-th layer), the Q-Former focuses on learning a context-aware representation of the object queries by attending to the BEV features. This stage allows the Q-Former to capture the spatio-temporal relationships and semantics encoded in the BEV representation with direct representation-based supervision. In the second stage (from the ℓ-th layer onwards), the Q-Former maps the object query features into an MLLM-aligned space, making them more amenable to the MLLM's language-based reasoning capabilities.

3.3. Detection-Captioning Alignment

In current BEV-based perception and captioning frameworks, the 3D detection and captioning tasks are typically optimized independently, which may lead to suboptimal performance and a lack of coherence between the predicted bounding boxes and the generated captions. To address this limitation, we further propose a Detection-Captioning Alignment (DCA) module that aims to bridge the gap between the detection and captioning outputs. The main challenge here lies in the significant discrepancy between the modalities of the detection labels (class labels and bounding box coordinates) and the captioning logits (language tokens). Directly aligning these outputs can lead to a performance drop in both tasks.

We tackle this challenge by introducing a cross-modal prompting approach. We define a set of N learnable prompt tokens $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathbf{p}_1, ..., \mathbf{p}_N\} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}$ that serves as a shared embedding space for aligning the detection and captioning outputs. Formally, let $\hat{\mathbf{c}}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{b}}$ denote the class labels and bounding box coordinates from the detection head, respectively. We project the concatenated detection outputs into the cross-modal prompt space via attention pooling:

$$\mathbf{x}_{\text{det}} = \left[\Phi^{\text{cls}}(\hat{\mathbf{c}}), \Phi^{\text{box}}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}) \right] \qquad (4)$$

$$\mathbf{p}_{\text{det}} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{\exp\left(\mathbf{x}_{\text{det}}^\top \cdot \mathbf{p}_i\right)}{\sum_{j=1}^{N} \exp\left(\mathbf{x}_{\text{det}}^\top \cdot \mathbf{p}_j\right)} \right) \mathbf{p}_i \qquad (5)$$

where $\Phi^{(\cdot)}$ denotes trainable projection heads parameterized as MLPs.

Similarly, we project the captioning logits into the same prompt space:

$$\mathbf{p}_{\text{cap}} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(\frac{\exp\left((\Phi^{\text{cap}}(\hat{\mathbf{o}}))^\top \cdot \mathbf{p}_i\right)}{\sum_{j=1}^{N} \exp\left((\Phi^{\text{cap}}(\hat{\mathbf{o}}))^\top \cdot \mathbf{p}_j\right)} \right) \mathbf{p}_i \qquad (6)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{o}}$ represents the captioning logits from the MLLM. Finally, to enforce alignment between the prompt-aligned detection and captioning embeddings, we employ the CLIP contrastive loss [33]:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DCA}}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{G}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{CLIP}}(\mathbf{p}_{\text{det}}, \mathbf{p}_{\text{cap}}). \qquad (7)$$

By minimizing $\mathcal{L}_{\text{DCA}}$, we encourage the detection and captioning outputs to be aligned in the shared prompt space.

The DCA module enhances the BLA module by explicitly enforcing consistency between the primary outputs of the perception and captioning branches. By incorporating both alignment mechanisms, our proposed framework attains a more comprehensive understanding of the 3D scene and enables more accurate caption generation grounded in the detected objects.

3.4. Training

The final loss function for training the proposed MTA framework is a weighted combination of the detection loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{DET}}$, the language modeling loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{LM}}$, the BEV-language alignment loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{BLA}}$, and the detection-captioning alignment loss $\mathcal{L}_{\text{DCA}}$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{MTA}} = \alpha \mathcal{L}_{\text{DET}} + \beta \mathcal{L}_{\text{LM}} + \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{\text{BLA}} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{\text{DCA}} \qquad (8)$$

By default, we do not tune and set $(\alpha, \beta) = (10, 1)$ following [16], and set $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = (1, 10^{-2})$ to ensure a balanced magnitude.

4. Experiments and Results

We conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the proposed MTA framework, demonstrating its effectiveness in improving both 3D dense captioning and detection performance through novel alignment mechanisms. The experimental setup, including datasets, evaluation metrics, and implementation details, is described in Sec. 4.1. In Sec. 4.2, we compare MTA's performance against the baseline TOD3Cap network and other state-of-the-art methods, along with qualitative results. Finally, Sec. 4.3 presents ablation studies to validate MTA's alignment components.

4.1. Experimental Set-up

Datasets. We conduct comprehensive experiments on the nuScenes [2] and TOD3Cap [16] datasets. NuScenes is a widely used benchmark in autonomous driving, containing 700 training and 150 validation scenes. Each scene is captured for a duration of ~20s using six cameras covering the entire 360-degree field of view, with key samples annotated at 2Hz. The detection task contains 1.4M annotated bounding boxes from 10 object categories. The TOD3Cap dataset extends nuScenes with dense language captioning annotations, providing approximately 2.3M language descriptions, with an average of 2.7K descriptions per scene.

Perception Metrics. For the BEV perception task, we report the standard 3D object detection metrics within the nuScenes dataset, including: mean Average Precision

(mAP), Average Translation Error (ATE), Average Scale Error (ASE), Average Orientation Error (AOE), Average Velocity Error (AVE), Average Attribute Error (AAE), and nuScenes Detection Score (NDS). More details on detection metrics can be found in [2]. The reported results are calculated using the validation split for all experiments.

Captioning Metrics. For the BEV captioning task, we report the m@IoU=k metric [8]. Let $(\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{o}_i)$ denote each ground-truth box-caption pair, where $\mathbf{b}_i$ and $\mathbf{o}_i$ are the bounding box coordinates and the caption for the i-th object, respectively. The predicted box-caption pair is denoted as $(\hat{\mathbf{b}}_i, \hat{\mathbf{o}}_i)$. The m@IoU=k metric is formulated as:

$$m@\text{IoU}{=}k := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} m(\hat{\mathbf{o}}_i, \mathbf{o}_i) \cdot \mathbb{1}\left\{ \text{IoU}\left(\hat{\mathbf{b}}_i, \mathbf{b}_i\right) \geq k \right\},$$

where N indicates the number of ground-truth objects, and m denotes the standard image captioning metrics, including BLEU-4 [31], METEOR [1], Rouge [23], and CIDEr [37], abbreviated as B-4, M, R, and C, respectively. $\mathbb{1}$ represents the indicator function that is set to 1 if the IoU value for the i-th box is bigger than the threshold k, otherwise 0.

Implementation Details. For model configurations, we follow the set-up in TOD3Cap [16] unless otherwise specified. We note that MTA shares the same architecture as TOD3Cap, with the exception of our proposed BLA and DCA mechanisms. We employ the commonly used BEVFormer-tiny [20] as the pretrained BEV perception module. The BEV captioning module incorporates either the pretrained Llama-3.2-1B [25] or InternLM2 [3] as the LLM. Unless stated otherwise, all studies are conducted with Llama 3. In all experiments, models are trained for 10 epochs with a learning rate of 2×10^{-4}, keeping the Llama model frozen except for the adapter [48] parameters. Additionally, the pretrained BEVFormer baseline is further trained for 10 epochs to ensure a fair comparison.

4.2. Main Results

3D Dense Captioning Results. We compare the performance of the TOD3Cap network with that of the same models trained with the proposed MTA, as well as other state-of-the-art methods: Scan2Cap [8] uses a message passing graph module to facilitate learning object relation features. X-Trans2Cap [47] applies a teacher-student approach to transfer detailed appearance information from 2D images to 3D scenes. Vote2Cap-DETR [7] employs a one-stage design with dual prediction heads that decode scene features into bounding boxes and captions.

As shown in Tab. 1, the proposed MTA demonstrates consistent and significant improvement over TOD3Cap

Method	LM	m@IoU=0.25				m@IoU=0.5			
		C↑	B-4↑	M↑	R↑	C↑	B-4↑	M↑	R↑
Scan2Cap [8]*	Custom [8]	60.6	41.5	28.4	58.6	62.5	39.2	26.4	56.5
X-Trans2Cap [47]*	Custom [47]	99.8	45.9	35.5	66.8	92.2	43.3	34.7	65.7
Vote2Cap-DETR [7]*	Custom [7]	110.1	48.0	44.4	67.8	98.4	46.1	41.3	65.1
TOD3Cap [16]	Llama 3.2 [25]	113.1	48.7	49.8	68.0	108.7	46.7	47.8	65.3
MTA(Ours)	Llama 3.2 [25]	**122.8**	**49.4**	**50.3**	**68.7**	**118.7**	**47.6**	**48.4**	**66.2**
TOD3Cap [16]	InternLM2 [3]	109.0	47.6	49.4	67.5	105.1	45.6	47.4	64.8
MTA(Ours)	InternLM2 [3]	117.0	48.6	49.9	68.2	113.0	46.6	47.8	65.4

Table 1. **3D dense captioning performance comparison on the TOD3Cap dataset**. The best-performing method is highlighted in **bold**. *Results from [16]. ↑: Higher values are better. LM: Language Model. The proposed MTA significantly outperforms the baseline TOD3Cap method and other state-of-the-art approaches across all metrics. When using Llama 3.2 as the language model, MTA achieves an 8.6% improvement on C@0.25 and a 9.2% improvement on C@0.5 compared to TOD3Cap. MTA shows similar improvements in the InternLM2 setting. These improvements are consistent across other metrics at both IoU thresholds of 0.25 and 0.5.

Method	LM	NDS↑	mAP↑	True Positive Metrics					Inference Complexity	
				mATE↓	mASE↓	mAOE↓	mAVE↓	mAAE↓	# Params	FPS
BEVFormer [20]	-	37.4	26.8	0.903	0.292	0.611	0.573	0.221	33.6 M	4.1
TOD3Cap [16]	Llama 3.2 [25]	37.7	26.6	<u>0.895</u>	0.290	**0.584**	0.570	0.219	33.6 M	4.1
MTA(Ours)	Llama 3.2 [25]	**38.9**	**27.9**	**0.878**	<u>0.285</u>	<u>0.595</u>	<u>0.541</u>	<u>0.213</u>	33.6 M	4.1
TOD3Cap [16]	InternLM2 [3]	37.7	26.8	0.905	0.288	0.596	0.562	0.215	33.6 M	4.1
MTA (Ours)	InternLM2 [3]	<u>38.4</u>	<u>27.6</u>	0.899	**0.281**	0.608	**0.540**	**0.212**	33.6 M	4.1

Table 2. **3D detection performance comparison on the nuScenes validation set**. The best-performing method is highlighted in **bold**, while the second-best method is indicated by an <u>underline</u>. LM: Language Model. The proposed MTA significantly outperforms the TOD3Cap method. Specifically, with Llama 3.2 as the language model, MTA surpasses TOD3Cap with a 3.2% improvement in NDS and a 4.9% improvement in mAP. Similar gains are observed when using InternLM2 as the language model. Note that MTA has same architecture as the baseline BEVFormer during inference, and thus it does not introduce additional complexity at runtime.

Method	Overall mAP	Object Frequency			Weather		Time of Day	
		Rare	Common	Frequent	Sunny	Rainy	Day	Night
BEVFormer	26.8	17.6	33.3	47.4	26.7	28.8	27.0	12.6
TOD3Cap	26.6	17.1	33.3	47.7	26.4	28.8	26.8	12.4
MTA (Ours)	**27.9**	**18.9**	**34.2**	**47.9**	**27.7**	**29.7**	**28.1**	**13.1**

Table 3. **mAP comparison on the nuScenes validation set across object frequency, weather conditions, and time of day.** The proposed MTA achieves the best performance across all scenarios, demonstrating robust generalization. Notable improvements are observed for rare objects (< 2% frequency) and nighttime conditions, where MTA outperforms TOD3Cap by 10.5% and 5.6%, respectively. (Object frequency: rare < 2%, common 2%–20%, frequent > 20%)

provements, aligning with those observed in the Llama 3.2 setting. These results highlight the effectiveness of MTA in enhancing the quality, relevance, and coherence of the generated captions, regardless of the language model used.

3D Detection Results. As shown in Tab. 2, MTA consistently outperforms the baseline models across almost all detection metrics. In this comparison, BEVFormer can be considered as the vision-only baseline, TOD3Cap as the vanilla multi-task learning baseline, and our proposed MTA as the aligned multi-task learning approach. In the Llama 3 setting, compared to the BEVFormer baseline, which was trained with the sole objective of maximizing detection performance, MTA achieves a 4.1% improvement in mAP. Similarly, MTA outperforms the TOD3Cap method, yielding a 4.9% increase in mAP. It is worth noting that the original TOD3Cap paper does not report detection results [16]. Hence, we retrained their model to obtain comparative numbers, which show a slight improvement in NDS and a slight drop in mAP compared to BEVFormer. We attribute this to the lack of alignment mechanisms focusing on both tasks in the original TOD3Cap method. Similar performance improvements are also observed in the InternLM2 setting.

Tab. 3 shows results on long-tail scenarios and challenging weather or day conditions. MTA demonstrates robust performance, achieving significantly improved performance over TOD3Cap with a 10.7% increase in mAP for rare classes and a 5.7% increase in nighttime conditions.

across all captioning metrics in both the Llama 3.2 and InternLM2 settings. In the Llama 3.2 setting, MTA boosts the performance of the TOD3Cap baseline by 9.7 points (8.6%) on C@0.25 and 10.0 points (9.2%) on C@0.5. These substantial gains in CIDEr scores suggest that the captions generated with MTA are more closely aligned with the ground-truth descriptions, in terms of both n-gram overlap and capturing the importance and relevance of the words within the context of the scene. Furthermore, MTA achieves improvements of 0.7 points (1.4%) on BLEU-4@0.25 and 0.9 points (1.9%) on BLEU-4@0.5, indicating enhanced fluency and grammatical correctness of the generated captions. Similar improvements are also observed for METEOR and ROUGE metrics at both IoU thresholds of 0.25 and 0.5. In the InternLM2 setting, MTA also demonstrates consistent im-

Figure 2. **Qualitative results comparing the proposed MTA with baseline methods on nuScenes and TOD3Cap datasets.** Visualization results show that MTA shows improved alignment with ground-truth detections over the counterpart methods. Captioning results show that the proposed MTA generates captions that are more accurate in terms of the description and localization of objects over the TOD3Cap. Unlike MTA, TOD3Cap labels object 1 (a bus) as a trash can in the caption, illustrating a heightened risk of hallucination. *We note that BEVFormer is only suited for perception tasks, thus caption is not provided.

These results highlight the effectiveness of the alignment mechanisms in MTA in enhancing the model's ability to handle long-tail scenarios.

Computational Complexity. One of the key advantages of MTA is that the BLA and DCA components are only used during training time. As a result, MTA does not require any architectural changes or introduce any additional complexity during inference, which is critical for real-world deployment. As shown in the last two columns of Tab. 2, the number of parameters and frames per second (FPS) values at inference time are the same for all three methods (evaluated on a single V100 GPU), as the detection architecture and parameters are identical. This highlights the practical applicability of MTA, as it achieves improved performance without compromising on inference speed or model size.

Qualitative Results. Fig. 2 presents a representative example to visualize the qualitative results on the nuScenes and TOD3Cap validation sets. The detection results demonstrate that MTA achieves superior detection quality and closer alignment with ground-truth detections compared to baseline methods. Similarly, the captioning results highlight MTA's effectiveness in producing captions that better match the ground-truth captions in terms of object description and localization compared to the TOD3Cap baseline. For instance, the caption generated by the TOD3Cap

method incorrectly identifies a bus as a trash can, while MTA accurately describes the object. These qualitative results demonstrate another crucial benefit of MTA's alignment mechanism: reducing the likelihood of generating hallucinated captions, which is essential for safety-critical applications like autonomous driving. The qualitative findings further confirm the quantitative results, demonstrating the effectiveness of MTA in achieving superior performance in both BEV perception and captioning tasks. Additional qualitative results are provided in the supplementary materials.

4.3. Ablation Study

We perform extensive ablation studies to validate the key design choices in the proposed MTA framework. We note that additional ablation studies and comprehensive experimental tables are provided in the supplementary materials.

BLA & DCA Module Analysis. To gain a better understanding of the individual contributions of the proposed BLA and DCA modules, we conduct an ablation study, as shown in Tab. 4. We analyze the performance of each module separately and in combination (MTA), comparing them to the baseline TOD3Cap model.

Notably, both the BLA and DCA mechanisms independently contribute to significant performance improvements over TOD3Cap. The BLA module has a particularly pro-

nounced effect on detection performance, as evidenced by substantial increases in NDS and mAP scores. This finding suggests that aligning BEV features with linguistic representations enhances the model's ability to accurately localize and classify objects within the 3D scene. In contrast, the DCA module has a stronger influence on captioning performance. This implies that enforcing consistency between detection and captioning outputs within the shared prompt space facilitates the generation of more accurate captions that are better grounded in the visual content. As a result, it reduces the occurrence of hallucinations or inconsistencies between the described objects and their spatial-temporal relationships within the scene. When both BLA and DCA modules are combined in our MTA framework, we achieve the best overall performance across all metrics, demonstrating the effectiveness of jointly optimizing 3D perception and captioning tasks through multimodal alignment.

Method	Captioning		Perception	
	C@0.5↑	B-4@0.5↑	NDS↑	mAP↑
TOD3Cap	108.7	46.7	37.7	26.6
+ BLA (Ours)	111.9	46.4	**38.9**	27.7
+ DCA (Ours)	113.6	46.4	38.7	27.5
+ MTA (Ours)	**118.7**	**47.6**	**38.9**	**27.9**

Table 4. **Ablation study on the contributions of the BLA and DCA mechanisms.** Both the BLA and DCA mechanisms independently enhance overall performance over the TOD3Cap baseline. Combining both modules in the MTA framework yields the highest performance across all metrics.

Effect of ℓ. We also investigate the impact of attaching the BLA objective to different layers of the Q-Former, where the total number of layers is $L = 8$. The results in Tab. 5 demonstrate that aligning at the middle layer yields the best performance. We hypothesize that aligning at an early stage forces the detection embedding to directly mimic the text embedding without sufficient interaction with the BEV features, potentially hindering the detection performance. Conversely, aligning at a later stage of the Q-Former leaves little room for the remaining layers to map the query to the MLLM space, considering that the text embedding from the text encoder $\mathcal{T}$ differs from the MLLM, which can impede the captioning performance. Consequently, in other experiments, we apply BLA to align the first half of the Q-Former layers, striking a balance between allowing the detection embedding to interact with the BEV features and providing sufficient capacity for mapping to the MLLM space.

BLA Layer ℓ	Captioning		Perception	
	C@0.5↑	B-4@0.5↑	NDS↑	mAP↑
1 (first)	111.2	**46.4**	38.4	27.3
4 (middle)	**111.9**	**46.4**	**38.9**	**27.7**
8 (last)	107.7	45.8	37.9	27.1

Table 5. **Ablating the BLA attachment layer ℓ.** Aligning at the middle layer achieves the best performance.

Alignment Objective. We compare three training objectives for BLA and DCA alignment modules: Mean Squared Error (MSE), Negative Cosine Similarity (Cos. Sim.), and the CLIP Contrastive Loss (CLIP) [33].

As shown in Tab. 6, we empirically find that for the BLA objective, the MSE and CLIP objectives offer advantages over the Cos. Sim., with MSE showing marginal advantages over the CLIP loss across all captioning and detection metrics. Therefore, we opt for MSE as the objective for BLA. In contrast, for the DCA objective, as presented in Tab. 7, the CLIP objective consistently outperforms MSE and Cos. Sim. across all metrics.

The difference in optimal objectives for BLA and DCA arises from their distinct alignment goals and the nature of the modalities being aligned. BLA focuses on aligning BEV features with linguistic representations, where the direct correspondence enforced by MSE proves effective. In contrast, DCA aims to align detection and captioning outputs within a shared prompt space, where the key is to establish correspondences between information in the two modalities. For example, consider the caption, "traffic cone about 7 meters away in the back left of the ego car." Here, the detection output should align the bounding box location with the spatial description "7 meters away in the back left," while the classification label should correspond with the object category "traffic cone" mentioned in the caption. The shared prompt space, leveraging the contrastive learning objective, proves effective.

BLA Objective	Captioning		Perception	
	C@0.5↑	B-4@0.5↑	NDS↑	mAP↑
CLIP	110.6	**46.4**	38.8	27.6
MSE	**111.9**	**46.4**	**38.9**	**27.7**
Cos. Sim.	110.3	46.3	38.5	27.3

Table 6. **Ablating the BLA objective.** Mean squared error (MSE) achieves the best overall performance.

DCA Objective	Captioning		Perception	
	C@0.5↑	B-4@0.5↑	NDS↑	mAP↑
CLIP	**113.6**	**46.4**	**38.7**	**27.5**
MSE	112.4	46.3	38.0	27.2
Cos. Sim.	113.1	**46.4**	38.3	**27.5**

Table 7. **Ablating the DCA objective.** The CLIP loss achieves the best results across all metrics.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced MTA, a novel multimodal task alignment framework that bridges the gap between BEV perception and captioning tasks, significantly enhancing performance on both tasks. MTA consists of two novel mechanisms: BEV-Language Alignment (BLA) and Detection-Captioning Alignment (DCA). BLA harnesses a multimodal contextual learning mechanism to align BEV-based visual representations and scene understanding with

ground-truth linguistic representations. DCA leverages a cross-modal prompting mechanism to align detection and captioning outputs. Through extensive quantitative and qualitative experiments, we demonstrated the effectiveness of MTA in achieving improved performance on both BEV perception and captioning tasks. Importantly, MTA's alignment mechanisms are active only during training, ensuring no additional computational cost during inference, which is a critical factor in autonomous driving applications.

References

[1] Satanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. METEOR: An Automatic Metric for MT Evaluation with Improved Correlation with Human Judgments. In *ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization*, 2005. 5

[2] Holger Caesar, Varun Bankiti, Alex H. Lang, Sourabh Vora, Venice Erin Liong, Qiang Xu, Anush Krishnan, Yu Pan, Giancarlo Baldan, and Oscar Beijbom. nuScenes: A Multimodal Dataset for Autonomous Driving. In *CVPR*, 2020. 2, 5

[3] Cai et al., Shanghai AI Laboratory, SenseTime Group, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, and Fudan University. InternLM2 Technical Report. *arXiv*, 2024. 5, 6

[4] Xu Cao, Tong Zhou, Yunsheng Ma, Wenqian Ye, Can Cui, Kun Tang, Zhipeng Cao, Kaizhao Liang, Ziran Wang, James M. Rehg, and Chao Zheng. MAPLM: A Real-World Large-Scale Vision-Language Dataset for Map and Traffic Scene Understanding. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3

[5] Li Chen, Penghao Wu, Kashyap Chitta, Bernhard Jaeger, Andreas Geiger, and Hongyang Li. End-to-end Autonomous Driving: Challenges and Frontiers. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024. 1

[6] Sijin Chen, Hongyuan Zhu, Xin Chen, Yinjie Lei, Tao Chen, and Gang YU. End-to-End 3D Dense Captioning with Vote2Cap-DETR. In *CVPR*, 2023. 2

[7] Sijin Chen, Hongyuan Zhu, Mingsheng Li, Xin Chen, Peng Guo, Yinjie Lei, Gang Yu, Taihao Li, and Tao Chen. Vote2Cap-DETR++: Decoupling Localization and Describing for End-to-End 3D Dense Captioning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024. 1, 5, 6

[8] Zhenyu Chen, Ali Gholami, Matthias Niessner, and Angel X. Chang. Scan2Cap: Context-Aware Dense Captioning in RGB-D Scans. In *CVPR*, 2021. 1, 2, 5, 6

[9] 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. In *CVPR*, 2024. 4

[10] Shengchao Hu, Li Chen, Penghao Wu, Hongyang Li, Junchi Yan, and Dacheng Tao. ST-P3: End-to-end Vision-based Autonomous Driving via Spatial-Temporal Feature Learning. In *ECCV*, 2022. 1

[11] Yihan Hu, Jiazhi Yang, Li Chen, Keyu Li, Chonghao Sima, Xizhou Zhu, Siqi Chai, Senyao Du, Tianwei Lin, Wenhai Wang, Lewei Lu, Xiaosong Jia, Qiang Liu, Jifeng Dai, Yu Qiao, and Hongyang Li. Planning-oriented Autonomous Driving. In *CVPR*, 2023. 1

[12] Jyh-Jing Hwang, Runsheng Xu, Hubert Lin, Wei-Chih Hung, Jingwei Ji, Kristy Choi, Di Huang, Tong He, Paul Covington, Benjamin Sapp, James Guo, Dragomir Anguelov, and Mingxing Tan. EMMA: End-to-End Multimodal Model for Autonomous Driving. *arXiv*, 2024. 3

[13] Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc V. Le, Yunhsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. Scaling Up Visual and Vision-Language Representation Learning With Noisy Text Supervision. In *ICML*, 2021. 3

[14] Xiaosong Jia, Zhenjie Yang, Qifeng Li, Zhiyuan Zhang, and Junchi Yan. Bench2Drive: Towards Multi-Ability Benchmarking of Closed-Loop End-To-End Autonomous Driving. In *NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2024. 1

[15] Bo Jiang, Shaoyu Chen, Qing Xu, Bencheng Liao, Jiajie Chen, Helong Zhou, Qian Zhang, Wenyu Liu, Chang Huang, and Xinggang Wang. VAD: Vectorized Scene Representation for Efficient Autonomous Driving. In *ICCV*, 2023. 1

[16] Bu Jin, Yupeng Zheng, Pengfei Li, Weize Li, Yuhang Zheng, Sujie Hu, Xinyu Liu, Jinwei Zhu, Zhijie Yan, Haiyang Sun, Kun Zhan, Peng Jia, Xiaoxiao Long, Yilun Chen, and Hao Zhao. TOD3Cap: Towards 3D Dense Captioning in Outdoor Scenes. In *ECCV*, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6

[17] Muhammad Uzair Khattak, Hanoona Rasheed, Muhammad Maaz, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. MaPLe: Multi-modal Prompt Learning. In *CVPR*, 2023. 3

[18] Boyi Li, Yue Wang, Jiageng Mao, Boris Ivanovic, Sushant Veer, Karen Leung, and Marco Pavone. Driving Everywhere with Large Language Model Policy Adaptation. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3

[19] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. BLIP-2: Bootstrapping Language-Image Pre-training with Frozen Image Encoders and Large Language Models. In *ICML*, 2023. 3

[20] Zhiqi Li, Wenhai Wang, Hongyang Li, Enze Xie, Chonghao Sima, Tong Lu, Yu Qiao, and Jifeng Dai. BEVFormer: Learning Bird's-Eye-View Representation from Multi-Camera Images via Spatiotemporal Transformers. In *ECCV*, 2022. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6

[21] Mingfu Liang, Jong-Chyi Su, Samuel Schulter, Sparsh Garg, Shiyu Zhao, Ying Wu, and Manmohan Chandraker. AIDE: An Automatic Data Engine for Object Detection in Autonomous Driving. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3

[22] Tingting Liang, Hongwei Xie, Kaicheng Yu, Zhongyu Xia, Zhiwei Lin, Yongtao Wang, Tao Tang, Bing Wang, and Zhi Tang. BEVFusion: A Simple and Robust LiDAR-Camera Fusion Framework. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 2

[23] Chin-Yew Lin. ROUGE: A Package for Automatic Evaluation of Summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, 2004. 5

[24] Zhijian Liu, Haotian Tang, Alexander Amini, Xinyu Yang, Huizi Mao, Daniela Rus, and Song Han. BEVFusion: Multi-

Task Multi-Sensor Fusion with Unified Bird's-Eye View Representation. In *ICRA*, 2023. 1, 2

[25] Llama Team, AI @ Meta. The Llama 3 Herd of Models. *arXiv*, 2024. 5, 6

[26] Yunsheng Ma, Wenqian Ye, Can Cui, Haiming Zhang, Shuo Xing, Fucai Ke, Jinhong Wang, Chenglin Miao, Jintai Chen, Hamid Rezatofighi, Zhen Li, Guangtao Zheng, Chao Zheng, Tianjiao He, Manmohan Chandraker, Burhaneddin Yaman, Xin Ye, Hang Zhao, and Xu Cao. Position: Prospective of Autonomous Driving - Multimodal LLMs, World Models, Embodied Intelligence, AI Alignment, and Mamba. In *WACVW*, pages 1010–1026, 2025. 1

[27] Srikanth Malla, Chiho Choi, Isht Dwivedi, Joon Hee Choi, and Jiachen Li. DRAMA: Joint Risk Localization and Captioning in Driving. In *WACV*, 2023. 2

[28] Jiageng Mao, Junjie Ye, Yuxi Qian, Marco Pavone, and Yue Wang. A Language Agent for Autonomous Driving. In *COLM*, 2024. 3

[29] Ana-Maria Marcu, Long Chen, Jan Hünermann, Alice Karnsund, Benoit Hanotte, Prajwal Chidananda, Saurabh Nair, Vijay Badrinarayanan, Alex Kendall, Jamie Shotton, and Oleg Sinavski. LingoQA: Video Question Answering for Autonomous Driving. In *ECCV*, 2024. 1

[30] Norman Mu, Jingwei Ji, Zhenpei Yang, Nate Harada, Haotian Tang, Kan Chen, Charles R. Qi, Runzhou Ge, Kratarth Goel, Zoey Yang, Scott Ettinger, Rami Al-Rfou, Dragomir Anguelov, and Yin Zhou. MoST: Multi-modality Scene Tokenization for Motion Prediction. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3

[31] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a Method for Automatic Evaluation of Machine Translation. In *ACL*, 2002. 5

[32] Tianwen Qian, Jingjing Chen, Linhai Zhuo, Yang Jiao, and Yu-Gang Jiang. NuScenes-QA: A Multi-Modal Visual Question Answering Benchmark for Autonomous Driving Scenario. In *AAAI*, 2024. 2

[33] 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. Learning Transferable Visual Models From Natural Language Supervision. In *ICML*, 2021. 3, 4, 8

[34] Chonghao Sima, Katrin Renz, Kashyap Chitta, Li Chen, Hanxue Zhang, Chengen Xie, Ping Luo, Andreas Geiger, and Hongyang Li. DriveLM: Driving with Graph Visual Question Answering. In *ECCV*, 2024. 1

[35] Ran Tian, Boyi Li, Xinshuo Weng, Yuxiao Chen, Edward Schmerling, Yue Wang, Boris Ivanovic, and Marco Pavone. Tokenize the World into Object-level Knowledge to Address Long-tail Events in Autonomous Driving. In *CoRL*, 2024. 3

[36] Xiaoyu Tian, Junru Gu, Bailin Li, Yicheng Liu, Chenxu Hu, Yang Wang, Kun Zhan, Peng Jia, Xianpeng Lang, and Hang Zhao. DriveVLM: The Convergence of Autonomous Driving and Large Vision-Language Models. In *CoRL*, 2024. 3

[37] Ramakrishna Vedantam, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. CIDEr: Consensus-based image description evaluation. In *CVPR*, 2015. 5

[38] Shihao Wang, Zhiding Yu, Xiaohui Jiang, Shiyi Lan, Min Shi, Nadine Chang, Jan Kautz, Ying Li, and Jose M. Alvarez. OmniDrive: A Holistic LLM-Agent Framework for Autonomous Driving with 3D Perception, Reasoning and Planning. *arXiv*, 2024. 2, 3

[39] Yue Wang, Vitor Guizilini, Tianyuan Zhang, Yilun Wang, Hang Zhao, and Justin Solomon. DETR3D: 3D Object Detection from Multi-view Images via 3D-to-2D Queries. In *CoRL*, 2021. 3

[40] Xinshuo Weng, Boris Ivanovic, Yan Wang, Yue Wang, and Marco Pavone. PARA-Drive: Parallelized Architecture for Real-time Autonomous Driving. In *CVPR*, 2024. 1

[41] Bin Xiao, Haiping Wu, Weijian Xu, Xiyang Dai, Houdong Hu, Yumao Lu, Michael Zeng, Ce Liu, and Lu Yuan. Florence-2: Advancing a Unified Representation for a Variety of Vision Tasks. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3

[42] Runsheng Xu, Zhengzhong Tu, Hao Xiang, Wei Shao, Bolei Zhou, and Jiaqi Ma. CoBEVT: Cooperative Bird's Eye View Semantic Segmentation with Sparse Transformers. In *CoRL*, 2022. 2

[43] Zhenhua Xu, Yujia Zhang, Enze Xie, Zhen Zhao, Yong Guo, Kwan-Yee K. Wong, Zhenguo Li, and Hengshuang Zhao. DriveGPT4: Interpretable End-to-end Autonomous Driving via Large Language Model. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2024. 1

[44] Chenyu Yang, Yuntao Chen, Hao Tian, Chenxin Tao, Xizhou Zhu, Zhaoxiang Zhang, Gao Huang, Hongyang Li, Yu Qiao, Lewei Lu, Jie Zhou, and Jifeng Dai. BEVFormer v2: Adapting Modern Image Backbones to Bird's-Eye-View Recognition via Perspective Supervision. In *CVPR*, 2023. 1, 2

[45] Xin Ye, Burhaneddin Yaman, Sheng Cheng, Feng Tao, Abhirup Mallik, and Liu Ren. BEVDiffuser: Plug-and-Play Diffusion Model for BEV Denoising with Ground-Truth Guidance. In *CVPR*, 2025. 2

[46] Lu Yuan, Dongdong Chen, Yi-Ling Chen, Noel Codella, Xiyang Dai, Jianfeng Gao, Houdong Hu, Xuedong Huang, Boxin Li, Chunyuan Li, Ce Liu, Mengchen Liu, Zicheng Liu, Yumao Lu, Yu Shi, Lijuan Wang, Jianfeng Wang, Bin Xiao, Zhen Xiao, Jianwei Yang, Michael Zeng, Luowei Zhou, and Pengchuan Zhang. Florence: A New Foundation Model for Computer Vision. *arXiv*, 2021. 3

[47] Zhihao Yuan, Xu Yan, Yinghong Liao, Yao Guo, Guanbin Li, Zhen Li, and Shuguang Cui. X-Trans2Cap: Cross-Modal Knowledge Transfer using Transformer for 3D Dense Captioning. In *CVPR*, 2022. 5, 6

[48] Renrui Zhang, Jiaming Han, Chris Liu, Peng Gao, Aojun Zhou, Xiangfei Hu, Shilin Yan, Pan Lu, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Qiao. LLaMA-Adapter: Efficient Fine-tuning of Language Models with Zero-init Attention. In *ICLR*, 2024. 4, 5

[49] Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Learning to Prompt for Vision-Language Models. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 2022. 3