

# IllusionBench: A Large-scale and Comprehensive Benchmark for Visual Illusion Understanding in Vision-Language Models

Yiming Zhang, Zicheng Zhang, Xinyi Wei, Xiaohong Liu, Guangtao Zhai, Xiongkuo Min\*  
 Institute of Image Communication and Network Engineering,  
 Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China  
 {ming\_zhang\_sjtu, zzc1998, moj-will, xiaohongliu, zhaiguangtao, minxiongkuo}@sjtu.edu.cn

**Abstract**—Current Visual Language Models (VLMs) show impressive image understanding but struggle with visual illusions, especially in real-world scenarios. Existing benchmarks focus on classical cognitive illusions, which have been learned by state-of-the-art (SOTA) VLMs, revealing issues such as hallucinations and limited perceptual abilities. To address this gap, we introduce IllusionBench, a comprehensive visual illusion dataset that encompasses not only classic cognitive illusions but also real-world scene illusions. This dataset features 1,051 images, 5,548 question-answer pairs, and 1,051 golden text descriptions that address the presence, causes, and content of the illusions. We evaluate ten SOTA VLMs on this dataset using true-or-false, multiple-choice, and open-ended tasks. In addition to real-world illusions, we design trap illusions that resemble classical patterns but differ in reality, highlighting hallucination issues in SOTA models. The top-performing model, GPT-4o, achieves 80.59% accuracy on true-or-false tasks and 76.75% on multiple-choice questions, but still lags behind human performance. In the semantic description task, GPT-4o’s hallucinations on classical illusions result in low scores for trap illusions, even falling behind some open-source models. IllusionBench is, to the best of our knowledge, the largest and most comprehensive benchmark for visual illusions in VLMs to date.

**Index Terms**—Benchmark, VLM, Visual Illusion

## I. INTRODUCTION

Visual illusions are perceptual anomalies caused by the visual system, characterized by a discrepancy between visual perception and reality [1]. However, Richard Gregory’s classification [2] provides a framework by dividing visual illusions into three main categories: physical illusions, physiological illusions, and cognitive illusions. Among these, cognitive visual illusions are the result of unconscious inferences and are perhaps the most widely recognized.

These classic cognitive illusion images share a common feature: they are all artificially synthesized and inherently ambiguous.

In addition to artificially synthesized images, a small proportion of images captured in real-world scenes also exhibit visual illusions. The fundamental cause of this phenomenon is the inverse projection problem, where information is irreversibly lost during the projection from the three-dimensional world to two-dimensional images [3]. This results in difficulties

such as information loss, ambiguity, and multiple possible interpretations when attempting to infer three-dimensional objects and scenes from two-dimensional images (light and shadow projections) [4].

While the human brain compensates for the missing depth information in two-dimensional images (retinal projections) through binocular disparity and motion parallax [5], this issue remains unresolved in two-dimensional images captured by cameras. Consequently, both humans and vision models may experience visual illusions, leading to difficulties or errors in interpreting these images [6].




Fig. 1: Error cases from IllusionBench.

To address this challenge, the human visual system leverages contextual cues for cognitive reasoning and utilizes monocular cues, such as perspective, occlusion relationships, shadows, and lighting, to alleviate the difficulties in information interpretation [7]. However, the extent to which current VLMs can recognize and interpret these visual illusions in real-world scenes remains an open question, as shown in Fig. 1.

Recent advancements in VLMs, like GPT-4o and Gemini-pro-1.5, have greatly improved visual question answering (VQA) [8]–[10]. The improvements highlight their growing ability to bridge the gap between visual and textual information, enabling them to understand visual illusions.

Previous research has used artificially synthesized classic

\*Corresponding authors

TABLE I: Comparison of IllusionBench with other illusion datasets

Dataset	Base Image	Question Type	Number of Instance	Text Description?	Image Type
GVIL	16	Binary	1600	×	Color & Size illusions and variant
HallusionBench	72	Binary	1129*	×	Color & Size illusions and variant
IllusionVQA	374	Multiple-choice	1435	×	12 types, mainly classical synthetic cognitive illusions
Ours	1051	Binary, Multiple-choice, Open-ended description	6599	✓	Classic illusions, real scene illusions, trap illusions, no illusion, and Ishihara images

\* Note: The instances in HallusionBench include more than just visual illusions.




Fig. 2: Performance of advanced VLMs and human evaluators on IllusionBench perception tasks (left) and description tasks (right). The left image shows P1-P5 representing perception tasks on the subsets of **Classic Cognitive Illusion, Real Scene Illusion, No Illusion, Ishihara Image, and Trap Illusion**, respectively. Similarly, the right image shows D1-D5 representing description tasks on these subsets. “T/F”, “Mul”, “Sem”, and “Illu” respectively represent true-or-false, multiple-choice and semantic descriptions.

cognitive visual illusion images as benchmarks for VLMs to explore the similarities between artificial intelligence and human visual cognition and to evaluate VLMs’ understanding of visual illusions [11]–[13]. Unlike previous studies, our work includes not only classic cognitive illusion images, which lack real-world context, but also a large collection of real-scene visual illusions. These real-world images better represent practical applications and assess VLMs’ ability to use contextual cues, similar to human perception. Additionally, because SOTA VLMs may have already learned classical illusions, these images may no longer be sufficient to test the visual perception ability of VLMs. To address the issue of potential overfitting to classic cognitive illusions, we introduce Ishihara color blindness detection images and trap illusion images. These images are accompanied by carefully crafted, manually annotated question-answer pairs, as well as image descriptions that cover image semantics, the presence of visual illusions, and their underlying causes.

Using our testing framework, we comprehensively evaluate the latest SOTA VLMs, such as GPT-4o, Gemini-pro-1.5, and several open-source models. Specifically, our framework includes true-or-false, multiple-choice, open-ended questions.

Additionally, each image in our dataset is assigned a manually annotated cognitive difficulty level, and we conduct human testing to provide a multidimensional, fine-grained comparison between human performance and VLMs’ performance on visual illusion cognition tasks. Fig. 2 shows the performances of SOTA VLMs on these tasks. Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- **IllusionBench Dataset:** We build a large-scale dataset that includes both classic and real-world visual illusions, color blindness test images, and trap illusions, supplemented with question-answer pairs and detailed annotations on image semantics, the presence of illusions, and their causes. To the best of our knowledge, IllusionBench is the **largest** and most comprehensive visual illusion benchmark for VLMs to date.
- **Comprehensive Testing Framework:** We apply a rigorous framework to evaluate SOTA VLMs, such as GPT-4o and Gemini-pro-1.5, using a range of question types including true-or-false, multiple-choice, open-ended, ensuring a thorough evaluation of the models’ capabilities in understanding visual illusions.

## II. RELATED WORK

Existing research has demonstrated that visual illusions for humans can induce equivalent illusions in models [14]. However, these studies primarily focus on specific types of illusions, including motion [15], brightness and color [16], and completion [17].

Recent studies have explored VLMs’ ability to perceive visual illusions through natural language. A pioneering work [11] tested this by using a dataset of 1,600 variants from 16 root images, focusing on color and geometric distortions. The study aims to evaluate if SOTA VLMs align with human perception in visual illusions. Results show that while larger models perform better in localization tasks, VLMs generally struggle to interpret visual illusions as humans do.

Another study [12] introduced a benchmark to evaluate VLMs’ handling of visual illusions and language hallucinations using a dataset of 346 images, including 72 focused on illusions, paired with question-answer tasks. The models, including GPT-4V, struggle with these illusions and hallucinations, achieving only 31.42% accuracy. This highlights a misalignment with human perception and suggests that SOTA




Fig. 3: **Categories in IllusionBench.** The annotations under each image represent the human cognitive difficulty score.

VLMs may overfit classic illusions, making them less effective for testing complex visual understanding.

Additionally, [13] introduced a dataset of 374 classic cognitive illusion images, generating 439 question-answer pairs to test VLMs’ understanding and localization of challenging visual content. The study finds that advanced VLMs like GPT-4V and Gemini Pro perform poorly on visual illusions, with accuracy below that of human evaluators, highlighting current limitations in interpreting complex visual scenes.

Previous studies mainly focus on synthetic cognitive illusions, but our study expands this by including real-world scenes with visual illusions to better assess VLMs’ use of contextual cues. Additionally, we introduce Ishihara and trap illusions to evaluate potential overfitting, ensuring a more precise alignment with human visual perception. To the best of our knowledge, IllusionBench is the largest and most comprehensive visual illusion benchmark for VLMs to date, as shown in Table I.

### III. ILLUSIONBENCH

To evaluate VLMs’ understanding of visual illusions, we create IllusionBench with more than 1K images equipped with 5K QA pairs and manually annotated golden descriptions, as shown in Fig. 4. IllusionBench includes five image types: classical illusions, real scene illusions, no illusions, Ishihara images, and trap illusions (Fig. 3). Testing tasks involve judgment, multiple-choice, and descriptive questions focused on illusion existence, causes, and content. This section details the dataset composition, question generation methods, and tasks.

#### A. Collection and Composition of Images

We collect 1K+ images from various online repositories. After manual selection, 780 images are confirmed to contain visual illusions, 26 are Ishihara color blindness detection images, and 245 images have no illusions, as shown Appendix Fig. 1. The details are:

- **Classic Cognitive Illusion Images** These include blur, distortion, paradox, and fictitious illusions—key examples of traditional synthetic illusions. Designed by psychologists, these ambiguous images test VLMs’ alignment with human perception. However, their classic na-

ture and limited number may reduce their effectiveness, as they could be part of advanced VLMs’ training datasets.

- **Trap Illusion** Trap illusions are edited versions of classic visual illusions, resembling them in appearance but differing in physical properties. These images test whether VLMs overfit classic cognitive illusions, potentially causing hallucinations.
- **Real Scene Illusion Images** IllusionBench includes 597 real-scene images with visual illusions. These images depict real-world objects and scenes, with unique and definite semantic descriptions. The illusions arise from the inverse projection problem, where information is lost in the transition from 3D to 2D. Understanding these images requires monocular cues like perspective, occlusion, shadows, and lighting, as well as contextual reasoning.
- **Ishihara Color Blindness Detection Images** IllusionBench includes 26 Ishihara images, verified by vision-healthy individuals, where the patterns convey unique and definite semantics. These images test whether VLMs’ visual cognition aligns with human perception, specifically regarding Gestalt principles such as grouping, similarity, and proximity.
- **No Illusion Images** IllusionBench contains 245 images with no illusions, depicting diverse subjects such as people, landscapes, and objects. These images provide a baseline for evaluating VLMs’ visual understanding and the impact of illusions and evaluate the models’ yes-bias when addressing questions about illusion presence.

#### B. Benchmark on Illusion Perception Ability

1) **Question Types and QA Pairs Generation:** The question-answer pairs in IllusionBench include both binary (true-or-false) and multiple-choice questions. Each image is accompanied by at least two binary questions and three multiple-choice questions, all manually annotated by humans. Each image also has a manually assigned cognitive difficulty rating, categorized as Easy, Neutral, or Hard, with all questions related to a given image sharing the same difficulty level.

- **True-or-false Question:** IllusionBench includes over 2,200 binary questions focused on semantic content and



**Check if the following description is correct**

Q: The man is drinking from the can. A: False  
 Q: There is a visual illusion in the image. A: True

**What is the man wearing?**

i. A hat ii. A t-shirt iii. A jacket iv. A dress

**What causes the visual illusion?**

i. The can is closer to the camera ii. The man is a giant  
 iii. The can is digitally altered iv. The sky is artificially colored

In this picture, a man stands with his mouth open in front of a beer can held in another person's hand. There is a visual illusion in the image. The illusion is created by the clever use of forced perspective, camera angle and positioning, making it appear as though the man is about to drink from an enormous beer can, even though the can is actually much closer to the camera than the man.

Fig. 4: Example of real scene illusion in IllusionBench. Each image in IllusionBench is equipped with at least two true-or-false questions, three multiple-choice questions, and a description that summarizes the semantic content of the image, the existence of visual illusions, and their causes.

TABLE II: Performance of VLMs across different image categories and difficulty levels on IllusionBench true-or-false task. The best performance is marked in **bold**. “Human” refers to the average performance of two human evaluators.

Sub-category	Image Category					Difficulty Rating			All
	Classical (P1)	Real Scene (P2)	No Illusion (P3)	Ishihara (P4)	Trap (P5)	Easy	Neutral	Hard	
<b>Closed-Source VLMs</b>									
GPT-4o	<b>0.7653</b>	<b>0.8082</b>	0.8532	0.7692	0.5000	0.8526	0.8040	0.7397	<b>0.8059</b>
Gemini-pro-1.5	0.6363	0.6998	0.8319	0.8269	0.5000	0.7907	0.6943	0.6591	0.7183
Qwen-vl-Max	0.6276	0.7223	<b>0.8589</b>	0.8269	0.3684	0.8295	0.6913	0.6777	0.7338
Qwen-vl-plus	0.5522	0.6479	0.8250	<b>0.9800</b>	0.3055	0.7592	0.6447	0.6058	0.6742
<b>Opened-Source VLMs</b>									
CogVLM-17B (Vicuna-v1.5-7B)	0.4028	0.4291	0.4431	0.4808	<b>0.5263</b>	0.4263	0.4352	0.4286	0.4308
DeepSeek-VL-7B-chat	0.3994	0.4705	0.4812	0.4694	<b>0.5263</b>	0.4682	0.4649	0.4478	0.4626
InternLM-XComposer2-VL-7B (InternLM2)	0.5552	0.6456	0.8033	0.7500	0.3158	0.7436	0.6379	0.5914	0.6625
LLaVA-v1.5 (Vicuna-v1.5-7B)	0.4128	0.4192	0.4741	0.4808	<b>0.5263</b>	0.4437	0.4319	0.4204	0.4333
LLaVA-v1.5 (Vicuna-v1.5-13B)	0.5145	0.7092	0.7847	0.7692	0.2632	0.7693	0.6719	0.6061	0.6895
LLaVA-NeXT (Llama3-8B)	0.6221	0.6735	0.8302	0.7885	<b>0.5263</b>	0.7897	0.6586	0.6489	0.6995
mPLUG-Owl2 (LLaMA-7B)	0.5843	0.6154	0.7557	0.6731	0.3421	0.7001	0.6026	0.616	0.6375
Qwen-VL-Chat	0.3866	0.4449	0.4534	0.4423	<b>0.5263</b>	0.4464	0.4416	0.4230	0.4391
<b>Human</b>	0.9130	0.9000	0.9787	1.0000	1.0000	0.9394	0.9170	0.9142	0.9234

the presence of illusions, with 57% of correct answers marked as False to counteract yes-bias in some VLMs. Semantic statements are intentionally misleading by human visual standards as shown in Fig. 4.

- **Multiple-choice Questions:** IllusionBench also features over 3,300 multiple-choice questions targeting fine-grained perception of image content and illusion causes. Each question offers four options, with one correct answer. Options are shuffled during evaluation.

2) *LLM-assisted Evaluation for VQA:* Our observations reveal that some VLMs do not output answers in the specified format. So we employ a *LLM-Assisted Evaluation* method, which involves inputting the questions, correct answers, and VLM responses into a large language model (LLM) to evaluate the accuracy of the responses. Qwen-plus assisted in the evaluation of all models for 5 rounds.

While *LLM-Assisted Evaluation* is efficient, it can sometimes err when the model’s output significantly deviates from the standard answer format. To address this, we manually review and correct all cases marked incorrect by the LLM. Thus, our evaluation combines manual and LLM-assisted methods for accuracy. Further details are in the Appendix. B.

### C. Benchmarks on Illusion Description Ability

1) *Golden Description Definition and Question Type:* In addition to multiple question-answer pairs, each image is

also accompanied by a manually crafted *golden description*, covering the main content of the image, the existence of any visual illusion, and the causes of the illusion. The average length of each description is 53.21 words. All descriptions follow the format:

*In this picture, [image semantics content]. There [is/is no] visual illusion in the image. The reason for visual illusions is [illusion causes].*

Supported by the golden descriptions, we conduct open-ended question-answer testing VLMs’ semantic describing ability. To evaluate whether VLMs can accurately describe the semantic content of the image with illusions, the prompt is:

*# user: Please provide a description of the content in this image.*

2) *LLM-assisted Evaluation for Description:* This work examines how VLMs understand visual illusions, which often lead to challenges and inaccuracies in image interpretation. We evaluate VLM performance by assessing the accuracy of their descriptions, specifically their alignment with physical reality and human perception.

Previous studies have shown that single-modal language models are effective for evaluating language tasks [18]. After collecting open-ended responses from the VLMs, we use advanced LLMs to quantitatively evaluate multimodal description tasks. Specifically, both the model’s output and the golden description are input into the LLM, which compares the two to identify significant conflicts. Preciseness is scored on a scale of



TABLE III: Performance of VLMs across different image categories and difficulty ratings on IllusionBench multiple-choice task. The best performance is marked in **bold**. “Human” refers to the average performance of two human evaluators.

Sub-category VLMs	Image Category					Difficulty Rating			All
	Classical (P1)	Real Scene (P2)	No Illusion (P3)	Ishihara (P4)	Trap (P5)	Easy	Neutral	Hard	
<b>Closed-Source VLMs</b>									
GPT-4o	<b>0.7206</b>	<b>0.7620</b>	<b>0.8255</b>	<b>0.7564</b>	0.6667	<b>0.8163</b>	<b>0.7558</b>	<b>0.7172</b>	<b>0.7675</b>
Gemini-pro-1.5	0.7050	0.7432	0.7901	0.6795	0.6795	0.7998	0.7335	0.6818	0.7444
Qwen-vl-Max	0.6531	0.7026	0.7620	0.7051	<b>0.7051</b>	0.7608	0.6981	0.6392	0.7064
Qwen-vl-plus	0.5038	0.5715	0.7020	0.6410	0.5556	0.6720	0.5563	0.5339	0.5903
<b>Opened-Source VLMs</b>									
CogVLM-17B (Vicuna-v1.5-7B)	0.4624	0.4979	0.5943	0.5256	0.5256	0.5904	0.4980	0.4147	0.5112
DeepSeek-VL-7B-chat	0.3158	0.3603	0.3623	0.1538	0.1538	0.3843	0.3388	0.3078	0.3473
InternLM-XComposer2-VL-7B (InternLM2)	0.5188	0.6138	0.6961	0.4103	0.4103	0.6801	0.5863	0.5404	0.6077
LLaVA-v1.5 (Vicuna-v1.5-7B)	0.3195	0.3345	0.3835	0.2692	0.2692	0.3848	0.3134	0.3250	0.3395
LLaVA-v1.5 (Vicuna-v1.5-13B)	0.5075	0.5594	0.6274	0.4872	0.4872	0.6295	0.5322	0.5173	0.5612
LLaVA-NeXT (Llama3-8B)	0.5094	0.6042	0.6771	0.6410	0.6410	0.6515	0.6013	0.5404	0.6050
mPLUG-Owl2 (LLaMA-7B)	0.4530	0.5137	0.5794	0.3333	0.3333	0.5621	0.4997	0.4540	0.5107
Qwen-VL-Chat	0.3158	0.3614	0.3609	0.1538	0.1538	0.3834	0.3390	0.3106	0.3477
<b>Human</b>	0.9327	0.8712	0.9275	1.0000	0.9167	0.9170	0.8889	0.8889	0.8975

[0, 1, 2]. The evaluations of all models are assisted by Qwen-plus for 5 rounds. Our human study shows that Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient (SRCC) between LLM and human evaluation results exceeds 0.9. Details regarding prompts and other specifics can be found in the Appendix. C.

#### IV. EXPERIMENT SETUP

##### A. Vision Language Models

We test four SOTA closed-source models and eight open-source models. The closed-source models include GPT-4o (version 2024-05-13) [19], Gemini-pro-1.5 (latest update in May 2024) [20], Qwen-VL-Plus, and Qwen-VL-Max [21]. We use the latest versions available at the time of writing, with their default API parameters. The open-source models include CogVLM-17B (Vicuna-v1.5-7B) [22], DeepSeek-VL-7B-chat [23], InternLM-XComposer2-VL-7B (InternLM2) [24], LLaVA-v1.5 (Vicuna-v1.5-7B), LLaVA-v1.5 (Vicuna-v1.5-13B), LLaVA-NeXT (Llama3-8B) [25], mPLUG-Owl2 (LLaMA-7B) [26], and Qwen-VL-Chat [21]. These models span different architectures and parameter scales, are trained on a wide range of vision-language tasks, and exhibit strong visual understanding capabilities.

##### B. Human vs VLMs

To evaluate the alignment of the perception of visual illusion between VLMs and human, we utilize a subset of IllusionBench to evaluate human visual illusion perception. We recruited two human evaluators and provided them with a subset of 200 sampled images from the dataset, proportionally sampled according to image categories. The human evaluators completed all multiple-choice and judgment questions within this subset. We then quantify human cognitive abilities using the same LLM-assisted method described earlier.

#### V. RESULT ON ILLUSIONBENCH

##### A. Result on Illusion Perception

**The existence of visual illusions significantly affects the visual perception of VLMs.** We evaluate VLMs’ ability

to perceive visual illusions using true-or-false and multiple-choice tasks, with results in Table II and Table III, revealing several key insights:

1) GPT-4o performs best in both tasks, with a true-or-false accuracy of 0.8059 and multiple-choice accuracy of 0.7675, but still lags behind human performance, indicating room for improvement in handling illusions.

2) Performances of all VLMs vary across image categories, with higher accuracy for no-illusion images and real-scene illusions compared to classical cognition illusions. GPT-4o excels in classic illusions but underperforms in trap illusions, likely due to hallucinations when encountering patterns similar to classic ones, suggesting that testing VLMs with only classic illusions is insufficient.

3) We also use Ishihara color blindness test images to examine if VLMs’ perception aligns with Gestalt principles. Qwen-vl-plus shows the highest judgment accuracy (0.98), nearing the human level, but the multiple-choice performance is weaker, highlighting gaps in fine-grained perception and specific knowledge of the Ishihara test. Other VLMs all have gaps with humans in both tasks.

##### B. Result on Illusion Description

The performance results for VLMs on the open-ended description task are shown in Table IV and Appendix Table II, revealing several key insights:

As shown in Table IV, GPT-4o achieves the highest overall performance in the description task. The open-source model CogVLM-17B performs comparably to the closed-source Qwen-vl series. However, as shown in Fig. 2, GPT-4o performs poorly in the trap illusion subset, even worse than some open-source models. Detailed test results can be found in Appendix Table II. This is because GPT-4o exhibits significant hallucinations regarding classical cognitive illusions, which affects its perceptual ability with trap illusion images. This also indicates that classical cognitive illusions have already been learned by some SOTA models, making them insufficient for testing the perceptual abilities of these models. The real-world

TABLE IV: Performance of VLMs on IllusionBench description task. The best performance is marked in **bold**. The blue part represents the standard deviation between samples.

VLMs	Semantic Content Description
<b>Closed-Source VLMs</b>	
GPT-4o	<b>1.2872 ± 0.9315</b>
Gemini-pro-1.5	1.0257 ± 0.9789
Qwen-vl-Max	0.7571 ± 0.9492
Qwen-vl-plus	0.7924 ± 0.9490
<b>Opened-Source VLMs</b>	
CogVLM-17B (Vicuna-v1.5-7B)	0.9001 ± 0.9703
DeepSeek-VL-7B-chat	0.7550 ± 0.9518
InternLM-XComposer2-VL-7B (InternLM2)	0.7431 ± 0.9313
LLaVA-v1.5 (Vicuna-v1.5-7B)	0.4814 ± 0.8260
LLaVA-v1.5 (Vicuna-v1.5-13B)	0.5290 ± 0.8540
LLaVA-NeXT (Llama3-8B)	0.7364 ± 0.9431
mPLUG-Owl2 (LLaMA-7B)	0.5975 ± 0.8916
Qwen-VL-Chat	0.7336 ± 0.9408

scene illusions in this study benefit from their diverse sources and larger quantity, which not only enhance illusion-related research but also compensate for the limitations of classical cognitive illusions.

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this study, we introduce IllusionBench, the most extensive and comprehensive benchmark for evaluating VLMs on visual illusions. Our findings demonstrate that while SOTA VLMs, like GPT-4o, perform well in various tasks, they still struggle to interpret visual illusions accurately, highlighting a significant gap between model performance and human perception. However, because of the significant hallucinations regarding classical cognitive illusions, GPT-4o performs poorly in the trap illusion subset. The persistent challenges indicate that there is still much room for improvement in aligning VLMs with human visual cognition. IllusionBench can bring VLMs closer to human-like understanding and interpretation of complex visual scenes.


## REFERENCES

- [1] Dejan Todorović, “What are visual illusions?,” *Perception*, vol. 49, no. 11, pp. 1128–1199, 2020.
- [2] Richard L Gregory, “Putting illusions in their place,” *Perception*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 1–4, 1991.
- [3] E. Bruce Goldstein and Laura Cacciamani, *Sensation and Perception*, Cengage Learning, Boston, MA, 11th edition, 2022.
- [4] Stephen E Palmer, *Vision Science: Photons to Phenomenology*, MIT Press, 1999.
- [5] Ian P Howard and Brian J Rogers, *Binocular Vision and Stereopsis*, Oxford University Press, 1995.
- [6] Antonio Torralba and Alexei A Efros, “Unbiased look at dataset bias,” *CVPR 2011*, pp. 1521–1528, 2011.
- [7] Richard L Gregory, “Eye and brain: The psychology of seeing,” *Princeton University Press*, 1998.
- [8] Jingyi Zhang, Jiaying Huang, Sheng Jin, and Shijian Lu, “Vision-language models for vision tasks: A survey,” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 46, no. 8, pp. 5625–5644, 2024.
- [9] Bohao Li, Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, Guangzhi Wang, Rui Wang, Ruimao Zhang, and Ying Shan, “Seed-bench: Benchmarking multimodal large language models,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2024, pp. 13299–13308.

- [10] Shukang Yin, Chaoyou Fu, Sirui Zhao, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Tong Xu, and Enhong Chen, “A survey on multimodal large language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13549*, 2023.
- [11] Yichi Zhang, Jiayi Pan, Yuchen Zhou, Rui Pan, and Joyce Chai, “Grounding visual illusions in language: Do vision-language models perceive illusions like humans?,” in *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023, pp. 5718–5728.
- [12] Tianrui Guan, Fuxiao Liu, Xiyang Wu, Ruiqi Xian, Zongxia Li, Xiaoyu Liu, Xijun Wang, Lichang Chen, Furong Huang, Yaser Yacoob, et al., “Hallusionbench: an advanced diagnostic suite for entangled language hallucination and visual illusion in large vision-language models,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024, pp. 14375–14385.
- [13] Haz Sameen Shahgir, Khondker Salman Sayeed, Abhik Bhattacharjee, Wasi Uddin Ahmad, Yue Dong, and Rifat Shahriyar, “Illusionvqa: A challenging optical illusion dataset for vision language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15952*, 2024.
- [14] Alex Gomez-Villa, Adrián Martín, Javier Vazquez-Corral, Marcelo Bertalmío, and Jesús Malo, “On the synthesis of visual illusions using deep generative models,” *Journal of Vision*, vol. 22, no. 8, pp. 2–2, 2022.
- [15] Eiji Watanabe, Akiyoshi Kitaoka, Kiwako Sakamoto, Masaki Yasugi, and Kenta Tanaka, “Illusory motion reproduced by deep neural networks trained for prediction,” *Frontiers in psychology*, vol. 9, pp. 345, 2018.
- [16] Alexander Gomez-Villa, Adrian Martin, Javier Vazquez-Corral, and Marcelo Bertalmio, “Convolutional neural networks can be deceived by visual illusions,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2019.
- [17] Been Kim, Emily Reif, Martin Wattenberg, and Samy Bengio, “Do neural networks show gestalt phenomena? an exploration of the law of closure,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.01069*, vol. 2, no. 8, 2019.
- [18] Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al., “Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [19] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altmenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al., “Gpt-4 technical report,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [20] Machel Reid, Nikolay Savinov, Denis Teplyashin, Dmitry Lepikhin, Timothy Lillicrap, Jean-baptiste Alayrac, Radu Soricut, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, Julian Schrittwieser, et al., “Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*, 2024.
- [21] 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*, 2023.
- [22] Weihai Wang, Qingsong Lv, Wenmeng Yu, Wenyi Hong, Ji Qi, Yan Wang, Junhui Ji, Zhuoyi Yang, Lei Zhao, Xixuan Song, et al., “Cogvlm: Visual expert for pretrained language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03079*, 2023.
- [23] Haoyu Lu, Wen Liu, Bo Zhang, Bingxuan Wang, Kai Dong, Bo Liu, Jingxiang Sun, Tongzheng Ren, Zhuoshu Li, Yaofeng Sun, et al., “Deepseek-vl: towards real-world vision-language understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05525*, 2024.
- [24] Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Yuhang Cao, Bin Wang, Linke Ouyang, Xilin Wei, Songyang Zhang, Haodong Duan, Maosong Cao, et al., “Internlm-xcomposer2: Mastering free-form text-image composition and comprehension in vision-language large model,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.16420*, 2024.
- [25] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Sheng Shen, and Yong Jae Lee, “Llava-next: Improved reasoning, ocr, and world knowledge,” 2024.
- [26] 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 *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024, pp. 13040–13051.

## APPENDIX

### A. More Information on Illusion Perception Tasks



	Easy	Neutral	Hard	Total
Classic Illusion	24	89	51	164
Real Scene Illusion	111	338	148	597
No Illusion	229	12	4	245
Ishihara Images	2	15	9	26
Trap Illusion	0	9	10	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>1051</b>

Fig. 5: Dataset statistics. IllusionBench contains not only classic cognitive illusions but also a large number of real scene illusions, with real scenes accounting for more than 50% of the total. It is also equipped with human cognitive difficulty scores, and it is the largest and most comprehensive visual illusion benchmark for VLM to date.

1) *QA Pairs Generation and Prompts*: The question-answer pairs in IllusionBench include both binary (true-or-false) and multiple-choice questions. Each image is accompanied by at least two binary questions and three multiple-choice questions, all manually annotated by humans. Each image also has a manually assigned cognitive difficulty rating, categorized as Easy, Neutral, or Hard, with all questions related to a given image sharing the same difficulty level.

- **True-or-False Question**: IllusionBench contains over 2,200 binary questions, primarily addressing semantic content and the presence of illusions. The semantic statements are designed to be the most misleading according to human visual standards. Notably, trap illusions are labeled as containing illusions, while Ishihara color blindness detection images are labeled as not containing illusions. Due to the tendency of some VLMs to exhibit yes-bias, where they prefer to answer true/yes, 57% of the binary questions in IllusionBench have False as the correct answer. The input format for the question is as follows:

# user: [Image Tokens] Given an image, check if the following description is correct, and answer ‘True’ or ‘False’. Do not explain the reason. Description: [True-or-False Question]

- **Multiple-choice Questions**: In addition to True-or-False questions, IllusionBench also includes over 3,300 multiple-choice questions, focusing on the fine-grained perception of image content and the specific causes of illusions. Each question offers four carefully designed options, with only one being correct. The correct and

wrong answers are shuffled during the actual evaluation. The input format for the question is as follows:  
# user: [Image Tokens] Given an image, a question, and some options, You have to select the correct one. Do not explain your reasoning. Answer with only the Roma number that corresponds to the correct option. Do not repeat the entire answer. Do not explain the reason. [Multiple-choice Questions and Options]

2) *True/False Bias Test*: Based on our observations, some models tend to favor either true or false responses when completing true-or-false tasks. Therefore, we further analyzed this bias in the models’ answers. We used the False Positive Ratio (FP Ratio) to characterize the models’ response preferences and quantify the tendency of the VLMs to incorrectly classify a negative instance as positive. It is defined as the proportion of false positives relative to all incorrect predictions. Mathematically, the FP Ratio can be expressed as:

$$R_{FP} = \frac{FP}{FP + FN}$$

where  $FP$  represents the number of instances where the VLM incorrectly answers “True” when the correct answer is “False”.  $FN$  represents the number of instances where the VLM incorrectly answers “False” when the correct answer is “True”.  $FP + FN$  denotes the total number of incorrect answers made by the VLM. The  $R_{FP}$  closer to 0.5 indicates greater robustness in the VLM, while a ratio near 1 suggests a bias toward answering “True”, and a ratio near 0 indicates a bias towards answering “False”.

As shown in Appendix Table. V, CogVLM, DeepSeek-VL-7B-chat, LLaVA-v1.5 (Vicuna-v1.5-7B), and Qwen-VL-Chat exhibit a strong tendency to answer “True”, which results in lower performance for these VLMs on true-or-false tasks. One possible reason is that the training datasets for these models contain a majority of samples labeled as “True”, with insufficient instances of negative responses. This imbalance may lead the models to learn this bias, causing them to favor “True” answers in judgment tasks.

### B. Details on LLM-assisted Evaluation for VQA

1) *Settings for LLM Evaluation for VQA*: Our observations have revealed that some VLMs do not output answers in the specified format. For instance, in binary questions, responses might appear as “True,” “The answer is true”, or “It is true, because...”. To address this issue, after collecting responses from various VLMs for these binary and multiple-choice questions, we employed a *LLM-Assisted Evaluation* method. This approach involves inputting the questions, correct answers, and VLM responses into a large language model (LLM) to assess the accuracy of the responses. Qwen- plus assisted in the evaluation of all models.

To mitigate the inherent variability of LLMs, where identical prompts can yield non-definitive responses, we employ a 5-round voting strategy. For each question-answer pair, we send the prompt defined in the template below five times and determined the correctness of the response based on the

TABLE V: FP ratio of VLMs across different image categories and difficulty levels on IllusionBench true-or-false task.

Sub-category VLMs	Image Category					Difficulty Rating			All
	Classical (P1)	Real Scene (P2)	No Illusion (P3)	Ishihara (P4)	Trap (P5)	Easy	Neutral	Hard	
<b>Closed-Source VLMs</b>									
GPT-4o	0.4	0.372	0.3571	0.3571	0.3571	0.3364	0.3571	0.4286	0.373
Gemini-pro-1.5	0.6341	0.6253	0.4937	0.4937	0.4937	0.5563	0.6060	0.6280	0.5997
Qwen-vl-Max	0.6905	0.6995	0.5588	0.5588	0.5588	0.6480	0.6731	0.6667	0.6661
Qwen-vl-plus	0.837	0.8952	0.76	0.76	0.76	0.8194	0.8777	0.8506	0.8567
<b>Opened-Source VLMs</b>									
CogVLM-17B (Vicuna-v1.5-7B)	0.9481	0.958	0.8467	0.8467	0.8467	0.9182	0.9431	0.9366	0.9334
DeepSeek-VL-7B-chat	0.9850	0.9669	0.9915	0.9915	0.9915	0.9784	0.9691	0.9882	0.9764
InternLM-XComposer2-VL-7B (InternLM2)	0.6536	0.5596	0.3789	0.3789	0.3789	0.5026	0.5447	0.5879	0.5456
LLaVA-v1.5 (Vicuna-v1.5-7B)	1.0000	0.9987	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.9983	1.0000	0.9992
LLaVA-v1.5 (Vicuna-v1.5-13B)	0.8802	0.8424	0.7981	0.7981	0.7981	0.8412	0.8209	0.8601	0.8367
LLaVA-NeXT (Llama3-8B)	0.3462	0.1864	0.3171	0.3171	0.3171	0.2452	0.2069	0.2690	0.2315
mPLUG-Owl2 (LLaMA-7B)	0.4545	0.2706	0.2966	0.2966	0.2966	0.3348	0.2914	0.3369	0.3137
Qwen-VL-Chat	0.9621	0.9117	0.9697	0.9697	0.9697	0.9174	0.9174	0.9395	0.9340

majority decision, selecting the outcome that occurred three times or more.

Although *LLM-Assisted Evaluation* is highly efficient, it can occasionally produce errors, particularly when there is a significant discrepancy between the model’s output format and the standard answer. To mitigate this issue, we performed manual secondary reviews on all cases marked as incorrect by the LLM and corrected the results accordingly. Therefore, our evaluation process combines both manual and LLM-assisted methods to ensure the precision of the quantitative results.

#### 2) Prompt Templates for LLM Evaluation for VQA:

- Prompt for true-or-false question evaluation:  
*#user: Given the question [true-or-false question], the correct answer is [correct answer], and the respondent’s answer is [VLM’s answer]. Determine if the respondent’s answer is correct (1) or incorrect (0). If the answers match (both ‘True’ or both ‘False’), output 1. Otherwise, output 0. Only return the result as a single digit.*
- Prompt for multiple-choice question evaluation:  
*#user: Given the question [multiple-choice question and options], the correct answer is the option [correct answer]. The respondent’s answer is [VLMs answer]. Determine if the respondent’s answer is correct (1) or incorrect (0). If uncertain, also provide 0. Only return the result as a single digit.]*

### C. Details on LLM-assisted Evaluation for Descriptions

1) *Settings and Prompt for LLM Evaluation for Descriptions:* This work focuses on how VLMs understand visual illusions, which often lead to challenges and inaccuracies in image interpretation. Therefore, we assess VLM performance by examining the accuracy of their descriptions, particularly whether they align with physical reality or human sensory perception.

Previous studies have shown that single-modal language models are effective for evaluating language tasks. After collecting open-ended responses from the VLMs, we use advanced LLM to quantitatively assess multimodal description tasks. Specifically, both the model’s output and the golden description are input into the LLM, which compares the two

to identify significant conflicts. Preciseness is scored on a scale of [0, 1, 2].

- 2 indicates no conflict;
- 1 indicates minor conflict;
- 0 indicates a significant conflict.

Qwen-plus assisted in the evaluation of all models. Prompt for semantic content description evaluation is:

*# user: Respondent description is ‘[VLM description]’, reference description is ‘[Golden description]’. Evaluate if there is a conflict between the image contents in the respondent’s answer and the reference answer. Rate as follows: 2: No conflict. 1: Minor conflict, less controversial than the reference. 0: Clear conflict, more controversial than the reference. Only focus on conflicts between the descriptions. Differences in detail or omitted information are not considered conflicts. Just answer the rate number, do not output any other word.*

To address the inherent variability of LLMs, where identical prompts can yield non-definitive responses, we employed a 5-round averaging strategy. For each descriptive output generated by the VLM, we sent the prompt defined below five times and averaged the scores to determine the final score for that description. This method effectively mitigates the inherent variability of LLMs.

#### 2) Human Study for LLM Evaluation for Descriptions:

Additionally, we randomly selected 200 images, proportionate to the image categories, for a human study sample. We recruited two human evaluators, each of whom assessed the descriptions generated by GPT-4o, Gemini-pro-1.5, and Qwen-vl-plus for 100 images. The Spearman Correlation Coefficients (SRCC) between the human scores and LLM scores were 0.9055 and 0.9246, respectively. These results strongly validate the effectiveness and accuracy of the LLM-assisted method for evaluating descriptions.

### D. Extended Experiment Result on IllusionBench Description Task

1) *Detailed Performance Result for Description Task:* The detailed performance results for VLMs on the open-ended description task are shown in Table VI, revealing several key insights:



TABLE VI: Detailed performance of VLMs on IllusionBench description task across different image categories and difficulty levels.

VLMs	Image Category					Difficulty Rating			All Hard
	Classical	Real Scene	No Illusion	Ishihara	Trap	Easy	Neutral		
<b>Closed-Source VLMs</b>									
GPT-4o	1.2805	1.2269	1.4939	1.4321	0.3333	1.4317	1.2196	1.1892	1.2872
Gemini-pro-1.5	0.8962	0.9294	1.3633	1.2308	0.5263	1.2822	0.8918	0.8829	1.0257
Qwen-vl-Max	0.6768	0.6745	1.1020	0.2308	0.3158	0.9863	0.6429	0.6171	0.7571
Qwen-vl-plus	0.7134	0.6655	1.1903	0.8077	0.2222	1.0190	0.6848	0.6396	0.7924
<b>Opened-Source VLMs</b>									
CogVLM-17B (Vicuna-v1.5-7B)	0.7866	0.8208	1.2490	0.5000	0.4211	1.1776	0.7646	0.7252	0.9001
DeepSeek-VL-7B-chat	0.7707	0.6215	1.1602	0.3600	0.2105	1.0259	0.6577	0.5096	0.7550
InternLM-XComposer2-VL-7B (InternLM2)	0.5915	0.6365	1.2204	0.1538	0.0526	1.0628	0.6004	0.5135	0.7431
LLaVA-v1.5 (Vicuna-v1.5-7B)	0.3841	0.3735	0.8939	0.0000	0.0526	0.7104	0.3629	0.3514	0.4814
LLaVA-v1.5 (Vicuna-v1.5-13B)	0.4207	0.3786	1.0245	0.3846	0.0000	0.8033	0.3823	0.3829	0.5290
LLaVA-NeXT(Llama3-8B)	0.5122	0.6114	1.2898	0.1154	0.3158	1.0219	0.6069	0.5360	0.7364
mPLUG-Owl2(LLaMA-7B)	0.5122	0.4707	1.0449	0.1538	0.1579	0.8743	0.4838	0.3784	0.5975
Qwen-VL-Chat	0.6524	0.6399	1.1020	0.3077	0.2105	0.9973	0.6199	0.5360	0.7336

- **There is a significant gap between the description capabilities of VLMs for illusion images and those of humans.** Only the most advanced models, such as GPT-4o and Gemini-pro-1.5, achieved an average description score exceeding 1. Additionally, for most VLMs, the preciseness of their descriptions across various questions declines as the human-assigned difficulty scores increase. This suggests that as the complexity of the tasks rises, these VLMs struggle to maintain accuracy in their generated descriptions, indicating that their current abilities to comprehend and process complex contexts or problems still need improvement.
- **The presence of visual illusions indeed impacts VLMs’ ability to describe images precisely.** Most models perform best when describing the semantic content of images in the “no illusion” category, suggesting that visual illusions pose a significant challenge to VLMs’ understanding.

2) *Examples for Description Tasks in IllusionBench:*

- **Examples for the gap between the description capabilities of VLMs for illusion images and those of humans.** Appendix Fig. 6 presents two examples from the “real scene illusion” category where GPT-4o misinterpreted the images due to the illusions present.
- **The classical cognitive illusion is no longer sufficient to test the alignment of VLMs with human vision.** Appendix Fig. 7 shows the performance of various state-of-the-art closed-source VLMs on a modified Jastrow illusion task. In this edited version, unlike the original where both shapes are identical but appear different due to orientation, the lower shape is genuinely larger. As depicted in Appendix Fig. 7, only Gemini-pro-1.5 correctly identified the size difference, while GPT-4o and Qwen-VL-Max incorrectly applied the standard Jastrow illusion conclusion. This aligns with Table VI, which shows GPT-4o excelling in classical illusions but failing entirely in trap illusions, answering all related questions incorrectly. These findings suggest that advanced VLMs have learned classical cognitive illusions so well that they

hallucinate when faced with similar patterns that differ in reality. Consequently, classical illusions are no longer adequate for testing VLM alignment with human vision, underscoring the need for comprehensive datasets like IllusionBench.



**Golden description:** The athlete stands in front of the referee's table and communicates with the referee. There is a visual illusion in the image. Since the athlete is bending down to talk, and the referee's white hair in front of him is just exposed, giving the illusion that the white hair belongs to the athlete



**User:** Please provide a description of the content in this image.

**GPT-4o:** The image shows a basketball player wearing a blue "Thunder" jersey with the number "35" leaning over a table during a game. The player has white hair, and several people at the table are using laptops.





**Golden description:** In this picture, a person is positioned in front of a fountain in such a way that the water appears to be spraying out of their mouth. There is a striking visual illusion in the image. The reason for visual illusions here is the alignment of the person with the fountain's water jets and the camera angle, which together make it look as if the person is the source of the water spray.



**User:** Please provide a description of the content in this image.

**GPT-4o:** A person in a red top is leaning back and spitting water into the air, creating a fountain-like effect. The background features a body of water and lush greenery.

Fig. 6: Example of VLM in describing real scene illusion images.




**Golden description:** In this picture, there are two arcs that are parallel to each other with different size. There is no visual illusion in the picture.



**User:** Please provide a description of the content in this image.



**GPT-4o:** The image shows two identical, curved shapes positioned one above the other. The top shape appears smaller than the bottom shape due to the Jastrow illusion.



**User:** Please provide a description of the content in this image.

**Gemini-pro-1.5:** The image consists of two curved rectangles, one above the other, against a white background.



**User:** Please provide a description of the content in this image.



**Qwen-VL-Max:** The image contains two curved lines of equal length but different orientations, creating an optical illusion

Fig. 7: Example of VLMs in describing trap illusion images.