

EVLM: Self-Reflective Multimodal Reasoning for Cross-Dimensional Visual Editing

Umar Khalid¹, Hasan Iqbal², Azib Farooq³, Nazanin Rahnavard¹, Jing Hua², Chen Chen¹

¹Center for Research in Computer Vision, University of Central Florida, USA

²Department of Computer Science, Wayne State University, USA

³Miami University, USA

{umar.khalid, nazanin.rahnavard, chen.chen}@ucf.edu, {hasan.iqbal, jing.hua}@wayne.edu




Figure 1. **EVLM facilitated editing across 2D, 3D, and 4D tasks.** In each editing scenario, EVLM takes as input a reference image, video, text instruction, or a combination of these modalities and generates precise editing instructions to modify the original content. For example, EVLM supported with [3] changes object colors (e.g., *“Turn the Pink Rose into Red”*) in one of the above 2D editing results. Although another option could be changing the glove color, EVLM naturally chooses to edit the rose color as there is no reference text to alter the gloves appearance. In 3D editing, EVLM applies stylistic transformations, with a simple text as input: *“Give Style”*, and understand the emulation of Van Gogh’s portrait style is required on a monocular video of a face, with a reference image and text. In 4D editing, EVLM performs texture and dynamic transformations, as shown in *“Turn him into a Silver Statue”* and *Turn him into a Makoto Shinkai hero,* where the input is a video. The examples in the third row highlight the model’s understanding of object addition. With vague instructions like *“Cover his eyes”* and an image grid containing both glasses and a person, EVLM intuitively outputs the instruction *“Give him black shades”*. These results demonstrate EVLM’s ability to interpret context, reference image, and textual cues across multiple editing dimensions.

Abstract

Editing complex visual content based on ambiguous instructions remains a challenging problem in vision-

language modeling. While existing models can contextualize content, they often struggle to grasp the underlying intent within a reference image or scene, leading to misaligned edits. We introduce the Editing Vision-



Figure 2. Reference image and prompt for the editing task: "An Einstein Face!" The reference includes an image with a mustache and the image-with-text "Green Jacket." These were provided to GPT-4o, along with supporting prompts (details in *supplementary*), to guide the generation of accurate editing instructions. GPT-4o encountered challenges integrating textual, visual, and OCR information to produce coherent instructions. Despite multiple attempts, DALL-E 3 guided by GPT-4o was unable to generate the desired edited image that fully aligns with the *reference intent*.

Language Model (EVLM), a system designed to interpret such instructions in conjunction with reference visuals, producing precise and context-aware editing prompts. Leveraging Chain-of-Thought (CoT) reasoning and KL-Divergence Target Optimization (KTO) alignment technique, EVLM captures subjective editing preferences without requiring binary labels. Fine-tuned on a dataset of 30,000 CoT examples, with rationale paths rated by human evaluators, EVLM demonstrates substantial improvements in alignment with human intentions. Experiments across image, video, 3D, and 4D editing tasks show that EVLM generates coherent, high-quality instructions, supporting a scalable framework for complex vision-language applications.

1. Introduction

Recent strides in text-to-image (T2I) generation [20, 44, 46], driven by the advancements in diffusion models [19, 53], have yielded impressive results in generating high-quality images that align closely with natural language descriptions. This success has spurred a range of image editing techniques [3, 4, 22, 58, 59, 72, 74, 79] which leverage diffusion models to offer diverse and powerful editing capabilities. Notably, instruction-based methods [3, 24, 38] have gained significant attention, enabling users to modify images intuitively with simple language inputs. *However, as editing tasks grow in complexity, can these methods handle vague instructions effectively? How can they maintain contextual integrity while capturing the user’s intended visual transformations?*

Motivation. Recent approaches [15, 75] have begun integrating Large Language Models (LLMs) with diffusion

models to automatically refine textual instructions. While promising, these methods often struggle to capture the nuanced visual concepts intended by the user as illustrated in Figure 2, where GPT-4o faces challenges in simultaneously integrating textual, visual, and OCR information to generate coherent editing instructions and effectively perform editing tasks. To address this limitation, we introduce the Editing Vision-Language Model (EVLM), specifically designed to interpret unclear textual cues while flexibly handling any reference modality—whether images, videos, or textual hints—alongside the original content. EVLM is uniquely capable of handling diverse reference modalities and can seamlessly leverage information from other modalities when one—such as textual or visual cues—is ambiguous. Furthermore, EVLM autonomously identifies and distinguishes between reference and original images, generating optimized editing instructions based on imprecise inputs. These refined instructions can then be fed into text-conditioned diffusion models like IP2P [3], enabling more accurate and context-aware image edits.

A unique aspect of EVLM is its ability to deduce relationships between the reference and original images. This requires substantial reasoning capabilities, especially in complex visual contexts. Yet, existing Vision-Language Models (VLMs) often rely on datasets with brief responses and limited rationales, impeding their capacity for deep reasoning [33, 60, 71]. Moreover, no current VLM has been tailored explicitly for editing tasks, raising a fundamental question: *How can VLMs be adapted to support reasoning-driven, context-sensitive editing tasks?*




Figure 3. Directly providing the reference and original images to Llama-3.2-90B-Vision-Instruct [11] does not yield the intended editing prompt. For instance, the model fails to recognize that a style transfer is required in this scenario, even when few-shot examples and Chain-of-Thought (CoT) reasoning are included in the prompt.

To address this, we introduce an alignment technique that incorporates Chain-of-Thought (CoT) with reflection

reasoning specifically designed for visual editing tasks. Using Llama-3.2-90B-Vision-Instruct[11] as a baseline model (see Figure 3), we observe that even with few-shot prompt engineering, existing models struggle to interpret the relationship between reference and original images accurately. EVLM bridges this gap with advanced reasoning and intent-understanding capabilities, achieved through fine-tuning on a curated dataset of 30,000 Chain-of-Thought examples, meticulously generated with GPT-4o and validated by human feedback.

Furthermore, EVLM’s reasoning capabilities are enhanced through KL-Divergence Target Optimization (KTO), where rationale paths generated by GPT-4o are aligned to match the quality of desired responses as rated by human evaluators. Given the inherent subjectivity of the editing task, we assume there are no strictly *wrong* instructions or *reasoning* paths; instead, certain instructions are simply more desired. This perspective led us to model our training using the KTO algorithm, making us the first to investigate KTO’s effectiveness in vision-language modeling. By aligning EVLM with the stylistic expectations of human raters without binary preference signals, this KTO-aligned variant, EVLM-KTO, demonstrates significant improvements in generating coherent, context-aware instructions across diverse visual editing tasks. The reasoning-with-reflection framework not only elevates EVLM’s performance but also opens new pathways for leveraging KTO in vision-language processing applications. Our key contributions in this work are as follows:

- A specialized Vision-Language Model that interprets ambiguous instructions using reference visuals to generate optimized prompts for diffusion models, supporting nuanced, context-aware editing.
- A high-quality Chain-of-Thought dataset with 30,000 examples generated by GPT-4o and refined by human raters, enhancing EVLM’s reasoning and instruction generation.
- We employ KL-Divergence Target Optimization to align EVLM’s outputs with desired rationales, addressing subjectivity in editing tasks without binary preference signals.
- Extensive evaluations on image, video, 3D, and 4D editing tasks show EVLM’s versatility. Its reasoning-with-reflection framework extends to broader vision-language applications (see Fig. 1).

2. Related Work

2.1. Reflection in Language Models

In recent studies, reflection in language models has been largely centered on enabling models to assess and adjust their own responses at the inference stage (*i.e.*, self-reflection). This area of research can be categorized by

the type of feedback utilized. Some approaches have provided models with external feedback mechanisms, such as through code execution results or expert critique [5, 51]. Other studies encourage models to rely solely on their internal knowledge for response adjustments [30, 34], though opinions differ on the reliability of this approach [21]. For certain tasks, like math word problems, models can employ reverse verification, where the answer is re-applied to verify the initial question, supporting answer accuracy [63, 66].

2.2. Alignment and Reasoning in Vision LLMs

Research into vision-language models (VLMs) has explored their reasoning abilities across a variety of areas, including mathematical problem-solving [33, 60], higher education topics [71], and scientific queries [32]. Some studies, such as [14, 73], specifically train VLMs to produce sequential solutions for mathematical or chart-based tasks, while others, like [49], focus on developing VLMs capable of chain-of-thought (CoT) reasoning for object localization. Enhancing VLM alignment with large language models (LLMs) has been approached using preference-based optimization methods, such as Direct Preference Optimization (DPO) [9, 40, 54, 70], and Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) [54], which aim to boost factual accuracy while reducing hallucination in model outputs. To strengthen reasoning in LLMs, iterative DPO techniques have been applied to improve mathematical CoT reasoning, supporting consistent accuracy and coherence across complex reasoning tasks [41, 48, 55]. KL-Divergence Target Optimization (KTO) [12] in large language models (LLMs) is another alignment technique that optimizes the model’s outputs to closely match a reference distribution, typically reflecting desired qualities or styles. Instead of relying on explicit positive and negative feedback pairs, KTO uses KL-divergence to minimize the distance between the model’s generated outputs and a target model’s distribution. This approach is particularly useful for aligning the model with nuanced human preferences in subjective tasks, as it adjusts the model’s behavior to mirror a reference standard without strict binary rewards, resulting in outputs that are contextually coherent and stylistically consistent.

Diffusion-Based Editing. Diffusion-based generative models have shown notable success in text-guided image editing [3, 6, 18, 37, 43, 47, 56]. Adapting these models to video editing, however, presents challenges in managing visual attributes while preserving temporal coherence. Approaches like Tune-A-Video [65], Make-A-Video [52], and MagicVideo [76] address this by extending Text-to-Image (T2I) models into Text-to-Video (T2V) frameworks using spatio-temporal attention or self-attention mechanisms. Techniques inspired by Prompt-to-Prompt [18] and Plug-and-Play [56] further adapt T2I models for localized video




Figure 4. **Illustration of the data preparation pipeline.** On the left, the input setup includes a reference image and an original image, prompting GPT-4o to generate a structured Chain-of-Thought (CoT) rationale. This rationale proceeds through stages of initial thinking, *intermediate* output generation, and reflective refinement, ultimately producing a final output. *Only the thinking, reflection, and final output are parsed to construct the training data.* On the right, human annotators assess the rationale, marking it as “Desired” if it aligns with the intended transformation, providing target labels for KTO training. This pipeline enables EVLM to internalize nuanced reasoning paths, enhancing context-aware visual editing precision.

editing [65]. Recent work also explores T2I models as 2D priors to modify 3D scenes, as in Instruct 3D-to-3D [23] and Instruct-NeRF2NeRF (IN2N) [16], which employ IP2P [3] for instruction-based editing of NeRFs. ViCA-NeRF [10] extends IN2N by using depth information to propagate edits across views, and DreamEditor [78] applies SDS loss to optimize mesh-based neural fields for precise text-driven editing. Control4D [50] introduces a continuous 4D space, learning a 4D GAN from ControlNet [72] to tackle supervision inconsistencies in 4D portrait editing.

3. Approach

EVLM is designed to autonomously generate editing instructions and identify target objects for modification in images or videos based on multimodal inputs. The model takes in a reference input (which could be an image, video, text, or any combination of these modalities) and an original visual input (image or video) and outputs a precise set of editing instructions along with the label of the object requiring modification. Our pipeline includes three main stages: (A) Data Preparation 3.1, (B) Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) with reflection 3.2, (C) Subjective Instruction Alignment using KL-Divergence Target Optimization (KTO) 3.3.

3.1. Data Preparation

To prepare EVLM for nuanced, subjective editing tasks, we curated a dataset comprising nearly 30,000 training samples with diverse input combinations. The dataset includes a variety of input formats, from individual reference images to grids combining multiple reference images or frames, ensuring EVLM encounters a range of visual and textual cues

for generating context-aware editing prompts. Each sample includes a reference (image, text, or video) and an original input (image or video), allowing EVLM to learn from a wide range of multimodal editing contexts (details are in *supplementary*).

Each data sample is augmented with a rationale generated by GPT-4o, specifically using reflective reasoning. We prompt GPT-4o to first generate a detailed rationale—essentially a reflective explanation of its reasoning—followed by the editing instruction itself. This rationale serves to provide an underlying reasoning path that human evaluators can review, rating each as “desired” or “not desired” based on how well it aligns with subjective preferences for the editing task. This reflective approach to rationale generation allows modelling subtle variations in instruction quality during SFT, without requiring explicit positive-negative pairs.

With the dataset prepared, including rationales that capture nuanced reasoning, the next step is to perform Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) on EVLM, training it to incorporate these reflective reasoning paths to improve coherence and alignment in instruction generation.

3.2. Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) with Reflection

Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) with Reflection in EVLM focuses on refining the model’s capability to generate thoughtful, step-by-step responses for Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prediction tasks. We perform SFT by prompting the model to “Generate a reason first and then output an editing prompt,” encouraging the model to articulate its rationale before providing the editing instruction. This prompt structure guides EVLM to produce reasoning first, followed

by the editing instruction itself, with identity tags clearly separating each component. As shown in Fig. 4, this structured approach improves interpretability and facilitates accurate extraction during evaluation by systematically separating the rationale from the final output.

Reflective Reasoning Framework. To enhance training data for image transformations, we introduce a multi-step reflective reasoning framework comprising *initial reasoning*, *intermediate output generation*, and *reflective refinement*. Each stage progressively aligns the transformation instruction with the desired outcome, as shown in Fig. 4.

- **Initial Reasoning:** At this stage, the model assesses the primary elements in the original and reference images, forming a preliminary transformation goal. This generates an initial output, reflecting the model’s understanding of key elements in the original image that need adaptation.
- **Intermediate Output Generation:** Based on the initial reasoning, an intermediate instruction is produced to define the initial transformation approach. This phase enables the model to articulate its preliminary solution and serves as a foundational step for further refinement.
- **Reflective Refinement:** The model reflects on the intermediate output, considering whether it fully aligns with the intended transformation style or context of the reference image. This reflective adjustment leads to a refined instruction that more accurately captures the desired outcome. The final training data is constructed by parsing only the reflective thinking and the final refined instruction, ensuring alignment with the reference style.

This framework supports the model in internalizing and generalizing transformation principles through iterative reasoning, enhancing adaptability and precision in diverse editing scenarios.

3.3. KL-Divergence Target Optimization (KTO) for Subjective Alignment

To enhance the quality of reasoning chains, we introduce an adaptation of **KL-Divergence Target Optimization (KTO)** tailored for subjective alignment in visual language modeling tasks. This KTO-based approach aims to optimize EVLM’s response generation to align with a human-preferred reference distribution, ρ_{ref} , which encapsulates stylistic and contextual preferences. The objective of KTO is to minimize the divergence between EVLM’s output distribution, ρ_ϕ , and ρ_{ref} , ensuring alignment with human evaluators’ preferences. Given the subjective nature of editing tasks, KTO focuses on minimizing misalignment rather than enforcing strict correctness, by leveraging desirable outputs rated by human evaluators.

Formally, we define the dataset for KTO as $\mathcal{S}_{\text{KTO}} = \{(\mathcal{V}, u, y_{\text{pref}})\}$, where \mathcal{V} represents the visual context, u is the input instruction, and y_{pref} is the preferred response as

rated by human evaluators. The KTO objective can be expressed as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{KTO}}(\rho_\phi; \rho_{\text{ref}}) = \mathbb{E}_{(\mathcal{V}, u, y_{\text{pref}}) \sim \mathcal{S}_{\text{KTO}}} [w(s_\phi(u, y_{\text{pref}}) - \eta_0)], \quad (1)$$

where $s_\phi(u, y_{\text{pref}}) = \log \frac{\rho_\phi(y_{\text{pref}} | u, \mathcal{V})}{\rho_{\text{ref}}(y_{\text{pref}} | u, \mathcal{V})}$ represents the relative reward between the model’s output and the reference, and η_0 denotes the baseline divergence, calculated as:

$$\eta_0 = \text{KL}(\rho_\phi(y' | u, \mathcal{V}) \| \rho_{\text{ref}}(y' | u, \mathcal{V})). \quad (2)$$

This baseline divergence serves as a control term, mitigating excessive deviations from human-preferred outputs to maintain a desired stylistic and contextual alignment.

Modified Value Function. To capture human sensitivity in alignment, we utilize a modified value function $w(\cdot)$ inspired by the Kahneman-Tversky prospect theory [12]. The function is defined as:

$$w(s_\phi(u, y_{\text{pref}}) - \eta_0) = \alpha \cdot \sigma(\gamma \cdot (s_\phi(u, y_{\text{pref}}) - \eta_0)), \quad (3)$$

where σ is a logistic function that introduces diminishing returns as alignment improves. Here, α is a scaling factor for alignment with preferred responses, while γ modulates the rate of conservativeness in output generation.

Reference Divergence Approximation. Since computing the exact divergence η_0 across all outputs is computationally expensive, we approximate η_0 by sampling from a batch of size n , creating pairs (u_i, y_j) where y_j is selected from the batch but $i \neq j$. This approximation is given by:

$$\hat{\eta}_0 = \max \left(0, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \neq j} \log \frac{\rho_\phi(y_j | u_i, \mathcal{V}_i)}{\rho_{\text{ref}}(y_j | u_i, \mathcal{V}_i)} \right). \quad (4)$$

This approximation anchors the model within a human-centered subjective framework, ensuring contextual adaptability.

Dynamic Handling of Preferred and Non-Preferred Responses To enhance alignment across varying response preferences, we extend KTO to handle both preferred and non-preferred responses by introducing separate scaling parameters, α_P and α_N , for preferred and non-preferred responses, respectively. This allows the model to prioritize alignment with preferred responses and penalize non-preferred ones, particularly useful in minimizing critical errors in sensitive applications.

The combined KTO objective for both response types is formulated as:

$$L_{\text{KTO}}(\rho_\phi, \rho_{\text{ref}}) = \mathbb{E}_{u, y \sim \mathcal{S}} [\alpha_y - w(u, y)], \quad (5)$$

where $w(u, y)$ is defined as:

$$w(u, y) = \begin{cases} \alpha_P \sigma(\gamma(s_\phi(u, y) - \eta_0)) & \text{if } y \in y_{\text{pref}} \\ \alpha_N \sigma(\gamma(\eta_0 - s_\phi(u, y))) & \text{if } y \in y_{\text{non-pref}} \end{cases}$$



Figure 5. **Image Editing Results Using Reference Images or Text Prompts.** The first row demonstrates EVLM’s ability to refine vague textual prompts into precise editing instructions. For example, given the reference text “Army Camouflage Bag,” EVLM generates a refined prompt such as “*Turn his bag into an Army bag*,” which is used by the T2I [3] model. Additionally, EVLM identifies the object label “bag” to serve as input for Grounded-SAM to create a mask. The results, compared with the baseline text-based editing diffusion model IP2P, show improved control over the editing process. In the second row, we compare EVLM with an image-based editing framework, CSGO [67]. EVLM effectively interprets reference images, such as identifying a “Paint Brush,” to guide transformations. It provides the T2I [3] model with accurate editing instructions and masks, highlighting its ability to deliver precise guidance and achieve superior visual editing outcomes.

This formulation ensures an emphasis on preferred outputs, while penalizing non-preferred responses, thereby improving EVLM’s alignment with human judgments.

4. Experiments

Model Architecture. Our model is based on the Qwen2-VL-7B [61] architecture, which combines a 675M parameter Vision Encoder and a 7.6B parameter Language Model (LLM) to enhance multimodal capabilities. A key feature is Naive Dynamic Resolution, enabling the model to handle images of varying resolutions by dynamically converting them into flexible visual tokens [8]. This is achieved by removing absolute position embeddings in the Vision Transformer (ViT) and incorporating 2D-RoPE, which captures two-dimensional positional information. Another enhancement, Multimodal Rotary Position Embedding (M-RoPE), enables efficient positional encoding across text, images, and video by decomposing rotary embeddings into tempo-

Table 1. Accuracy Comparison of EVLM with Baseline Models Using Large LLM Evaluators on MME benchmark.

| Model | Gemini Pro 1.5 | LLAMA 405B | GPT-4o | Claude-3.5 Sonnet | Average Accuracy |
|--------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------|
| mPLUG-Owl [68] | 44.8 | 45.1 | 43.3 | 42.7 | 43.9 |
| mPLUG-Owl2 [69] | 50.2 | 51.6 | 51.3 | 49.5 | 50.7 |
| LLAVA [31] | 48.3 | 46.8 | 47.2 | 45.9 | 47.1 |
| MiniGPT-4 [77] | 43.7 | 44.1 | 42.5 | 45.3 | 43.9 |
| CogVLM [62] | 41.4 | 42.2 | 40.7 | 39.6 | 41.0 |
| InstructBLIP [7] | 47.6 | 46.9 | 48.4 | 47.2 | 47.5 |
| Qwen-VL [2] | 49.3 | 50.4 | 48.6 | 47.8 | 49.1 |
| LLAMA-3.2-11B [11] | 55.5 | 57.2 | 56.3 | 54.8 | 55.9 |
| LLAMA-3.2-90B [11] | 64.7 | 63.5 | 66.1 | 64.3 | 64.8 |
| EVLM-KTO | 95.4 | 94.8 | 96.2 | 95.1 | 95.4 |

Table 2. Comparison of LLAMA-11B, Qwen2-7B, LLAVA 1.6 (Vicuna 7B), and EVLM on Common Benchmarks.

| Benchmark | LLAMA-11B | Qwen2-7B | LLAVA 1.6 (Vicuna 7B) | EVLM (KTO) |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| MMMU (val, CoT) [71] | 50.7 | 54.1 | 35.8 | 53.0 |
| MMMU-Pro, Vision (test) [71] | 33.0 | 43.5 | - | 43.8 |
| MathVista (testmini) [33] | 51.5 | 58.2 | 34.6 | 59.1 |
| ChartQA (test, CoT) [35] | 83.4 | 83.0 | - | 82.8 |
| A12 Diagram (test) [25] | 91.1 | 83.0 | - | 83.0 |
| DocVQA (test) [36] | 88.4 | 94.5 | - | 93.1 |
| VQAv2 (test) [36] | 75.2 | - | 81.8 | 77.4 |

ral, height, and width components [61]. This approach allows precise positional modeling across modalities.

Evaluations. The evaluation of EVLM’s performance on our MME benchmark uses a binary classification approach to determine if the generated editing instructions align with the ground truth. Large language models, including Gemini Pro 1.5, LLAMA 405B [11], GPT-4o [1], and Claude-3.5 Sonnet, assess whether EVLM’s output conveys the same meaning as the ground truth by responding “YES” or “NO.” As shown in Table 1, accuracy is calculated as the percentage of “YES” responses across 3,000 samples from our MME benchmark dataset. This measure highlights EVLM’s ability to produce precise, contextually aligned instructions, outperforming baseline models.

Table 2 highlights EVLM’s strong performance across a variety of benchmarks, consistently achieving top results even compared to larger models like LLAMA-11B. Notably, EVLM reaches 59.1 on MathVista, outperforming all other models, and achieves the highest score of 43.8 on MMMU-Pro Vision, underscoring its superior visual




Figure 6. **Text-based Editing for Video, 3D, and 4D.** Examples of editing results generated by EVLM guided T2I [3] diffusion model across video, 3D, and 4D tasks. For video editing, EVLM guided editing is compared with Any-V2V [28] and Tune-a-Video [65], where it demonstrates improved style consistency, as seen in the “Bronze” and “Van Gogh Style Jacket” examples. In the 3D editing task, EVLM is compared with IN2N and IG2G for prompt-based edits like “Black trousers” and “Bronze shirt,” showing superior control and alignment. In the 4D editing task, EVLM applies transformations like “Van Gogh’s Self Portrait” and “Bronze Statue” with high consistency across frames, surpassing baseline methods such as Instruct 4D-to-4D. In these examples, EVLM serves as a *prompt refinement* tool, identifying the object to be edited and providing labels to Grounded-SAM, which then guides [3] to achieve the desired visual edits.

reasoning and comprehension abilities. While it performs slightly lower than LLAMA-11B on ChartQA and AI2 Diagram, EVLM remains highly competitive, and it performs best on DocVQA (93.1) among models of similar or smaller size, demonstrating its effectiveness in document comprehension. These results emphasize EVLM’s efficient generalization, proving that its KTO-based fine-tuning with our MME benchmark enables it to excel in real-world tasks without needing increased model parameters.

4.1. Additional Evaluations

As discussed, EVLM is designed specifically to generate precise editing instructions. It serves as a plug-and-play model capable of processing any input modality to produce refined textual guidance for Diffusion models in editing tasks. Next, we demonstrate that integrating EVLM with IP2P [3] yields high-quality results in cross-dimensional visual editing tasks.

Image and Video Editing. For image editing, we utilize EVLM to refine the editing prompt and pinpoint the object to be modified. Grounded-SAM [45] generates the mask, after which the image editing is executed. As shown in Figure 5, we compare our approach with CSGO [67], which

uses an image as a reference, and IP2P [3], which relies on a text reference. Our EVLM+IP2P framework demonstrates superior control and understanding, effectively integrating both textual and visual cues. We further extend our EVLM+IP2P pipeline for video editing by following the Tune-A-Video recipe [65], an report results in Figure 6. We compare our results with Any-V2V [28] and TAV [65] using textual prompts, where our approach demonstrates superior control and consistency.

3D Editing & 4D Editing. We conduct 3D editing evaluations, comparing our approach with the baselines IN2N [17] and IG2G [57] methods, using the IN2N [17] and 3DEgo [27] datasets. For 3D scene reconstruction, we employ the 3D Gaussian Splatting technique [26]. Further, we perform evaluations on dynamic scene editing task using 4D scenes captured by single hand-held cameras and multi-camera arrays, including: (I) *Monocular* scenes from the DyCheck [13] and HyperNeRF [42] datasets, which feature simple, object-centric scenes with a moving camera; and (II) *Multi-camera* scenes from the DyNeRF/N3DV [29] datasets, which capture indoor scenes involving face-forward perspectives and human motion. The framework in [64] serves as the backbone for 4D scene re-




Figure 7. **Image as a reference.** Examples of 3D and 4D editing results generated using EVLM, where the model outputs context-aware editing instructions based on a reference image and an original video. EVLM autonomously interprets the editing rationale; for instance, in the first example, it identifies the brown dustbin as a shared element between the original and reference images and generates an optimal editing instruction: *"Give the car pink color and make recycle bins brown"* to achieve require editing with IP2P diffusion module.

construction, while the iterative dataset updating process follows the approach outlined in [39]. Our 3D and 4D qualitative results are presented in Figures 6 and 7, demonstrating that EVLM-guided editing surpasses other baselines in achieving controlled and consistent editing.

Table 3. **Ablations.** Effect of Alpha Ratio (α_P/α_N) and Gamma (γ) on Accuracy (MME Benchmark)

| Alpha Ratio (α_P/α_N) | Accuracy (%) | Gamma Value (γ) | Accuracy (%) |
|--|--------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| 0.5 | 93.5 | 0.05 | 93.0 |
| 0.75 | 94.2 | 0.10 | 93.8 |
| 1.0 | 95.4 | 0.20 | 95.4 |
| 1.5 | 94.8 | 0.30 | 94.5 |
| 2.0 | 94.0 | 0.50 | 94.0 |

Ablations on α_P/α_N Ratio and γ (Gamma). This ablation study examines the impact of the α_P/α_N ratio and γ on EVLM’s accuracy. We find that setting α_P/α_N to 1.0 achieves optimal accuracy, indicating that balanced weighting between desirable and undesirable outputs aligns best with human preferences. Deviations from this balance result in reduced accuracy, likely due to over- or under-penalization. For γ , moderate values (around 0.2 to 0.3) yield the highest accuracy, as they provide a balanced conservativeness in model responses.

Ablations on Training and Prompting Techniques for EVLM Optimization. Ablations performed in Figure 8 highlight that aligning model with direct responses (EVLM-Direct) does not result in strong performance, even when CoT prompting is employed during inference. While CoT prompting generally improves accuracy compared to Direct Prompting, the superior performance of EVLM-KTO demonstrates the importance of refined and reflective alignment techniques for achieving optimal results.




Figure 8. Ablation study results for EVLM training methods with different prompting types. CoT Prompting consistently outperforms Direct Prompting, with EVLM-KTO yielding the best accuracy overall.

5. Conclusion

We present EVLM, a Vision-Language Model tailored for visual editing, designed to resolve ambiguities in text-based instructions by leveraging reference visuals. By integrating Chain-of-Thought (CoT) reasoning and KL-Divergence Target Optimization (KTO), EVLM aligns with human-preferred styles, managing subjectivity without strict positive-negative pairs. Fine-tuned on a curated dataset of 30,000 CoT examples, EVLM excels in generating context-aware, optimized editing prompts across image, video, 3D, and 4D scenarios. Our experiments confirm EVLM’s superiority in adaptability and accuracy over baselines, demonstrating its robustness in diverse editing tasks. This framework opens doors for reasoning-driven applications in areas like augmented reality and interactive media, with future work focusing on expanding CoT and refining KTO alignment for enhanced performance in complex scenarios.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023. 6
- [2] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-vl: A versatile vision-language model for understanding, localization, text reading, and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12966*, 1(2):3, 2023. 6
- [3] Tim Brooks, Aleksander Holynski, and Alexei A Efros. Instructpix2pix: Learning to follow image editing instructions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18392–18402, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7
- [4] Xi Chen, Yutong Feng, Mengting Chen, Yiyang Wang, Shilong Zhang, Yu Liu, Yujun Shen, and Hengshuang Zhao. Zero-shot image editing with reference imitation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07547*, 2024. 2
- [5] Xinyun Chen, Maxwell Lin, Nathanael Schärli, and Denny Zhou. Teaching large language models to self-debug. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 3
- [6] Guillaume Couairon, Jakob Verbeek, Holger Schwenk, and Matthieu Cord. Diffedit: Diffusion-based semantic image editing with mask guidance. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. 3
- [7] Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale Fung, and Steven Hoi. Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning, 2023. 6
- [8] Mostafa Dehghani, Basil Mustafa, Josip Djolonga, Jonathan Heek, Matthias Minderer, Mathilde Caron, Andreas Steiner, Joan Puigcerver, Robert Geirhos, Ibrahim M Alabdulmohsin, et al. Patch n’pack: Navit, a vision transformer for any aspect ratio and resolution. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 6
- [9] Yihe Deng, Pan Lu, Fan Yin, Ziniu Hu, Sheng Shen, James Zou, Kai-Wei Chang, and Wei Wang. Enhancing large vision language models with self-training on image comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19716*, 2024. 3
- [10] Jiahua Dong and Yu-Xiong Wang. Vica-nerf: View-consistency-aware 3d editing of neural radiance fields. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 4
- [11] 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 preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024. 2, 3, 6
- [12] Kawin Ethayarajh, Winnie Xu, Niklas Muennighoff, Dan Jurafsky, and Douwe Kiela. Kto: Model alignment as prospect theoretic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01306*, 2024. 3, 5
- [13] Hang Gao, Ruilong Li, Shubham Tulsiani, Bryan Russell, and Angjoo Kanazawa. Monocular dynamic view synthesis: A reality check. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:33768–33780, 2022. 7
- [14] Jiahui Gao, Renjie Pi, Jipeng Zhang, Jiacheng Ye, Wanjun Zhong, Yufei Wang, Lanqing Hong, Jianhua Han, Hang Xu, Zhenguo Li, et al. G-llava: Solving geometric problem with multi-modal large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11370*, 2023. 3
- [15] Yuying Ge, Sijie Zhao, Chen Li, Yixiao Ge, and Ying Shan. Seed-data-edit technical report: A hybrid dataset for instructional image editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04007*, 2024. 2
- [16] Ayaan Haque, Matthew Tancik, Alexei Efros, Aleksander Holynski, and Angjoo Kanazawa. Instruct-nerf2nerf: Editing 3d scenes with instructions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023. 4
- [17] Ayaan Haque, Matthew Tancik, Alexei A Efros, Aleksander Holynski, and Angjoo Kanazawa. Instruct-nerf2nerf: Editing 3d scenes with instructions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 19740–19750, 2023. 7
- [18] Amir Hertz, Ron Mokady, Jay Tenenbaum, Kfir Aberman, Yael Pritch, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Prompt-to-prompt image editing with cross attention control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.01626*, 2022. 3
- [19] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:6840–6851, 2020. 2
- [20] Jonathan Ho, William Chan, Chitwan Saharia, Jay Whang, Ruiqi Gao, Alexey Gritsenko, Diederik P Kingma, Ben Poole, Mohammad Norouzi, David J Fleet, et al. Imagen video: High definition video generation with diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02303*, 2022. 2
- [21] Jie Huang, Xinyun Chen, Swaroop Mishra, Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Adams Wei Yu, Xinying Song, and Denny Zhou. Large language models cannot self-correct reasoning yet. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01798*, 2023. 3
- [22] Nisha Huang, Yuxin Zhang, Fan Tang, Chongyang Ma, Haibin Huang, Weiming Dong, and Changsheng Xu. Diffstyler: Controllable dual diffusion for text-driven image stylization. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2024. 2
- [23] Hiromichi Kamata, Yuiko Sakuma, Akio Hayakawa, Masato Ishii, and Takuya Narihira. Instruct 3d-to-3d: Text instruction guided 3d-to-3d conversion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15780*, 2023. 4
- [24] Bahjat Kawar, Shiran Zada, Oran Lang, Omer Tov, Huiwen Chang, Tali Dekel, Inbar Mosseri, and Michal Irani. Imagic: Text-based real image editing with diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6007–6017, 2023. 2
- [25] Aniruddha Kembhavi, Mike Salvato, Eric Kolve, Minjoon Seo, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ali Farhadi. A diagram is worth a dozen images. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*,

- October 11–14, 2016, *Proceedings, Part IV 14*, pages 235–251. Springer, 2016. 6
- [26] Bernhard Kerbl, Georgios Kopanas, Thomas Leimkühler, and George Drettakis. 3d gaussian splatting for real-time radiance field rendering. *ACM Transactions on Graphics (ToG)*, 42(4):1–14, 2023. 7
- [27] Umar Khalid, Hasan Iqbal, Azib Farooq, Jing Hua, and Chen Chen. 3dego: 3d editing on the go! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10102*, 2024. 7
- [28] Max Ku, Cong Wei, Weiming Ren, Huan Yang, and Wenhu Chen. Anyv2v: A plug-and-play framework for any video-to-video editing tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14468*, 2024. 7
- [29] Tianye Li, Mira Slavcheva, Michael Zollhoefer, Simon Green, Christoph Lassner, Changil Kim, Tanner Schmidt, Steven Lovegrove, Michael Goesele, Richard Newcombe, et al. Neural 3d video synthesis from multi-view video. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5521–5531, 2022. 7
- [30] Yanhong Li, Chenghao Yang, and Allyson Ettinger. When hindsight is not 20/20: Testing limits on reflective thinking in large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024. 3
- [31] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2024. 6
- [32] Pan Lu, Swaroop Mishra, Tanglin Xia, Liang Qiu, Kai-Wei Chang, Song-Chun Zhu, Oyvind Tafjord, Peter Clark, and Ashwin Kalyan. Learn to explain: Multimodal reasoning via thought chains for science question answering. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:2507–2521, 2022. 3
- [33] Pan Lu, Hritik Bansal, Tony Xia, Jiacheng Liu, Chunyuan Li, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Hao Cheng, Kai-Wei Chang, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. Mathvista: Evaluating mathematical reasoning of foundation models in visual contexts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02255*, 2023. 2, 3, 6
- [34] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, et al. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 3
- [35] 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 preprint arXiv:2203.10244*, 2022. 6
- [36] Minesh Mathew, Dimosthenis Karatzas, and CV Jawahar. Docvqa: A dataset for vqa on document images. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, pages 2200–2209, 2021. 6
- [37] Chenlin Meng, Yang Song, Jiaming Song, Jiajun Wu, Jun-Yan Zhu, and Stefano Ermon. Sdedit: Image synthesis and editing with stochastic differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.01073*, 2021. 3
- [38] Ron Mokady, Amir Hertz, Kfir Aberman, Yael Pritch, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Null-text inversion for editing real images using guided diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6038–6047, 2023. 2
- [39] Linzhan Mou, Jun-Kun Chen, and Yu-Xiong Wang. Instruct 4d-to-4d: Editing 4d scenes as pseudo-3d scenes using 2d diffusion. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 20176–20185, 2024. 8
- [40] Yassine Ouali, Adrian Bulat, Brais Martinez, and Georgios Tzimiropoulos. Clip-dpo: Vision-language models as a source of preference for fixing hallucinations in lvlms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.10433*, 2024. 3
- [41] Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Weizhe Yuan, Kyunghyun Cho, He He, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, and Jason Weston. Iterative reasoning preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.19733*, 2024. 3
- [42] Dong Huk Park, Samaneh Azadi, Xihui Liu, Trevor Darrell, and Anna Rohrbach. Benchmark for compositional text-to-image synthesis. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 1)*, 2021. 7
- [43] Gaurav Parmar, Krishna Kumar Singh, Richard Zhang, Yijun Li, Jingwan Lu, and Jun-Yan Zhu. Zero-shot image-to-image translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.03027*, 2023. 3
- [44] Aditya Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. Zero-shot text-to-image generation. In *ICML*, pages 8821–8831. PMLR, 2021. 2
- [45] Tianhe Ren, Shilong Liu, Ailing Zeng, Jing Lin, Kunchang Li, He Cao, Jiayu Chen, Xinyu Huang, Yukang Chen, Feng Yan, et al. Grounded sam: Assembling open-world models for diverse visual tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14159*, 2024. 7
- [46] Robin Rombach, Andreas Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and Björn Ommer. High-resolution image synthesis with latent diffusion models. In *CVPR*, pages 10684–10695, 2022. 2
- [47] Nataniel Ruiz, Yuanzhen Li, Varun Jampani, Yael Pritch, Michael Rubinstein, and Kfir Aberman. Dreambooth: Fine tuning text-to-image diffusion models for subject-driven generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 22500–22510, 2023. 3
- [48] Amrith Setlur, Saurabh Garg, Xinyang Geng, Naman Garg, Virginia Smith, and Aviral Kumar. RL on incorrect synthetic data scales the efficiency of llm math reasoning by eight-fold. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.14532*, 2024. 3
- [49] Hao Shao, Shengju Qian, Han Xiao, Guanglu Song, Zhuofan Zong, Letian Wang, Yu Liu, and Hongsheng Li. Visual cot: Unleashing chain-of-thought reasoning in multi-modal language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16999*, 2024. 3
- [50] Ruizhi Shao, Jingxiang Sun, Cheng Peng, Zerong Zheng, Boyao Zhou, Hongwen Zhang, and Yebin Liu. Control4d: Dynamic portrait editing by learning 4d gan from 2d diffusion-based editor. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20082*, 2023. 4
- [51] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: language agents

- with verbal reinforcement learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 8634–8652. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023. 3
- [52] Uriel Singer, Adam Polyak, Thomas Hayes, Xi Yin, Jie An, Songyang Zhang, Qiyuan Hu, Harry Yang, Oron Ashual, Oran Gafni, Devi Parikh, Sonal Gupta, and Yaniv Taigman. Make-a-video: Text-to-video generation without text-video data. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. 3
- [53] Y. Song and S. Ermon. Improved techniques for training score-based generative models. In *Proceedings of NeurIPS*, pages 12438–12448, 2020. 2
- [54] Zhiqing Sun, Sheng Shen, Shengcao Cao, Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yikang Shen, Chuang Gan, Liang-Yan Gui, Yu-Xiong Wang, Yiming Yang, et al. Aligning large multi-modal models with factually augmented rlhf. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14525*, 2023. 3
- [55] Zhiqing Sun, Longhui Yu, Yikang Shen, Weiyang Liu, Yiming Yang, Sean Welleck, and Chuang Gan. Easy-to-hard generalization: Scalable alignment beyond human supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.09472*, 2024. 3
- [56] Narek Tumanyan, Michal Geyer, Shai Bagon, and Tali Dekel. Plug-and-play diffusion features for text-driven image-to-image translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.12572*, 2022. 3
- [57] Cyrus Vachha and Ayaan Haque. Instruct-gs2gs: Editing 3d gaussian splats with instructions, 2024. 7
- [58] Haofan Wang, Qixun Wang, Xu Bai, Zekui Qin, and Anthony Chen. Instantstyle: Free lunch towards style-preserving in text-to-image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02733*, 2024. 2
- [59] Haofan Wang, Peng Xing, Renyuan Huang, Hao Ai, Qixun Wang, and Xu Bai. Instantstyle-plus: Style transfer with content-preserving in text-to-image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.00788*, 2024. 2
- [60] Ke Wang, Junting Pan, Weikang Shi, Zimu Lu, Mingjie Zhan, and Hongsheng Li. Measuring multimodal mathematical reasoning with math-vision dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14804*, 2024. 2, 3
- [61] Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, et al. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*, 2024. 6
- [62] Weihang Wang, Qingsong Lv, Wenmeng Yu, Wenyi Hong, Ji Qi, Yan Wang, Junhui Ji, Zhuoyi Yang, Lei Zhao, Xixuan Song, Jiazheng Xu, Bin Xu, Juanzi Li, Yuxiao Dong, Ming Ding, and Jie Tang. Cogvlm: Visual expert for pretrained language models, 2023. 6
- [63] Yixuan Weng, Minjun Zhu, Fei Xia, Bin Li, Shizhu He, Shengping Liu, Bin Sun, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. Large language models are better reasoners with self-verification. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023. 3
- [64] Guanjun Wu, Taoran Yi, Jiemin Fang, Lingxi Xie, Xiaopeng Zhang, Wei Wei, Wenyu Liu, Qi Tian, and Xinggang Wang. 4d gaussian splatting for real-time dynamic scene rendering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 20310–20320, 2024. 7
- [65] Jay Zhangjie Wu, Yixiao Ge, Xintao Wang, Stan Weixian Lei, Yuchao Gu, Yufei Shi, Wynne Hsu, Ying Shan, Xiaohu Qie, and Mike Zheng Shou. Tune-a-video: One-shot tuning of image diffusion models for text-to-video generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 7623–7633, 2023. 3, 4, 7
- [66] Zhenyu Wu, Qingkai Zeng, Zhihan Zhang, Zhaoxuan Tan, Chao Shen, and Meng Jiang. Large language models can self-correct with key condition verification. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2024. 3
- [67] Peng Xing, Haofan Wang, Yanpeng Sun, Qixun Wang, Xu Bai, Hao Ai, Renyuan Huang, and Zechao Li. Csgo: Content-style composition in text-to-image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.16766*, 2024. 6, 7
- [68] Qinghao Ye, Haiyang Xu, Guohai Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Yiyang Zhou, Junyang Wang, Anwen Hu, Pengcheng Shi, Yaya Shi, et al. mplug-owl: Modularization empowers large language models with multimodality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14178*, 2023. 6
- [69] Qinghao Ye, Haiyang Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Anwen Hu, Haowei Liu, Qi Qian, Ji Zhang, and Fei Huang. mplug-owl2: Revolutionizing multi-modal large language model with modality collaboration. In *2024 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 13040–13051. IEEE, 2024. 6
- [70] Tianyu Yu, Haoye Zhang, Yuan Yao, Yunkai Dang, Da Chen, Xiaoman Lu, Ganqu Cui, Taiwen He, Zhiyuan Liu, Tat-Seng Chua, et al. Rlaif-v: Aligning mllms through open-source ai feedback for super gpt-4v trustworthiness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17220*, 2024. 3
- [71] 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 *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9556–9567, 2024. 2, 3, 6
- [72] Lvmin Zhang and Maneesh Agrawala. Adding conditional control to text-to-image diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05543*, 2023. 2, 4
- [73] Liang Zhang, Anwen Hu, Haiyang Xu, Ming Yan, Yichen Xu, Qin Jin, Ji Zhang, and Fei Huang. Tinychart: Efficient chart understanding with visual token merging and program-of-thoughts learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16635*, 2024. 3
- [74] Yuxin Zhang, Nisha Huang, Fan Tang, Haibin Huang, Chongyang Ma, Weiming Dong, and Changsheng Xu. Inversion-based style transfer with diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10146–10156, 2023. 2
- [75] Haozhe Zhao, Xiaojian Ma, Liang Chen, Shuzheng Si, Ruijie Wu, Kaikai An, Peiyu Yu, Minjia Zhang, Qing Li, and Baobao Chang. Ultraedit: Instruction-based fine-grained im-

- age editing at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.05282*, 2024. [2](#)
- [76] Daquan Zhou, Weimin Wang, Hanshu Yan, Weiwei Lv, Yizhe Zhu, and Jiashi Feng. Magicvideo: Efficient video generation with latent diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.11018*, 2022. [3](#)
- [77] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592*, 2023. [6](#)
- [78] Jingyu Zhuang, Chen Wang, Liang Lin, Lingjie Liu, and Guanbin Li. Dreameditor: Text-driven 3d scene editing with neural fields. In *SIGGRAPH Asia 2023 Conference Papers*, pages 1–10, 2023. [4](#)
- [79] Junhao Zhuang, Yanhong Zeng, Wenran Liu, Chun Yuan, and Kai Chen. A task is worth one word: Learning with task prompts for high-quality versatile image inpainting, 2023. [2](#)