

# Are They the Same? Exploring Visual Correspondence Shortcomings of Multimodal LLMs

Yikang Zhou<sup>1</sup> Tao Zhang<sup>1</sup> Shilin Xu<sup>3</sup> Shihao Chen<sup>1</sup> Qianyu Zhou<sup>5</sup> Yunhai Tong<sup>2</sup>  
 Shunping Ji<sup>1</sup> Jiangning Zhang<sup>4</sup> Xiangtai Li<sup>2</sup> Lu Qi<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Wuhan University <sup>2</sup>Bytedance Seed <sup>3</sup>Peking University <sup>4</sup>Zhejiang University <sup>5</sup>STJU

Project Page: <https://zhouyiks.github.io/projects/CoLVA/>

E-mail: zhang\_tao@whu.edu.cn, xiangtai94@gmail.com, zhouyik@whu.edu.cn



Figure 1. Visualization results of GPT-4o and our proposed CoLVA on challenging cases of MMVM benchmarks. GPT-4o’s answers are incorrect for all these examples, with the errors highlighted in red. The correct answers in the options are highlighted in green.

## Abstract

Recent advancements in multimodal models have shown a strong ability in visual perception, reasoning abilities, and vision-language understanding. However, studies on visual matching ability are missing, where finding the visual correspondence of objects is essential in vision research. Our research reveals that the matching capabilities in recent multimodal LLMs (MLLMs) still exhibit systematic shortcomings, even with current strong MLLMs models, GPT-4o. In particular, we construct a Multimodal Visual Matching (MMVM) benchmark to fairly benchmark over 30 different MLLMs. The MMVM benchmark is built from 15 open-source datasets and Internet videos with manual annotation. We categorize the data samples of MMVM benchmark into eight aspects based on the required cues and capabilities

to more comprehensively evaluate and analyze current MLLMs. In addition, we have designed an automatic annotation pipeline to generate the MMVM SFT dataset, including 220K visual matching data with reasoning annotation. Finally, we present CoLVA, a novel contrastive MLLM with two novel technical designs: fine-grained vision expert with object-level contrastive learning and instruction augmentation strategy. CoLVA achieves 51.06% overall accuracy (OA) on the MMVM benchmark, surpassing GPT-4o and baseline by 8.41% and 23.58% OA, respectively. The results show the effectiveness of our MMVM SFT dataset and our novel technical designs. Code, benchmark, dataset, and models are available at <https://github.com/zhouyiks/CoLVA>.

# 1. Introduction

Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) [12, 47, 49, 57, 80] have made remarkable progress with the development of LLMs [29, 75, 90]. They have greatly benefited various applications, including image and video understanding [6, 47, 105], visual question answering (VQA) [12, 80], and visual grounding [31, 64, 105].

Despite the advancements of MLLMs with various capabilities [6, 12, 24, 34, 40, 68, 80], they often struggle with visual correspondence, a fundamental ability that plays a key role in several vision tasks, including tracking [35, 65], feature matching [5], and reconstruction [21]. As shown in Fig. 1, even the GPT-4o [57] cannot understand some simple matching questions well. This limitation is critical, as it hinders MLLMs from comprehending correspondence-aware information.

Based on this motivation, we aim to systematically analyze this problem in MLLMs [12, 47, 57, 80] and propose a corresponding method to address it. At first, building a new and challenging benchmark on instance-level correspondence across multiple images is required due to the lack of comprehensive evaluations for this direction. Specifically, we collect 1,510 samples from 15 public datasets [3, 7, 14, 16, 17, 25, 27, 55, 56, 59, 60, 77, 79, 91, 96] and internet video platforms. These samples encompass various scenes, such as indoor environments, urban settings, and card and billiards games. Each sample is carefully annotated with multi-image QA pairs by three skilled annotators. For the benchmark, we evaluate 36 state-of-the-art (SOTA) MLLM methods across eight aspects, including color, shape, posture, size, textual or logo markers, and more. The quantitative evaluation on our benchmark highlights the merits of our work, as the best public model, Qwen2-VL-72B-Instruct [80], achieves only 38% accuracy. Additionally, as shown in Fig. 2, based on evaluation results across different aspects, open-source MLLMs [12, 33, 52, 80] perform significantly worse on samples requiring complex cues for reasoning (such as RP, OO, BR, and OM) compared to samples that can be completed using only appearance cues (such as SZ, TM, SP, and CL).

Despite the unsatisfactory results achieved by state-of-the-art (SOTA) MLLM models [12, 33, 51, 52, 57, 80], we recognize the potential of existing architectural designs for correspondence-aware learning by analyzing the attention map between queries and candidate objects. This insight motivates us to develop an automatic data generation pipeline for building a high-quality visual matching SFT dataset, named MMVM. We propose CoLVA with two techniques to help with correspondence training: fine-grained vision expert with object-level contrastive learning and instruction augmentation. On the one hand, the MMVM dataset includes multi-choice QA pairs, each accompanied by textual reasoning and explanation. On the other hand,




Figure 2. The SOTA open-source MLLMs’ performance on the MMVM benchmark. Our benchmark evaluates visual matching tasks from 8 aspects. SZ, TM, SP, and CL samples can be completed using appearance cues, while RP, OO, BR, and OM samples require complex cues and reasoning. Our CoLVA surpasses current SOTA MLLMs in all aspects of the MMVM benchmark.

we construct a strong baseline CoLVA by integrating two simple but effective techniques into the InternVL2 [12] and fine-tuning it with our MMVM dataset. These tricks enhance the model’s instance-discriminative representation. Finally, extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our MMVM dataset and network design, achieving 32.25% and 7.22% improvements over the baseline and the closed GPT-4o. To sum up, our contributions are three-fold:

- We establish a challenging benchmark for the correspondence problem in Multimodal LLMs, which has been insufficiently explored. Our analysis reveals that current MLLM methods are inadequate for addressing this issue.
- We propose a high-quality MMVM dataset and two simple, yet effective techniques for correspondence learning designed to enhance the instance-level discriminative ability.
- Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed dataset. Moreover, our proposed techniques significantly improve the performance of existing MLLMs.

## 2. Related Work

**Multi-modal Large Language Models.** With the development of LLMs [1, 2, 4, 71, 74, 76], Multimodal LLMs raise significant attention in image and video understanding. Current MLLMs [12, 15, 47, 48, 80] explore adapter layers to transfer visual features (CLIP [62]) into visual token input for LLMs. LLaVA [47] is one representative work that uses MLPs as a visual adapter. The following works [8, 34, 48] mainly explore high-quality data for both pre-training and instruction tuning. Meanwhile, sev-

eral works [6, 45, 85, 98] explore stronger visual cues or inject fine-grained visual prompts into MLLMs. For example, VIP-LLaVA [6] integrates arbitrary visual prompts into LLaVA [47]. Several works have also studied MLLMs in video [42, 44, 53, 68, 100, 107] and 3D [24, 81, 86]. In particular, recent works on video MLLMs can be summarized in two directions. One direction [40, 42] aims to compress visual tokens for longer video modeling. The other direction designs stronger memory attention to achieve state-of-the-art performance. Several works [61, 69, 78] explore video grounding and provide strong text features for visual tracking. To our knowledge, no works explore fine-grained visual correspondence understanding in MLLMs. Our work is the first step in a fine-grained correspondence understanding of multi-images.

**Visual Corresponding Learning.** Learning instance discriminate features is critical to many applications, including object tracking, person re-identification, and multi-view reconstruction. Several works [49, 54, 80, 109] explore the cross-image understanding of MLLMs, and most works follow the VQA pipeline. Our works are inspired by previous visual corresponding learning [35, 36, 84, 101–104, 108] and present a new learning framework with contrastive visual tokens for current MLLMs.

**Region Understanding of Multimodal LLMs.** Understanding fine-grained information is also important to build stronger MLLMs. Several works [45, 64, 98, 105] explore region-aware or mask-aware instruction tuning pipelines to MLLMs. In particular, Osprey [98] adopts mask-aware pooling into MLLMs to understand fine-grained region features. Meanwhile, several works [31, 64, 105] explore the visual grounding of MLLMs to make MLLMs output specific locations. GLaMM [64] combines interactive segmentation with LLaVA [47] and proposes grounded VQA and segmentation in one framework. Our studies explore region-level understanding in cross-image settings, which is orthogonal to previous works.

**Evaluating Multimodal LLMs.** Earlier works mainly focus on traditional VQA queries in general cases, such as TextVQA [67], VQAv2 [22], and GQA [28]. Recent works like MME [18], MM-VeT [97], and MM-Bench [50], are designed to evaluate the specific features of MLLMs, including hallucination, reasoning, robustness, OCR, and chat analysis. Meanwhile, several works [72, 73] explore the vision-centric features of MLLMs. We argue that our benchmark is a solid complement to existing MLLMs, making current MLLMs understand fine-grained matching ability without degradation of VQA tasks.

### 3. MMVM Benchmark and Dataset

#### 3.1. MMVM Benchmark

**Dataset Format.** To ensure the absolute fairness of the benchmark, instead of using ChatGPT as a judge, we formulate instruction examples into multiple-choice questions, similar to MMBench [50]. We use text prompts or visual prompts to specify objects. Considering that most MLLMs cannot understand additional visual prompts, we overlay the visual prompts onto the images using highlight contours of different colors and a number tag. The evaluation item consists of image pairs (more than two images), a question, and options. The MLLM must select the correct answer from the given options based on the question and image pairs.

**Data Collection.** Our benchmark samples contain two parts: one is filtered from public datasets, and the other is manually selected from internet videos. **Firstly**, we carefully filter the most challenging 790 samples from 15 video segmentation, tracking, and multi-view matching datasets (including OVIS [60], Youtube-VIS 2021 [91], LVVIS [79], MOSE [16], BDD100k [96], BURST [3], SportMOT [14], VideoCube [27], MultiviewX [25], VastTrack [59], MOT17 [56], LaSOT [17], VIPSeg [55], WildTrack [7], and OxUvA [77]), and **manually** annotate the QA pairs. These samples include various scenes such as indoor, urban, and wilderness environments and contain images captured by different platforms, including fixed cameras, mobile phones, vehicle-mounted cameras, and drones. **Secondly**, to further enhance the diversity and challenge of the MMVM benchmark, we **manually** collect 720 videos from various internet video platforms. These videos include more challenging scenarios such as crowded streets, card games, and billiards games. For these samples, we also carefully annotate QA pairs manually. For some samples, we use text prompts rather than visual prompts to refer to objects to more comprehensively benchmark MLLMs’ visual matching performance. Combining the above two sample parts, we construct the MMVM benchmark, which includes 1,510 manually annotated multi-image QA pairs. Finally, these 1,510 samples are cross-validated by three skilled annotators to ensure complete correct. For more annotated examples, please see our appendix.

**Evaluation Metric.** We use accuracy as the evaluation metric, following previous VQA benchmarks [18, 22]. To analyze the deficiencies of various MLLMs in visual matching more thoroughly, we **manually** categorized all samples based on the cues for matching.

The right side of Fig. 3 shows samples of different categories: 1) Color (CL). 2) Shape or posture (SP). 3) Textual or LOGO markers (TM). 4) Size (SZ). 5) Relative position in the scene (RP). 6) Object orientation and movement (OO). 7) Binding relationship with other objects (BR). 8) Object Markers (OM).




Figure 3. Visualization of MMVM Benchmark. Our MMVM Benchmark contains 1,510 manually annotated multi-image QA pairs, 8 matching patterns, and 2 types of object referring methods. We collect those evaluate samples from 15 open-source video datasets and various internet video platforms.




Figure 4. The proposed automatic visual matching data generation pipeline. We begin by collecting various image pairs from open-source video datasets. We then utilize the InternVL-76B model to generate the reasons for object matching. Finally, we organize all the image pairs and the generated matching reasons into a unified format for multi-image VQA tasks.

The samples of CL, SP, TM, and SZ rely on MLLMs’ ability to perceive basic object information such as color, size, position, posture, and OCR capabilities. The samples of RP, OO, BR, and OM require MLLMs to reason for vision matching through surrounding environments or objects.

### 3.2. MMVM Dataset

To improve the visual matching performance of current MLLMs, we collect the MMVM dataset, a large-scale visual matching dataset.

**Multiple-choice QA Generation.** We filter and reorganize the train sets of current video segmentation datasets, including OVIS [60], YouTube-VIS 2021 [91], VIPSeg [55], BDD100K [96], and BURST [3]. As shown on the left side

of Fig. 4, we sample frames at fixed 1-second intervals for each video, then organize adjacent frames into image pairs. Each object pair will generate a question-answer (QA) pair, with incorrect options being other objects in the images. Following this process, we have generated 220K QA pairs. **Reason Annotations.** Multiple-choice training data can hardly provide strong supervision for MLLMs. Inspired by chain-of-thought [82], we append reasoning and explanation for each multiple-choice question. For this purpose, we design a pipeline to prompt MLLMs to generate reasons automatically. As shown in the middle of Fig. 4, first, we prompt the SOTA MLLM InternVL2-76B [12] to annotate basic information for all query and candidate objects, including color, size, position, posture, etc. Then, we give both the answer (which two objects are the same) and the objects’ basic information as conditions and prompt InternVL2-76B to generate corresponding reasons. Finally, we obtain 220K matching QA pairs with reasons, with one data sample shown on the right side of Fig. 4.

## 4. Method

### 4.1. Analysis of Current MLLMs’ Shortcomings

We have evaluated 36 SOTA MLLMs on the MMVM benchmark. However, the results are promising: None of the MLLMs can achieve an overall accuracy exceeding 50% (Tab. 1). This phenomenon suggests significant deficiencies in current MLLMs’ performance on the visual matching task. We argue that two main factors cause this phenomenon: **1) Although current MLLMs possess the necessary capabilities for visual matching, such as detailed**




Figure 5. The attention map of image pairs when the MLLMs generate responses. In all image pairs, a query object is specified in the first image, while multiple candidate objects are specified in the second image. The MLLMs select the candidate object in the second image that matches the query object.




Figure 6. The overview of CoLVA. The left side shows how we use object-level contrastive loss to train the RADIO adapter to simultaneously obtain discriminative features and align the RADIO feature space with MLLM’s feature space. The right side shows how we integrate the learned contrastive visual tokens into the MLLMs. We directly concatenate the learned contrastive visual tokens with the origin visual tokens output from the MLLM’s visual encoder and feed them into the MLLM’s LLM for answer generation.

descriptions of objects’ appearances and positions, they lack corresponding data to teach them to utilize these basic knowledge and abilities for correct visual matching. This hypothesis stems from two observations: Firstly, as shown in Fig. 5, we visualize the attention maps between multiple SOTA MLLMs’ responses and images, which show that MLLMs correctly focus on the query objects. Secondly, we find that these MLLMs, such as InternVL2-76B, can accurately identify query objects’ basic information, including category, color, position, shape, posture, and relationships with other objects in the environment. However, it only achieved a score of 25 on the MMVM benchmark. These results indicate that current MLLMs possess the necessary capabilities for visual matching, yet they cannot properly utilize these abilities to perform visual matching successfully. 2) Current MLLMs rely on CLIP models to understand images and cannot comprehend fine-grained and dis-

criminative visual features, which are essential for visual matching since candidate objects often share extremely similar semantic information. As shown in Fig. 5, the attention maps demonstrate that MLLMs give almost equal attention to all candidate objects, unable to distinguish the correct object.

## 4.2. CoLVA

To address the shortcomings summarized in Sec. 4.1, we propose a novel Object-level Contrastive Learning (OCL) strategy and introduce a fine-grained vision expert to provide the discriminative and fine-grained visual features, thereby improving the MLLM’s visual matching performance. Additionally, we propose an instruction augmentation strategy to facilitate MLLM training. These two novel designs will be detailed in the following.

**Baseline.** Due to its strong single and multi-image QA per-

formance, we select the SOTA MLLM InternVL2 [12] as our baseline. We construct a strong baseline by fine-tuning InternVL2 using a combination of LLaVA SFT data [48] and our MMVM data.

**Object-Level Contrastive Learning.** Inspired by the success of contrastive learning in visual representation [10, 23, 58], tracking [88, 89], and video segmentation [35, 36, 84, 94, 103], we introduce a novel object-level contrastive learning (OCL) strategy to help MLLM learn more discriminative features for better visual matching.

Firstly, we obtain the object-level representations using masked average pooling based on the image feature. Then, the object-level contrastive loss is conducted on the object-level representations:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{\exp(\mathbf{O} \cdot \mathbf{O}^+)}{\exp(\mathbf{O} \cdot \mathbf{O}^+) + \sum_{\mathbf{O}^-} \exp(\mathbf{O} \cdot \mathbf{O}^-)}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{O}$  denotes the object-level representation of the query object.  $\mathbf{O}^+$  and  $\mathbf{O}^-$  denote the representations of positive and negative candidate objects, respectively.

**Fine-grained Vision Expert.** We find that directly applying OCL on MLLM’s vision backbone only achieves limited improvement (34.05 vs. 32.38, as shown in Tab. 2). It is because MLLM’s CLIP-style backbone lacks fine-grained visual features. Inspired by [66, 73], we incorporate an additional fine-grained vision expert, RADIO [63], into the MLLM to provide more powerful visual representations. RADIO is distilled from the SAM [30] encoder, DINOv2 [58], CLIP [62], and other vision foundation models, thus possessing comprehensive capabilities such as fine-grained visual features and good image-text alignment ability. Due to the significant gaps between RADIO’s and MLLM’s feature spaces, we introduce an additional pre-training stage to align them, and OCL can be easily integrated into this process. As depicted on the left side of Fig. 6, we incorporate RADIO into the MLLM. OCL is used in the pre-training stage to simultaneously obtain discriminative features and align the RADIO feature space with MLLM’s feature space. For an input image pair, one image is fed into the MLLM’s original visual encoder, while another is input into the RADIO. We then apply OCL (details in Eq. 1) on all objects’ representations. Due to the limited image pairs with segmentation annotations, we simulate many pseudo-video data with masklets based on image segmentation datasets following [103].

In the pre-training stage, we freeze the InternVL2’s visual encoder, the InternVL2 adapter, and RADIO, focusing solely on training the RADIO adapter. After the pre-training stage, RADIO’s feature space is aligned with the MLLM’s. The MLLM can perform the SFT stage the same as the previous methods [12, 47].

**Instruction Augmentation.** In the SFT stage, we use highlighted contours to mark the query and candidate objects

and draw corresponding ID tags. The instruction data can be summarized in the format:

“<Edited\_IMAGES>\n<SYSTEM><Question\_Answer>”

where <SYSTEM> is: “Here are two images. In the second image, I have marked several visual objects with their contours in different colors, and each is identified by a white ID against a background that matches the contour’s color.”

This instruction format allows the MMVM data to be seamlessly compatible with InternVL2 [12] for direct training. However, it still has some drawbacks. 1) Editing the image may disrupt the original object information, especially for small objects. 2) Since the tags are used indirectly to refer to objects, gradients cannot be directly backpropagated to the corresponding image features. To address these challenges, we designed a new instruction format to support direct use of object-level representations to refer to objects:

“<Edited\_IMAGES>\n<SYSTEM><Object\_Info><Question\_Answer>”

where <Object\_Info> is: “object-1: <Obj 1>, object-2: <Obj 2>, ..., object-n: <Obj n>”, with “<Obj 1>” to “<Obj n>” replaced by the respective object-level representations. This instruction format allows gradients to be directly backpropagated through the object-level representations to the corresponding image features, enabling the MLLM to learn the required discriminative and fine-grained features more effectively.

During the training, we randomly use these two instruction formats to organize the data, which we refer to as instruction augmentation. Only the first instruction format that editing the images is adopted to support fair comparisons across all MLLMs.

## 5. Experiments

**Baselines and Datasets.** We use the pre-trained InternVL2 4B [12] as the baseline. **Please refer to the appendix for more experimental results of CoLVA built on different baseline MLLMs.** During the SFT phase, we utilize the LLaVA SFT data [48] and our MMVM dataset. The LLaVA SFT data comprises approximately 665k conversation entries, and our MMVM data includes around 220k.

**Implementation Details.** Our model comprises three components: a pre-trained MLLM InternVL2-4B [12], a fine-grained vision expert RADIO [63], and a RADIO adapter. We adopt Xtuner [13] codebase to implement our method. We maintain the original architecture of both InternVL2-4B and RADIO, while the RADIO adapter is implemented using a two-layer MLP. Our training includes two stages: pre-training and supervised fine-tuning (SFT). We freeze the MLLM and RADIO during the pre-train stage, focusing solely on training the RADIO Adapter. During the SFT stage, we freeze the RADIO, the RADIO adapter, and all components of InternVL2-4B except the LLM. The LLM of the MLLM is tuned applying LoRA [26]. We use the Osprey-727K [98] for the region-text pre-training.

Table 1. MMVM Benchmark results. Accuracy is the metric, and the overall accuracy is computed across all 1,510 evaluation samples. The accuracy for each of the eight match types is calculated separately on their respective samples. The full term of the match type abbreviation can be found in Sec. 3.1.

Model Size	Method	Overall	CL	SP	TM	SZ	RP	OO	BR	OM
~4B	InternVL2-2B [12]	9.87	9.66	6.90	10.28	10.39	8.28	11.20	10.80	8.80
	xGen-MM-v1.5-4B [87]	13.50	10.47	17.24	18.69	25.97	6.71	19.20	17.61	16.20
	VILA1.5-3B[43]	15.36	10.96	6.89	19.62	29.87	9.57	20.80	19.30	18.98
	Qwen2-VL-2B-Instruct [80]	15.69	13.42	20.69	17.75	31.16	9.57	22.40	18.75	16.67
	Ovis1.6-Llama3.2-3B [52]	16.62	13.09	20.69	20.56	33.77	9.28	22.40	21.59	20.83
	DeepSeek-VL-1.3B [51]	16.82	12.60	13.79	18.69	37.66	10.43	22.40	21.59	17.59
InternVL2-4B [12]	17.62	14.73	34.48	17.76	15.58	10.28	24.00	31.25	21.30	
4B~13B	Chameleon-7B [70]	10.07	9.49	17.24	14.95	11.69	6.86	9.60	13.07	10.65
	Cambrian-13B [72]	10.72	9.32	6.89	9.34	23.37	6.28	16.00	15.34	7.87
	Mini-Gemini-7B-HD [39]	13.18	10.80	10.34	14.95	25.97	8.28	14.40	18.18	13.89
	LLaVA-NEXT-13B [49]	13.77	8.35	10.34	10.28	22.08	7.57	22.4	22.73	18.52
	LLaVA1.5-13B [46]	14.04	11.78	13.79	14.02	31.17	7.57	20.00	18.18	14.35
	MiniCPM-V2.5-8B [92]	14.11	10.80	17.24	13.08	31.17	6.28	24.00	20.45	17.13
	Monkey-7B [41]	14.43	13.09	6.89	14.01	31.16	7.85	17.60	18.18	15.74
	VILA1.5-13B [43]	14.70	13.91	13.79	13.08	36.36	7.57	22.40	17.04	15.74
	Slime-13B [106]	14.83	11.29	6.89	16.82	32.46	9.00	18.40	21.02	17.59
	mPLUG-Owl3-7B [93]	16.22	14.07	20.68	16.82	31.16	8.57	20.80	20.45	19.90
	InternVL2-8B [12]	16.89	13.58	20.69	22.43	24.68	11.57	24.00	23.30	18.52
	VITA-8*7B [19]	17.42	14.57	13.79	23.36	29.87	10.57	24.80	22.16	20.37
	DeepSeek-VL-7b [51]	17.68	14.24	17.24	20.56	35.06	10.00	22.40	25.00	23.61
	Ovis1.6-Gemma2-9B [52]	17.75	17.68	17.24	15.89	32.47	12.14	20.00	19.32	18.98
	LLaVA-Next-Interleave-7B [34]	19.34	15.88	41.38	15.89	41.56	10.71	19.20	23.30	27.78
LLaVA-OneVision-ov-7B [33]	20.92	16.69	17.24	25.23	31.16	14.28	22.40	30.68	25.92	
Qwen2-VL-7B-Instruct [80]	27.48	24.87	37.93	30.84	62.33	17.85	28.00	28.97	31.94	
13B~40B	Yi-VL-34B [95]	11.26	9.49	17.24	18.69	12.99	7.57	9.60	15.34	11.57
	Eagle-X5-34B-Chat [66]	13.84	10.47	13.79	13.08	27.27	7.86	23.20	18.18	14.81
	LLaVA-Next-34B [49]	15.03	11.29	20.69	16.82	32.47	8.71	21.6	19.89	17.13
	VILA1.5-40B [43]	15.36	14.73	20.69	14.95	36.36	5.00	22.40	18.18	17.13
	InternVL2-40B [12]	26.03	24.88	41.38	33.64	42.86	16.86	31.20	31.82	31.02
40B~	Idefics-80B-instruct [32]	13.58	11.13	13.79	14.95	24.68	7.00	20.80	17.61	13.89
	InternVL2-76B [12]	25.83	24.06	31.03	30.84	40.26	19.28	31.20	30.11	31.02
	LLaVA-OneVision-ov-72B [33]	29.34	28.48	34.48	26.17	55.84	21.14	28.00	34.66	32.41
	InternVL2.5-78B [11]	36.42	35.02	37.93	38.32	58.44	25.86	38.40	39.20	43.98
	Qwen2-VL-72B-Instruct [80]	38.08	37.64	44.83	42.06	64.94	32.28	36.00	35.80	39.81
Unkown	Claude3-5V-Sonnet	40.20	34.21	41.38	56.07	77.92	34.86	40.00	32.39	40.28
	GeminiPro1-5	40.73	36.00	44.83	44.86	74.02	35.14	44.80	38.07	38.42
	GPT4o-20240806	42.65	39.28	65.52	60.75	67.53	32.28	44.00	43.18	50.00
2B	CoLVA-Qwen2VL-2B (Ours)	47.48	40.92	31.03	47.66	68.83	50.57	49.60	33.52	38.42
4B	CoLVA-InternVL2-4B (Ours)	49.87	43.21	41.38	45.79	77.92	44.43	53.60	44.89	53.24
7B	CoLVA-Qwen2VL-7B (Ours)	51.06	42.72	37.93	49.53	80.52	46.43	52.80	47.73	49.54

## 5.1. Main Results

**Results on MMVM benchmark.** As shown in Tab. 1, we report the average accuracy of over 20 open-source MLLMs of varying sizes, three proprietary MLLMs, and our method on the MMVM Benchmark. On the MMVM Benchmark, none of the open-source or proprietary MLLMs achieved an overall accuracy exceeding 50%. By introducing object-level contrastive learning, fine-grained vision expert, and instruction augmentation, our method achieved significant performance improvements, reaching state-of-the-art performance and surpassing the previous highest accuracy obtained by GPT4o. Among all open-source MLLMs, InternVL2 [12] achieved the highest accuracy in the sub-

4B and 13B~40B tiers, while Qwen2-VL [80] excelled in the 4B~13B and above-40B tiers. Overall, Qwen2-VL-72B [80] achieved the highest accuracy among all open-source MLLMs, approaching the accuracy of the proprietary GPT4o (38.08 vs. 42.65).

## 5.2. Ablation Study and Analysis

**The Effectiveness of Data and Methods.** As shown in Tab. 2, we used InternVL2-4B as our base model, achieving an overall accuracy of 17.62% on our MMVM benchmark. By fine-tuning InternVL2-4B with LLaVA SFT data [48] and our MMVM data, we observed a significant increase in overall accuracy (+14.76%), validating the effectiveness

of our MMVM SFT data. We adopted this fine-tuned InternVL2-4B as a strong baseline and integrated our methods, which include object-level contrastive learning, fine-grained vision expert, and instruction augmentation. By incorporating the fine-grained vision expert into the fine-tuned InternVL2 and using object-level contrastive learning to pre-train its adapter, we observed an 8.07% improvement in overall accuracy. Due to the substantial gap between the feature space of the fine-grained vision expert and that of the MLLM, directly using the visual features from the fine-grained vision expert did not yield any significant impact (32.25 vs. 32.38). Notably, directly applying object-level contrastive learning to the visual encoder of InternVL2 resulted in only a limited improvement in overall accuracy (34.05 vs. 32.38), as the CLIP-style vision backbone lacks fine-grained visual features. Further augmentation of instructions led to an additional accuracy gain of 5.38%.

**The Effectiveness of Object-level Contrastive Learning.** Our method employs object-level contrastive learning to pre-train the RADIO adapter. Compared to other standard methods that use image-text pairs (Image-Text) or region-text pairs (Region-Text) to pre-train the adapter by applying autoregressive training objective, our method (Region-Region) demonstrates significant advantages (45.83 vs. 33.64, or 45.83 vs. 30.93).

**The Alternatives of RADIO.** Our method remains effective for vision-only self-supervised learning (SSL) models. In particular, we replaced RADIO with DINOv2 [58] and ConvNext-L [83]. As shown in Tab. 4, our method still proves effective for vision-only SSL models, with a significant improvement in accuracy (40.34 vs 32.38). However, there is a gap between RADIO and DINOv2. This means both a semantic and spatial-aware visual expert is needed to achieve better results.

**Analysis on Different Match Types.** From detailed results of Tab. 1, MLLMs work better in matching based on object size (SZ), shape (SP), and textual or LOGO markers (TM). These three types require focusing solely on the object itself, indicating that current MLLMs possess proficient object-level perception and understanding. In contrast, MLLMs find it more challenging to match based on object relative position (RP), object orientation and movement (OO), and binding relationships with other objects (BR). These require MLLMs to understand the interrelationships between objects and infer information that remains invariant across time and space.

**CoLVA Failure Cases Analysis.** We have observed that CoLVA tends to fail when performing matching in densely populated object scenarios, as illustrated in Fig. 7. One reason for this is that CoLVA is prone to hallucinations regarding the query object in multi-object, multi-image contexts. For instance, in the left example of Fig. 7, CoLVA correctly identifies the query object as a player. However, in the sec-

Table 2. The effectiveness of our methods and MMVM data. Data denotes using the combination of MMVM data and LLaVA SFT data. OCL denotes object-level contrastive learning. VE denotes fine-grained vision expert. IA denotes instruction augmentation.

Data	OCL	VE	IA	OA	$\Delta$
				17.62	-
✓				32.38	+14.76
✓	✓			34.05	+1.67
✓		✓		32.25	-0.13
✓	✓	✓		40.45	+8.07
✓	✓	✓	✓	45.83	+5.38

Table 3. The effectiveness of object-level contrastive loss. Image-Text/Region-Text means using image-text/region-text pairs for align pre-training. Region-Region means using contrastive loss for align pre-training.

Metric	Baseline	No Alignment	Image-Text	Region-Text	Region-Region
Overall Acc.	32.38	32.25	33.64	30.93	45.83

Table 4. The alternatives of RADIO. The baseline is without any fine-grained vision expert.

	Overall	CL	SP	TM	SZ	RP	OO	BR	OM
Baseline	32.38	25.04	24.14	32.71	74.03	19.00	35.20	43.18	36.57
RADIO	45.83	38.30	31.03	41.12	76.62	41.71	51.20	39.77	46.76
DINOv2	40.34	33.72	44.83	42.06	64.94	32.28	36.00	35.80	39.81
ConvNext-L	39.80	31.59	34.48	42.99	77.92	26.57	48.80	44.32	44.44



Figure 7. The failure cases of CoLVA on MMVM benchmark. CoLVA tends to fail when performing matching in densely populated object scenarios.

ond image, it mistakenly hallucinates object-7, which is actually a horse, as the matched player. Additionally, in multi-view scenarios, CoLVA is susceptible to incorrectly matching another object based on partial information of the query object from a single viewpoint.

## 6. Conclusion

In this paper, we present the MMVM benchmark and corresponding evaluation metrics to comprehensively evaluate current MLLMs’ performance in visual correspondence. The experiment results demonstrate all MLLMs perform poorly, with none achieving accuracy above 50%, including GPT-4o. To address the significant deficiencies of current MLLMs in visual correspondence, we designed an automatic annotation pipeline to generate a 220K visual matching SFT dataset with reasoning. Furthermore, we developed CoLVA through two novel designs: combining object-level contrastive learning with RADIO to obtain descriptive and



fine-grained visual features and an instruction augmentation strategy for better training. Experiments demonstrate that our novel designs bring a performance improvement of 13.45 OA. Benefiting from our SFT data and the novel designs, our proposed CoLVA-Qwen2VL-7B achieves 51.06 OA on the MMVM benchmark, which surpasses the baseline Qwen2-VL-7B-Instruct with a 23.58 OA performance improvement.

## A. More Experiment Result

**Exploration CoLVA on more MLLMs.** To validate the generalization capability of our CoLVA across different MLLMs, we integrated CoLVA into three distinct MLLMs: InternVL2-4B [12], Qwen2VL-2B [80], and LLaVA1.5-7B [48]. Their performance on the MMVM benchmark is presented in Tab. 5. The results demonstrate that CoLVA significantly enhances the fine-grained visual matching capabilities across all three MLLMs. Notably, LLaVA1.5-7B, which has not undergone multi-image training, exhibited the smallest accuracy improvement after integrating CoLVA. In contrast, both InternVL2-4B and Qwen2VL-2B, having been trained with multiple images, showed substantial accuracy improvements on the MMVM benchmark post-CoLVA integration. The most significant accuracy enhancement was observed with Qwen2VL-2B, likely due to its unique architectural innovation, the Multimodal Rotary Position Embedding (M-RoPE). This feature enables MLLMs to simultaneously capture and integrate positional information from one-dimensional text sequences, two-dimensional visual images, and three-dimensional videos, facilitating fine-grained visual matching tasks within spatiotemporally varying multi-image contexts.

**Results on common VQA benchmarks.** To investigate whether CoLVA adversely affects the inherent general visual question answering (VQA) capabilities of MLLMs, we conducted tests across six relevant benchmarks: MM-Bench [50], MME [18], MMStar [9], MMMU [99], POPE [38], and BLINK [20]. The results are presented in Table 2. We used InternVL2-4B as the baseline and integrated our CoLVA into this framework. The results indicate that the negative impact of CoLVA on the general VQA capabilities of MLLMs is minimal. In fact, it even shows positive effects on the MME, POPE, and BLINK benchmarks. Therefore, our CoLVA does not compromise the original general VQA capabilities of MLLMs and can be a good supplementary of current mainstream VQA datasets.

**Ablation studies in more detailed results.** Here, we present the detailed results of the main ablation experiments, as shown in Tab. 7. The table includes the overall accuracy and accuracy across eight different match types. Our method significantly improves accuracy over a strong baseline (45.83 vs. 32.38) across six match types. The improvement is less pronounced for the size (SZ) match type,

where accuracy is approaching saturation (76.62 vs. 74.03).

## B. More Implementation Details

**More training details.** Our CoLVA training is divided into two phases: the pre-training phase and the fine-tuning phase. During the pre-training phase, we sample 500k images with segmentation labels from SA1B [30]. For each image, we apply augmentations such as Crop, Resize, Flip, and Rotation to simulate a pseudo video. We then sample two frames from this pseudo video to serve as our training samples. Taking InternVL2 [12] as the base model and RADIO [63] as the vision expert, we input one image into the InternVL2 visual encoder and the other into RADIO. When selecting the (anchor, positive, negatives) triplet, the anchor is chosen from the image features output by RADIO, while the positive and negatives are selected from the image features output by the InternVL2 visual encoder. We perform full training from scratch on the RADIO adapter using only object-level contrastive loss.

In the fine-tuning phase, we apply instruction augmentation to the original 220k MMVM data samples using object-level representations. Consequently, we utilize a total of 440k MMVM data samples during fine-tuning. When using Qwen2VL [80] as the base model, to reduce sequence length and decrease computational resource requirements, we scale the long edge of all images to 1024 pixels and pad the short edge to 1024 pixels.

**Inference details.** When performing inference on the MMVM benchmark, we integrate CoLVA into the MLLMs. For inference on general VQA benchmarks, we maintain the MLLMs’ original architecture and load the LLM parameters trained with CoLVA.

## C. More visualization results

**More challenging test cases of our MMVM.** Here, we present more examples from the MMVM benchmark, which features diverse scenes and presents significant challenges, as illustrated in Fig. 8. In particular, our MMVM contains extremely small objects.

## D. Further Discussion

**Future works.** We have argued the fine-grained visual perception and logical reasoning ability of MLLMs in the main paper. We give a more detailed description here.

The former means the MLLMs must understand various scale objects well, where detailed information, such as object parts, remote objects, and thin objects, play a critical role in perception. Thus, equipping MLLMs with dense perception ability and visual prompts [31, 37, 65, 98, 105] is needed.

The latter means that MLLMs must have instance-aware understanding and can perform visual comparisons [59].

Table 5. The effectiveness of CoLVA on more MLLMs. OA denotes the overall accuracy.

MLLM	CoLVA	OA	CL	SP	TM	SZ	RP	OO	BR	OM
InternVL2-4B	×	17.62	14.73	34.48	17.76	15.58	10.28	24.00	31.25	21.30
	✓	45.83	38.30	31.03	41.12	76.62	41.71	51.20	39.77	46.76
Qwen2VL-2B	×	15.69	13.42	20.69	17.75	31.16	9.57	22.40	18.75	16.67
	✓	47.48	40.92	31.03	47.66	68.83	50.57	49.60	33.52	38.42
LLaVA1.5-7B	×	14.64	12.44	10.34	16.82	29.87	8.00	19.20	19.32	16.20
	✓	36.56	29.13	27.59	38.32	71.43	26.14	40.80	42.04	39.35

Table 6. The Impact of CoLVA on the Common VQA Capabilities of MLLMs.

MLLM	CoLVA	MMBench DEV Overall	MME Perception	MME Reasoning	MMStar Overall	MMMU Val Overall	POPE Overall	BLINK Overall
InternVL2-4B	×	77.40	1536.14	533.93	54.40	47.56	84.52	45.76
	✓	77.32	1552.82	549.64	53.47	44.11	86.11	47.24

Table 7. The effectiveness of our methods and MMVM data with detailed results. Data denotes using the combination of MMVM data and LLaVA SFT data. OCL denotes object-level contrastive learning. VE denotes fine-grained vision expert. IA denotes instruction augmentation. OA denotes the overall accuracy.

Data	OCL	VE	IA	OA	CL	SP	TM	SZ	RP	OO	BR	OM
				17.62	14.73	34.48	17.76	15.58	10.28	24.00	31.25	21.30
✓				32.38	25.04	24.14	32.71	74.03	19.00	35.20	43.18	36.57
✓	✓			34.05	25.78	26.77	31.97	75.01	22.32	35.29	42.98	37.51
✓		✓		32.25	24.22	27.59	31.78	68.83	19.14	35.20	40.34	39.35
✓	✓	✓		40.45	33.72	44.85	39.37	75.33	30.00	48.00	38.65	44.78
✓	✓	✓	✓	45.83	38.30	31.03	41.12	76.62	41.71	51.20	39.77	46.76

With this ability, MLLMs can distinguish various objects and perform visual reasoning. This is why we adopt contrastive loss during the pre-training stage.

In addition, automatically collecting more high-quality supervised fine-tuning data is another way to boost MLLMs.

**Board impact.** Our works explore one fundamental limitation of current SOTA MLLMs: visual correspondence shortcomings. We present a new benchmark: MMVM, a training dataset, and a new training framework, CoLVA, to improve the visual correspondence in MLLM models. Our work will raise the attention of visual correspondence in MLLM design and inspire research on cross-image VQA tasks and fine-grained VQA tasks.

## References

- [1] Marah Abdin, Jyoti Aneja, Hany Awadalla, Ahmed Awadallah, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Jianmin Bao, Harkirat Behl, et al. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14219*, 2024. 2
- [2] Rohan Anil, Andrew M Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, et al. Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10403*, 2023. 2
- [3] Ali Athar, Jonathon Luiten, Paul Voigtlaender, Tarasha Khurana, Achal Dave, Bastian Leibe, and Deva Ramanan. Burst: A benchmark for unifying object recognition, segmentation and tracking in video. In *WACV*, 2023. 2, 3, 4
- [4] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*, 2023. 2
- [5] Adam Baumberg. Reliable feature matching across widely separated views. *CVPR*, 2000. 2
- [6] Mu Cai, Haotian Liu, Siva Karthik Mustikovela, Gregory P. Meyer, Yuning Chai, Dennis Park, and Yong Jae Lee. Making large multimodal models understand arbitrary visual prompts. In *CVPR*, 2024. 2, 3
- [7] T Chavdarova, P Baqué, S Bouquet, A Maksai, C Jose, L Lettry, P Fua, L Van Gool, and F Fleuret. The wildtrack multi-camera person dataset. In *CVPR*, 2018. 2, 3
- [8] Lin Chen, Jinsong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Conghui He, Jiaqi Wang, Feng Zhao, and Dahua Lin. Sharegpt4v:



Figure 8. More challenging test cases of our MMVM benchmark, where each row shows cases of different match types.

Improving large multi-modal models with better captions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12793*, 2023. 2

- [9] Lin Chen, Jinsong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Zehui Chen, Haodong Duan, Jiaqi Wang, Yu Qiao, Dahua Lin, et al. Are we on the right way for evaluating large vision-language models? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.20330*, 2024. 9
- [10] Xinlei Chen, Haoqi Fan, Ross Girshick, and Kaiming He. Improved baselines with momentum contrastive learning.

*arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.04297*, 2020. 6

- [11] Zhe Chen, Weiyun Wang, Yue Cao, Yangzhou Liu, Zhangwei Gao, Erfei Cui, Jinguo Zhu, Shenglong Ye, Hao Tian, Zhaoyang Liu, et al. Expanding performance boundaries of open-source multimodal models with model, data, and test-time scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.05271*, 2024. 7
- [12] Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Muyan Zhong, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou

- Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. In *CVPR*, 2024. 2, 4, 6, 7, 9
- [13] XTuner Contributors. Xtuner: A toolkit for efficiently fine-tuning llm. <https://github.com/InternLM/xtuner>, 2023. 6
- [14] Yutao Cui, Chenkai Zeng, Xiaoyu Zhao, Yichun Yang, Gangshan Wu, and Limin Wang. Sportsmot: A large multi-object tracking dataset in multiple sports scenes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05170*, 2023. 2, 3
- [15] Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale Fung, and Steven Hoi. Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06500*, 2023. 2
- [16] Henghui Ding, Chang Liu, Shuting He, Xudong Jiang, Philip HS Torr, and Song Bai. Mose: A new dataset for video object segmentation in complex scenes. In *ICCV*, 2023. 2, 3
- [17] Heng Fan, Liting Lin, Fan Yang, Peng Chu, Ge Deng, Sijia Yu, Hexin Bai, Yong Xu, Chunyuan Liao, and Haibin Ling. Lasot: A high-quality benchmark for large-scale single object tracking. In *CVPR*, 2019. 2, 3
- [18] Chaoyou Fu, Peixian Chen, Yunhang Shen, Yulei Qin, Mengdan Zhang, Xu Lin, Jinrui Yang, Xiawu Zheng, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Yunsheng Wu, and Rongrong Ji. Mme: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13394*, 2024. 3, 9
- [19] Chaoyou Fu, Haojia Lin, Zuwei Long, Yunhang Shen, Meng Zhao, Yifan Zhang, Xiong Wang, Di Yin, Long Ma, Xiawu Zheng, et al. Vita: Towards open-source interactive omni multimodal llm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.05211*, 2024. 7
- [20] 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. In *ECCV*, 2025. 9
- [21] Andreas Geiger, Julius Ziegler, and Christoph Stiller. Stereoscan: Dense 3d reconstruction in real-time. *IV*, 2011. 2
- [22] Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Making the V in VQA matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in Visual Question Answering. In *CVPR*, 2017. 3
- [23] Kaiming He, Haoqi Fan, Yuxin Wu, Saining Xie, and Ross Girshick. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *CVPR*, 2020. 6
- [24] Yining Hong, Haoyu Zhen, Peihao Chen, Shuhong Zheng, Yilun Du, Zhenfang Chen, and Chuang Gan. 3d-llm: Injecting the 3d world into large language models. In *NeurIPS*, 2023. 2, 3
- [25] Yunzhong Hou, Liang Zheng, and Stephen Gould. Multi-view detection with feature perspective transformation. In *ECCV*, 2020. 2, 3
- [26] Edward J Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. Lora: Low-rank adaptation of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.09685*, 2021. 6
- [27] Shiyu Hu, Xin Zhao, Lianghua Huang, and Kaiqi Huang. Global instance tracking: Locating target more like humans. *TPAMI*, 2023. 2, 3
- [28] Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning. Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering. *CVPR*, 2019. 3
- [29] Louis Martin Hugo Touvron, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, and et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023. 2
- [30] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, et al. Segment anything. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02643*, 2023. 6, 9
- [31] Xin Lai, Zhuotao Tian, Yukang Chen, Yanwei Li, Yuhui Yuan, Shu Liu, and Jiaya Jia. Lisa: Reasoning segmentation via large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.00692*, 2023. 2, 3, 9
- [32] Hugo Laurençon, Lucile Saulnier, Léo Tronchon, Stas Bekman, Amanpreet Singh, Anton Lozhkov, Thomas Wang, Siddharth Karamcheti, Alexander Rush, Douwe Kiela, et al. Obelics: An open web-scale filtered dataset of interleaved image-text documents. In *NeurIPS*, 2024. 7
- [33] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Dong Guo, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Yanwei Li, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-onevision: Easy visual task transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03326*, 2024. 2, 7
- [34] Feng Li, Renrui Zhang, Hao Zhang, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Wei Li, Zejun Ma, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-next-interleave: Tackling multi-image, video, and 3d in large multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.07895*, 2024. 2, 7
- [35] Siyuan Li, Lei Ke, Martin Danelljan, Luigi Piccinelli, Mattia Segu, Luc Van Gool, and Fisher Yu. Matching anything by segmenting anything. In *CVPR*, 2024. 2, 3, 6
- [36] Xiangtai Li, Haobo Yuan, Wenwei Zhang, Guangliang Cheng, Jiangmiao Pang, and Chen Change Loy. Tube-link: A flexible cross tube framework for universal video segmentation. In *ICCV*, 2023. 3, 6
- [37] Xiangtai Li, Haobo Yuan, Wei Li, Henghui Ding, Size Wu, Wenwei Zhang, Yining Li, Kai Chen, and Chen Change Loy. Omg-seg: Is one model good enough for all segmentation? In *CVPR*, 2024. 9
- [38] Yifan Li, Yifan Du, Kun Zhou, Jimpeng Wang, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen. Evaluating object hallucination in large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10355*, 2023. 9
- [39] Yanwei Li, Yuechen Zhang, Chengyao Wang, Zhisheng Zhong, Yixin Chen, Ruihang Chu, Shaoteng Liu, and Jiaya Jia. Mini-gemini: Mining the potential of multi-modality vision language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.18814*, 2023. 7
- [40] Yanwei Li, Chengyao Wang, and Jiaya Jia. Llama-vid: An image is worth 2 tokens in large language models. In *ECCV*, 2024. 2, 3
- [41] Zhang Li, Biao Yang, Qiang Liu, Zhiyin Ma, Shuo Zhang, Jingxu Yang, Yabo Sun, Yuliang Liu, and Xiang Bai. Mon-

- key: Image resolution and text label are important things for large multi-modal models. In *CVPR*, 2024. 7
- [42] Bin Lin, Yang Ye, Bin Zhu, Jiayi Cui, Munan Ning, Peng Jin, and Li Yuan. Video-llava: Learning united visual representation by alignment before projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10122*, 2023. 3
- [43] Ji Lin, Hongxu Yin, Wei Ping, Pavlo Molchanov, Mohammad Shoeybi, and Song Han. Vila: On pre-training for visual language models. In *CVPR*, 2024. 7
- [44] Kevin Lin, Faisal Ahmed, Linjie Li, Chung-Ching Lin, Ehsan Azarnasab, Zhengyuan Yang, Jianfeng Wang, Lin Liang, Zicheng Liu, Yumao Lu, et al. Mm-vid: Advancing video understanding with gpt-4v (ision). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19773*, 2023. 3
- [45] Weifeng Lin, Xinyu Wei, Ruichuan An, Peng Gao, Bocheng Zou, Yulin Luo, Siyuan Huang, Shanghang Zhang, and Hongsheng Li. Draw-and-understand: Leveraging visual prompts to enable mllms to comprehend what you want. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.20271*, 2024. 3
- [46] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning, 2023. 7
- [47] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08485*, 2023. 2, 3, 6
- [48] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03744*, 2024. 2, 6, 7, 9
- [49] 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. 2, 3, 7
- [50] Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhang, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, et al. Mmbench: Is your multimodal model an all-around player? In *ECCV*, 2024. 3, 9
- [51] Haoyu Lu, Wen Liu, Bo Zhang, Bingxuan Wang, Kai Dong, Bo Liu, Jingxiang Sun, Tongzheng Ren, Zhuoshu Li, Hao Yang, et al. Deepseek-vl: towards real-world vision-language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05525*, 2024. 2, 7
- [52] Shiyin Lu, Yang Li, Qing-Guo Chen, Zhao Xu, Weihua Luo, Kaifu Zhang, and Han-Jia Ye. Ovis: Structural embedding alignment for multimodal large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20797*, 2024. 2, 7
- [53] Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Rasheed, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Video-chatgpt: Towards detailed video understanding via large vision and language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05424*, 2023. 3
- [54] Fanqing Meng, Jin Wang, Chuanhao Li, Quanfeng Lu, Hao Tian, Jiaqi Liao, Xizhou Zhu, Jifeng Dai, Yu Qiao, Ping Luo, et al. Mmiu: Multimodal multi-image understanding for evaluating large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.02718*, 2024. 3
- [55] Jiayu Miao, Xiaohan Wang, Yu Wu, Wei Li, Xu Zhang, Yunchao Wei, and Yi Yang. Large-scale video panoptic segmentation in the wild: A benchmark. In *CVPR*, 2022. 2, 3, 4
- [56] Anton Milan. Mot16: A benchmark for multi-object tracking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.00831*, 2016. 2, 3
- [57] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023. 2
- [58] Maxime Oquab, Timothée Darcet, Théo Moutakanni, Huy Vo, Marc Szafraniec, Vasil Khalidov, Pierre Fernandez, Daniel Haziza, Francisco Massa, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, et al. Dinov2: Learning robust visual features without supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07193*, 2023. 6, 8
- [59] Liang Peng, Junyuan Gao, Xinran Liu, Weihong Li, Shaohua Dong, Zhipeng Zhang, Heng Fan, and Libo Zhang. Vasttrack: Vast category visual object tracking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03493*, 2024. 2, 3, 9
- [60] Jiyang Qi, Yan Gao, Yao Hu, Xinggang Wang, Xiaoyu Liu, Xiang Bai, Serge Belongie, Alan Yuille, Philip HS Torr, and Song Bai. Occluded video instance segmentation: A benchmark. In *IJCV*, 2022. 2, 3, 4
- [61] Mengxue Qu, Xiaodong Chen, Wu Liu, Alicia Li, and Yao Zhao. Chatvtg: Video temporal grounding via chat with video dialogue large language models. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3
- [62] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *ICML*, 2021. 2, 6
- [63] Mike Ranzinger, Greg Heinrich, Jan Kautz, and Pavlo Molchanov. Am-radio: Agglomerative vision foundation model reduce all domains into one. In *CVPR*, 2024. 6, 9
- [64] Hanoona Rasheed, Muhammad Maaz, Sahal Shaji, Abdelrahman Shaker, Salman Khan, Hisham Cholakkal, Rao M Anwer, Eric Xing, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Fahad S Khan. Glamm: Pixel grounding large multimodal model. In *CVPR*, 2024. 2, 3
- [65] Nikhila Ravi, Valentin Gabeur, Yuan-Ting Hu, Ronghang Hu, Chaitanya Ryali, Tengyu Ma, Haitham Khedr, Roman Rädle, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, et al. Sam 2: Segment anything in images and videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00714*, 2024. 2, 9
- [66] Min Shi, Fuxiao Liu, Shihao Wang, Shijia Liao, Subhashree Radhakrishnan, De-An Huang, Hongxu Yin, Karan Sapra, Yaser Yacoob, Humphrey Shi, Bryan Catanzaro, Andrew Tao, Jan Kautz, Zhiding Yu, and Guilin Liu. Eagle: Exploring the design space for multimodal llms with mixture of encoders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.15998*, 2024. 6, 7
- [67] Amanpreet Singh, Vivek Natarajan, Meet Shah, Yu Jiang, Xinlei Chen, Devi Parikh, and Marcus Rohrbach. Towards vqa models that can read. In *CVPR*, 2019. 3
- [68] Enxin Song, Wenhao Chai, Guanhong Wang, Yucheng Zhang, Haoyang Zhou, Feiyang Wu, Haozhe Chi, Xun Guo, Tian Ye, Yanting Zhang, et al. Moviechat: From dense token to sparse memory for long video understanding. In *CVPR*, 2024. 2, 3
- [69] Yiming Sun, Fan Yu, Shaoxiang Chen, Yu Zhang, Junwei Huang, Chenhui Li, Yang Li, and Changbo Wang. Chat-tracker: Enhancing visual tracking performance via chatting with multimodal large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.01756*, 2024. 3

- [70] Chameleon Team. Chameleon: Mixed-modal early-fusion foundation models, 2024. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09818*, 2024. 7
- [71] InternLM Team. Internlm: A multilingual language model with progressively enhanced capabilities, 2023. 2
- [72] Shengbang Tong, Ellis Brown, Penghao Wu, Sanghyun Woo, Manoj Middepogu, Sai Charitha Akula, Jihan Yang, Shusheng Yang, Adithya Iyer, Xichen Pan, et al. Cambrian-1: A fully open, vision-centric exploration of multimodal llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.16860*, 2024. 3, 7
- [73] Shengbang Tong, Zhuang Liu, Yuxiang Zhai, Yi Ma, Yann LeCun, and Saining Xie. Eyes wide shut? exploring the visual shortcomings of multimodal llms. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3, 6
- [74] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023. 2
- [75] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, Aurelien Rodriguez, Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, and Guillaume Lample. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023. 2
- [76] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shrutvi Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023. 2
- [77] Jack Valmadre, Luca Bertinetto, Joao F Henriques, Ran Tao, Andrea Vedaldi, Arnold WM Smeulders, Philip HS Torr, and Efstratios Gavves. Long-term tracking in the wild: A benchmark. In *ECCV*, 2018. 2, 3
- [78] Haibo Wang, Zhiyang Xu, Yu Cheng, Shizhe Diao, Yufan Zhou, Yixin Cao, Qifan Wang, Weifeng Ge, and Lifu Huang. Grounded-videollm: Sharpening fine-grained temporal grounding in video large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.03290*, 2024. 3
- [79] Haochen Wang, Cilin Yan, Keyan Chen, Xiaolong Jiang, Xu Tang, Yao Hu, Guoliang Kang, Weidi Xie, and Efstratios Gavves. Ov-vis: Open-vocabulary video instance segmentation. In *IJCV*, 2024. 2, 3
- [80] Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, et al. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*, 2024. 2, 3, 7, 9
- [81] Zehan Wang, Haifeng Huang, Yang Zhao, Ziang Zhang, and Zhou Zhao. Chat-3d: Data-efficiently tuning large language model for universal dialogue of 3d scenes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08769*, 2023. 3
- [82] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 4
- [83] Sanghyun Woo, Shoubhik Debnath, Ronghang Hu, Xinlei Chen, Zhuang Liu, In So Kweon, and Saining Xie. Convnext v2: Co-designing and scaling convnets with masked autoencoders. In *CVPR*, 2023. 8
- [84] Junfeng Wu, Qihao Liu, Yi Jiang, Song Bai, Alan Yuille, and Xiang Bai. In defense of online models for video instance segmentation. In *ECCV*, 2022. 3, 6
- [85] Mingrui Wu, Xinyue Cai, Jiayi Ji, Jiale Li, Oucheng Huang, Gen Luo, Hao Fei, Xiaoshuai Sun, and Rongrong Ji. Controlmllm: Training-free visual prompt learning for multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21534*, 2024. 3
- [86] Runsen Xu, Xiaolong Wang, Tai Wang, Yilun Chen, Jiangmiao Pang, and Dahua Lin. Pointllm: Empowering large language models to understand point clouds. In *ECCV*, 2024. 3
- [87] Le Xue, Manli Shu, Anas Awadalla, Jun Wang, An Yan, Senthil Purushwalkam, Honglu Zhou, Viraj Prabhu, Yutong Dai, Michael S Ryoo, et al. xgen-mm (blip-3): A family of open large multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.08872*, 2024. 7
- [88] Bin Yan, Yi Jiang, Peize Sun, Dong Wang, Zehuan Yuan, Ping Luo, and Huchuan Lu. Towards grand unification of object tracking. In *ECCV*, 2022. 6
- [89] Bin Yan, Yi Jiang, Jiannan Wu, Dong Wang, Ping Luo, Zehuan Yuan, and Huchuan Lu. Universal instance perception as object discovery and retrieval. In *CVPR*, 2023. 6
- [90] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Guanting Dong, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jialin Wang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Ma, Jin Xu, Jingren Zhou, Jinze Bai, Jinzheng He, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Chen, Kexin Yang, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Na Ni, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Ru Peng, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Runji Lin, Shijie Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Tianhang Zhu, Tianhao Li, Tianyu Liu, Wenbin Ge, Xiaodong Deng, Xiaohuan Zhou, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Zhang, Xipin Wei, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Yao, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yunfei Chu, Yuqiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, and Zhihao Fan. Qwen2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10671*, 2024. 2
- [91] Linjie Yang, Yuchen Fan, and Ning Xu. Video instance segmentation. In *ICCV*, 2019. 2, 3, 4
- [92] Yuan Yao, Tianyu Yu, Ao Zhang, Chongyi Wang, Junbo Cui, Hongji Zhu, Tianchi Cai, Haoyu Li, Weilin Zhao, Zhihui He, Qianyu Chen, Huarong Zhou, Zhenheng Zou, Haoye Zhang, Shengding Hu, Zhi Zheng, Jie Zhou, Jie Cai, Xu Han, Guoyang Zeng, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Minicpm-v: A gpt-4v level mllm on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.01800*, 2024. 7
- [93] Jiabo Ye, Haiyang Xu, Haowei Liu, Anwen Hu, Ming Yan, Qi Qian, Ji Zhang, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. mplug-owl3: Towards long image-sequence understanding in multi-modal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.04840*, 2024. 7
- [94] Kaining Ying, Qing Zhong, Weian Mao, Zhenhua Wang, Hao Chen, Lin Yuanbo Wu, Yifan Liu, Chengxiang Fan,

- Yunzhi Zhuge, and Chunhua Shen. Ctvis: Consistent training for online video instance segmentation. In *ICCV*, 2023. 6
- [95] Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, Heng Li, Jiangcheng Zhu, Jianqun Chen, Jing Chang, et al. Yi: Open foundation models by 01. ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04652*, 2024. 7
- [96] Fisher Yu, Haofeng Chen, Xin Wang, Wenqi Xian, Yingying Chen, Fangchen Liu, Vashisht Madhavan, and Trevor Darrell. Bdd100k: A diverse driving dataset for heterogeneous multitask learning. In *CVPR*, 2020. 2, 3, 4
- [97] Weihao Yu, Zhengyuan Yang, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Kevin Lin, Zicheng Liu, Xinchao Wang, and Lijuan Wang. Mm-vet: Evaluating large multimodal models for integrated capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02490*, 2023. 3
- [98] Yuqian Yuan, Wentong Li, Jian Liu, Dongqi Tang, Xinjie Luo, Chi Qin, Lei Zhang, and Jianke Zhu. Osprey: Pixel understanding with visual instruction tuning. In *CVPR*, 2024. 3, 6, 9
- [99] 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 *CVPR*, 2024. 9
- [100] Hang Zhang, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. Video-llama: An instruction-tuned audio-visual language model for video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02858*, 2023. 3
- [101] Tao Zhang, Xingye Tian, Haoran Wei, Yu Wu, Shunping Ji, Xuebo Wang, Xin Tao, Yuan Zhang, and Pengfei Wan. 1st place solution for pvuw challenge 2023: Video panoptic segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04091*, 2023. 3
- [102] Tao Zhang, Xingye Tian, Yu Wu, Shunping Ji, Xuebo Wang, Yuan Zhang, and Pengfei Wan. Dvis: Decoupled video instance segmentation framework. In *ICCV*, 2023.
- [103] Tao Zhang, Xingye Tian, Yikang Zhou, Shunping Ji, Xuebo Wang, Xin Tao, Yuan Zhang, Pengfei Wan, Zhongyuan Wang, and Yu Wu. Dvis++: Improved decoupled framework for universal video segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.13305*, 2023. 6
- [104] Tao Zhang, Xingye Tian, Yikang Zhou, Yu Wu, Shunping Ji, Cilin Yan, Xuebo Wang, Xin Tao, Yuan Zhang, and Pengfei Wan. 1st place solution for the 5th lsvos challenge: Video instance segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14392*, 2023. 3
- [105] Tao Zhang, Xiangtai Li, Hao Fei, Haobo Yuan, Shengqiong Wu, Shunping Ji, Chen Change Loy, and Shuicheng Yan. Omg-llava: Bridging image-level, object-level, pixel-level reasoning and understanding. In *NeurIPS*, 2024. 2, 3, 9
- [106] Yi-Fan Zhang, Qingsong Wen, Chaoyou Fu, Xue Wang, Zhang Zhang, Liang Wang, and Rong Jin. Beyond llava-hd: Diving into high-resolution large multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08487*, 2024. 7
- [107] Yue Zhao, Ishan Misra, Philipp Krähenbühl, and Rohit Girdhar. Learning video representations from large language models. In *CVPR*, 2023. 3
- [108] Yikang Zhou, Tao Zhang, Shunping Ji, Shuicheng Yan, and Xiangtai Li. Dvis-daq: Improving video segmentation via dynamic anchor queries. In *ECCV*, 2024. 3
- [109] Husein Zolkepli, Aisyah Razak, Kamarul Adha, and Ariff Nazhan. Mmmmodal – multi-images multi-audio multi-turn multi-modal. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.11297*, 2024. 3