

# VG-TVP: Multimodal Procedural Planning via Visually Grounded Text-Video Prompting

Muhammet Furkan Ilaslan<sup>1, 2\*</sup>, Ali Koksal<sup>2</sup>, Kevin Qinghong Lin<sup>1</sup>, Burak Satar<sup>2</sup>,  
Mike Zheng Shou<sup>1</sup>, Qianli Xu<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Show Lab, National University of Singapore, Singapore

<sup>2</sup>Institute for Infocomm Research, Agency for Science, Technology, and Research (A\*STAR), Singapore  
{m.furkanilaslan, qinghonglin}@u.nus.edu, mike.zheng.shou@gmail.com  
{stuimf, koksali.ali, burak\_satar, qxu}@i2r.a-star.edu.sg

## Abstract

Large Language Model (LLM)-based agents have shown promise in procedural tasks, but the potential of multimodal instructions augmented by texts and videos to assist users remains under-explored. To address this gap, we propose the Visually Grounded Text-Video Prompting (VG-TVP) method which is a novel LLM-empowered Multimodal Procedural Planning (MPP) framework. It generates cohesive text and video procedural plans given a specified high-level objective. The main challenges are achieving textual and visual informativeness, temporal coherence, and accuracy in procedural plans. VG-TVP leverages the zero-shot reasoning capability of LLMs, the video-to-text generation ability of the video captioning models, and the text-to-video generation ability of diffusion models. VG-TVP improves the interaction between modalities by proposing a novel Fusion of Captioning (FoC) method and using Text-to-Video Bridge (T2V-B) and Video-to-Text Bridge (V2T-B). They allow LLMs to guide the generation of visually-grounded text plans and textual-grounded video plans. To address the scarcity of datasets suitable for MPP, we have curated a new dataset called Daily-Life Task Procedural Plans (Daily-PP). We conduct comprehensive experiments and benchmarks to evaluate human preferences (regarding textual and visual informativeness, temporal coherence, and plan accuracy). Our VG-TVP method outperforms unimodal baselines on the Daily-PP dataset.

**Dataset** — <https://github.com/mfurkanilaslan/VG-TVP>

## Introduction

To acquire procedural knowledge, such as operating a machine, a person can refer to procedure plans, which specify the steps to achieve a task. Procedure plans may take different formats such as text, image, video, and a combination of them. Procedure Planning (PP) is the process of generating procedure plans. Depending on the modality of procedure plans, PP can be implemented using different methods and various sources of information. For example, LLMs have been used to generate procedure plans either in a zero-shot manner (Huang et al. 2022) or by fusing information from various resources (e.g. WikiHow) (Lu et al. 2023b).

\* Corresponding author.



Figure 1: VG-TVP generates MPP with multiple steps for a high-level goal, supplying textual and visual guidelines.

Instructional videos (IVs) are a useful source of information on procedural knowledge. It provides a rich context of the task steps and effectively incorporates the temporal information essential for procedural knowledge learning. However, the quality of IVs might be inconsistent and it usually involves considerable effort of a human learner to understand the information and acquire the knowledge. To address this issue, one may resort to computational methods to parse the IVs and use the extracted visual elements to generate informative procedure plans. This necessitate several capabilities, such as semantics understanding (Zhukov et al. 2019), action-step prediction (Niu et al. 2024), and scene understanding (Zhou et al. 2023). However, existing IVs may lack complete procedural information or contain visual content that does not align with the semantic plans. Hence, generating video content in association with the textual plans is desirable to form the final procedure plans.

In this paper, we aim to improve PP by generating multimodal content from different resources, including IVs. We are interested in enhancing human understanding by integrating visually grounded text and action-based video generations (Figure 1). Inspired by Text-to-Image Prompting (TIP) (Lu et al. 2023b), we cast the problem as MPP via Visually Grounded Text-Video Prompting (VG-TVP) (Figure 2). VG-TVP generates video-enhanced action and state procedures given text descriptions of a task and IVs, which is in contrast to generating image plans and using their descriptions as text plans (Lu et al. 2023b; Soucek et al. 2024).

We anticipate that video-augmented procedure plans are advantageous to image-augmented ones (Lu et al. 2023b; Ramesh et al. 2021) because images focus on the static “states” of the task, whereas videos display dynamic changes of “states” with human-centred “actions”. However, the challenges faced by TIP, including textual-visual informativeness, coherent temporal alignment, and high-level accurate plan generations (Lu et al. 2023b), become even more prominent in MPP. In particular, the *framework* needs to ensure both temporal consistency (i.e. coherent temporal alignment between text and video plans) and spatial consistency (i.e. subsequent video steps must logically follow preceding ones in actions, objects, and contexts). Existing generative models, including LLMs and multimodal LLMs (MLLMs), cannot adequately address these challenges.

We propose a novel video-to-text–text-to-video (V2T-T2V) methodology that enhances the capability of LLMs for MPP tasks. Given the high-level goal-oriented task description, we first use LLMs to generate vanilla text plans. Meanwhile, we generate video captions from given IVs via V2T-Bridge (V2T-B). Subsequently, LLMs compile captions from various IVs to form a cohesive “*Fusion of Captioning (FoC)*” (Figure 3) that adheres to the required steps. We leverage the *LLMs’* capabilities by eliciting video captions and vanilla text plans to generate final revised text plans. Finally, video plans are generated by considering the generated text plans. Consequently, generated video plans are aligned with the generated text plans through VG-TVP.

Video-augmented PP is advantageous to IVs in several aspects. First, generated videos (a few seconds for each step) focus on the task steps, making them concise and relevant to the task. This may help alleviate the cognitive efforts of human learners than if they watch lengthy videos ( $\approx 5 - 10$  minutes) with much auxiliary information and time management. Second, the structured PP format could also improve the clarity and reliability of the MPP content, which facilitates self-paced learning. Third, using well-crafted prompts, we guide the video generation module to generate human-centred content, i.e. showing human actions whenever possible (Figure 5). This potentially helps reduce users’ cognitive load owing to a smaller cognitive gap than if only state changes of the scene (without humans) are visualized.

VG-TVP addresses 3 major technical challenges: (1) *Costly structure of foundational models (FM)*. Although FMs are proficient in text generation, they must be trained with visual information. Training of data-hungry FMs from scratch demands high costs. In contrast, VG-TVP employs 3 distinct components that strategically leverage each other’s

inputs and outputs, thereby eliminating the need to train separate models for specific tasks. (2) *Alignment between procedures in IVs and generated text plans*. This challenge is addressed by FoC collaborating with VG-TVP alignment prompt. (3) *Inadequacy of video captioning models to capture detailed MPP*. Captioning algorithms aim to capture the descriptions of the scenes, instead of detailed MPP. For instance, VLog (Lin and Lei 2023) focuses on different aspects such as image, region, and the audio in the videos. Although it uses the latest LLMs, image, and audio models, it is not capable of combining the multimodal procedures for MPP tasks. A multimodal pre-trained video captioning model is proposed, focusing on dense events in the videos to capture descriptions in the same sequence (Yang et al. 2023). However, it only captures instructions, not coherent MPPs. In short, although existing methods are capable of captioning, additional information is required to generate MPPs.

The contributions of the study are four-fold. (1) We design a multi-modal framework, VG-TVP, that employs zero-shot prompting and avoids the costly training procedure. (2) We propose a novel method, FoC, which removes irrelevant contents in IVs, aligns mismatched steps between video captions and generates relevant text plans. They provide detailed MPP in the absence of IVs by exploiting video captions. (3) We propose Video-to-Text (V2T) and Text-to-Video (T2V) bridges to generate visually grounded text and video plans that are temporally coherent and accurate in planning. (4) We introduce a well-curated dataset called the Daily-Life Task Procedural Plans (Daily-PP) to mitigate the challenges in existing datasets for MPP content. VG-TVP’s results show superior performance in the zero-shot setting compared to several baselines under the Daily-PP dataset.

## Related Works

### Video Understanding for Procedural Planning

There has been remarkable progress achieved in understanding IVs via various problem statements (Kuehne, Arslan, and Serre 2014; Miech et al. 2019; Ilaslan et al. 2023; Zhou, Xu, and Corso 2018; Chang et al. 2020). While prior studies handle the problems via fully (Elhamifar and Naing 2019; Zhu and Yang 2020) or weakly-supervised (Zhukov et al. 2019; Zhao et al. 2022) or unsupervised settings (Alayrac et al. 2016), others focus on step discovery (Dvornik et al. 2023), prompting (Lu et al. 2023a) or diffusion models (Fang et al. 2023; Wang et al. 2023a; Lian et al. 2023). Unlike existing studies, we focus on generating visually grounded text-video pairs to obtain coherent MPPs.

### Multimodal Generation

Zero-shot planners (Huang et al. 2022; Song et al. 2023) or reasoners (Kojima et al. 2022) have leveraged the natural language generation capabilities of LLMs. While these efforts have yielded promising results, developing LLMs with multimodal content generation capabilities may lead to broader practical impacts. Although the performance of T2V models lagged behind that of Text-to-Image (T2I) models (Ramesh et al. 2021), recent advances have enhanced T2V performances (Zhou et al. 2022; Singer et al. 2023;




Figure 2: VG-TVP Model: Given the textual input and multiple instructional videos, VG-TVP generates visually grounded textual plans and video plans by using V2T-B and T2V-B. ChatGPT 3.5 is used to reorganize all captions to generate FoC.

Khachatryan et al. 2023; Wu et al. 2023). Existing models lack robustness as exhibited by LLMs in text generation, highlighting the need for advanced LLM-based frameworks for MPP tasks. Unlike existing models, VG-TVP leverages LLM capabilities for MPP tasks, offering dynamic, and comprehensive guidance through video generation in a human-centered manner.

### Integration of Visual Knowledge

IVs contain complex visual procedural knowledge that should be integrated into LLMs by reducing the complexity. Thus, it has been integrated with different methods such as usage of given images or generated texts as additional features (Yang et al. 2022; Lu et al. 2023b). However, image data results in inadequate descriptions of task actions since it provides only static information. To address that, VG-TVP harnesses IVs' captions to integrate visual knowledge into LLMs, leveraging their zero-shot reasoning capability. Moreover, in the PP tasks, integrated visual knowledge must be aligned for coherent outcomes (Shen, Wang, and Elhamifar 2021; Dvornik et al. 2023) which is a challenge for MPP tasks. To address that, we propose a method to combine video captions and vanilla text systematically.

### VG-TVP Approach

We propose two key ideas in a methodology. The first idea involves generating MPPs for the tasks by exploiting their IVs, which is called "SEEN" (Idea 1). For the "SEEN" tasks, the model utilizes the relevant task IVs and captures their

captions. Finally, video captions of these "SEEN" tasks and vanilla text plans are aligned to generate visually grounded text and video plans. The "UNSEEN" tasks (Idea 2) which the model has not previously encountered, involve generating MPPs for tasks that lack IVs. For example, "Cooking Kimchi Fried Rice" and "Cooking Szechuan Chicken" are two "SEEN" tasks under the Daily-PP dataset. We propose an exploration of "Cooking Chicken Fried Rice" as an "UNSEEN" task by utilizing the captions of "Cooking Kimchi Fried Rice" and "Cooking Szechuan Chicken".

### Problem Statement

We formulate the problem as a visually grounded textual-video pairs alignment and generation task.  $G^V$  is given multiple IVs which represent high-level goal videos, and  $G^T$  is given textual input which denotes high-level goal texts, provided by the user in natural language. The model's output is a comprehensive multimodal procedural plan, represented as Goal Plan,  $G^P$ . It comprises the final sequence of visually-grounded text plan  $TP = \{\{pt_1, pc_1\}, \{pt_2, pc_2\}, \dots, \{pt_n, pc_n\}\}$  and video plan  $VP = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$  pairs. In this notation,  $pt_i$  represents the text of the final revised textual plan and  $pc_i$  denotes its corresponding context. Consequently,  $G^P = \{TP, VP\}$  is generated by merging 3 multimodal features: vanilla text generation, video captioning via V2T-Bridge, and video generation via T2V-Bridge.

## Method

We leverage the zero-shot reasoning ability of LLMs to generate vanilla text plans by proposing a step-by-step prompting template. To enhance the MPP, we propose the VG-TVP model (Figure 2), applying V2T-B and T2V-B for generating a comprehensive multimodal procedural plan.

**Vanilla Text Plan Generation.** The model generates vanilla text plans for the steps called Vanilla Textual Plan (VTP),  $VTP = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}$  via vanilla prompt template function,  $f_{prompt}(vanilla)$ . This is a natural language format “What’s the step-by-step procedure for <[TASK]>?” used to elicit information from LLMs shown in Figure 2. Inspired by the TIP approach (Lu et al. 2023b), we adopt the zero-shot chain-of-thought approach (Kojima et al. 2022) for VTP generation. For example, for “Cooking Spaghetti” task, the input text will be “What’s the step-by-step procedure for How to Cook Spaghetti?”. Each step represents a VTP paired with text and context at timestamp  $i$ ,  $s_i = \{t_i, ct_i\}$ . While  $T = \{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n\}$  represents the VTP-text,  $CT = \{ct_1, ct_2, \dots, ct_n\}$  denotes VTP-context generation. The initial text plan VTP is derived using  $f_{prompt}(vanilla)$  focused on the specified <[TASK]>.

**Fusion of Captioning.** We employ VLog model (Lin and Lei 2023) which integrates the capabilities of ChatGPT (OpenAI 2023), BLIP2 (Li et al. 2023), GRIT (Du, Rush, and Cardie 2021), Whisper (Radford et al. 2023) models. VLog generates video captions from 3 modalities: image, region, and audio. Our framework excludes audio captions as some videos lacked speech or significant auditory content. Thus, we follow the visual information. V2T-B is the method that textualizes the scenes of IVs by using a video captioning algorithm. For example, in the “apple juice” task, given that the 3rd caption of the 1st IV represents the step “wooden cutting board with sliced apples on it” between 17 – 26 seconds (sec), similar steps appear in the 4th IV at 39 – 50 sec, and the 7th IV at 9 – 19 sec in the 2nd step (not in 3rd). In other IVs’ captions, steps similar to “pouring water into a blender” are included in different steps. Therefore, FoC reorders and aligns the steps for vanilla textual matching (Figure 15 in the Appendix). FoC is insufficient for completing the MPP alone. It provides additional visual information to VG-TVP for generating MPP tasks. Consequently, we formulate the V2T-B as  $FoC = f_{captions} \oplus \{(G^V), f_{prompt}(description)\}$ . The Description prompt is “According to the captions above, then prepare the logical video captions for the task procedures of the <[TASK]> step-by-step in a sentence template of <person> <verb> <action>?”. Detailed video captions and FoC can be found in the supplementary materials.

### Visually-Grounded Textual and Video Plan Generation.

There has been a shift toward leveraging LLMs for visual generations (Yu et al. 2023; Blattmann et al. 2023), moving beyond the conventional use of diffusion models. Specifically, (Lin et al. 2023) equipped with image annotations and a GPT4-based video planner, is prone to generating unnecessary instructions for PP tasks. For instance, “A hungry cat is finding food.” prompt in (Lin et al. 2023) leads LLMs to




Figure 3: FoC captures and fuses IVs’ captions. Then, it injects into the system by aligning them with vanilla textual.

segment the generated narrations into scenes. VG-TVP focuses on generating MPP to assist humans rather than storytelling or directing videos. VG-TVP’s *GoalPlan* is the final sequence of visually-grounded text plan (TP) and video plan (VP) pairs,  $G^P = \{TP, VP\}$ . However, multimodal generation brings an alignment challenge. Thus, we propose FoC collaborating with VG-TVP alignment prompt to revise VTPs and tackle this challenge.

Text-video alignment is essential for maintaining consistency and coherence between textual and visual plans. It synchronizes procedural steps across modalities, enabling users to correlate textual instructions with relevant generated videos and follow the instructions accurately. This aids comprehension and enhances the learning experience by offering unified and coherent instructions. We formulate the prompt alignment with the integration of VTPs and FoC via a prompt template:  $TP = f_{prompt}(alignment) \oplus \{(FoC), (VTP)\}$ . Alignment prompt represents “Rewrite the step-by-step procedures of <[TASK]> by using video captions pair-wisely in a template <text>, <context> and

VG-TVP (Ours) versus	Textual Informative			Visual Informative			Temporal Coherence			Plan Accuracy		
	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose
Llama2-7B-q4	<b>44.00</b>	40.00	16.00	<b>74.00</b>	2.00	24.00	<b>68.00</b>	8.00	24.00	<b>74.00</b>	6.00	20.00
Llama2-7B-q8	<b>52.00</b>	22.00	26.00	<b>62.00</b>	18.00	20.00	<b>62.00</b>	24.00	14.00	<b>70.00</b>	12.00	18.00
Llama2-13B-q4	<b>40.00</b>	24.00	36.00	<b>46.00</b>	10.00	44.00	<b>42.00</b>	34.00	24.00	40.00	18.00	<b>42.00</b>
Llama2-13B-q8	20.00	<b>48.00</b>	32.00	<b>56.00</b>	18.00	26.00	36.00	<b>44.00</b>	20.00	<b>46.00</b>	22.00	32.00
Mistral-7B-q4	<b>58.00</b>	26.00	16.00	<b>56.00</b>	12.00	32.00	<b>52.00</b>	20.00	28.00	<b>48.00</b>	28.00	24.00
Mistral-7B-q8	<b>54.00</b>	22.00	24.00	<b>58.00</b>	14.00	28.00	<b>46.00</b>	34.00	20.00	<b>56.00</b>	16.00	28.00
GPT3.5	<b>40.00</b>	24.00	36.00	<b>56.00</b>	12.00	32.00	<b>54.00</b>	14.00	32.00	<b>56.00</b>	10.00	34.00
TIP Model	<b>71.43</b>	21.43	7.14	<b>57.14</b>	21.43	21.43	<b>42.86</b>	35.71	21.43	<b>42.86</b>	28.57	28.57

Table 1: Percentages of human evaluation comparisons between VG-TVP (Ours), baseline models by employing different LLMs (first 7 rows), and TIP (Lu et al. 2023b) for SEEN tasks. Win represents the preferred option for VG-TVP.

<visual> separately.”. We follow this alignment to generate the relevant task videos which compose the Video Plan,  $VP = (T2V-B) \oplus (TP)$ .  $VP$  is derived by employing T2V-B which exploits a sequence of visually-grounded text plan  $TP$ . Then, we generate relevant tasks’ video plans by using ModelScope (Wang et al. 2023b). Consequently, a visually grounded approach leverages both text and visual information to tackle the alignment and coherency challenges.

## Experiments

Baselines utilize text/context to generate text-aligned inclusive vanilla video plans. On the other hand, VG-TVP exploits vanilla text and FoC to generate visually grounded MPP content to assist individuals. We use a Win-Tie-Lose comparison on 50 seen and 15 unseen tasks, involving 28 human subjects for benchmarking. VG-TVP generated 2,504 videos for “seen” and 687 for “unseen” tasks, while baselines produced 2,701 and 681 vanilla textual videos, respectively. We included 2 tasks from WikiPlan&RecipePlan, TIP model (Lu et al. 2023b), to facilitate a fair benchmarking. Moreover, we conduct one more comparison with 2 different prompts (in the Appendix). This comparison aims to compare the effectiveness of injecting human orientation into text and video plans with VG-TVP against prompting. The qualitative results display that human orientation is more effectively integrated with VG-TVP. Additionally, we measure the textual relevance between generated baselines’ and VG-TVP’s text plans with reference text plans using BLEU (Papineni et al. 2002), and METEOR (Banerjee and Lavie 2005). Finally, we design an LLM (via ChatGPT4o) (with Socratic Method (Chang 2023)) evaluation protocol to evaluate baselines and VG-TVP on 4 aspects as in the human evaluation metric. Each scored out of 25 points, to assess the quality of task plans. The details are in the Appendix.

### Daily-PP Dataset

Existing datasets are not suitable for the MPP content generation. Specifically, CrossTask (Zhukov et al. 2019), lacked specified task patterns, making it difficult to use for PP analysis. COIN (Tang et al. 2019), does not align with the structure needed for our research. Similarly, ProceL (Elhamifar and Naing 2019) required updates to meet the specific demands of IV analysis. WikiPlan&RecipePlan (Lu et al.

2023b) is not precisely tailored for following a structured task sequence. Thus, we curated a new dataset - called *Daily-Life Task Procedural Plans (Daily-PP)* - to better align with MPP content, drawing inspiration from the strengths and addressing the limitations of existing collections.

The Daily-PP consists of 5 domains (Breakfast, Dinner, Drink, Hobby&Crafts, and Home&Garage), 50 seen tasks, and 15 unseen tasks. Seen tasks include 7 or 10 IVs from YouTube, depending on the video density for each task. Moreover, 3 domains (Breakfast, Drink, and Dinner) have unseen tasks such as egg benedict, carrot mango lassi, and chicken fried rice. Unseen tasks are those without any IVs. The model generates their MPPs by using their vanilla text plan with 2 relevant seen tasks’ video captions. For example, VG-TVP uses the video captions of *carrot juice & mango lassi* tasks to generate the MPP of *carrot mango lassi*. The Daily-PP dataset structure is shown in the Appendix.

### Human Evaluation Metric

Existing metrics such as BLEU and METEOR evaluate text similarity by comparing generated texts with reference texts. However, they have limitations in MPP tasks. In cases where tasks do not have strict laws or steps, it cannot be assumed there is a single ground truth (GT). Daily life tasks such as “Hanging a Mirror”, and “Cooking Pancakes” lack definitive instructions and can vary widely. They cannot be deemed as having only one correct GT. Thus, a human evaluation survey is the optimal metric for assessing tasks aimed at generating MPPs. An example of a survey is in the Appendix.

## Results

**Baselines.** We employ 7 different LLMs to generate vanilla text plans (Touvron et al. 2023; Jiang et al. 2023; Brown et al. 2020) which are (1) LLaMA2-7B-q4, (2) LLaMA2-7B-q8, (3) LLaMA2-13B-q4, (4) LLaMA2-13B-q8, (5) Mistral-7B-q4, (6) Mistral-7B-q8 and (7) ChatGPT3.5.

**Quantitative Analysis.** The performance of VG-TVP in “SEEN” tasks is shown in Table 1. There are only two “TIE” results in the comparison between VG-TVP and Llama2-13B-q8, specifically for textual informativeness (48.00%) and temporal coherence (44.00%). The highest preference rate of VG-TVP is observed as 58.00% against Mistral-7B-q4. Benchmarking with the TIP model demonstrates

VG-TVP (Ours) versus	Textual Informativeness			Visual Informativeness			Temporal Coherence			Plan Accuracy		
	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose
Llama2-7B-q4	<b>40.00</b>	26.67	33.33	<b>60.00</b>	26.67	13.33	<b>60.00</b>	26.67	13.33	<b>66.67</b>	20.00	13.33
Llama2-7B-q8	<b>66.67</b>	6.67	26.67	<b>53.33</b>	26.67	20.00	<b>53.33</b>	26.67	20.00	<b>60.00</b>	6.67	33.33
Llama2-13B-q4	26.67	<b>53.33</b>	20.00	<b>46.67</b>	13.33	40.00	<b>53.33</b>	26.67	20.00	<b>40.00</b>	33.33	26.67
Llama2-13B-q8	<b>53.33</b>	40.00	6.67	<b>60.00</b>	33.33	6.67	<b>80.00</b>	0.00	20.00	<b>66.67</b>	13.33	20.00
Mistral-7B-q4	<b>40.00</b>	<b>40.00</b>	20.00	<b>53.33</b>	26.67	20.00	<b>46.67</b>	46.67	6.67	<b>40.00</b>	53.33	6.67
Mistral-7B-q8	<b>73.33</b>	20.00	6.67	<b>86.67</b>	0.00	13.33	<b>66.67</b>	26.67	6.67	<b>73.33</b>	20.00	6.67
GPT3.5	13.33	<b>80.00</b>	6.67	<b>60.00</b>	6.67	33.33	20.00	<b>40.00</b>	<b>40.00</b>	26.67	33.33	<b>40.00</b>

Table 2: Percentages of human evaluation comparisons between VG-TVP (Ours) and baseline models by employing different LLMs (q: quantization) for UNSEEN tasks. WIN, and LOSE represent the better and worse results of VG-TVP, respectively.

Models	BLEU		METEOR	
	Base.	VG-TVP	Base.	VG-TVP
Llama2-7B-q4	0.013	0.013	<b>0.089</b>	0.082
Llama2-7B-q8	<b>0.014</b>	0.011	<b>0.082</b>	0.075
Llama2-13B-q4	<b>0.012</b>	0.011	0.067	<b>0.071</b>
Llama2-13B-q8	<b>0.014</b>	0.012	<b>0.082</b>	0.073
Mistral-7B-q4	0.012	<b>0.014</b>	0.091	<b>0.093</b>
Mistral-7B-q8	0.013	<b>0.015</b>	0.084	<b>0.094</b>
GPT3-5	0.017	<b>0.024</b>	0.072	<b>0.085</b>

Table 3: Automatic evaluations on 50 seen tasks from Daily-PP. Generated Baselines’ (Base.) and VG-TVP’s text plans are compared with the reference textual.

that VG-TVP achieved better textual informativeness with a score of 71.43%. In terms of visual informativeness, VG-TVP’s performance ranges from a lower bound of 46.00% to a higher bound of 74.00%. VG-TVP, without losing any evaluation against the baseline models, achieves the highest average score in this challenge. In comparison with the TIP model, VG-TVP generates better visual plans with a 57.14% preference score. In temporal coherence, VG-TVP obtains a higher preference rate of 36.00% against Llama2-13B-q8, while achieving a preference parity of 44.00% among subjects. In the benchmarking comparison with the TIP model, VG-TVP reaches a better rate with 42.86%. In plan accuracy, VG-TVP’s ratio is only 2.00% behind Llama2-13B-q4, yet it achieves successful ratios against other baselines. The benchmarking with the TIP model, VG-TVP achieves more accurate plans with 42.86%.

For the “UNSEEN” tasks, unlike the TIP model, VG-TVP can combine different task information to generate multi-modal procedural plans for new, unseen content that lacks IVs or additional information. Therefore, the TIP model is not included in the detailed benchmarking, in Table 2. In terms of textual informativeness, VG-TVP is not preferred over Llama2-13B-q4 and GPT3.5. However, the majority of subjects rated the comparison as “TIE”. In visual informativeness, VG-TVP achieves superior preference rates, ranging from 46.67% to 86.67%, against all baselines. Regarding temporal coherence and plan accuracy, VG-TVP obtains better ratios than all models except GPT3.5. Consequently, VG-TVP’s superior performance can be seen from higher preferences over baselines across various tasks and models,








Figure 4: Impact of FoC on the task, “How to Fold the Presidential Pocket Square?”.






particularly in visual informativeness, showing its effectiveness in MPP.

Table 3 shows the textual relevance evaluations of baseline and VG-TVP’s text plans using BLEU and METEOR on 50 seen tasks from the Daily-PP dataset. Except for the Llama2-13B-q4 on the METEOR and the Llama2-7B-q4 on the BLEU, baseline-generated text plans outperform via Llama2-7B-q8, Llama2-13B-q4, and Llama2-13B-q8 models. For Mistral-7B-q4, Mistral-7B-q8, and GPT3.5, VG-TVP text plans perform better in both metrics. These results cannot show the semantic performance of the text plans because a single GT for daily life tasks is not adequate to cover the MPP content. Therefore, human evaluation is the optimum metric for MPP tasks to assist people.

**Qualitative Analysis.** The generated vanilla text plans successfully verbalize procedural information across many tasks. However, using vanilla text plans may not achieve the same efficiency for visuals while generating videos. We hypothesize that augmenting these vanilla textual with IVs can enhance MPP, thereby more effectively assisting individuals. Our results and comparative analyses with VG-TVP and baselines confirm this hypothesis. We generate baseline models’ videos using the text-context structure of vanilla textual. Figure 5 provides a qualitative analysis through a visual example using the Llama2-13B-q8+T2V. The unseen task, “How to bake kofta/meatballs and potatoes?” combines “Pan-Cooking Kofta/Meatballs” and “Cooking French

What's the step-by-step procedure for <task>? Task: How to Bake Kofta/Meatballs and Potatoes?						
Step 1	Text: "Preheat your oven to 400 degrees Fahrenheit (200 degrees Celsius)." Context: "N/A"					
Step 2	Text: "Wash the kofta and pat it dry with paper towels." Context: "Cut the kofta into bite-sized pieces and place them on a baking sheet lined with parchment paper. Drizzle the kofta with olive oil, salt, and pepper, and mix well to coat evenly."					
Step 3	Text: "Scrub the potatoes clean and pat them dry with paper towels." Context: "Poke some holes in the potatoes with a fork to allow steam to escape while they bake. Place the potatoes on the same baking sheet as the kofta. Drizzle the potatoes with olive oil, salt and pepper, and mix well to coat evenly."					
Step 4	Text: "Bake the kofta and potatoes in the preheated oven for 20-25 minutes, or until the kofta is cooked through and the potatoes are tender when pierced with a fork." Context: "N/A"					
Step 5	Text: "Remove the baking sheet from the oven and let it cool for a few minutes before serving." Context: "Serve the kofta and potatoes hot, garnished with fresh herbs like parsley or cilantro if desired. Enjoy!"					

a) Llama2-13B-q8 Model + T2V, Textual and Video Generation – Unseen Tasks

Step 1	Text: "Preheat oven to 400 degrees Fahrenheit (200 degrees Celsius)." Context: "Preheated oven at 400 degrees Fahrenheit (200 degrees Celsius)." Visual: "A person turning on the oven to 400 degrees Fahrenheit."					
Step 2	Text: "Wash kofta and pat it dry with paper towels." Context: "N/A" Visual: "A person drying the meatballs with paper towels."					
Step 3	Text: "Cut kofta into bite-sized pieces and place on a baking sheet lined with parchment paper." Context: "Baking sheet lined with parchment paper." Visual: "Person shaping meat mixture into meatballs."					
Step 4	Text: "Drizzle kofta with olive oil, salt, and pepper, and mix well to coat evenly." Context: "Meat and spices mixed together in a bowl." Visual: "Person mixing meat and spices in a bowl."					
Step 5	Text: "Scrub potatoes clean and pat them dry with paper towels." Context: "Potatoes scrubbed clean and pierced with a fork for steam escape." Visual: "Person cleaning the potatoes."					
Step 6	Text: "Poke holes in potatoes with a fork to allow steam to escape while baking." Context: "N/A" Visual: "Person poking holes in potatoes."					
Step 7	Text: "Place potatoes on the same baking sheet as the kofta." Context: "Olive oil, salt, and pepper used to season the kofta and potatoes." Visual: "Person placing the potatoes and meatballs on the same baking sheet."					
Step 8	Text: "Drizzle potatoes with olive oil, salt, and pepper, and mix well to coat evenly." Context: "Parchment paper and oil to prevent sticking." Visual: "Person mixing potatoes and spices."					
Step 9	Text: "Bake kofta and potatoes in the preheated oven for 20-25 minutes, or until kofta is cooked through and potatoes are tender when pierced with a fork." Context: "Baking sheet with kofta and potatoes placed in oven." Visual: "Person is baking meatballs and potatoes until cooked on all sides."					
Step 10	Text: "Remove baking sheet from oven and let it cool for a few minutes before serving." Context: "Meatballs browned on all sides and cooked through." Visual: "Person removes cooked meatballs and potatoes from oven and transferred to serving dish."					

b) VG-TVP (Ours), Textual and Video Generation – Unseen Tasks

Figure 5: Qualitative comparison between Llama2-13B-q8 Model and VG-T2V (Ours). Visuals (orange) are used to generate video plans. VG-TVP can increase the number of steps to generate the MPP more informative and accurate.

Fries". Figure 5 a) displays the vanilla text and video plan generations, where the baseline model outlines five steps to complete the task. In Figure 5 b), text&video plans are generated using VG-TVP, and video plans are highlighted through visual prompts. VG-TVP enhances textual information, thereby improving the quality of generated video plans.

**Ablations.** FoC is the key technical component of VG-TVP which captures and fuses IVs' captions to integrate into the VG-TVP. For example, Figure 4 a) is generated based on *Text*: "Finally, tuck the ends of the pocket square into your pocket to create a neat and tidy appearance", *Context*: "Remember, the key to folding a pocket square is to be consistent and precise in your folds and to make sure the edges are aligned, and the corners are squared off.". The FOC leverages textual to generate a "Visual" prompt as "A person tucking the ends of a folded pocket square into their pocket, creating a neat and tidy appearance." that is used to generate the video shown in Figure 4 b). Unlike baseline's generation (Figure 4a), VG-TVP generates a video with sharp lines

of the suit jacket and folded square inside the pocket (Figure 4b). Consequently, FoC improves the impact of VG-TVP to generate more plan-accurate and informative visuals.

## Conclusion and Future Work

This paper presents a novel approach to MPP through the development of LLM-powered frameworks, addressing the complexities of generating cohesive PPs for both seen and unseen tasks. By leveraging the capabilities of LLMs, VG-TVP enhances the coherence and consistency of PPs, demonstrating the efficacy of integrating visually grounded text and action-based video generations to enhance human assisting. Daily-PP dataset represents a significant stride towards overcoming the limitations of existing datasets, providing a more structured and comprehensive resource for evaluating MPP. VG-TVP may serve as an effective model for future research on leveraging multimodal information to enhance human learning experiences.

## Acknowledgements

This research is supported by the Singapore International Graduate Award (SINGA) Scholarship.

## References

- Alayrac, J.; Bojanowski, P.; Agrawal, N.; Sivic, J.; Laptev, I.; and Lacoste-Julien, S. 2016. Unsupervised Learning from Narrated Instruction Videos. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR, Las Vegas, NV, USA*, 4575–4583. IEEE.
- Banerjee, S.; and Lavie, A. 2005. METEOR: An Automatic Metric for MT Evaluation with Improved Correlation with Human Judgments. In *Proceedings of the ACL Workshop on Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evaluation Measures for Machine Translation and/or Summarization*, 65–72. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Blattmann, A.; Rombach, R.; Ling, H.; Dockhorn, T.; Kim, S. W.; Fidler, S.; and Kreis, K. 2023. Align Your Latents: High-Resolution Video Synthesis with Latent Diffusion Models. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, 22563–22575. IEEE.
- Brown, T. B.; Mann, B.; Ryder, N.; Subbiah, M.; Kaplan, J.; Dhariwal, P.; Neelakantan, A.; Shyam, P.; Sastry, G.; Askell, A.; Agarwal, S.; Herbert-Voss, A.; Krueger, G.; Henighan, T.; Child, R.; Ramesh, A.; Ziegler, D. M.; Wu, J.; Winter, C.; Hesse, C.; Chen, M.; ...; and Amodei, D. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NeurIPS*.
- Chang, C.; Huang, D.; Xu, D.; Adeli, E.; Fei-Fei, L.; and Niebles, J. C. 2020. Procedure Planning in Instructional Videos. In *16th European Conference Computer Vision, ECCV, Glasgow, UK*, volume 12356 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 334–350. Springer.
- Chang, E. Y. 2023. Prompting Large Language Models With the Socratic Method. arXiv:2303.08769.
- Du, X.; Rush, A. M.; and Cardie, C. 2021. GRIT: Generative Role-filler Transformers for Document-level Event Entity Extraction. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume, EACL*, 634–644. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dvornik, N.; Hadji, I.; Zhang, R.; Derpanis, K. G.; Wildes, R. P.; and Jepson, A. D. 2023. StepFormer: Self-Supervised Step Discovery and Localization in Instructional Videos. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, 18952–18961. IEEE.
- Elhamifar, E.; and Naing, Z. 2019. Unsupervised Procedure Learning via Joint Dynamic Summarization. In *2019 International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV, Seoul, Korea (South)*, 6340–6349. IEEE.
- Fang, F.; Liu, Y.; Koksai, A.; Xu, Q.; and Lim, J. 2023. Masked Diffusion with Task-awareness for Procedure Planning in Instructional Videos. *CoRR*, abs/2309.07409.
- Huang, W.; Abbeel, P.; Pathak, D.; and Mordatch, I. 2022. Language Models as Zero-Shot Planners: Extracting Actionable Knowledge for Embodied Agents. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML, Baltimore, Maryland, USA*, volume 162, 9118–9147. PMLR.
- Ilaslan, M. F.; Song, C.; Chen, J.; Gao, D.; Lei, W.; Xu, Q.; Lim, J.; and Shou, M. 2023. GazeVQA: A Video Question Answering Dataset for Multiview Eye-Gaze Task-Oriented Collaborations. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP*, 10462–10479. Singapore: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiang, A. Q.; Sablayrolles, A.; Mensch, A.; Bamford, C.; Chaplot, D. S.; de Las Casas, D.; Bressand, F.; Lengyel, G.; Lample, G.; Saulnier, L.; Lavaud, L. R.; Lachaux, M.; Stock, P.; Scao, T. L.; Lavril, T.; Wang, T.; Lacroix, T.; and Sayed, W. E. 2023. Mistral 7B. *CoRR*, abs/2310.06825.
- Khachatryan, L.; Movsisyan, A.; Tadevosyan, V.; Henschel, R.; Wang, Z.; Navasardyan, S.; and Shi, H. 2023. Text2Video-Zero: Text-to-Image Diffusion Models are Zero-Shot Video Generators. In *International Conference on Computer Vision, Paris, France*, 15908–15918. IEEE.
- Kojima, T.; Gu, S. S.; Reid, M.; Matsuo, Y.; and Iwasawa, Y. 2022. Large Language Models are Zero-Shot Reasoners. In *Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NeurIPS, New Orleans, USA*. Curran Associates Inc.
- Kuehne, H.; Arslan, A. B.; and Serre, T. 2014. The Language of Actions: Recovering the Syntax and Semantics of Goal-Directed Human Activities. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR, Columbus, OH, USA*, 780–787. IEEE.
- Li, J.; Li, D.; Savarese, S.; and Hoi, S. C. H. 2023. BLIP-2: Bootstrapping Language-Image Pre-training with Frozen Image Encoders and Large Language Models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 19730–19742. PMLR.
- Lian, L.; Shi, B.; Yala, A.; Darrell, T.; and Li, B. 2023. LLM-grounded Video Diffusion Models. *CoRR*, abs/2309.17444.
- Lin, H.; Zala, A.; Cho, J.; and Bansal, M. 2023. VideoDirectorGPT: Consistent Multi-scene Video Generation via LLM-Guided Planning. *CoRR*, abs/2309.15091.
- Lin, K. Q.; and Lei, S. W. 2023. VLog: Video as a Long Document. <https://github.com/showlab/VLog>. Accessed:2024-12-15.
- Lu, Y.; Feng, W.; Zhu, W.; Xu, W.; Wang, X. E.; Eckstein, M. P.; and Wang, W. Y. 2023a. Neuro-Symbolic Procedural Planning with Commonsense Prompting. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR, Kigali, Rwanda*.
- Lu, Y.; Lu, P.; Chen, Z.; Zhu, W.; Wang, X. E.; and Wang, W. Y. 2023b. Multimodal Procedural Planning via Dual Text-Image Prompting. *CoRR*, abs/2305.01795.
- Miech, A.; Zhukov, D.; Alayrac, J.; Tapaswi, M.; Laptev, I.; and Sivic, J. 2019. HowTo100M: Learning a Text-Video Embedding by Watching Hundred Million Narrated Video Clips. In *International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV, Seoul, Korea (South)*, 2630–2640. IEEE.



- Niu, Y.; Guo, W.; Chen, L.; Lin, X.; and Chang, S.-F. 2024. SCHEMA: State Changes Matter for Procedure Planning in Instructional Videos. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. *CoRR*, abs/2303.08774.
- Papineni, K.; Roukos, S.; Ward, T.; and Zhu, W.-J. 2002. BLEU: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL '02*, 311–318. USA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Radford, A.; Kim, J. W.; Xu, T.; Brockman, G.; McLeavey, C.; and Sutskever, I. 2023. Robust Speech Recognition via Large-Scale Weak Supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 28492–28518. PMLR.
- Ramesh, A.; Pavlov, M.; Goh, G.; Gray, S.; Voss, C.; Radford, A.; Chen, M.; and Sutskever, I. 2021. Zero-Shot Text-to-Image Generation. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML*, volume 139, 8821–8831. PMLR.
- Shen, Y.; Wang, L.; and Elhamifar, E. 2021. Learning To Segment Actions From Visual and Language Instructions via Differentiable Weak Sequence Alignment. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR*, 10156–10165. IEEE.
- Singer, U.; Polyak, A.; Hayes, T.; Yin, X.; An, J.; Zhang, S.; Hu, Q.; Yang, H.; Ashual, O.; Gafni, O.; Parikh, D.; Gupta, S.; and Taigman, Y. 2023. Make-A-Video: Text-to-Video Generation without Text-Video Data. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR, Kigali, Rwanda*.
- Song, C. H.; Sadler, B. M.; Wu, J.; Chao, W.; Washington, C.; and Su, Y. 2023. LLM-Planner: Few-Shot Grounded Planning for Embodied Agents with Large Language Models. In *International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV, Paris, France*, 2986–2997. IEEE.
- Soucek, T.; Damen, D.; Wray, M.; Laptev, I.; and Sivic, J. 2024. GenHowTo: Learning to Generate Actions and State Transformations from Instructional Videos. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR, Seattle, WA, USA*, 6561–6571. IEEE.
- Tang, Y.; Ding, D.; Rao, Y.; Zheng, Y.; Zhang, D.; Zhao, L.; Lu, J.; and Zhou, J. 2019. COIN: A Large-Scale Dataset for Comprehensive Instructional Video Analysis. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR, Long Beach, CA, USA*, 1207–1216. IEEE.
- Touvron, H.; Martin, L.; Stone, K.; Albert, P.; Almahairi, A.; Babaei, Y.; Bashlykov, N.; Batra, S.; Bhargava, P.; Bosch, S.; Bikel, D.; Blecher, L.; Canton-Ferrer, C.; Chen, M.; Cucurull, G.; Esiobu, D.; Fernandes, J.; Fu, J.; Fu, W.; Fuller, B.; Gao, C.; ...; and Scialom, T. 2023. Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models. *CoRR*, abs/2307.09288.
- Wang, H.; Wu, Y.; Guo, S.; and Wang, L. 2023a. PDPP: Projected Diffusion for Procedure Planning in Instructional Videos. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, 14836–14845. IEEE.
- Wang, J.; Yuan, H.; Chen, D.; Zhang, Y.; Wang, X.; and Zhang, S. 2023b. ModelScope Text-to-Video Technical Report. *CoRR*, abs/2308.06571.
- Wu, J. Z.; Ge, Y.; Wang, X.; Lei, S. W.; Gu, Y.; Shi, Y.; Hsu, W.; Shan, Y.; Qie, X.; and Shou, M. Z. 2023. Tune-A-Video: One-Shot Tuning of Image Diffusion Models for Text-to-Video Generation. In *International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV, Paris, France*, 7589–7599. IEEE.
- Yang, A.; Nagrani, A.; Seo, P. H.; Miech, A.; Pont-Tuset, J.; Laptev, I.; Sivic, J.; and Schmid, C. 2023. Vid2Seq: Large-Scale Pretraining of a Visual Language Model for Dense Video Captioning. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, 10714–10726. IEEE.
- Yang, Y.; Yao, W.; Zhang, H.; Wang, X.; Yu, D.; and Chen, J. 2022. Z-LaVI: Zero-Shot Language Solver Fueled by Visual Imagination. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP, Abu Dhabi, UAE*, 1186–1203. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yu, L.; Lezama, J.; Gundavarapu, N. B.; Versari, L.; Sohn, K.; Minnen, D.; Cheng, Y.; Gupta, A.; Gu, X.; Hauptmann, A. G.; Gong, B.; Yang, M.; Essa, I.; Ross, D. A.; and Jiang, L. 2023. Language Model Beats Diffusion - Tokenizer is Key to Visual Generation. *CoRR*, abs/2310.05737.
- Zhao, H.; Hadji, I.; Dvornik, N.; Derpanis, K. G.; Wildes, R. P.; and Jepson, A. D. 2022. P<sup>3</sup>IV: Probabilistic Procedure Planning from Instructional Videos with Weak Supervision. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR, New Orleans, USA*, 2928–2938. IEEE.
- Zhou, D.; Wang, W.; Yan, H.; Lv, W.; Zhu, Y.; and Feng, J. 2022. MagicVideo: Efficient Video Generation With Latent Diffusion Models. *CoRR*, abs/2211.11018.
- Zhou, H.; Martín-Martín, R.; Kapadia, M.; Savarese, S.; and Niebles, J. C. 2023. Procedure-Aware Pretraining for Instructional Video Understanding. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, 10727–10738. IEEE.
- Zhou, L.; Xu, C.; and Corso, J. J. 2018. Towards Automatic Learning of Procedures From Web Instructional Videos. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, (AAAI-18), New Orleans, Louisiana, USA*, 7590–7598. AAAI Press.
- Zhu, L.; and Yang, Y. 2020. ActBERT: Learning Global-Local Video-Text Representations. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR, Seattle, WA, USA*, 8743–8752. IEEE.
- Zhukov, D.; Alayrac, J.; Cinbis, R. G.; Fouhey, D. F.; Laptev, I.; and Sivic, J. 2019. Cross-Task Weakly Supervised Learning From Instructional Videos. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR, Long Beach, CA, USA*, 3537–3545. IEEE.

## Appendix

VG-TVP focuses on generating multimodal text and video plans by capturing "state+action" from instructional videos (IVs). Despite having a limited number of IVs, VG-TVP generates textual and video plans for unseen tasks using relevant combinations. This capability indicates that a potential limitation has been addressed to a certain extent. Empirical results demonstrate VG-TVP's ability to generate informative, temporally coherent, and accurate MPP content. We propose a new framework for future research on leveraging multimodal information to enhance human learning experiences. It might serve as an effective and guiding resource for future studies, addressing key questions from educational psychology to cognitive load theory, such as "How much do the generated instructions boost the humans' success rate?", with the advancement of AI models.

For fair comparisons with the baselines, inference parameters of all models have been set as 0.8 "temperature", 40 "top-k", 0.05 "min-p", and 0.095 "top-p" sampling, 512 for "prompt evaluation batch size (n-batch)", and 4096 tokens for "context length (n-ctx)". Moreover, the system prompt has been set as "You are a helpful AI assistant."

### Daily-PP Dataset

The Daily-PP dataset (Figure 17) consists of 5 domains which are Breakfast, Dinner, Drink, Hobby&Crafts, and Home&Garage. It includes 50 seen tasks and 15 unseen tasks, each with 7 to 10 IVs sourced from YouTube, reflecting the task's commonality. Unlike unseen tasks, the seen tasks are directly supported by these IVs. Unseen tasks are conceptually modeled through captions from related seen tasks. For example, carrot juice and mango lassi IVs are used to formulate the MPP for carrot mango lassi.

**Statistical Analysis.** 700 and 300 unique action verbs were generated for seen and unseen tasks, respectively. Specifically, the verbs for seen tasks were utilized approximately 3,000 times in "text," over 8,000 times in "context," and more than 5,000 times in "visual" settings (in total > 16,000). For unseen tasks, the verbs were used over 700 times in "text," more than 1,900 times in "context," and over 1,400 times in "visual" settings, (in total > 4,000).

For seen tasks, more than 3,000 unique words were generated. These words were used over 19,000 times in "text," more than 50,000 times in "context," and over 27,000 times in "visual" settings, totaling nearly 100,000 instances. For unseen tasks, over 1,200 unique words were generated. These words were used more than 5,200 times in "text," over 13,000 times in "context," and more than 7,000 times in "visual" settings, (in total > 26,000).

VG-TVP generated over 700 action verbs for both seen and unseen tasks. 3,000 and 1,500 unique words were generated for seen and unseen tasks, respectively. These words were used over 83,000 times for seen tasks and more than 33,000 times for unseen tasks. The detailed graphs to show the top 30 "verbs and words" frequencies and word cloud distributions for the seen and unseen tasks at the baselines, and VG-TVP are displayed below from Figures 6 to 15.




Figure 6: Top 30 Words in "Text", Seen Tasks, VG-TVP




Figure 7: Top 30 Words in "Context", Seen Tasks, VG-TVP




Figure 8: Top 30 Words in "Visual", Seen Tasks, VG-TVP




Figure 9: Top 30 Words in "Text", Unseen Tasks, VG-TVP




Figure 10: Top 30 Words in "Context", Unseen, VG-TVP




Figure 11: Top 30 Words in "Visual", Unseen Tasks, VG-TVP




Figure 12: Top 30 Words for Seen Tasks, Vanilla Model




Figure 13: Top 30 Words for Unseen Tasks, Vanilla Model



Figure 14: Word cloud distributions of the vanilla textual generations for seen and unseen tasks in the Daily-PP.



Figure 15: Word cloud distributions for VG-TVP's textual generations for seen and unseen tasks in the Daily-PP.

In seen tasks, the most frequently generated words by VG-TVP were "add & ingredient" for Text, "use & add" for Context, and "car & pan" for Visual; "add & use" by Baseline. In unseen tasks, VG-TVP's most frequently generated words were "ingredient & add" for Text, "cup & add" for Context, and "pan & bowl" for Visual; "add & cup" by Baseline.

## The Impact of V2T-B and FoC

V2T-B is the method that textualizes the scenes of IVs by using a video captioning algorithm. VLog is used to generate captions from IVs. We focus on visual information rather than audio information because of the scene audio conflicts, and lack of audio in some videos. This alignment problem between visual and audio is solved via zero-shot prompting.

In our methodology, baseline videos are generated based on the textual context derived from vanilla textual instructions. Vanilla textual baselines have shown notable competence in delivering verbal instructions for a variety of tasks. Yet, when it comes to transferring these textual instructions into video format, their performance in terms of efficiency and visual effectiveness may falter. We propose integrating the FoC via IVs could substantially improve MPP. Figure 16 shows an example of the FoC effect. Both figures are generated according to the *Text*: "Strain and Serve", and *Context*: "Once the tea has steeped, it is time to strain the leaves and serve the tea. You can use a strainer or infuser to remove the tea leaves from the water. Once the tea is strained, you can pour it into cups or mugs and add any desired sweeteners or flavorings.. However, the FOC leverages the text and context to generate a special text as a Visual for output video generation. For this example, the VG-TVP generates a Visual: "The person pours the brewed tea into cups or a serving pitcher and enjoys.". That provides more accurate, text-aligned video plans (Figure 18) that consist of augmented action and state information for the high-level MPP tasks.

FoC reorders and aligns all the steps captured from IVs for the relevant task (Figure 20). There might be a few instances where FoC, due to incorrect information captured by VLog in the IVs (e.g., an apple being mislabeled as an orange or lemon based on its color), may also disorder information. In such cases, VG-TVP addresses this challenge by leveraging the vanilla text and aligning with it while generating visually grounded text plans. This alignment is crucial for providing relevant visual information to VG-TVP, enabling the generation of augmented MPP content.



Figure 16: Impact of FoC for "How to Brew a Pot of Tea?".

## Human Evaluation Survey

We use the T2V model for 2 reasons. (1) Compatibility of the models: ModelScope was chosen due to its superior realistic video quality. (2) Testing: We utilized 7 LLMs to gen-

erate over 6000 videos, evaluated by human subjects under consistent protocols. The human evaluation metric was realized based on "textual and visual informativeness, temporal coherence, and plan accuracy". A total of 28 participants were involved in the survey. No subject was shown the same task twice. If a subject has already seen "Kimchi Fried Rice" task generated by the LLama2-7B-q4 model, they would not be shown a different version of the same task generated by another model. Each participant was over 21 years old and possessed fluency in English. They were only asked to compare two different sequences from the perspective of these four aspects. An example of the survey is shown in Figure 19. The results derived from the analysis of the collected data are presented in Tables 1 and 2 in the main paper.

## Qualitative Comparison Example

This part consists of two different examples: 1) 2 different visualization prompts' text-video plans versus VG-TVP's text-video plans. 2) The comparison of GPT-3.5's text-video plans and VG-TVP's text-video plans.

**Different Prompting with Visualized Instructions.** LLMs can generate text plans for tasks they have never encountered before, leveraging their zero-shot reasoning capabilities. However, this might cause issues of hallucination. Therefore, it is pertinent to investigate whether alternative prompt engineering methods, beyond the vanilla approach, can enhance the performance of LLMs in generating accurate procedural plans. This example aims to compare the performance of these alternative prompts against the proposed VG-TVP framework.

We explored 2 different prompts to generate text and video plans for the "How to make pancakes?" example. First, we apply "What is the step-by-step procedure for how to make pancakes? Rewrite the textual instruction of making pancakes with visualized instruction pair-wisely in a template <text> <context>, and <visual> separately." as  $f_{prompt}(alignment)$ . Secondly, we apply "What is the step-by-step procedure for how to make pancakes? Rewrite the textual instruction of pancake with visualized video instruction pair-wisely in a template <text> <context>, and <visual> separately." as  $f_{prompt}(alignment)$ . Then we use their text plans to generate video plans. Finally, we apply the VG-TVP model to generate the MPP of the relevant task. The final text and video plans and their comparisons are shown in Figures 21, 22, and 23. The final text and video plan results show the superiority of VG-TVP.

**GPT-3.5 vs. VG-TVP.** In our use case, we requested human subjects to evaluate the generated textual and video generations (relevant steps) in terms of temporal coherence and plan accuracy. While the generated visuals support our hypothesis by being more successful and human-centred, GPT3.5's textual generations tend to reduce the overall number of steps required to complete the task. Although the exact reason for this behaviour is difficult to determine, given the closed nature of GPT3.5 and the unknown data used during its training process, it might stem from the model's reliance on exact visual matches between vanilla textual and FoC outputs. If an exact match is not provided between

them, GPT3.5 opts to use only the matching visuals for text, context, and visual generation. This results in a reduced number of overall steps, leading to deficiencies in temporal coherence and plan accuracy. Consequently, the observed lower performance in temporal coherence and plan accuracy (shown in Table 2) is not due to a negative enhancement from the visual injections but rather due to the expectations of exact visual matches. When considering other performance evaluations, we can also identify positive enhancements for GPT3.5. Therefore, we would like to explain it with an example in different aspects. Textuals generated in 2 different stages are shown in Figure 24 below. (1) Vanilla Textual by GPT3.5 and (2) VG-TVP Generated Textuals.

- **Visual Description:** The visual description helps users by visualizing the task to make it more intuitive. For example, the visual texts of Step 10 and Step 11 of VG-TVP in Figure 24 show the final version of the product.
- **Alignment of Text-Video Pairs:** It represents the importance of aligned text-video pairs which provide a comprehensive guide, aiding users in visualizing each step.
- **Focused on Key Actions:** It provides avoiding unnecessary information and ensuring clarity. While Step 8 of GPT3-5 (Figure 24) explains the step ignoring the human effect, VG-TVP highlights that effect. VG-TVP’s Step 8 is more human-centered, acknowledging that factors like stove structure and heat power can influence cooking.
- **Clear and Concise Steps:** VG-TVP separates the text, context, and visual texts. Therefore, that makes VG-TVP more concise and understanding than baselines. The clear and concise texts provide a detailed, explanatory, and user-friendly guide, ensuring users benefit from outputs.

We design another experiment with CLIP scores in different frame rates (5,10, 15, and 20) to highlight the impact of generating videos instead of single static images. That experiment’s results show the average of mean similarity scores (MSS) for seen and unseen tasks of baselines, VG-TVP; and also benchmark comparisons.

Results display that VG-TVP consistently outperforms baselines and TIP, highlighting the effectiveness of our approach across various task types and frame rates.

For SEEN tasks (Table 4), VG-TVP achieves higher MSS than the baselines at every frame rate, with an improvement margin that increases as the frame rate decreases. For instance, at a frame rate of 20, VG-TVP achieves an average of MSS 0.3189, compared to the baseline’s 0.2946. This margin further widens at a frame rate of 5, where VG-TVP scores 0.3216, significantly outperforming the baseline’s 0.2969. These results illustrate VG-TVP’s robustness in generating coherent, high-similarity outputs even at lower frame rates, which is crucial for procedural tasks where step-by-step accuracy is the highest.

In UNSEEN tasks (Table 5), VG-TVP also surpasses baseline models with similar trends across frame rates. For example, at a frame rate of 20, VG-TVP achieves an average of MSS 0.3268 compared to the baseline’s 0.3009, and at a frame rate of 5, VG-TVP reaches 0.3302 versus the baseline’s 0.3027. When benchmarked against TIP, VG-TVP’s

Frame Rate	SEEN Tasks (Idea 1)	
	Baselines	VG-TVP
20	0.294634078	0.318871641
15	0.296215234	0.320155963
10	0.296341701	0.320829739
5	0.296913945	0.321579028

Table 4: Average MSS of Baselines and VG-TVP for Seen Tasks (Idea 1).

Frame Rate	UNSEEN Tasks (Idea 2)	
	Baselines	VG-TVP
20	0.3009426	0.3268314
15	0.3020536	0.3290246
10	0.3025034	0.3290118
5	0.3027169	0.3301511

Table 5: Average MSS of Baselines and VG-TVP for Unseen Tasks (Idea 2).

performance is further validated, achieving an average MSS of 0.3290, substantially higher than TIP’s 0.3025. This consistent improvement across SEEN and UNSEEN tasks and in comparison, with TIP underscores VG-TVP’s superiority in generating visually and temporally coherent outputs, reinforcing its suitability for practical applications requiring detailed, dynamic multimodal procedural plans.

## LLM Evaluation Protocol with Socratic Method

The Socratic Model represents the resolution of complex tasks through a series of questions. It involves various principles (Chang 2023), such as identifying key points of the tasks, proposing cause-and-effect relationships for tasks, presenting text plan examples, and asking evaluation aspects questions. Thus, we leverage each of these principles using ChatGPT-4o. The evaluation protocol evaluates baselines and VG-TVP on 4 aspects as in the human evaluation metric. There are 5 and 3 randomly chosen tasks from each domain that were evaluated for seen (Candy Bouquet, Change a Tire, Kimchi Fried Rice, Moka Pot Coffee, and Pancake) and unseen (Chicken Fried Rice, Carrot Mango Lassi and Egg Benedict) tasks, respectively. This evaluation considers the semantic relevance of the task plans generated by baselines and VG-TVP. Each scored out of 25 points, thereby out of 100 points in total. All results for the seen and unseen tasks are shown in Table 6 and Table 7 in terms of Textual Informativeness, Visual Informativeness, Temporal Alignment, and Plan Accuracy which are displayed as T.I., V.I., T.A., and P.A., respectively. The final protocol is as follows:

**Textual Informativeness. (25 points)** This aspect assesses the instructional text’s clarity, comprehensiveness, detail, and overall quality. It consists of *Comprehensiveness (10 points)*, *Clarity&Precision (10 points)*, and *Detail Level (5 points)*. *“Comprehensiveness”* covers essential steps (5 points) and additional information (5 points). Essential steps evaluate whether all necessary steps are included. Addi-

tional information considers the inclusion of supplementary details, such as background information, optional steps, or alternative methods. "Clarity&Precision" covers language clarity (5 points) which assesses the language's clarity and simplicity, and specificity (5 points) which evaluates the precision of instructions, including clear descriptions of actions, measurements, and conditions. Finally, the "Detail Level" covers ingredient&tool specifications (2.5 points) and step-by-step breakdown (2.5 points). Ingredient&tool specifications represent specificity in listing ingredients, tools, and equipment. Step-by-step breakdown ensures complex actions are broken down into manageable components.

**Visual Informativeness. (25 points)** This measures the effectiveness of visual descriptions in conveying the steps and elements. It consists *Visualization Cues (10 points)*, *Imagery Description (10 points)*, and *Use of Examples and Analogies (5 points)*. *Visualization Cues* evaluate descriptive elements that help visualize actions and objects. *Imagery and Descriptions* assess how well the instructions create a visual of the process. *Use of Examples and Analogies* consider examples or illustrations that aid in visualization.

**Temporal Alignment. (25 points)** This evaluates the logical sequencing and timing information provided in the instructions. It consists *Chronological Order (10 points)*, *Time Indications (10 points)*, and *Simultaneous Actions (5 points)*. *Chronological Order* checks if the steps are presented in a logical sequence. *Time Indications* evaluate the presence and accuracy of time-related information. *Simultaneous Actions* considers how well the instructions handle simultaneous or overlapping actions.

**Plan Accuracy. (25 points)** This measures the accuracy and practicality of the instructions in guiding the user to successfully complete the task. It consists of *Correctness of Steps (15 points)*, *Consistency (5 points)*, and *Practicality&Feasibility (5 points)*. *Correctness of Steps* assesses whether the steps align with the actual task requirements. *Consistency* evaluates if the instructions are consistent and free of contradictions. *Practicality&Feasibility* considers the real-world applicability and ease of execution.

**Scoring and Feedback.** The sum of points from each aspect provides an overall score out of 100. Additionally, detailed feedbacks for each aspect, are provided to highlight strengths and areas for improvement. For example, (in terms of textual informativeness), LLM (ChatGPT-4o) evaluator generates comments for baselines and VG-TVP (while both using the model GPT-3.5) "(21.5/23). The instructions provide a clear outline of the necessary steps and ingredients, including optional adjustments. However, they lack detailed explanations and context, such as the reasoning behind ingredient choices.", and "(23.5/25). The instructions are highly detailed, clear, and comprehensive, covering all necessary components. They include specific measurements and thorough explanations, making the process easy to follow." respectively. Therefore, for fair benchmarking, we compare the baseline's text plans and VG-TVP's text plans while they use the same model (GPT-3.5 for this example).

Models	T.I.	V.I.	T.A.	P.A.	Total
Llama2-7B-q4					
Baseline	20.6	7.5	18	18.9	65
VG-TVP	23.6	22.7	22	23	91.3
Llama2-7B-q8					
Baseline	20.8	7.4	18.4	19	65.6
VG-TVP	23.7	22.2	21.8	22.8	90.5
Llama2-13B-q4					
Baseline	21.2	8.3	18.8	19.5	67.8
VG-TVP	24.1	23.2	22	23.2	92.5
Llama2-13B-q8					
Baseline	21.3	8.1	18.7	19.3	67.4
VG-TVP	24	22.6	22.2	23.5	92.3
Mistral-7B-q4					
Baseline	20.4	7.6	18.2	19.3	65.5
VG-TVP	23.7	22.6	21.9	22.9	91.1
Mistral-7B-q8					
Baseline	20.9	7.9	18.3	19.7	66.8
VG-TVP	23.8	22.6	22.2	23	91.6
ChatGPT3.5					
Baseline	22.2	8.6	19	19.8	69.6
VG-TVP	24	22.6	21.9	23.6	92.1

Table 6: Average results of LLM evaluations (chosen from 5 random tasks, 1 from each domain) for SEEN tasks. ChatGPT-4o compares baselines and VG-TVP textual.

Models	T.I.	V.I.	T.A.	P.A.	Total
Llama2-7B-q4					
Baseline	21.3	9.8	18.7	19.3	69.2
VG-TVP	23.0	22.0	21.7	23.0	89.7
Llama2-7B-q8					
Baseline	21.0	10.2	18.3	19.3	68.8
VG-TVP	23.2	22.5	22.0	22.7	90.3
Llama2-13B-q4					
Baseline	21.7	11.0	19.2	19.8	71.7
VG-TVP	23.2	22.5	22.0	23.0	90.7
Llama2-13B-q8					
Baseline	21.5	10.7	18.8	20.3	71.3
VG-TVP	23.5	22.5	22.0	23.7	91.7
Mistral-7B-q4					
Baseline	21.5	12.2	18.7	20.0	72.3
VG-TVP	23.8	23.0	22.3	23.2	92.3
Mistral-7B-q8					
Baseline	22.3	13.0	19.5	20.5	75.3
VG-TVP	24.0	23.0	22.3	23.3	92.7
ChatGPT3.5					
Baseline	22.5	11.0	19.8	20.8	74.2
VG-TVP	24.0	22.8	22.5	23.7	93.0

Table 7: Average results of LLM evaluations (chosen from 3 random tasks, 1 from each domain) for UNSEEN tasks. ChatGPT-4o compares baselines and VG-TVP textual.




Figure 17: Daily-PP: Daily Life Task Procedures Dataset Structure

**What's the step-by-step procedure for <task>? Task: How to Cook Szechuan Chicken?**

Step 1	<p>Text: "Ingredients"</p> <p>Context: "1 pound boneless, skinless chicken breast or thighs, cut into bite-sized pieces, a quarter cup cornstarch, 2 tablespoons vegetable oil, 3 cloves minced garlic, 1 fish piece of grated ginger, a quarter cup soy sauce, a quarter cup Shaoxing wine (or dry sherry), 1 tablespoon crushed or ground Szechuan peppercorns, 1 teaspoon sugar, a quarter teaspoon red pepper flakes (optional, for some heat), salt and black pepper, thinly sliced scallions for garnish."</p> <p>Visual: "A medium bowl filled with a variety of ingredients, including chicken pieces, cornstarch, soy sauce, Shaoxing wine, Szechuan peppercorns, sugar, red pepper flakes, salt, and black pepper."</p>	
Step 2	<p>Text: "Marinate the Chicken: In a medium bowl, whisk together the cornstarch, soy sauce, Shaoxing wine, Szechuan peppercorns, sugar, and red pepper flakes (if using)."</p> <p>Context: "Add the chicken pieces to the marinade and toss to coat evenly. Cover and refrigerate for at least 30 minutes or up to 2 hours."</p> <p>Visual: "A plate with a chicken piece coated in marinade, ready to be refrigerated for at least 30 minutes or up to 2 hours."</p>	
Step 3	<p>Text: "Cook the Chicken: Heat 1 tablespoon of vegetable oil in a large skillet or wok over medium-high heat."</p> <p>Context: "Remove the chicken from the marinade, letting any excess liquid drip off. Add the chicken to the skillet and cook until browned on all sides and cooked through, about 6-8 minutes. Transfer the chicken to a plate and set aside."</p> <p>Visual: "A large skillet or wok filled with chicken pieces cooking over medium-high heat until browned on all sides and cooked through, about 6-8 minutes."</p>	
Step 4	<p>Text: "Stir-Fry the Chicken: In the same skillet or wok, heat another tablespoon of vegetable oil over medium heat."</p> <p>Context: "Add the minced garlic and grated ginger to the skillet and stir-fry until fragrant, about 30 seconds."</p> <p>Visual: "A skillet or wok filled with chicken and vegetables stir-frying over medium heat, with fragrant garlic and ginger aroma."</p>	
Step 5	<p>Text: "Add Soy Sauce and Wine: Pour in the soy sauce and Shaoxing wine (or dry sherry) and stir-fry for about 2 minutes, until the sauce has thickened slightly."</p> <p>Context: "Stir in the crushed or ground Szechuan peppercorns and cook for another minute, until fragrant."</p> <p>Visual: "A skillet or wok with soy sauce and Shaoxing wine (or dry sherry) being poured into the stir-fry, causing the sauce to thicken slightly."</p>	
Step 6	<p>Text: "Add Vegetables: Add the sliced bell peppers, carrots, and mushrooms to the skillet or wok and stir-fry for about 2 minutes, until they are slightly tender."</p> <p>Context: "Stir in another tablespoon of vegetable oil if needed, and cook for another minute, until the vegetables are coated in the sauce and slightly browned."</p> <p>Visual: "A skillet or wok filled with sliced bell peppers, carrots, and mushrooms stir-frying over medium heat until slightly tender, adding another tablespoon of vegetable oil if needed."</p>	
Step 7	<p>Text: "Cook Until Done: Continue to cook the chicken and vegetables over medium-high heat, stirring occasionally, until they are cooked through and the sauce has thickened slightly."</p> <p>Context: "Adjust the heat as needed to prevent burning. Cook for about 5-7 minutes more, until the chicken is cooked through and the vegetables are tender but still crisp."</p> <p>Visual: "A skillet or wok with chicken and vegetables cooking over medium-high heat, stirring occasionally, until they are cooked through and the sauce has thickened slightly, adjusting the heat as needed to prevent burning."</p>	
Step 8	<p>Text: "Serve: Transfer the Szechuan Chicken to a serving platter and garnish with thinly sliced scallions."</p> <p>Context: "Serve immediately, spooning the sauce over the top of the chicken and vegetables."</p> <p>Visual: "A plate of food with chopsticks and a fork on a table."</p>	

Figure 18: Qualitative result of VG-T2V Model (Ours) for the "How to Cook Szechuan Chicken?" task. Visual texts are used to generate task videos for the VG-TVP model.

## Welcome to the Human Evaluation Survey!

### Overview

Welcome to the Human Evaluation Survey!  
Before start to the survey, please read the instruction below.







#### Instructions:

- ◆ We are going to show you two different Sequences. Both Sequences consist Textual and Video Instructions. Given the <task> (for example, Task: How to make pancakes):
  - Compare Two Sequences of Steps (Sequence 1 and Sequence 2).
  - Sequence 1 Videos were generated by using <text> and <context> instructions
  - Sequence 2 Videos were generated by using <visual> instructions
  - Choose which Sequence is better in terms of 4 aspects:
    1. **Textual Informativeness:** whether the Textual Sequence (sequence of texts) contain the amount of information needed to complete the task.
    2. **Visual Informativeness:** whether the Visual Sequence (sequence of videos) contain the amount of information needed to complete the task.
    3. **Temporal Coherence:** whether the Multimodal sequence (paired sequence of texts and videos) meet the temporal common-sense requirements, such as a step occurs before another step instead of after.
    4. **Plan Accuracy:** whether the Multimodal sequence (paired sequence of texts and videos) can successfully complete the task.








#### What's the step-by-step procedure for <task>?

##### Task: How to Make a Gender Reveal Balloon?

#### Sequence 1:

Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6	Step 7	Step 8
<b>Text:</b> "Materials needed" <b>Context:</b> "Gender reveal balloons (you can buy these online or at party supply stores), balloon pump, ribbon or string, tape (optional)." <b>Visual:</b> "The expectant couple is preparing the gender reveal balloon by gathering supplies and decorations."	<b>Text:</b> "Inflate the Balloons" <b>Context:</b> "Inflate the gender reveal balloons with air using a balloon pump. Make sure to inflate them to the desired size, but not too tightly, as you want them to be easy to pop when needed."	<b>Text:</b> "Attach the Ribbon or String" <b>Context:</b> "Attach a ribbon or string to each balloon. This will make it easier to hold onto the balloons and pull them apart when it is time for the reveal."	<b>Text:</b> "Add the Gender Reveal Material" <b>Context:</b> "Open up the package of gender reveal material that comes with a piece of ribbon or string. Make sure the material is usually in the form of a powder or confetti that you'll fill the balloons with. Follow the manufacturer's instructions for how much material to use and how to fill the balloons."	<b>Text:</b> "Seal the Balloons" <b>Context:</b> "Once the balloons are filled with the gender reveal material, seal them by tying off the opening with a piece of ribbon or string. Make sure the opening is securely closed so that the material doesn't spill out before it's time for the reveal."	<b>Text:</b> "Prepare the Reveal" <b>Context:</b> "Before you start the reveal, make sure you have everything you need nearby, such as a knife or pin to pop the balloons, and a container to catch the reveal material."	<b>Text:</b> "Start the Reveal" <b>Context:</b> "When it's time for the reveal, have each person hold onto their balloon and pull them apart gently. The gender reveal material will spill out of the balloons and show the gender of the baby."	<b>Text:</b> "Optional Step: Clean Up" <b>Context:</b> "After the reveal, clean up any mess that was made by disposing of the gender reveal material and inflated balloons."
							

#### Sequence 2:

Step 1	Step 2	Step 3	Step 4	Step 5	Step 6	Step 7
<b>Text:</b> "Materials needed" <b>Context:</b> "Gender reveal balloons (you can buy these online or at party supply stores), balloon pump, ribbon or string, tape (optional)." <b>Visual:</b> "The expectant couple is preparing the gender reveal balloon by gathering supplies and decorations."	<b>Text:</b> "Inflate the Balloons" <b>Context:</b> "Inflate the gender reveal balloons with air using a balloon pump. Make sure to inflate them to the desired size, but not too tightly, as you want them to be easy to pop when needed." <b>Visual:</b> "They are inflating the balloon with either pink or blue confetti, depending on the baby's gender."	<b>Text:</b> "Attach the Ribbon or String" <b>Context:</b> "Attach a ribbon or string to each balloon. This will make it easier to hold onto the balloons and pull them apart when it is time for the reveal." <b>Visual:</b> "The excited parents-to-be is sealing the balloon securely to keep the confetti hidden until the reveal moment."	<b>Text:</b> "Prepare the Reveal" <b>Context:</b> "Before you start the reveal, make sure you have everything you need nearby, such as a knife or pin to pop the balloons, and a container to catch the reveal material." <b>Visual:</b> "They are arranging the venue and setting up the space for the gender reveal celebration."	<b>Text:</b> "Start the Reveal" <b>Context:</b> "When it's time for the reveal, have each person hold onto their balloon and pull them apart gently. The gender reveal material will spill out of the balloons and show the gender of the baby." <b>Visual:</b> "The guests are gathering around eagerly, waiting for the big reveal with anticipation."	<b>Text:</b> "Optional Step: Clean Up" <b>Context:</b> "After the reveal, clean up any mess that was made by disposing of the gender reveal material and inflated balloons." <b>Visual:</b> "The couple is releasing the balloon into the air or popping it to reveal the pink or blue confetti."	<b>Text:</b> "Celebrate!" <b>Context:</b> "Everyone is cheering and celebrating as the gender of the baby is unveiled." <b>Visual:</b> "Everyone is cheering and celebrating as the gender of the baby is unveiled."
						

1. Which sequence contains richer **Textual Informativeness**? The richer Textual Sequence means more information in textual sequence (Step 1, Step 2, ..., Step N) is for completing the given <task>. Select an Option [Please only consider texts in this option.]

- 1 - Sequence 1 is better
  0 - Tie
  2 - Sequence 2 is better

2. Which sequence contains richer **Visual Informativeness**? The richer Visual Sequence means more information in video sequence (the videos under each Step) is for completing the given <task>. Select an Option [Please only consider videos in this option.]

- 1 - Sequence 1 is better
  0 - Tie
  2 - Sequence 2 is better

3. Which sequence has more sensible **Temporal Coherence**? The sensible Temporal Multimodal (text and videos) sequence follows real-world common-sense understanding. In short, the first step of <task> occurs before the second step instead of after. Select an Option [Please consider texts and videos together in this option.]

- 1 - Sequence 1 is better
  0 - Tie
  2 - Sequence 2 is better

4. Which sequence is more likely to attain a greater level of **Plan Accuracy**? The greater level of Plan Accuracy means whether accomplishing the <task> or not. Select an Option [Please consider texts and videos together in this option.]

- 1 - Sequence 1 is better
  0 - Tie
  2 - Sequence 2 is better

Figure 19: The survey example for the human evaluation study.









Figure 20: The fundamental representation of the FoC to show how different mismatched steps in IVs are aligned and prepared for generating an accurate MPP content.









**What is the step-by-step procedure for how to make pancakes? Rewrite the textual instruction of making pancakes with visualized instruction pair-wisely in a template <text>, <context>, and <visual> separately.**

Step 1	Text: "Mix the Batter." Context: "In a large mixing bowl, combine 1 cup of all-purpose flour, 2 tablespoons of sugar, and 2 teaspoons of baking powder." Visual: "Show a picture of a mixing bowl with measuring cups and spoons nearby."			
Step 2	Text: "Add Eggs and Milk" Context: "In a separate bowl, beat 1 egg and mix in 1/4 cup of milk." Visual: "Show a picture of an egg being beaten with a fork or whisk in one hand, while the other hand holds the measuring cup containing the milk."			
Step 3	Text: "Add Butter and Vegetable Oil" Context: "Cut 1 tablespoon of cold butter into small pieces and add it to the mixing bowl with the flour mixture." Visual: "Show a picture of a butter knife cutting butter into small pieces."			
Step 4	Text: "Add Buttermilk" Context: "Pour in 1/2 cup of buttermilk and mix until just combined. Do not overmix!" Visual: "Show a picture of a spoon stirring the batter gently, with a bit of foam on top."			
Step 5	Text: "Cook the Pancakes" Context: "Heat a non-stick pan or griddle over medium heat. Grease the pan with some butter or cooking spray." Visual: "Show a picture of a non-stick pan or griddle heating up, with a bit of butter or cooking spray being applied to the surface."			
Step 6	Text: "Pour in the Batter" Context: "Use a 1/4 cup measuring cup to scoop the batter onto the hot pan." Visual: "Show a picture of a measuring cup pouring the batter into the pan, with a bit of foam on top."			
Step 7	Text: "Cook for 2-3 Minutes" Context: "Cook the pancakes for 2-3 minutes, until bubbles appear on the surface and the edges start to dry." Visual: "Show a picture of a pancake cooking on the pan, with bubbles appearing on the surface and the edges starting to dry."			
Step 8	Text: "Flip and Cook for Another Minute." Context: "Use a spatula to carefully flip the pancake and cook for another minute, until the other side is golden brown." Visual: "Show a picture of a spatula flipping the pancake onto the other side, with a bit of foam on top."			
Step 9	Text: "Serve and Enjoy!" Context: "Once the pancakes are cooked, serve them hot with your favorite toppings such as syrup, butter, fruit, or whipped cream." Visual: "Show a picture of pancakes being served on a plate, with different toppings available for selection."			

Vanilla Generated Text and Video Plans via Visualized Instruction Prompting (Llama2-7B-q4)

Figure 21: Qualitative Comparison Example with Visualized Instruction Prompting by Llama2-7B-q4, (Task: How to make pancakes?)
















What is the step-by-step procedure for how to make pancakes? Rewrite the textual instruction of pancake with visualized video instruction pair-wisely in a template <text> <context>, <visual> separately.

Step 1	Text: "Mix the Batter." Context: "In a large mixing bowl, combine 1 1/2 cups of all-purpose flour, 3 tablespoons of sugar, 2 teaspoons of baking powder, and 1/4 teaspoon of salt. Whisk together until well combined." Visual: "A person is holding a mixing bowl and using a whisk to mix the ingredients together. The camera zooms in on the mixing bowl, showing the flour, sugar, baking powder, and salt being combined. The person uses a whisk to mix the ingredients together until they are well combined."	The first Visual sentence is used to generate video plans.			
Step 2	Text: "Add the Eggs" Context: "In another bowl, whisk together 1 cup of milk, 1 large egg, and 1 tablespoon of melted butter. Pour the wet ingredients into the dry ingredients and stir until just combined." Visual: "The person is holding a separate bowl containing the wet ingredients (milk, egg, and melted butter). They are pouring the wet ingredients into the dry ingredients in the mixing bowl. The person is using a spoon to stir the mixture until it is just combined."				
Step 3	Text: "Cook the Pancakes." Context: "Heat a non-stick skillet or griddle over medium heat. Drop the batter by 1/4 cupfuls onto the skillet, and cook for 2 to 3 minutes or until bubbles appear on the surface of the pancake and the edges start to dry." Visual: "The person is holding a non-stick skillet or griddle and heating it up over medium heat. They are dropping the batter by 1/4 cupfuls onto the skillet. The camera zooms in on the pancake as it cooks, showing the bubbles forming on the surface and the edges drying out."	All Visual sentences are used to generate video plans.			
Step 4	Text: "Flip the Pancakes" Context: "Flip the pancakes and cook for another 1 to 2 minutes or until golden brown. Serve immediately with your favorite toppings." Visual: "The person is turning the pancake over and cooking it for another minute or two, until it is golden brown. The camera zooms out to show the finished pancakes on a plate, ready to be served with toppings."				

Vanilla Generated Text and Video Plans via Visualized Video Instruction Prompting (Llama2-7B-q4)

Figure 22: Qualitative Comparison Example with Visualized Video Instruction Prompting by Llama2-7B-q4, (Task: How to make pancakes?)


What is the step-by-step procedure for how to make pancakes? Rewrite the textual instruction of pancake with visualized video instruction pair-wisely in a template <text> <context>, <visual> separately.

Step 1	Text: "Ingredients: 1 cup all-purpose flour, 2 tablespoons sugar, 2 teaspoons baking powder, a quarter teaspoon salt, 1 cup buttermilk (you can substitute with regular milk if you don't have buttermilk), 2 large eggs, vegetable oil or melted butter for cooking the pancakes." Context: "In a medium-sized bowl, whisk together the flour, sugar, baking powder, and salt." Visual: "A person holding a medium-sized bowl and whisking together ingredients."			
Step 2	Text: "Mix wet ingredients: In a separate bowl, mix the buttermilk and eggs." Context: "In a separate bowl, mix the buttermilk and eggs." Visual: "A person holding a separate bowl and mixing ingredients."			
Step 3	Text: "Add the wet ingredients to the dry ingredients and stir until just combined (be careful not to overmix). The batter should still be slightly lumpy." Context: "In a medium-sized bowl, whisk together the flour, sugar, baking powder, and salt. Add the wet ingredients and stir until just combined." Visual: "A person holding a medium-sized bowl and stirring ingredients."			
Step 4	Text: "Heat a non-stick skillet or griddle over medium heat." Context: "On a stovetop, there is a skillet or griddle heating up over medium heat." Visual: "A skillet or griddle on a stovetop with heat visible."			
Step 5	Text: "Scoop batter onto skillet or griddle by using a 1-4 cup measuring cup, scoop the batter onto the skillet or griddle." Context: "A person holding a measuring cup pouring batter onto a hot skillet or griddle." Visual: "A person pouring batter onto a hot skillet or griddle."			
Step 6	Text: "Cook the pancakes for about 2-3 minutes, until bubbles appear on the surface and the edges start to dry." Context: "On the skillet or griddle, the pancakes are cooking for about 2-3 minutes, until bubbles appear on the surface and the edges start to dry." Visual: "A pancake cooking on a hot skillet or griddle with bubbles visible on the surface."			
Step 7	Text: "Flip the pancakes and cook for another 1-2 minutes, until they're golden brown and cooked through." Context: "After cooking for about 1-2 minutes on the first side, flip the pancakes and cook for another minute until they're golden brown and cooked through." Visual: "A person flipping a pancake with a spatula."			
Step 8	Text: "Serve the pancakes hot with your favorite toppings, such as maple syrup, butter, fresh fruit, or whipped cream." Context: "On a plate, the pancakes are served hot with toppings such as maple syrup, butter, fresh fruit, or whipped cream." Visual: "A stack of pancakes on a plate with toppings visible."			
Step 9	Text: "Someone finishes a stack of pancakes with berries and syrup on top." Context: "On the plate, the person is finishing off a stack of pancakes with berries and syrup on top." Visual: "A person holding a plate of pancakes with berries and syrup on top."			

Vanilla Generated Text and Video Plans via VG-TVP (Ours)


Figure 23: Qualitative Comparison Example by VG-TVP (Ours), (Task: How to make pancakes?)

What's the step-by-step procedure for <task>? Task: How to Make Pancakes?	
Step 1	Text: "Ingredients" Context: "1 cup all-purpose flour, 2 tablespoons sugar (optional, adjust to taste), 1 tablespoon baking powder, 1/2 teaspoon salt 1 cup milk (you can use dairy milk or a plant-based alternative), 2 tablespoons melted butter or vegetable oil, 1 large egg, butter or oil for cooking (to grease the pan)"
Step 2	Text: "In a large mixing bowl, whisk together the flour, sugar (if using), baking powder, and salt until well combined." Context: "N/A"
Step 3	Text: "In a separate bowl, whisk together the milk, melted butter or oil, and egg until thoroughly combined." Context: "N/A"
Step 4	Text: "Pour the wet ingredients into the dry ingredients and stir until just combined." Context: "Be careful not to overmix; it is okay if there are some small lumps in the batter."
Step 5	Text: "Heat a non-stick skillet or griddle over medium heat." Context: "Add a small amount of butter or oil to grease the surface."
Step 6	Text: "Once the skillet is hot, pour a ladleful of batter onto the skillet, using about 1/4 cup for each pancake." Context: "You can adjust the amount depending on how big you want your pancakes to be."
Step 7	Text: "Cook the pancakes for 2-3 minutes, or until bubbles form on the surface and the edges start to look set." Context: "N/A"
Step 8	Text: "Flip the pancakes using a spatula, and cook for an additional 1-2 minutes on the other side, or until golden brown and cooked through." Context: "N/A"
Step 9	Text: "Transfer the cooked pancakes to a plate and keep warm while you cook the remaining batter." Context: "You may need to adjust the heat of the skillet as you go to prevent burning."
Step 10	Text: "Serve the pancakes warm with your favorite toppings such as maple syrup, fresh fruit, whipped cream, or chocolate chips." Context: "N/A"
Step 11	Text: "Enjoy your delicious homemade pancakes" Context: "Feel free to customize the recipe by adding ingredients like vanilla extract, cinnamon, blueberries, or chocolate chips to the batter for extra flavor."



a) ChatGPT-3.5 Model + T2V, Textual and Video Generation – Seen Tasks

Step 1	Text: "Gather your ingredients." Context: "Flour, sugar, baking powder, salt, milk, melted butter or oil, and egg." Visual: "A person places various ingredients on a kitchen counter."
Step 2	Text: "Mix dry ingredients in a bowl." Context: "Flour, sugar, baking powder, and salt." Visual: "A bowl filled with flour, sugar, baking powder, and salt being mixed together."
Step 3	Text: "Combine wet ingredients separately." Context: "Milk, melted butter or oil, and egg." Visual: "A separate bowl with milk, melted butter or oil, and an egg being whisked together."
Step 4	Text: "Blend wet and dry mixtures." Context: "Pour wet ingredients into dry ingredients and stir." Visual: "Mixing the wet ingredients into the dry ingredients until combined."
Step 5	Text: "Preheat skillet and grease." Context: "Heat skillet, add butter or oil." Visual: "A skillet heating up with butter or oil being added to grease the surface."
Step 6	Text: "Pour batter onto skillet." Context: "Use a ladle for 1/4 cup of batter." Visual: "Pouring batter onto the heated skillet from a ladle."
Step 7	Text: "Cook until bubbles form." Context: "Wait 2-3 minutes." Visual: "Pancakes cooking on the skillet with bubbles forming on the surface."
Step 8	Text: "Flip and cook until golden." Context: "Flip pancakes, cook for 1-2 minutes." Visual: "Using a spatula to flip pancakes and cooking until golden brown."
Step 9	Text: "Transfer and keep warm." Context: "Place cooked pancakes on a plate." Visual: "Stacking pancakes on a plate and covering them to keep warm."
Step 10	Text: "Serve with favorite toppings." Context: "Maple syrup, fruit, whipped cream, or chocolate chips." Visual: "Pancakes served on a plate with various toppings like syrup and fruit."
Step 11	Text: "Enjoy your homemade pancakes!" Context: "Customize with vanilla, cinnamon, or blueberries." Visual: "A person enjoying a stack of homemade pancakes with a smile."



b) VG-TVP (Ours), Textual and Video Generation – Seen Tasks

Figure 24: Qualitative Comparison Example: GPT-3.5 vs. VG-TVP. Visuals (orange) are used to generate video plans.