

MM-GEN: Enhancing Task Performance Through Targeted Multimodal Data Curation

Siddharth Joshi^{1,2*}, Besmira Nushi¹, Vidhisha Balachandran¹,
 Varun Chandrasekaran^{1,3}, Vibhav Vineet¹, Neel Joshi¹, Baharan Mirzasoleiman²
¹Microsoft Research ²UCLA ³UIUC

Abstract

Vision-language models (VLMs) are highly effective but often underperform on specialized tasks, for example Llava-1.5 struggles on chart and diagram understanding, due to scarce task-specific training data. Existing training data, sourced from general-purpose datasets, fails to capture the nuanced details needed for these tasks. We introduce MM-GEN, a scalable method that generates task-specific, high-quality synthetic text for candidate images by leveraging stronger models. MM-GEN employs a three-stage targeted process: partitioning data into subgroups, generating targeted text based on task descriptions, and filtering out redundant and outlier data. Fine-tuning VLMs with data generated by MM-GEN leads to significant performance gains, including 29% on spatial reasoning and 15% on diagram understanding for Llava-1.5 (7B). Compared to human-curated caption data, MM-GEN achieves up to 1.6× better improvements for the original models, proving its effectiveness in enhancing task-specific VLM performance and bridging the gap between general-purpose datasets and specialized requirements. Code available at <https://github.com/sjoshi804/MM-Gen>.

1. Introduction

While vision-language models (VLMs) demonstrate state-of-the-art performance on several multi-modal tasks [29], they are often on tasks that are simpler in nature [3]. These models still struggle with more complex tasks, e.g., those that require fine-grained understanding of details in images [3, 15, 21, 49]. We posit that the primary limitation for these VLMs is the quality and nature of the training data. VLMs are typically trained on large-scale image-text data scraped from the internet; while the images are rich and informative, the associated text descriptions can (i) have limited relevance to the image [39], or (ii)

omit references to several specific details captured in the image [25]. Fig. 1 shows examples of such images and web-scraped captions. While the images are relevant for the tasks of chart understanding, spatial reasoning, and diagram understanding, respectively, the text fails to capture details essential for these tasks.

While synthetic caption generation strategies proposed in prior work [25, 39, 57] can create more descriptive text annotations (by referring to more visual details), they are agnostic of the downstream target task. Consequently, they *cannot* ensure that relevant details are captured in the text annotations. Recently, Shi et al. [48] manually curated a task-specific dataset aimed at the task of multimodal mathematical question-answering by augmenting existing image-text data with detailed textual annotations, based on their domain expertise, using strong VLMs. While effective, such a curation pipeline involves significant human effort and is not scalable [33, 59].

To address these limitations, we present MM-GEN, a highly general framework for *automatically synthesizing task-relevant text annotations for images* by leveraging stronger VLMs (i.e., VLMs that perform well on the specific task) and requiring minimal human effort. MM-GEN takes as input a small set of examples from the target task (henceforth referred to as “reference samples”), a list of image types associated with the task, and a pool of task-relevant candidate images for training. In practice, these inputs can be easily obtained: a small number of reference samples and associated image types can be directly collected from the target task, and a task-relevant image pool can be found via image search with search engines or retrieved from large-scale image-caption datasets [5, 46, 47]. Using the reference samples to specify the details of the task to the stronger VLM, MM-GEN generates text-annotations that are task-relevant for the candidate images. Fig. 1 shows how the text generated by MM-GEN captures task-relevant details. This simple approach is highly effective, resulting in significant improvements across a variety of target tasks. Moreover, human-effort in this process is limited to providing (i) a small set of reference samples for the task, and (ii) a pool

*Work completed in part during an internship at Microsoft Research and in part as part of PhD thesis research at UCLA. Correspondence to sjoshi804@cs.ucla.edu




Figure 1. Examples of general text captions vs. task-specific text annotations generated by MM-GEN and used for fine-tuning supervision.

of candidate images. To further improve the quality and efficacy of the generated data, MM-GEN introduces a perplexity [4] based data-filtering approach to improve performance on target task using a high-value subset of the synthesized data. The components in MM-GEN are general and applicable to any image-text based target task enabling it to easily generalize across tasks and scale.

We evaluate MM-GEN on improving VLMs’ (e.g., Llava-1.5 7B and 13B parameter versions) performance on fine-grained image understanding tasks — chart understanding and reasoning, diagram understanding, and spatial reasoning on maps. The data curated by MM-GEN enables an absolute improvement over Llava-1.5 (7B) of 15%, 14% and 29%, respectively. We also see improvements over the much larger Llava-1.5 (13B) of 13%, , respectively. Moreover, MM-GEN’s filtering strategy helps in shrinking data volumes by up to 50% with no / minimal loss in performance. Empirical results show that models trained via MM-GEN data have a better performance than those trained via generated generic captions. MM-GEN data is also more effective than text annotations generated without task-specific reference examples, showing the importance of a targeted, data-centric approach for describing tasks. Finally, we analyze the effects of key design choices in MM-GEN through ablation studies on e.g. size of the reference sample set, generating with / without partitioning, scaling number of in-context samples.

2. Related Work

Synthetic Data Generation for Multimodal Models: Nguyen et al. [39] highlighted the low quality of web-scraped captions. Later studies leveraged synthetic captions to enhance CLIP-style models [13, 26, 44, 57]. Since these models are frequently applied to image classification, synthetic captions are usually general, task-agnostic de-

scriptions that capture coarse-grained visual details about prominent objects in the image. We demonstrate in Sec. 5 that such data do not improve VLM performance in specialized tasks that require highly specific visual details. Recent work has curated combinations of real and synthetic data to improve VLMs using stronger VLMs and hand-crafted prompts [6, 27]. Llava [29] used manually designed prompts to generate diverse text annotations such as detailed descriptions, conversations, and complex reasoning. MiniGPT-4 [61] first generates text using small VLMs and then improves their quality by using strong VLMs, and finally manually filters the data. However, these data sets are not designed to improve performance on any specific task but instead focus on enhancing VLMs across a broad range of domains. More closely related is recent work on improving VLMs on specialized tasks. MathLLava [48] filters and augments human-curated multimodal data, using a stronger VLM and specialized prompts to create math VQA. Likewise, ChartInstruct [33] uses a highly specialized pipeline to generate chart-related data. In contrast, our approach automates the generation of high-quality, task-specific text annotations, minimizing human intervention and generalizing across a broader range of tasks.

Synthetic Data Generation for Training LMs: [2, 10, 11, 17, 28, 38] showed that LMs could be effectively pre-trained using high-quality synthetically generated data. Subsequently, [36, 37] highlighted the efficacy of synthetic task-specific training data to further improve performance in specialized tasks and proposed a framework to generate such data with minimal human intervention. We propose a generalizable framework for synthetic multimodal data generation to improve VLMs.

Data Filtering Methods Various filtering techniques have been explored for supervised learning [8, 22, 24, 35, 41, 42, 50, 52], self-supervised learning [19, 53], and multi-

modal contrastive learning [1, 12, 14, 20, 30]. More recently, data filtering has been applied to train generative LMs [7, 31, 51, 56, 60]. We adapt filtering from [31] to discard up to 50% of data, with no / minimal drop in accuracy.

3. Problem Formulation

Our objective is to generate text annotations for a given pool of candidate images, to improve performance, of a given VLM, on a target task T . Let a multimodal sample be denoted as $s = (v, t)$, where v represents an image and t represents the associated text (both the text prompt and text response). Let V_T^{pool} denote the provided pool of candidate images, e.g., a corpus of chart images, and N_{gen} the number of multimodal samples we wish to curate. Let S_T^{ref} be a small ($|S_T^{\text{ref}}| = n \ll N_{\text{gen}}$) set of *reference samples* that is *representative* of the task T . This set serves as a reference for the text that is relevant for task T . In practice, this could be samples from the validation set of a dataset for chart understanding like ChartQA [32]. Additionally, let types_T denote a list of the types of images associated with the task. For tasks like chart understanding, which have several different types of images, types_T could include *bar charts*, *line charts*, and *pie charts*. The goal then is to use S_T^{ref} , V_T^{pool} , and types_T to generate N_{gen} multimodal samples for fine-tuning a given VLM, to improve performance on task T . To generate annotations, we assume access to a stronger VLM, i.e., one with higher performance than the given VLM on target task T ¹.

4. MM-GEN Overview

In this section, we first motivate the need for task-relevant text annotations through an empirical case study. We then present MM-GEN: our framework for generating task-relevant text annotations.

4.1. Case Study: MS COCO

Here, we illustrate using MS COCO [54] how *even human-crafted text annotations can omit important details in the accompanying image*. Recall that the MS COCO dataset is a high-quality and large-scale dataset commonly used for training models for image captioning [39, 45]. Each image is manually annotated with 5 highly descriptive captions (annotators were asked to describe “all relevant details”).

We now investigate how effective these captions are at capturing ‘all visual details’ in the images. Fig. 2 shows the percentage of captions mentioning objects of different categories, when the corresponding image *contains* the object. Remarkably, 25% of object categories are included in the caption only for 25% of the images (and are omitted 75% of




Figure 2. Even high-quality human curated captions (MS COCO) miss many details found in images

the time). For tasks that rely on recognition of objects from these categories, even MS COCO’s “high-quality” captions will be ineffective. This illustrates how even extremely descriptive, but task-agnostic text-annotations may be missing important information for tasks that require certain specific details about the image. Note that, the problem is different from the long-tail of visual concepts [5]; in this analysis, the content is present in the image but not in text. This observation motivates our claim that most general purpose text-annotations, human or VLM generated, are likely to omit specific details required by a particular downstream task. For example, descriptive captions of charts may still omit discussions on the minimum / maximum values, trends over time, values at specific points etc.

4.2. MM-GEN: Design

We now introduce MM-GEN: an automated way to generate text annotations that can provide task-specific supervision. Using the help of a running example i.e., curating multimodal data for *Chart Understanding*, as exemplified by the ChartQA [32] dataset, we describe the 3 stages of MM-GEN: 1) partitioning data into subgroups, 2) generating task-relevant text annotations for each subgroup, 3) filtering the generated image-text pairs to keep the most informative ones.

Chart understanding, exemplified by Masry et al. [32], assesses a model’s reasoning skills on chart (in particular *bar charts*, *pie charts* and *line charts*) visualizations using questions requiring logical, arithmetic, and data-driven interpretation. As a running example, we consider improving Llava-1.5-7B [29] on task $T = \text{chart understanding}$, using a stronger VLM such as GPT-4 [40]. Here, the inputs to MM-GEN are:

1. **Reference Sample Set** S_T^{ref} : Examples from the ChartQA validation set.
2. **Types of Images** types_T : ['bar chart', 'pie chart', 'line chart']
3. **Candidate Image Pool** V_T^{pool} : Corpus of chart images

¹In practice, this can be a VLM specialized on the task of interest (e.g., a VLM specialized for object detection if the task is detection), a general stronger model than the model of interest or a combination of these.

containing bar charts, pie charts and line charts.

4.2.1. Partitioning Data into Subgroups

Many tasks in multimodal learning are broad, covering a range of image types, each with unique text requirements within the same overarching “task”. To capture this variability, we partition both the reference sample set and the candidate image pool into different subgroups, based on the various image types in this task, as delineated by types_T (e.g., ['bar chart', 'line chart', 'pie chart'] for chart understanding). In practice, as we did, one can easily obtain types_T from a description of the dataset.

Why Partition? Partitioning provides two key benefits. First, by grouping reference samples and candidate images by image type, we can identify, from the reference sample, the visual details that are task-relevant for a particular image type. In turn, we can effectively generate task-relevant annotations for candidate images of the same type. For example, on line charts, observing trends in y-axis values over a sequence of x-values is crucial, whereas on pie charts, the relative sizes of different slices are important. Thus, to generate task-relevant text for a line chart, using a reference of a line chart would be far more effective than using a reference from a pie chart. Second, we can ensure that the curated multimodal samples closely match the distribution of image types in the reference samples. Since the set of reference samples is representative of task T , matching the distribution of reference samples enables us to align the curated data with the distribution of task T .

How to Partition? Since we need to partition images based on the list of text in types_T , a natural choice is the multimodal contrastive model CLIP [43]. In particular, we leverage CLIP’s zero-shot classification capabilities, as follows. Let f_V and f_T denote CLIP’s vision and text encoders, respectively. We first encode the texts specified in types_T with the text encoder f_T . Next, we encode the images from S_T^{ref} and V_T^{pool} using the vision encoder f_V . Then, we perform zero-shot classification on the images, matching each image to the text embedding with the highest cosine similarity (S_C) to its embedding:

$$k^* = \arg \max_{k \in \text{types}_T} S_C(f_V(v), f_T(k))$$

where v refers to the image being classified (from the reference samples or candidate image pool), and k refers to the k -th text in types_T . This enables us to partition S_T^{ref} samples into subgroups based on the type of image they contain. $S_T^{\text{ref}} = \{\cup_{k \in \text{types}_T} S_{T_k}^{\text{ref}}\}$; $V_T^{\text{pool}} = \{\cup_{k \in \text{types}_T} V_{T_k}^{\text{pool}}\}$ where each $S_{T_k}^{\text{ref}}$ contains images of type k (where $k \in \text{types}$) as well as the corresponding text annotations, and each $V_{T_k}^{\text{pool}}$ contains candidate images of type k .

4.2.2. Generating Task-Relevant Text Annotations


Now we present how we generate task-relevant text annotations by leveraging a stronger VLM.

Recall that in § 4.1, we motivated the importance of task-specific text annotations. Here, we consider how to generate such annotations using a stronger VLM. In particular, we present how to describe the task T to the stronger VLM. An obvious solution is using a natural language description of the task. However, this requires significant human effort to accurately and comprehensively describe the task. This prevents efficiently generalizing to new tasks. Moreover, even with significant human effort, describing the task in such a manner is extremely challenging and can easily lead to an under-specified task description. For example, consider a natural description of chart understanding as “the ability to understand and reason over chart-based visualizations, focusing on bar charts, line charts and pie charts” (this description is created by Masry et al. [32]). However, such a description does not capture the visual details required to answer detailed questions on charts (e.g., attention to visual depictions of trends could be task-relevant for line charts).

A second, far more reliable and effective approach is *data-centric* i.e., use the reference samples to specify the task to the stronger VLM. In particular, we can leverage the in-context learning ability of stronger VLMs to use reference samples from task T to indicate to the model what types text is relevant for task T . In-context learning refers to large generative models’ ability to learn tasks from a minimal number of examples or demonstrations, often with just one [9]. This approach 1) significantly reduces the requirement on human effort to selecting a small # of reference samples e.g., for chart understanding, these can be examples from the validation set of ChartQA, and 2) ensures the task is sufficiently specified since reference samples demonstrate which visual details are task-relevant. In § 5, we conclusively demonstrate the superiority of the second approach for describing the task to the stronger VLM.

For each subgroup ($S_{T_k}^{\text{ref}}, V_{T_k}^{\text{pool}}$), we generate text annotations by randomly sampling a reference sample for the subgroup and a candidate image for the input to the stronger VLM. The exact construction of the prompt and resulting examples are included in Appendix A and Figure 1. Given N_{gen} , the target size for the generated data, for each subgroup in the partition ($S_{T_k}^{\text{ref}}, V_{T_k}^{\text{pool}}$) where $k \in \text{types}_T$, we generate a fraction of N_{gen} , proportional to the size of the reference samples of the subgroup. We then pair the candidate images, with the corresponding generated text-annotations i.e., the text prompts and the text responses, to curate the desired N_{gen} multimodal samples.


Low Perplexity: Already Learned ❌



Q: How many main reasons are listed for why individuals oppose legal marijuana?
A: Six

Counting # of bars -> Too easy for chart understanding!


High Perplexity: Likely Noisy ❌



Q: What are the two years where regional flights had identical annual growth?
A:

Answer Missing (Incomplete) -> Harmful Outlier!

Middle Perplexity ✅



Q: What was the highest percentage of the population recorded in the given years?
A: 11.2%

Non-Trivial + Meaningful Question / Answer

Figure 3. Examples of different text perplexity mapping to easy cases (low perplexity), potential noise and outliers in difficulty (highest perplexity), and meaningful, non-trivial questions (middle perplexity). Questions with middle perplexity are also more likely to add new and useful training signal.

4.2.3. Filtering Generated Data

We now present two important considerations that motivate filtering the curated data before training the VLM. First, the VLM we wish to improve may have non-trivial initial performance on task T and hence, it is possible that it might already fit some of the generated data effectively, i.e., generate accurate responses given the image and text prompt without even training on them. In this case, training on these data is unlikely to provide a significant improvement on the target task T . Second, since the stronger VLM is not necessarily perfectly accurate on task T , some of the generated examples may be unhelpful outliers (may have incorrect or incomplete responses, malformed questions etc.). Training on such data will not improve the performance, but may also degrade the performance of the VLM we wish to improve.

To filter out such examples from the generated data, we rely on a filtering criterion from data-filtering for LLM pre-training [31] that captures a similar notion: selecting examples with *middle perplexity*. Perplexity is a measure of how well a probability model predicts a sample in language modeling tasks [4]. Formally, given a sequence of tokens w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n with probability $P(w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n)$, the perplexity is defined as: $\exp(-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log P(w_i | w_1, \dots, w_{i-1}))$. A lower perplexity indicates that the model is already fit well to the tokens, while a higher perplexity implies greater difficulty in fitting the tokens [18]. Thus, by definition, samples that have been already fit have low perplexity. Moreover, outliers will have higher perplexity; by discarding outliers we can minimize the number of useless / harmful (incomplete / incorrect / malformed) examples in the generated data. In our framework, we measure the perplexity of each in-

stance using the masked language modeling (MLM) objective, computing this over the text response, conditioned on the image and text prompt as input, using the VLM we wish to improve. Fig. 3 shows examples of low, medium and high perplexity samples.

Empirically, we retain 50% of the generated data through filtering. This demonstrates significant gains in both performance and efficiency across tasks. Extended experimentation on optimizing the best fraction of data to retain per task may provide further benefits, albeit here we keep this fraction constant for all tasks for simplicity.

5. Experiments

Tasks. We evaluate MM-GEN on 3 complex multimodal tasks, requiring fine-grained understanding of details in the images, that several existing VLMs struggle on: 1) chart understanding & reasoning, 2) diagram understanding, and 3) spatial reasoning on maps.

Chart Understanding and Reasoning: We use ChartQA [32] to evaluate the ability of a model to understand and reason over chart-based visualizations. As inputs to MM-GEN, we have: 1) Reference Samples: the validation set of ChartQA (\approx 1K samples); 2) Types of Image: determined from dataset description as ['bar chart', 'line chart', 'pie chart']; 3) Candidate Image Pool: 15K images of charts taken from the ChartQA training set. With these inputs, we curate 150K multimodal samples and retain 75K after filtering.

Diagram Understanding: We use AI2D Diagrams (AI2D) [23] to assess a model's diagrammatic understanding using grade-school science diagrams and associated

multiple-choice questions about the relationships and components in these diagrams. As inputs to MM-GEN, we have: 1) Reference Samples: a random subset of size 100 sampled from AI2D’s training set; 2) Types of Image: determined as [‘physics diagram’, ‘biology diagram’, ‘chemistry diagram’, ‘geography diagram’] from the dataset description; 3) Candidate Image Pool: approximately 5K diagram images taken from the training images of AI2D. With these inputs, we curate a total of 100K multimodal samples and retain 50K after filtering.

Spatial Reasoning on Maps: We use SpatialMap [55] to test the spatial reasoning capabilities of VLMs on maps by requiring them to answer questions on cardinal directions (e.g., North, South, East, West) and reasoning about the relationships between different landmarks in the map. As inputs to MM-GEN, we have: 1) Reference Samples: the validation set of SpatialMap; 2) Types of Image: determined from dataset description as [‘map’]; 3) Candidate Image Pool: 1K images of maps retrieved from DataComp-Small [16] using CLIP embedding search. With these inputs, we curate 50K multimodal samples and retain 25K after filtering.

Baselines and Skyline. Since MM-GEN is the first framework for curating task-specific multimodal samples, we contribute baselines and a skyline to evaluate its effectiveness. We use GPT-4o [40] as the stronger VLM to generate the text annotations. Exact inputs and generated examples appear in App. A. We enumerate them below:

1. *Base Model:* This refers to the initial performance of the VLM, before any additional training.

2. *Task-Agnostic Captions:* This baseline uses task-agnostic text annotations generated by a stronger VLM for the candidate image pool. This is to compare with how traditional caption generation methods, that do not generate text annotations specialized for tasks, would perform on our tasks.

3. *Task-Specific Text Annotations, Generated using Natural Language Task Description but no Reference Images:* This baseline uses text annotations generated by a stronger VLM to be task-specific using a natural language description of each task. These descriptions are obtained from the original dataset descriptions [23, 32, 55]. This comparison allows us to compare the effectiveness of describing the task using natural language descriptions vs. describing using reference samples from the task, as is done by MM-GEN.

4. *Skyline – Training on i.i.d. Training Data:* When i.i.d. training data (curated manually by humans) specifically for the target task includes task-relevant details, training directly on this data creates as a skyline model; this provides a performance benchmark for MM-GEN to approach

or surpass. For 1) ChartQA, the skyline is i.i.d training data of size $\sim 30K$ containing images of charts, coupled with chart understanding question-answers; 2) AI2D, the skyline is i.i.d training data of size $\sim 5K$ containing images of grade-school diagrams, coupled with diagram understanding questions; 3) SpatialMap, the skyline is generated using the code provided to generate the evaluation set, containing images of synthetically generated maps, coupled with spatial reasoning question-answers.

Models. As the target VLM to improve, we use Llava-1.5 (7B parameters) [29], comparing the performance of the base model (before training on any additional data) to that of training on the data curated by the aforementioned baselines, the skyline and MM-GEN. To investigate the effectiveness of our approach across model sizes, we additionally evaluate MM-GEN on Llava-1.5 (13B parameters). Details on training setup are presented in Appendix D.

5.1. Analysis of Performance of across Tasks

Fig. 5 shows that MM-GEN can significantly improve upon the base model, across all 3 tasks, and either close the gap with or exceed the skyline performance across all three tasks. For ChartQA, MM-GEN achieves an absolute improvement of 15% over the base model, reaching $0.5\times$ of the skyline’s improvement. For AI2D, MM-GEN shows a 14% absolute improvement over the base model, and exceeds the skyline, achieving $1.6\times$ the improvement that the skyline can obtain. Finally, on SpatialMap, MM-GEN demonstrates a 29% absolute improvement over the base model which is $0.4\times$ of the skyline’s improvement. Figure 4 shows a qualitative comparison of all baselines.

Across all 3 tasks, we see that MM-GEN significantly outperforms baseline 2, highlighting the need for task-specific text annotations. Additionally, MM-GEN also outperforms the baseline 3: this emphasizes how it is crucial to specify the task in a data-centric manner i.e., using reference samples from the target task. It also highlights the significant challenge in specifying accurate and comprehensive task descriptions via natural language. Thus, not only is MM-GEN more easily generalizable across tasks, as it doesn’t need significant human effort to describe the task, but it is also more effective. Interestingly, on ChartQA and SpatialMap, these baselines worsen the performance of the base model. Upon manual inspection of the generated data, we identified another limitation in the baselines: a lack of diversity (c.f. Appendix C) in the generated annotations. Consequently, training on such highly repetitive data can lead to model overfitting, diminishing the model’s generalizability on these tasks. MM-GEN does not suffer from this as it creates diverse text annotations to mirror the diverse set of text annotations provided in the reference sample set.

The spread of MM-GEN’s absolute improvements over




Figure 4. Comparing different baselines for multimodal data generation with MM-GEN. MM-GEN not only customizes the generated text to the task via reference samples, but it also adds missing details to the text that are required for answering the task.




Figure 5. Comparing performance of MM-GEN across Tasks against Contributed Baselines and Skyline

baseline 1 can be attributed to the varying difficulties of each task for the base model, shown by the range of accuracies that the base model achieves on these tasks. Additionally, the varying improvements relative to the skyline can be explained by 1) the size and 2) the quality of the skyline data. For instance, on SpatialMap, the skyline performance is near-perfect, as the skyline data is created programmatically using the same code used to generate the test set and is thus perfectly i.i.d. In contrast, on AI2D and ChartQA, where data is curated by humans, the correspondence between training and test data is necessarily weaker. Moreover, the AI2D skyline dataset is relatively small ($\approx 5K$), which may contribute to its limited improvement. Despite these differences, MM-GEN consistently closes the gap to skyline performance, demonstrating for tasks in the wild, MM-GEN can curate task-relevant train-

ing data that is nearly as effective as human-curated data, with minimal human effort. Moreover, across all 3 tasks, we also observe that the 50% filtered MM-GEN dataset nearly matches the performance of the larger, pre-filtered dataset while being twice as efficient for training. On AI2D, we even see a small improvement from filtering, likely due to reduced overfitting on redundant, unfiltered data. On SpatialMap, the relatively small drop (3%) in filtered data performance can be attributed to the full dataset’s higher diversity. This diversity arises from the nature of the task, where questions involving pairs or groups of objects scale combinatorially with the number of objects in the map, allowing for significant diversity in MM-GEN’s generations.

Fig. 6 shows that, across all tasks, MM-GEN can even improve models as large as Llava-1.5 (13B Parameters). In




Figure 6. Evaluation on Llava-1.5 (13B Parameters)

Table 1. Effect of Performance on Control Tasks (MMM U)

Model	Accuracy (%)
Base Model	35.8
MM-GEN (ChartQA)	33.6
MM-GEN (AI2D)	37.0
MM-GEN (SpatialMap)	34.1

fact, the resulting performance, across tasks, is even higher than that achieved by Llava-1.5 (7B parameters) in Fig. 5. This shows that MM-GEN curated data can help boost performance of relatively stronger VLMs as well, utilizing their superior initial performance to achieve even higher performance, on target tasks.

Performance on Control Tasks In Table 1, we show that training on MM-GEN data, to improve performance on a given target task, does not hurt performance on other tasks (control tasks). Here, we use MMMU [58] to represent these tasks as it considers a comprehensive evaluation of VLMs across many domains.

Table 2. Performance of Training on Combined MM-GEN Data.

Model	Base Model (%)	MM-GEN All (%)
ChartQA	18.2	25.9
AI2D	55.2	65.7
SpatialMap	18.2	44.2

Combining Data from All Tasks We also consider training Llava-1.5 (7B) in Table 2 on a combination of data generated by MM-GEN for all tasks and observe that it can indeed improve performance across tasks simultaneously.

5.2. Ablations

Here, we conduct ablations for MM-GEN on the chart understanding task (ChartQA). We vary different components of text annotation generation, and compare performance

Table 3. Ablation Study on MM-GEN using ChartQA

Ablation	Accuracy (%)
MM-GEN	33.0
MM-GEN without Partition	31.6
MM-GEN with 3 In-Context Samples	30.5
10× Smaller Reference Set	32.8

training on the resulting data. We do not filter the data here to isolate the differences in text generation.

Importance of Partitioning into Subgroups: Here, we investigate the importance of the partitioning into subgroups performed by MM-GEN prior to data generation by comparing performance with and without partitioning on ChartQA. As shown in Table 3, partitioning contributes a non-trivial 2% of the total 15% improvement that MM-GEN achieves.

Effect of Number of In-Context Samples: We assess the impact of varying the number of in-context samples provided to the stronger VLM during generation. As seen in Table 3, increasing the number of in-context samples from 1 to 3 actually decreases the final performance, likely due to the limitations of current VLMs on multi-image understanding [34].

Effect of Reference Sample Set Size: Here, we compare the performance of MM-GEN using a 10× smaller reference sample set. Table 3 shows that MM-GEN can still achieve nearly identical performance, highlighting how even a very small number of reference data is sufficient.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced MM-GEN, a scalable and fully automated approach for curating task-specific multi-modal data to enhance the performance of small vision-language models (VLMs) across specialized tasks. Our results demonstrate that MM-GEN achieves performance gains on specialized tasks, of up to 29% absolute improvement over the base model and can even achieve 1.6x larger improvement compared to human-curated data (skyline), proving its efficacy in scenarios where human data curation is impractical. These results are a testimony of the untapped potential of multimodal data, and how automated and targeted text data enrichment can introduce improvements that cannot be harvested otherwise. Future avenues on this topic may study the value of creating planned curricula, when the goal is to create joint datasets that address task-specific gaps on a large number of tasks. In addition, in the absence of stronger teachers, it is also beneficial to study how approaches such as MM-GEN can use ensembles of several teachers in combination with answer verification techniques, to improve the quality of the training signal coming from synthesized data.

Acknowledgments We sincerely thank Natasha Butt, Mazda Moayeri, Arindam Mitra, and Alessandro Stolfo for their valuable feedback and insightful discussions throughout this project. This research was partially supported by the National Science Foundation CAREER Award (Award No. 2146492), National Science Foundation Grant (Award No. 2421782), the Simons Foundation, Cisco Systems, Optum AI, the UCLA Hellman Fellowship, an Okawa Research Grant, and the Amazon Doctoral Fellowship.

References

- [1] Amro Abbas, Kushal Tirumala, Dániel Simig, Surya Gan-guli, and Ari S. Morcos. Semdedup: Data-efficient learning at web-scale through semantic deduplication, 2023. 3
- [2] Marah Abdin, Jyoti Aneja, Hany Awadalla, Ahmed Awadal-lah, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Jianmin Bao, Harkirat Behl, Alon Ben-haim, Misha Bilenko, Johan Bjorck, Sébastien Bubeck, Martin Cai, Qin Cai, Vishrav Chaudhary, Dong Chen, Dongdong Chen, Weizhu Chen, Yen-Chun Chen, Yi-Ling Chen, Hao Cheng, Parul Chopra, Xiyang Dai, Matthew Dixon, Ronen Eldan, Victor Fragoso, Jianfeng Gao, Mei Gao, Min Gao, Amit Garg, Allie Del Giorno, Abhishek Goswami, Suriya Gunasekar, Emman Haider, Junheng Hao, Russell J. Hewett, Wenxiang Hu, Jamie Huynh, Dan Iter, Sam Ade Jacobs, Mojan Javaheripi, Xin Jin, Nikos Karam-patziakos, Piero Kauffmann, Mahoud Khademi, Dongwoo Kim, Young Jin Kim, Lev Kurilenko, James R. Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Yunsheng Li, Chen Liang, Lars Liden, Xihui Lin, Zeqi Lin, Ce Liu, Liyuan Liu, Mengchen Liu, Weishung Liu, Xiaodong Liu, Chong Luo, Piyush Madan, Ali Mahmoudzadeh, David Majercak, Matt Mazzola, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Arindam Mitra, Hardik Modi, Anh Nguyen, Brandon Norick, Barun Patra, Daniel Perez-Becker, Thomas Portet, Reid Pryzant, Heyang Qin, Marko Radmi-lac, Liliang Ren, Gustavo de Rosa, Corby Rosset, Sam-budha Roy, Olatunji Ruwase, Olli Saarikivi, Amin Saied, Adil Salim, Michael Santacrocce, Shital Shah, Ning Shang, Hiteshi Sharma, Yelong Shen, Swadheen Shukla, Xia Song, Masahiro Tanaka, Andrea Tupini, Praneetha Vaddamanu, Chunyu Wang, Guanhua Wang, Lijuan Wang, Shuohang Wang, Xin Wang, Yu Wang, Rachel Ward, Wen Wen, Philipp Witte, Haiping Wu, Xiaoxia Wu, Michael Wyatt, Bin Xiao, Can Xu, Jiahang Xu, Weijian Xu, Jilong Xue, Sonali Ya-dav, Fan Yang, Jianwei Yang, Yifan Yang, Ziyi Yang, Dong-han Yu, Lu Yuan, Chenruidong Zhang, Cyril Zhang, Jianwen Zhang, Li Lyna Zhang, Yi Zhang, Yue Zhang, Yunan Zhang, and Xiren Zhou. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone, 2024. 2
- [3] Vidhisha Balachandran, Jingya Chen, Neel Joshi, Besmira Nushi, Hamid Palangi, Eduardo Salinas, Vibhav Vineet, James Woffinden-Luey, and Safoora Yousefi. Eureka: Evaluating and understanding large foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.10566*, 2024. 1
- [4] Peter Brown et al. *Introduction to Natural Language Pro-cessing*. Morgan Kaufmann, 1992. 2, 5
- [5] Soravit Changpinyo, Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, and Radu Soricut. Conceptual 12m: Pushing web-scale image-text pre-training to recognize long-tail visual concepts. In *Proceed-ings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3558–3568, 2021. 1, 3
- [6] Lin Chen, Jinsong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Conghui He, Jiaqi Wang, Feng Zhao, and Dahua Lin. Sharegpt4v: Improving large multi-modal models with better captions, 2023. 2
- [7] Lichang Chen, Shiyang Li, Jun Yan, Hai Wang, Kalpa Gu-naratna, Vikas Yadav, Zheng Tang, Vijay Srinivasan, Tianyi Zhou, Heng Huang, et al. Alpargus: Training a better alpaca with fewer data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.08701*, 2023. 3
- [8] Cody Coleman, Christopher Yeh, Stephen Mussmann, Baha-ran Mirzasoleiman, Peter Bailis, Percy Liang, Jure Leskovec, and Matei Zaharia. Selection via proxy: Efficient data se-lection for deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.11829*, 2019. 2
- [9] Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Jingyuan Ma, Rui Li, Heming Xia, Jingjing Xu, Zhiyong Wu, Tianyu Liu, Baobao Chang, Xu Sun, Lei Li, and Zhifang Sui. A survey on in-context learning, 2024. 4
- [10] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Ab-hishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024. 2
- [11] Ronen Eldan and Yuanzhi Li. Tinystories: How small can language models be and still speak coherent english?, 2023. 2
- [12] Talfan Evans, Nikhil Parthasarathy, Hamza Merzic, and Olivier J Henaff. Data curation via joint example selec-tion further accelerates multimodal learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.17711*, 2024. 3
- [13] Lijie Fan, Dilip Krishnan, Phillip Isola, Dina Katabi, and Yonglong Tian. Improving clip training with language rewrites. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Sys-tems*, 36, 2024. 2
- [14] Alex Fang, Albin Madappally Jose, Amit Jain, Ludwig Schmidt, Alexander Toshev, and Vaishaal Shankar. Data fil-tering networks, 2023. 3
- [15] Xingyu Fu, Yushi Hu, Bangzheng Li, Yu Feng, Haoyu Wang, Xudong Lin, Dan Roth, Noah A Smith, Wei-Chiu Ma, and Ranjay Krishna. Blink: Multimodal large language models can see but not perceive. *ECCV*, 2024. 1
- [16] Samir Yitzhak Gadre, Gabriel Ilharco, Alex Fang, Jonathan Hayase, Georgios Smyrnis, Thao Nguyen, Ryan Marten, Mitchell Wortsman, Dhruva Ghosh, Jieyu Zhang, et al. Dat-acomp: In search of the next generation of multimodal datasets. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Sys-tems*, 36, 2024. 6
- [17] Suriya Gunasekar, Yi Zhang, Jyoti Aneja, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Allie Del Giorno, Sivakanth Gopi, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, Gustavo de Rosa, Olli Saarikivi, Adil Salim, Shital Shah, Harkirat Singh Behl, Xin Wang, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Adam Tauman Kalai, Yin Tat Lee, and Yuanzhi Li. Textbooks are all you need, 2023. 2
- [18] Frederick Jelinek. *Statistical Methods for Speech Recogni-tion*. MIT Press, 1997. 5
- [19] Siddharth Joshi and Baharan Mirzasoleiman. Data-efficient contrastive self-supervised learning: Most beneficial exam-ples for supervised learning contribute the least. In *Proceed-ings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learn-ing*, pages 15356–15370. PMLR, 2023. 2
- [20] Siddharth Joshi, Arnav Jain, Ali Payani, and Baharan Mirza-soleiman. Data-efficient contrastive language-image pre-training: Prioritizing data quality over quantity, 2024. 3

- [21] Amita Kamath, Jack Hessel, and Kai-Wei Chang. What’s ”up” with vision-language models? investigating their struggle with spatial reasoning, 2023. 1
- [22] Angelos Katharopoulos and François Fleuret. Not all samples are created equal: Deep learning with importance sampling. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2525–2534. PMLR, 2018. 2
- [23] Aniruddha Kembhavi, Mike Salvato, Eric Kolve, Minjoon Seo, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ali Farhadi. A diagram is worth a dozen images. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part IV 14*, pages 235–251. Springer, 2016. 5, 6
- [24] Krishnateja Killamsetty, Sivasubramanian Durga, Ganesh Ramakrishnan, Abir De, and Rishabh Iyer. Grad-match: Gradient matching based data subset selection for efficient deep model training. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5464–5474. PMLR, 2021. 2
- [25] Zhengfeng Lai, Vasileios Saveris, Chen Chen, Hong-You Chen, Haotian Zhang, Bowen Zhang, Juan Lao Tebar, Wenzhe Hu, Zhe Gan, Peter Grasch, Meng Cao, and Yinfei Yang. Revisit large-scale image-caption data in pre-training multimodal foundation models, 2024. 1
- [26] Zhengfeng Lai, Haotian Zhang, Bowen Zhang, Wentao Wu, Haoping Bai, Aleksei Timofeev, Xianzhi Du, Zhe Gan, Jiulong Shan, Chen-Nee Chuah, Yinfei Yang, and Meng Cao. Veclip: Improving clip training via visual-enriched captions, 2024. 2
- [27] Lei Li, Yuwei Yin, Shicheng Li, Liang Chen, Peiyi Wang, Shuhuai Ren, Mukai Li, Yazheng Yang, Jingjing Xu, Xu Sun, Lingpeng Kong, and Qi Liu. M³it: A large-scale dataset towards multi-modal multilingual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04387*, 2023. 2
- [28] Yuanzhi Li, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Allie Del Giorno, Suriya Gunasekar, and Yin Tat Lee. Textbooks are all you need ii: phi-1.5 technical report, 2023. 2
- [29] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 6
- [30] Pratyush Maini, Sachin Goyal, Zachary Chase Lipton, J Zico Kolter, and Aditi Raghunathan. T-MARS: Improving visual representations by circumventing text feature learning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 3
- [31] Max Marion, Ahmet Üstün, Luiza Pozzobon, Alex Wang, Marzieh Fadaee, and Sara Hooker. When less is more: Investigating data pruning for pretraining llms at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.04564*, 2023. 3, 5
- [32] Ahmed Masry, Do Xuan Long, Jia Qing Tan, Shafiq R. Joty, and Enamul Hoque. Chartqa: A benchmark for question answering about charts with visual and logical reasoning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2022, Dublin, Ireland, May 22-27, 2022*, pages 2263–2279. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022. 3, 4, 5, 6
- [33] Ahmed Masry, Mehrad Shahmohammadi, Md Rizwan Parvez, Enamul Hoque, and Shafiq Joty. Chartinstruct: Instruction tuning for chart comprehension and reasoning, 2024. 1, 2
- [34] Fanqing Meng, Jin Wang, Chuanhao Li, Quanfeng Lu, Hao Tian, Jiaqi Liao, Xizhou Zhu, Jifeng Dai, Yu Qiao, Ping Luo, Kaipeng Zhang, and Wenqi Shao. Mmiu: Multimodal multi-image understanding for evaluating large vision-language models, 2024. 8
- [35] Baharan Mirzasoleiman, Jeff Bilmes, and Jure Leskovec. Coresets for data-efficient training of machine learning models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6950–6960. PMLR, 2020. 2
- [36] Arindam Mitra, Luciano Del Corro, Shweti Mahajan, Andres Codas, Clarisse Simoes, Sahaj Agarwal, Xuxi Chen, Anastasia Razdaibiedina, Erik Jones, Kriti Aggarwal, Hamid Palangi, Guoqing Zheng, Corby Rosset, Hamed Khanpour, and Ahmed Awadallah. Orca 2: Teaching small language models how to reason, 2023. 2
- [37] Arindam Mitra, Luciano Del Corro, Guoqing Zheng, Shweti Mahajan, Dany Rouhana, Andres Codas, Yadong Lu, Wei ge Chen, Olga Vrousgos, Corby Rosset, Fillipe Silva, Hamed Khanpour, Yash Lara, and Ahmed Awadallah. Agentinstruct: Toward generative teaching with agentic flows, 2024. 2
- [38] Subhabrata Mukherjee, Arindam Mitra, Ganesh Jawahar, Sahaj Agarwal, Hamid Palangi, and Ahmed Awadallah. Orca: Progressive learning from complex explanation traces of gpt-4, 2023. 2
- [39] Thao Nguyen, Samir Yitzhak Gadre, Gabriel Ilharco, Sewoong Oh, and Ludwig Schmidt. Improving multimodal datasets with image captioning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 1, 2, 3
- [40] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023. 3, 6, 19
- [41] Mansheej Paul, Surya Ganguli, and Gintare Karolina Dziugaite. Deep learning on a data diet: Finding important examples early in training. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:20596–20607, 2021. 2
- [42] Omead Pooladzandi, David Davini, and Baharan Mirzasoleiman. Adaptive second order coresets for data-efficient machine learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 17848–17869. PMLR, 2022. 2
- [43] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision, 2021. 4
- [44] Noam Rotstein, David Bensaid, Shaked Brody, Roy Ganz, and Ron Kimmel. Fusecap: Leveraging large language models for enriched fused image captions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17718*, 2023. 2
- [45] Shibani Santurkar, Yann Dubois, Rohan Taori, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. Is a caption worth a thousand images? a study on representation learning. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. 3
- [46] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, et al. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:25278–25294, 2022. 1

- [47] Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, Sebastian Goodman, and Radu Soricut. Conceptual captions: A cleaned, hypernymed, image alt-text dataset for automatic image captioning. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2556–2565, 2018. 1
- [48] Wenhao Shi, Zhiqiang Hu, Yi Bin, Junhua Liu, Yang Yang, See-Kiong Ng, Lidong Bing, and Roy Ka-Wei Lee. Mathllava: Bootstrapping mathematical reasoning for multimodal large language models, 2024. 1, 2
- [49] Keri Stephens. Chatgpt-4 vision struggles with radiologic image interpretation. *AXIS Imaging News*, 2024. 1
- [50] Swabha Swayamdipta, Roy Schwartz, Nicholas Lourie, Yizhong Wang, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Noah A Smith, and Yejin Choi. Dataset cartography: Mapping and diagnosing datasets with training dynamics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.10795*, 2020. 2
- [51] Kushal Tirumala, Daniel Simig, Armen Aghajanyan, and Ari S. Morcos. D4: Improving LLM pretraining via document de-duplication and diversification. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2023. 3
- [52] Mariya Toneva, Alessandro Sordoni, Remi Tachet des Combes, Adam Trischler, Yoshua Bengio, and Geoffrey J Gordon. An empirical study of example forgetting during deep neural network learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.05159*, 2018. 2
- [53] Aditay Tripathi, Pradeep Shenoy, and Anirban Chakraborty. Dynamic data selection for efficient ssl via coarse-to-fine refinement. 2
- [54] Oriol Vinyals, Alexander Toshev, Samy Bengio, and Dumitru Erhan. Show and tell: Lessons learned from the 2015 mscoco image captioning challenge. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 39(4):652–663, 2016. 3
- [55] Jiayu Wang, Yifei Ming, Zhenmei Shi, Vibhav Vineet, Xin Wang, Yixuan Li, and Neel Joshi. Is a picture worth a thousand words? delving into spatial reasoning for vision language models. *NeurIPS*, 2024. 6
- [56] Yu Yang, Aaditya K Singh, Mostafa Elhoushi, Anas Mahmoud, Kushal Tirumala, Fabian Gloeckle, Baptiste Rozière, Carole-Jean Wu, Ari S Morcos, and Newsha Ardalani. Decoding data quality via synthetic corruptions: Embedding-guided pruning of code data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02418*, 2023. 3
- [57] Qiyang Yu, Quan Sun, Xiaosong Zhang, Yufeng Cui, Fan Zhang, Yue Cao, Xinlong Wang, and Jingjing Liu. Capsfusion: Rethinking image-text data at scale, 2024. 1, 2
- [58] Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoqi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, et al. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9556–9567, 2024. 8
- [59] Wenqi Zhang, Zhenglin Cheng, Yuanyu He, Mengna Wang, Yongliang Shen, Zeqi Tan, Guiyang Hou, Mingqian He, Yanna Ma, Weiming Lu, and Yueting Zhuang. Multimodal self-instruct: Synthetic abstract image and visual reasoning instruction using language model, 2024. 1
- [60] Chunting Zhou, Pengfei Liu, Puxin Xu, Srinivasan Iyer, Jiao Sun, Yuning Mao, Xuezhe Ma, Avia Efrat, Ping Yu, Lili Yu, et al. Lima: Less is more for alignment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 3
- [61] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigpt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592*, 2023. 2

Appendix

A. Exact Input to Stronger VLM and Generated Text Annotations

Exact Prompt to Stronger VLM

You are an expert in <name of task e.g. chart understanding / diagram understanding / spatial reasoning>. Given example image-question-answer tuples, your task is to generate diverse high-quality question-answer pairs relevant to this skill similar to the provided examples.

Step-by-Step Process:

1. Analyze the Example: Review the provided example question-answer pair to understand the structure, focus, and context.
2. Understand the New Image: Infer relevant details, objects, and themes in the new image, considering how they relate to the skill.
3. Generate Questions: Create questions that reflect the context and content of the new image, ensuring they align with the skill and follow the example's style.
4. If the question is a multiple-choice question, make sure to include the options in the question.
5. Formulate Answers: Generate accurate and concise answers to the questions. Ensure each answer directly corresponds to the content of the new image.

Output Format:

Return the results as a JSON list of objects. Each object should include:

- "Q": The generated question (include options if it's multiple-choice).
- "A": The generated answer.

Example Output:

```
[  
  {"Q": "Generated question 1", "A": "Generated answer 1"},  
  {"Q": "Generated question 2", "A": "Generated answer 2"}  
]
```

<Reference Sample>

<Candidate Image>

Figure 7, Figure 8 and Figure 9 show examples generated by MM-GEN for chart understanding, diagram understanding and spatial reasoning on map, respectively.




Figure 7. Examples Generated by MM-GEN for Chart Understanding





Figure 8. Examples Generated by MM-GEN for Diagram Understanding



Q: Which airport is located at the western edge near the Mediterranean Sea?
A: Matruh airport

Q: Which body of water borders the northernmost part of the map?
A: Mediterranean Sea

Q: Which landmark is located near the southernmost aeronautical station?
A: Sudan



Q: Which landmark is to the east of T.C. Cumhurbaşkanlığı Millî Kütüphanesi?
A: National Library of Turkey
B: Ankara Takbir Anıtı
C: 30 Ağustos Zafer Parkı
D: Ankara
A: C. 30 Ağustos Zafer Parkı

Q: How many major highways can be seen on the map?
A: 1



Q: What is located southwest of the point labeled 'A'?
A: The point labeled 'C'
B: The point labeled 'D'
C: The point labeled 'E'
D: The point labeled 'B'
A: B. The point labeled 'D'

Q: How many marked locations are directly along the green path within the circles?
A: 2 **B:** 3 **C:** 4 **D:** 5
A: B. 3

Figure 9. Examples Generated by MM-GEN for Spatial Reasoning on Maps

B. Pseudocode for MM-GEN

In this section, we present the exact pseudocode for MM-GEN. Each of the three steps is denoted as a subroutine in the pseudocode.

Algorithm 1 Data Generation Process


```

1: Subroutine 1: Partition (§ 4.2.1)
2:  $\{(S_{T_k}^{\text{ref}}, V_{T_k}^{\text{pool}})\}_{k \in \text{types}_T} = \text{PARTITION}(S_T^{\text{ref}}, V_T^{\text{pool}}, \text{types}_T)$ 
3: Subroutine 2: Generate Data (§ 4.2.2)
4: for all  $k \in \text{types}_T$  do
5:    $\mathcal{D}_k^{\text{GEN}} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
6:    $\text{Iterator}(V_{T_k}^{\text{pool}}) \leftarrow$  Randomly order elements of  $V_{T_k}^{\text{pool}}$  and create an infinite iterator
7:   Set  $\text{NUM\_GEN\_PER\_REF} \leftarrow N \cdot \frac{|S_{T_k}^{\text{ref}}|}{|S_T^{\text{ref}}|}$ 
8:   for all  $(v^{\text{ref}}, t_p^{\text{ref}}, t_{\text{res}}^{\text{ref}}) \in S_{T_k}^{\text{ref}}$  do
9:     for  $i = 1$  to  $\text{NUM\_GEN\_PER\_REF}$  do
10:       $v_{\text{candidate}} \leftarrow \text{NEXT}(\text{Iterator}(V_{T_k}^{\text{pool}}))$ 
11:       $(t_p, t_{\text{res}}) \leftarrow L_{\text{VLM}}(\text{SYS\_PROMPT}, v^{\text{ref}}, t_p^{\text{ref}}, t_{\text{res}}^{\text{ref}}, v_{\text{candidate}})$ 
12:       $\mathcal{D}_k^{\text{GEN}} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_k^{\text{GEN}} \cup \{(v_{\text{candidate}}, t_p, t_{\text{res}})\}$ 
13:     end for
14:   end for
15: end for
16:  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{GEN}} \leftarrow \bigcup_k \mathcal{D}_k^{\text{GEN}}$ 
17: Subroutine 3: Filter (§ 4.2.3)
18:  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{GEN}_{\text{fit}}} \leftarrow$  Filter  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{GEN}}$  by computing perplexity of all examples and selecting middle  $r\%$  of examples
19: return  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{GEN}_{\text{fit}}}$ 

```

C. Examples of Baselines Hurt Performance on Some Tasks

In Sec. 5, we observed that for ChartQA and for SpatialMap, some of the baselines can hurt the performance of the base model. Upon inspecting the generated data, we noticed that this is due to highly repetitive generated text annotations for these baselines. Here, in Figures 10, 11, 12, we present some of the generated examples to highlight this problem.



Task-Specific Annotation Generated Using Natural Language Description

Q: According to the map, how many aeronautical stations are shown in Egypt? A: 15 stations B: 20 stations C: 25 stations D: 30 stations
A: B. 25 stations

Q: What is the total number of aeronautical stations marked on the map? A: 20 B: 25 C: 30 D: 35
A: B. 25

Q: How many aeronautical stations are indicated on the map? A: 20 B: 25 C: 30 D: 35?
A: B. 25

Figure 10. Task: Spatial Reasoning on Maps; **Highly Repetitive** Generated Text for Baseline 3: Task-Specific Text Annotations, Generated Using Natural Language Task Description



Task-Agnostic Annotation


The map depicts the island of Great Britain during a historical period characterized by several distinct kingdoms. In the north, the region of Fortriu is marked, suggesting a location within present-day Scotland. Moving south, Northumbria stretches across the northeastern portion, indicating its large influence during this era. To the west of Northumbria lies the domain of Rheged, near Strathclyde, hinting at complex territorial relationships. The central part of the island is dominated by Mercia, which extends extensively and is a major kingdom. In the southwest, the realms of Powys and Gwent are noted, highlighting the territorial divisions within modern-day Wales. Wessex, in the south-central region, appears prominent and influential. The southeastern territories feature East Anglia, Essex, Kent, and Sussex, each delineated as separate entities, representing the distinct Anglo-Saxon kingdoms of that time.

The map illustrates the territories of historic Great Britain during the early medieval period. Major regions are marked in red, such as Northumbria, Mercia, and Wessex, which were prominent Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. To the northeast, Northumbria extends down the eastern coast, while Mercia occupies the central part of the island stretching towards the west. Wessex is located in the south, with its influence reaching the coastal areas. Smaller regions like Kent, Sussex, and Essex are positioned along the southeastern coastline. In the western part, Welsh territories such as Gwynedd and Powys are noted, indicating a distinct cultural and political identity. Scotland is dominated by the territories of Fortriu and Pictland to the north. The map highlights the diverse and complex political landscape of the British Isles during this era.

Figure 11. Task: Spatial Reasoning on Maps; **Highly Repetitive** Generated Text for Baseline 2: Task-Agnostic Captions

More see court choice as very important than after Justice Stevens' retirement

How important is the choice of next Supreme Court justice to you personally? (%)



Source: Survey conducted Feb. 18-21, 2016.
 Figures may not add to 100% because of rounding.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER

Task-Specific Annotation Generated Using Natural Language Description

Q: What percentage of respondents in February 2016 considered the choice of the next Supreme Court justice to be 'very important'? A: 57% B: 40% C: 24% D: 32%

A: A. 57%

Q: What percentage of respondents in February 2016 considered the choice of the next Supreme Court justice to be 'very important'? A: 57% B: 40% C: 24% D: 32%

A: A. 57%

Q: How did the percentage of people who found the choice of the next Supreme Court justice 'Very' important change from April 2010 to February 2016? A: Increased by 10% B: Decreased by 7% C: Increased by 17% D: Decreased by 15%

A: C. Increased by 17%

Q: How did the percentage of people who considered the choice of the next Supreme Court justice as 'Very important' change from April 2010 to February 2016? A: Increased B: Decreased C: Stayed the same D: Cannot be determined?"

A: A. Increased

Figure 12. Task: Chart Understanding; **Highly Repetitive** Generated Text for Baseline 3: Task-Specific Text Annotations, Generated Using Natural Language Task Description

D. Data Generation and Training Details

For all data generation, we used the GPT-4o model [40] (2023-06-01-preview).

For all the experiments, we use the follow common hyperparameters and trained on 4 A-100 GPUs.

Table 4. Training Hyperparameters for MM-GEN

Hyperparameter	Value
Model Name or Path	liuhaotian/llava-v1.5-7b or liuhaotian/llava-v1.5-13b
Vision Tower	openai/clip-vit-large-patch14-336
MM Projector Type	mlp2x_gelu
MM Vision Select Layer	-2
MM Use Image Start/End Token	False
MM Use Image Patch Token	False
Image Aspect Ratio	Pad
Group by Modality Length	True
BF16	True
Train Batch Size (Per Device)	16
Eval Batch Size (Per Device)	4
Gradient Accumulation Steps	1
Learning Rate	2e-5
Weight Decay	0.0
Warmup Ratio	0.03
LR Scheduler Type	Cosine
TF32	True
Model Max Length	2048

For each of the tasks, we tuned the number of epochs such that training loss converged for the MM-GEN generated data.

1. Chart Understanding (ChartQA): 6 epochs
2. Diagram Understanding (AI2D): 6 epochs
3. Spatial Reasoning on Map (SpatialMap): 3 epochs