

LongViTU: Instruction Tuning for Long-Form Video Understanding

Rujie Wu^{1*}, Xiaojian Ma^{2*†}, Hai Ci^{3*}, Yue Fan²,
 Yuxuan Wang², Haozhe Zhao¹, Qing Li² ✉, Yizhou Wang¹
¹Peking University, ²BIGAI, ³National University of Singapore
 *Equal contribution †Research lead [Project page](#)




Figure 1. **Illustration of LongViTU.** The top row shows an example video sequence, with **red boxes** highlighting key clues for the posed question and **yellow boxes** marking objects in key frames related to the answer. The middle row emphasizes the primary advantages of our proposed LongViTU over previous datasets, along with a Q&A sample; refer to [Section 1](#) for further details. The bottom row displays predictions from canonical open-source and commercial VLMs, evaluated by GPT-4 against ground truth using our novel predefined criteria.

Abstract

This paper introduces LongViTU, a large-scale (~121k QA pairs, ~900h videos), automatically generated dataset for long-form video understanding. We developed a systematic approach that organizes videos into a **hierarchical tree** structure and incorporates **self-revision** mechanisms to ensure high-quality QA pairs. Each QA pair in LongViTU features: 1) long-term context (average certificate length of 4.6 minutes); 2) rich knowledge and condensed reasoning (commonsense, causality, planning, etc.); and 3) explicit timestamp labels for relevant events. LongViTU also serves as a benchmark for instruction following in long-form and streaming video understanding. We evaluate the open-source state-of-the-art long video understanding model, LongVU, and the commercial model, Gemini-1.5-Pro, on our benchmark. They achieve GPT-4 scores of 49.9 and 52.3, respectively,

underscoring the substantial challenge posed by our benchmark. Further supervised fine-tuning (SFT) on LongVU led to performance improvements of 12.0% on our benchmark, 2.2% on the in-distribution (ID) benchmark EgoSchema, 1.0%, 2.2% and 1.2% on the out-of-distribution (OOD) benchmarks VideoMME (Long), WorldQA and OpenEQA, respectively. These outcomes demonstrate LongViTU’s high data quality and robust OOD generalizability.

1. Introduction

We present LongViTU, a novel dataset for large-scale, long-form video understanding (see [Figure 1](#)). Compared to existing Video Question-Answering (VQA) datasets, LongViTU provides greater naturalness and diversity. The primary advantages over prior works are summarized below, see [Table 1](#) for a clearer view.

- **Diverse Real World Scenarios.** Existing datasets suffer from limitations in domain coverage or scene diversity, like Env-QA [17] and OpenEQA [35] rely on videos from virtual environments, which inherently introduce a substantial domain gap. Others, including EgoVQA [14], EgoTaskQA [22], EgoSchema [36], WorldQA [67], MoVQA [64], MovieChat [45], and CinePile [41], *etc.*, despite utilizing real world videos, primarily feature limited or homogeneous scenes. In contrast, LongViTU leverages the comprehensive Ego4D dataset [19], enabling VQA tasks to encompass a broader spectrum of real-world scenarios with enhanced diversity and realism.
- **Explicit Timestamp Labels.** Previous datasets, such as Otter [25], Video-ChatGPT [34], InternVideo [51], VideoChat [28], MVBench [29], LLaVA-Video [66], and MM-Ego [60], lack explicit timestamp labels for QA-related events. This omission means the precise start and end times for each QA are undefined, despite multiple QAs being present in a single video. To address this, our hierarchical pipeline organizes video content into a tree structure, enabling QA generation at various granularities with explicit timestamps for each event. LongViTU provides precise temporal annotations for all QA events, facilitating accurate identification of key moments in ultra-long videos. This approach shifts away from *turn-based* QA paradigms by LLMs & VLMs, enabling *streaming* QA for extended video content.
- **Long Certificate Length.** In short datasets, such as NextQA [54] and ActivityNet-QA [62], the average *certificate length* (introduced in EgoSchema [36], which we adhere to) is typically less than 10 seconds. While longer datasets like WorldQA [67] reach average certificate length under 60 seconds, and EgoSchema [36] stays below 100 seconds. LongViTU achieving an average certificate length of 276.8 seconds (~4.6 minutes). For further statistical details, please refer to Figure 3.
- **Fine-grained Categorization.** Most datasets focus primarily on basic question types related to spatial elements (such as objects, attributes, locations, and states, *etc.*), lacking a detailed and structured categorization. While recent datasets like EgoTaskQA [22] and OpenEQA [35] have introduced categorized questions, their classifications remain broad. In contrast, LongViTU emphasizes the spatiotemporal dimensions, offering a fine-grained categorization that captures the intricate spatiotemporal details within video contexts. This is organized into three primary categories, along with more granular subcategories, illustrated in Figure 3b.
- **Open-ended Precise QA.** Unlike existing datasets with multiple-choice formats or irrelevant answers, LongViTU delivers open-ended precise QAs. By integrating a self-revision mechanism, LongViTU refines QAs to ensure

alignment with video content and removing redundancies. By preserving these primary advantages during dataset construction, the final dataset comprises ~121k high-quality QA pairs within ~900 hours of videos. To the best of our knowledge, LongViTU is the first publicly available long-form video question-answering dataset featuring explicit QA-related timestamp annotations. Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel automatic pipeline to generate high-quality video question-answering data, mitigating several limitations of existing datasets: diverse real world scenarios, explicit timestamp labels, long certificate length, fine-grained categorization, and open-ended precise QA.
- With our pipeline, we curate LongViTU, a large-scale high-quality pre-training dataset and benchmark aimed at advancing instruction tuning for long-form and streaming video understanding.
- We conducted extensive experiments demonstrating the benefits of LongViTU for canonical open-source and commercial VLMs and providing insightful analysis.

2. The LongViTU Dataset

We developed a hierarchical pipeline for processing long-form videos by structuring the content into a tree format. This approach effectively generates QA pairs with explicit timestamps and extended certificate lengths, while preserving fine-grained spatial details and temporal relevance across diverse scales.

2.1. Dataset Pipeline

2.1.1. Stage I: Hierarchical Video Tree Construction

Frame Level. Commencing at the frame level, we leverage InternLM-XComposer2 [13] to perform multi-frame dense captioning (sampled at 1 fps) across annotated events in the Ego4D [19]. Descriptions are structured as $\langle d_f, t_s^f, t_e^f \rangle$, containing frame-level text description d_f and accurate timestamps t_s^f and t_e^f derived from Ego4D’s temporal annotations for each event provided by human annotators.

$$\mathcal{F}^k = \langle d_f^k, t_s^{f^k}, t_e^{f^k} \rangle, \quad k = 1, \dots, F \quad (1)$$

where F denotes the total number of sampled frames.

Event Level. To eliminate redundant frame level text, we apply GPT-4 [1] to refine both manually annotated events from Ego4D and automated dense captions, yielding concise event level descriptions $\langle d_e, t_s^e, t_e^e \rangle$ with accurate temporal boundaries t_s^e and t_e^e .

$$\mathcal{E}^j = \langle d_e^j, t_s^{e^j}, t_e^{e^j}, \{\mathcal{F}^k\}_{k=1}^F \rangle, \quad j = 1, \dots, E \quad (2)$$

where E denotes the total number of events.

Table 1. **Comparison with previous datasets.** The video sources for each dataset are listed under "Base", where "Collection" indicates that videos are derived from various resources. Furthermore, \times^* denotes multiple-choice answers, while \checkmark^{**} indicates open-ended answers. LongViTU is the first large-scale dataset designed for long-form and streaming video understanding with explicit timestamp labels. The video durations and the number of QA pairs are approximate.

Dataset	Base	Scenario	Open-ended Answer	Fine-grained Categorization	Explicit Timestamp	Video Duration	QAs
EgoVQA [14]	IU Multiview [55]	real world	\times^*	\times	\times	10h	600
Env-QA [17]	AI2-THOR [24]	virtual env	\checkmark^{**}	\times	\times	130h	85.1K
EgoTaskQA [22]	LEMMA [21]	real world	\checkmark	\checkmark	\times	15h	40K
MoVQA [64]	Collection	movie	\times	\checkmark	\times	50h	22K
MovieChat [45]	Collection	movie	\checkmark	\times	\times	160h	13K
CinePile [41]	Collection	movie	\times	\times	\times	420h	303K
OpenEQA [35]	ScanNet [11] HM3D [40]	virtual env	\checkmark	\times	\times	3h	1.6K
WorldQA [67]	PVSG [59]	real world	\checkmark	\times	\times	10h	1K
EgoSchema [36]	Ego4D [19]	real world	\times	\times	\times	250h	5K
LLaVA-Video [66]	Collection	real world	\checkmark	\checkmark	\times	2000h	960K
MM-Ego [60]	Ego4D [19]	real world	\checkmark	\times	\times	3000h	7M
LongViTU (ours)	Ego4D [19]	real world	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	900h	121K

Segment Level. GPT-4 further organizes these events into segments in the hierarchical video tree $\mathcal{T}_{\text{video}}$, merging related events into segments summarized at the segment level, represented as $\langle d_s, t_s^i, t_e^s \rangle$.

$$\mathcal{S}^i = \langle d_s^i, t_s^i, t_e^s, \{\mathcal{E}^j\}_{j=1}^E \rangle, \quad i = 1, \dots, S \quad (3)$$

where S denotes the total number of segments.

Video Tree Formulation. Drawing on the pipeline above, we formalize the hierarchical tree structure for long-form video content as follows:

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{video}} = \langle R, \{\mathcal{S}^i\}_{i=1}^S \rangle \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{T}_{\text{video}}$ represents the hierarchical tree, with R as the root node and nodes down to frames. Figure 2 illustrates the whole architecture.

2.1.2. Stage II: Long-Form QA Generation

Sliding Window. A sliding window operation on video subtrees generates QAs by balancing spatial details and temporal sequences. A five-segment window captures long-term temporal relevance and short-term spatial features, questions are derived from the first three segments, and answers from the subsequent two. The hyperparameters are set based on the duration distribution of the Ego4D dataset and can be adjusted for specific task requirements.

QA Generation. We generate QA pairs from subtrees within the sliding window, formalized as:

$$\mathcal{QA}_{\text{video}} = \langle Q, A, \mathcal{D}_s \rangle \quad (5)$$

Here, $\mathcal{QA}_{\text{video}}$ denotes the set of generated QA pairs for the video subtree $\mathcal{T}_{\text{video}}$. The notation \mathcal{D}_s represents the selected

segments via the sliding window, where each segment $\mathcal{D}_s = \langle d_s^i, \mathcal{D}_e \rangle$ ($s = 1, \dots, S$) consists of event-level descriptions $\mathcal{D}_e = \langle d_e^j, \mathcal{D}_f \rangle$ ($e = 1, \dots, E$). Each event further includes frame-level descriptions $\mathcal{D}_f = \langle d_f^k \rangle$ ($f = 1, \dots, F$).

Self-Revision. In this stage, GPT-4 rigorously reviews the generated question-answer pairs to verify their consistency with the video content. It identifies and corrects any inconsistencies or inaccuracies, eliminates irrelevant or unnecessary information, and emphasizes the core elements of the QA pairs to mitigate redundancy and overly simplistic responses. Additional details on the prompts and human evaluation procedures for this process are provided in Appendix C.

2.2. Characteristics and Statistics

Key Advantages. Our two-stage methodology for constructing LongViTU aligns with the hierarchical structure of the video tree, offering several advantages that significantly enhance the data quality and utility:

- **Explicit Timestamp Labels:** Each tree node is annotated with precise event timestamps, enhancing the reliability of temporal analysis.
- **Long Certificate Length:** Comprehensive representation of event sequences ensures robust QA generation by covering longer temporal spans.
- **Fine-Grained Categorization:** By leveraging specific subtrees, the methodology optimizes input length for large language models (LLMs), enabling effective processing of extended temporal events, preservation of spatial details, and support for QA generation across detailed categories.




Figure 2. **Pipeline of LongViTU.** We adopt a *hierarchical* pipeline that organizes video content into a tree structure, with subtrees encapsulating information at different temporal scales. This framework facilitates the generation of QA pairs with *explicit timestamps*, ensuring adaptability to varying *contextual lengths*. By summarizing content across multiple temporal levels (*frame level*, *event level*, *segment level*), our approach overcomes the challenge of excessively long input length for LLMs from long-form video. This enables LLMs to generate distinct types of questions, resulting in a *fine-grained categorization* aligned with the video content. To further enhance quality, a *self-revision* step refines results by removing redundancy and irrelevant prior information. For more details, please refer to [Section 2](#).

Duration Distribution. The LongViTU dataset contains 1,833 videos, divided into 1,533 for training, 200 for validation, and 100 for testing, totaling approximately 900 hours. The average video duration is 29.3 minutes, ranging from 3.5 to 120.7 minutes with a standard deviation of 17.5 minutes, following a long-tail distribution ([Figure 3a](#)). Each video is accompanied by an average of 66 QA pairs, QA durations range from 6 to 1800 seconds, averaging 276.8 seconds, also exhibiting a long-tail pattern. Events and segments have average durations of 8.5 and 82 seconds, respectively. The dataset includes 121k QA pairs: 101k for training, 14k for validation, and 6k for testing.

Category Distribution. The sunburst diagram in [Figure 3b](#) illustrates the distribution of question-answer pairs across three main categories: Spatiotemporal Understanding (55%), further divided into Object (12.2%), Attribute (10.7%), Location (15.5%), and Action (16.6%); Episodic Reasoning (24.4%), including Transition (8.1%), Interaction (3.4%), Causality (5.4%), and Motivation (7.5%); and Common-sense Inference (20.6%), comprising Planning (5.4%), Risk

(2.7%), Function (6.4%), and Affordance (4.6%). Detailed categorization and examples are provided in [Appendix E](#).

Computational Cost. We utilized 8 NVIDIA A100 GPUs (80GB) for dataset construction and all experiments. Dense captioning of all videos required approximately 1 week, while the generation pipeline consumed an average of 10k tokens per QA-pair via the OpenAI API [37]. Training session durations ranged from a minimum of 3 hours to a maximum of 3 days.

3. Experiments

We evaluated mainstream VLMs on the LongViTU test set, with instruction tuning conducted using our training set. The results demonstrate that LongViTU poses unique challenges for modern VLMs, whether through frame-based or sampling-based approaches. SFT significantly improved performance on both In-Distribution (ID) and several canonical Out-of-Distribution (OOD) benchmarks, highlighting the strong generalization and robustness of LongViTU.




Figure 3. **Statistics of LongViTU.** Subfigure (a) depicts the distributions of video and QA durations within LongViTU. The bottom horizontal axis (from left to right) represents QA duration in seconds, while the right vertical axis (from bottom to top) shows the percentage of the total dataset. QA durations predominantly vary from 6 to 600 seconds, with an average of 276.8 seconds. The top horizontal axis (from right to left) denotes video durations, and the left vertical axis (from top to bottom) indicates their percentage distribution. Video durations primarily range from 5 to 60 minutes, with an average of 29.3 minutes, following a long-tail distribution. Subfigure (b) illustrates the QA categorization in LongViTU along with their word frequency distribution. The outermost ring of the sunburst chart highlights the eight most frequent words in each category, with segment sizes reflecting their proportional frequencies. Please zoom in for a clearer view.

3.1. Setup

Settings and Baselines. We fine-tuned multiple vision-language models (VLMs) on the complete LongViTU training set and evaluated their performance on the test set to address challenges in long-form video understanding, all input data was standardized in alignment with LLaVA [33]. Frame-based models such as mPLUG-OWL [61] and VideoLLaVA [31] uniformly sampled 8 frames per video as input. In contrast, LLaMA-VID [30], LongVA-DPO [65], LongVU [44], and Gemini-1.5-Pro [42] sampled 1 frame per second, while VideoAgent [15] sampled 1 frame every 2 seconds. All models, each with a uniform parameter size of 7B, generated answers to video-related questions. Evaluation employed a multi-level scoring system, where GPT-4 assessed the textual alignment between generated answers and ground truth based on predefined criteria, scores were averaged across subcategories to ensure a fair comparison.

Metrics and Benchmarks. Traditional caption metrics are inadequate for evaluating open-ended questions. To address this limitation, we developed a multi-level scoring criteria that leverages GPT-4’s near-human capabilities in text comprehension and alignment. This approach rigorously evaluates the alignment between predicted answers and ground truth, ensuring that key aspects of each question are addressed. Hallucinations or irrelevant responses are penalized, while concise and accurate answers are rewarded with higher scores. Detailed scoring criteria and prompts

are provided in Appendix C. Furthermore, all models were fine-tuned on the LongViTU training set and evaluated on the ID benchmark EgoSchema [36] and the OOD benchmarks VideoMME [16], WorldQA [67], and OpenEQA [35], achieving superior performance over baseline models.

3.2. Quantitative Analysis on LongViTU

The quantitative results on LongViTU detailed in Table 2 reveal the following critical insights:

Effective Fine-Tuning. Our supervised fine-tuning (SFT) led the open-source model LongVU to achieve a top GPT-4 score of 55.9, surpassing the commercial Gemini-1.5-Pro’s 52.3 at a dense sampling rate of 1 fps. This convergence between top open-source and commercial models highlights the challenges posed by LongViTU in facilitating comprehensive understanding of long-form video content.

Dense Sampling Challenge. At a sampling rate of 1 fps, LLaMA-VID underperforms compared to mainstream open-source video language models in both zero-shot and fine-tuned settings. This gap reflects limitations in existing dense sampling strategies for capturing essential features in long-form video understanding.

LLM Reliance Bias. The robust performance in text-only blind QA suggests a potential bias in QA systems favoring textual predictions. This phenomenon highlights over-reliance on textual intermediaries, allowing direct inference of answers from questions, further discussion in Appendix A.

Table 2. **Quantitative results on LongViTU.** All results are derived from evaluations conducted by GPT-4 [1], the criteria and prompt are detailed in Appendix C. * denotes results obtained in a zero-shot manner, while ** indicates fine-tuned results following training on the LongViTU training set, Δ compared highlighting the percentage difference in performance between their. "Overall Avg." represents the average scores across three primary categories. The top-performing open-source model, LongVU [44], achieved a score of 55.9, surpassing the 52.3 score of the best commercial model, Gemini-1.5-pro [42].

Setting	Method	Overall Avg.	Spatiotemporal Understanding				
			Object	Attribute	Location	Action	Avg.
Blind	GPT-4 turbo	38.2	26.1	33.2	32.0	29.4	30.2
Frame-Based	mPLUG-OWL*	42.4	33.5	37.6	43.6	35.4	37.8
	Video-LLaVA*	45.9	37.8	46.3	49.1	38.1	42.7
	Video-LLaVA**	50.7	39.3	49.2	49.6	41.8	44.9
	Δ compared	+10.5%	+4.0%	+6.3%	+1.0%	+9.7%	+5.2%
Sampling-Based	VideoAgent*	44.0	35.7	43.1	45.9	36.4	40.2
	LLaMA-VID*	38.2	29.4	35.6	40.1	31.5	34.3
	LLaMA-VID**	44.5	33.5	37.4	45.7	37.6	39.1
	Δ compared	+16.5%	+13.9%	+5.1%	+14.0%	+19.4%	+14.0%
	LongVA-DPO*	47.5	35.9	52.4	44.3	37.2	41.8
	LongVU*	49.9	39.3	47.6	52.3	44.3	46.3
	LongVU**	55.9	40.2	55.2	54.3	45.3	48.8
	Δ compared	+12.0%	+2.3%	+16.0%	+3.8%	+2.3%	+5.4%
Gemini-1.5-Pro*	52.3	54.3	58.6	56.3	48.1	54.7	
Setting	Method	Overall Avg.	Episodic Reasoning				
			Transition	Interaction	Causality	Motivation	Avg.
Blind	GPT-4 turbo	38.2	45.1	47.4	47.7	56.1	49.5
Frame-Based	mPLUG-OWL*	42.4	45.8	47.7	47.7	49.4	47.6
	Video-LLaVA*	45.9	45.6	50.5	48.8	53.2	49.4
	Video-LLaVA**	50.7	50.5	56.4	59.7	64.9	58.0
	Δ compared	+10.5%	+10.7%	+11.7%	+22.3%	+22.0%	+17.4%
Sampling-Based	VideoAgent*	44.0	43.1	45.5	49.9	52.8	48.1
	LLaMA-VID*	38.2	40.4	46.7	40.5	46.6	43.2
	LLaMA-VID**	44.5	46.7	48.4	54.2	57.7	52.1
	Δ compared	+16.5%	+15.6%	+3.6%	+33.8%	+23.8%	+20.6%
	LongVA-DPO*	47.5	51.8	54.6	52.2	59.5	54.8
	LongVU*	49.9	56.7	58.8	48.9	53.4	54.2
	LongVU**	55.9	62.4	63.5	63.2	70.0	65.2
	Δ compared	+12.0%	+10.1%	+8.0%	+29.2%	+31.1%	+20.3%
Gemini-1.5-Pro*	52.3	47.8	45.5	47.8	47.5	47.3	
Setting	Method	Overall Avg.	Commonsense Inference				
			Planning	Risk	Function	Affordance	Avg.
Blind	GPT-4 turbo	38.2	36.5	51.1	55.9	50.9	48.7
Frame-Based	mPLUG-OWL*	42.4	42.1	54.6	54.3	51.5	50.3
	Video-LLaVA*	45.9	41.6	56.8	55.3	54.6	51.7
	Video-LLaVA**	50.7	50.2	62.6	64.0	64.6	59.8
	Δ compared	+10.5%	+20.7%	+10.2%	+15.7%	+18.3%	+15.7%
Sampling-Based	VideoAgent*	44.0	40.0	53.7	55.5	53.1	50.7
	LLaMA-VID*	38.2	34.9	51.3	46.5	47.2	44.1
	LLaMA-VID**	44.5	43.9	54.5	55.7	53.8	51.7
	Δ compared	+16.5%	+25.8%	+6.2%	+19.8%	+14.0%	+17.2%
	LongVA-DPO*	47.5	46.3	57.0	61.9	59.2	56.1
	LongVU*	49.9	46.2	52.3	60.4	62.8	56.0
	LongVU**	55.9	59.9	67.9	68.7	70.4	66.4
	Δ compared	+12.0%	+29.7%	+29.8%	+13.7%	+12.1%	+18.6%
Gemini-1.5-Pro*	52.3	43.6	57.5	46.1	43.6	50.3	

Table 3. **Quantitative results on additional benchmarks.** The * denotes results obtained in a zero-shot manner, while ** indicates fine-tuned results following training on the LongViTU training set, Δ compared highlighting the percentage difference in performance between their. Denote s_2 as the stage 2 and s_3 as the stage 3, they are strictly following LLaMA-VID [30]. The zero-shot results of LongViTU on VideoMME are reproduced from the official checkpoint on Hugging Face, rather than those reported in the arXiv [44].

Method	EgoSchema	VideoMME				WorldQA	OpenEQA		
		Avg.	Short	Medium	Long		Avg.	ScanNet	HM3D
VideoLLM Online*	47.4	13.7	24.3	16.7	0.0	30.0	23.3	24.8	20.4
LLaMA-VID* s_3	23.6	14.6	19.5	12.6	11.5	30.9	31.1	31.0	31.3
LLaMA-VID* s_2	30.4	16.7	22.6	15.3	12.2	32.0	31.9	31.8	32.1
LLaMA-VID**	34.0	17.2	23.8	15.4	12.2	32.2	33.6	33.5	33.8
Δ compared	+11.8%	+3.0%	+5.3%	+0.7%	+0.0%	+0.6%	+5.3%	+5.3%	+5.3%
Video-LLaVA*	36.8	32.3	33.7	31.6	31.5	30.2	35.1	37.3	30.9
Video-LLaVA**	48.1	32.5	30.5	33.7	33.1	34.1	32.6	32.6	32.5
Δ compared	+30.7%	+0.6%	-9.5%	+6.6%	+5.1%	+12.9%	-7.1%	-12.6%	+5.2%
LongVA-DPO*	56.9	54.3	61.6	50.4	47.6	30.3	36.6	41.5	26.9
LLaVA-OneVision*	60.1	58.2	69.1	53.3	46.7	-	-	-	-
LongVU*	67.6	56.2	66.1	54.7	47.9	35.7	48.3	51.1	42.8
LongVU**	69.1	56.3	65.8	54.7	48.4	36.5	48.9	51.4	44.2
Δ compared	+2.2%	+0.2%	-0.5%	+0.0%	+1.0%	+2.2%	+1.2%	+0.6%	+3.3%

Spatial vs. Temporal Bias. The weaker performance in Spatiotemporal Understanding reveals the unresolved challenges in long-form video comprehension. Tasks requiring detailed spatial analysis are particularly demanding. In contrast, Episodic Reasoning and Commonsense Inference leverage the logical sequence of events, resulting in improved performance through text-based methods.

Limitations of Commercial Models. The commercial model Gemini-1.5-Pro demonstrates unexpectedly poor performance, marginally surpassing the zero-shot capabilities of open-source models while falling behind the fine-tuned open-source model LongVU. Due to resource constraints, full-length videos with specific timestamps embedded in the prompts were used instead of segmenting videos for each QA pair. Consequently, Gemini-1.5-Pro was required to process videos ranging from tens of minutes to over two hours for many questions, which significantly degraded its performance. These findings highlight the substantial challenges inherent in long-form video understanding.

3.3. Quantitative Analysis on Benchmarks

This section evaluates performance on benchmarks covering both In-Distribution (ID) and Out-of-Distribution (OOD) scenarios, leveraging datasets EgoSchema [36], VideoMME [16], WorldQA [67], and OpenEQA [35], as detailed in Table 3. Key findings are outlined below.

Limitations of Sampling Models. The LLaMA-VID [30] model exhibited a substantial performance drop during zero-shot evaluation in stage 3, which focuses on fine-tuning for long videos, compared to its performance in stage 2, which involves pre-training on images and short videos. This

disparity underscores critical deficiencies in the stage 3 fine-tuning strategy. We revised the fine-tuning approach by applying all adjustments used in stage 2 as the baseline. The results demonstrated significant improvements across all benchmarks, with a maximum gain of 11.8% on EgoSchema.

Better on Longer Videos. Fine-tuning with LongViTU resulted in decreased performance on shorter videos, as observed in the VideoMME Short subset and OpenEQA results. The average video duration of OpenEQA (49 seconds) is even shorter than that of the VideoMME Short subset (83 seconds). In contrast, performance on the Medium (563 seconds) and Long (2386 seconds) subsets improved. Specifically, LongViTU fine-tuning led to a 1% improvement on the VideoMME Long subset, while performance on the Short subset decreased and the Medium subset remained stable. This highlights the effectiveness of LongViTU in enhancing comprehension for longer videos, albeit with some trade-offs in performance on shorter ones.

Long-form Video Understanding Challenge. The VideoLLM Online [7] model struggled significantly with the Long subset of VideoMME, producing incoherent responses and failing to generate measurable evaluations, underscoring the challenges of understanding long-form videos. The LongViTU dataset serves as both a vital pre-training resource and a benchmark for advancing long-form video understanding. This is demonstrated by the improved performance of models like LongVU on various additional benchmarks after supervised fine-tuning (SFT) on LongViTU, emphasizing the importance of optimizing models with large-scale high-quality video question-answering data.

3.4. Qualitative Evaluation

We present visualizations of various question-answering types in Figure 7 to facilitate a more thorough qualitative analysis. Due to space constraints, these figures and the ablation study have been deferred to Appendix B.

Spatial Details. In Figure 7a, the dense arrangement of multiple foreground objects in the scene led to incorrect zero-shot predictions by both Video-LLaVA and LongVU. Fine-tuning with LongViTU enabled the model to focus on finer spatial features, resulting in correct answers.

Key Moments. As illustrated in Figure 7b, the fine-tuned models accurately identified the key moment, a brief appearance of *"a plant on the windowsill"*, and provided a precise and concise response, achieving a perfect GPT-4 score of 100. In contrast, the Video-LLaVA zero-shot model failed to capture this brief key moment.

Temporal Localization. In Figure 7c, both Video-LLaVA and LongVU correctly recognized *"two"* plug-in sockets in the kitchen at the end of a lengthy video and provided accurate responses after fine-tuning. However, both models failed in the zero-shot setting. This highlights the difficulty of extracting temporal details from extended video sequences and emphasizes the contribution of LongViTU data in improving generalization for long-form temporal localization.

3.5. Future Research

LongViTU introduces a novel direction in streaming video processing and video memory storage mechanisms for end-to-end models. Future research will build on these contributions, aiming to integrate streaming video understanding with question-answering, thereby paving the way for a more holistic approach to video understanding.

4. Related Work

Large Language Models. Large language models (LLMs), such as InstructGPT [38], GPT-4 [1], LLaMA [48], and LLaMA-2 [49], have demonstrated notable capabilities in text processing and have been applied to the generation of large-scale datasets. These models convert different modalities into structured textual descriptions, which can then be used to prompt GPT-4 to produce multimodal data.

Instruction Tuning. LLaVA [33] was among the first to leverage foundational vision models to generate image captions and detect bounding boxes, which were subsequently processed by ChatGPT or GPT-4 to generate image-based QA pairs. Building on this, methods like Bongard-OpenWorld [53], Video-LLaVA [31], and VideoChat [28] extended these principles to a more complex pipeline, shifting the focus from individual image QA to video-based QA. By sampling multiple frames from videos and applying LLaVA’s procedure, these approaches generate video QA datasets using structured frame descriptions, object cat-

egories, and attributes. However, the repetitive nature of frame-based descriptions, coupled with the input length limitations of LLMs, constrains the number of frames, thereby reducing the comprehensiveness of datasets.

Long-Context Language Models. Even the most advanced long-context LLMs [46], such as GPT-4-turbo, ChatGLM [18], Baichuan2 [57], and InternLM2 [6], capable of handling input sequences beyond 128k tokens, suffer significant performance degradation when dealing with long and intricate texts. They struggle to manage the redundancy and disorganization in detailed video descriptions, limiting their effectiveness in generating video QA. Unlike static images, videos inherently demand an understanding of temporal dynamics, making event correlation crucial for video comprehension. The current frame-based approach fails to address this temporal aspect adequately, often resulting in shallow QA generation confined to individual frame analysis.

Long-Form Video Understanding. Instruction tuning in the LLaVA paradigm [33] has demonstrated significant potential for multimodal tasks like captioning [8] and visual question-answering [2–4, 12, 20, 27, 39, 47, 52, 58]. Despite their effectiveness for images and short videos, these approaches encounter challenges with long-form videos [31, 34, 45, 50, 63, 65]. The primary limitation arises from the large number of visual tokens produced by encoders, which can range from 576 to 2880 tokens per image in models like LLaVA-NeXT [32]. As frame counts increase, these tokens rapidly surpass the context window limits of LLMs. To address this, recent methods use resamplers to reduce the visual tokens before passing them to LLMs [5, 10, 27, 30]. However, such reductions often degrade visual representations, resulting in diminished performance. Alternative approaches, including advanced pruning and feature merging, offer promising solutions [9, 23, 43, 68]. Notably, recent models such as VideoLLM Online [7], LongVILA [56], LLaVA-OV [26], LongVA [65], and LongVU [44] signify substantial advancements in long-form video understanding.

5. Conclusion

We present LongViTU, a large-scale dataset designed for long-form video understanding with integrated video memory and explicit timestamp annotations. Its hierarchical tree structure efficiently organizes video content, addressing critical challenges in generating QA pairs for extended videos. The self-revision process further enhances QA quality by mitigating hallucinations, redundancy, and irrelevant details. Fine-tuning on LongViTU demonstrates significant performance gains on both LongViTU and additional benchmarks, confirming its effectiveness and generalizability. Future work will explore advanced memory storage mechanisms that leverage explicit timestamps for advancing long-form video understanding and streaming question-answering.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023. 2, 6, 8
- [2] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:23716–23736, 2022. 8
- [3] 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.
- [4] Tom B Brown. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*, 2020. 8
- [5] Mu Cai, Jianwei Yang, Jianfeng Gao, and Yong Jae Lee. Matryoshka multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17430*, 2024. 8
- [6] Zheng Cai, Maosong Cao, Haojiong Chen, Kai Chen, Keyu Chen, Xin Chen, Xun Chen, Zehui Chen, Zhi Chen, Pei Chu, et al. Internlm2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.17297*, 2024. 8
- [7] Joya Chen, Zhaoyang Lv, Shiwei Wu, Kevin Qinghong Lin, Chenan Song, Difei Gao, Jia-Wei Liu, Ziteng Gao, Dongxing Mao, and Mike Zheng Shou. Videollm-online: Online video large language model for streaming video. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18407–18418, 2024. 7, 8
- [8] Lin Chen, Xilin Wei, Jinsong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Zehui Chen, Haodong Duan, Bin Lin, Zhenyu Tang, et al. Sharegpt4video: Improving video understanding and generation with better captions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04325*, 2024. 8
- [9] Liang Chen, Haozhe Zhao, Tianyu Liu, Shuai Bai, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Baobao Chang. An image is worth 1/2 tokens after layer 2: Plug-and-play inference acceleration for large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.06764*, 2024. 8
- [10] Zesen Cheng, Sicong Leng, Hang Zhang, Yifei Xin, Xin Li, Guanzheng Chen, Yongxin Zhu, Wenqi Zhang, Ziyang Luo, Deli Zhao, et al. Videollama 2: Advancing spatial-temporal modeling and audio understanding in video-llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07476*, 2024. 8
- [11] Angela Dai, Angel X Chang, Manolis Savva, Maciej Halber, Thomas Funkhouser, and Matthias Nießner. Scannet: Richly-annotated 3d reconstructions of indoor scenes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5828–5839, 2017. 3
- [12] Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale Fung, and Steven Hoi. Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning, 2023. 8
- [13] Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Yuhang Cao, Bin Wang, Linke Ouyang, Xilin Wei, Songyang Zhang, Haodong Duan, Maosong Cao, et al. Internlm-xcomposer2: Mastering free-form text-image composition and comprehension in vision-language large model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.16420*, 2024. 2
- [14] Chenyou Fan. Egovqa-an egocentric video question answering benchmark dataset. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops*, pages 0–0, 2019. 2, 3
- [15] Yue Fan, Xiaojian Ma, Rujie Wu, Yuntao Du, Jiaqi Li, Zhi Gao, and Qing Li. Videoagent: A memory-augmented multimodal agent for video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.11481*, 2024. 5
- [16] Chaoyou Fu, Yuhan Dai, Yondong Luo, Lei Li, Shuhuai Ren, Renrui Zhang, Zihan Wang, Chenyu Zhou, Yunhang Shen, Mengdan Zhang, et al. Video-mme: The first-ever comprehensive evaluation benchmark of multi-modal llms in video analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.21075*, 2024. 5, 7
- [17] Difei Gao, Ruiping Wang, Ziyi Bai, and Xilin Chen. Env-qa: A video question answering benchmark for comprehensive understanding of dynamic environments. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 1675–1685, 2021. 2, 3
- [18] Team GLM, Aohan Zeng, Bin Xu, Bowen Wang, Chenhui Zhang, Da Yin, Diego Rojas, Guanyu Feng, Hanlin Zhao, Hanyu Lai, et al. Chatglm: A family of large language models from glm-130b to glm-4 all tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12793*, 2024. 8
- [19] Kristen Grauman, Andrew Westbury, Eugene Byrne, Zachary Chavis, Antonino Furnari, Rohit Girdhar, Jackson Hamburger, Hao Jiang, Miao Liu, Xingyu Liu, et al. Ego4d: Around the world in 3,000 hours of egocentric video. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18995–19012, 2022. 2, 3
- [20] Bo He, Hengduo Li, Young Kyun Jang, Menglin Jia, Xuefei Cao, Ashish Shah, Abhinav Shrivastava, and Ser-Nam Lim. Ma-lmm: Memory-augmented large multimodal model for long-term video understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13504–13514, 2024. 8
- [21] Baoxiong Jia, Yixin Chen, Siyuan Huang, Yixin Zhu, and Song-chun Zhu. Lemma: A multi-view dataset for learning multi-agent multi-task activities. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 767–786. Springer, 2020. 3
- [22] Baoxiong Jia, Ting Lei, Song-Chun Zhu, and Siyuan Huang. Egotaskqa: Understanding human tasks in egocentric videos. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:3343–3360, 2022. 2, 3
- [23] Peng Jin, Ryuichi Takanobu, Wancai Zhang, Xiaochun Cao, and Li Yuan. Chat-univi: Unified visual representation empowers large language models with image and video understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13700–13710, 2024. 8
- [24] Eric Kolve, Roozbeh Mottaghi, Winson Han, Eli VanderBilt, Luca Weihs, Alvaro Herrasti, Matt Deitke, Kiana Ehsani, Daniel Gordon, Yuke Zhu, et al. Ai2-thor: An interactive 3d environment for visual ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.05474*, 2017. 3

- [25] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Liangyu Chen, Jinghao Wang, Fanyi Pu, Jingkang Yang, Chunyuan Li, and Ziwei Liu. Mimic-it: Multi-modal in-context instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05425*, 2023. 2
- [26] 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. 8
- [27] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR, 2023. 8
- [28] KunChang Li, Yinan He, Yi Wang, Yizhuo Li, Wenhai Wang, Ping Luo, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Videochat: Chat-centric video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06355*, 2023. 2, 8
- [29] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yinan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Ping Luo, et al. Mvbench: A comprehensive multi-modal video understanding benchmark. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 22195–22206, 2024. 2
- [30] Yanwei Li, Chengyao Wang, and Jiaya Jia. Llama-vid: An image is worth 2 tokens in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17043*, 2023. 5, 7, 8
- [31] Bin Lin, Bin Zhu, Yang Ye, Munan Ning, Peng Jin, and Li Yuan. Video-llava: Learning united visual representation by alignment before projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10122*, 2023. 5, 8
- [32] 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. 8
- [33] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2024. 5, 8
- [34] 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. 2, 8
- [35] Arjun Majumdar, Anurag Ajay, Xiaohan Zhang, Pranav Putta, Sriram Yenamandra, Mikael Henaff, Sneha Silwal, Paul Mcvay, Oleksandr Maksymets, Sergio Arnaud, et al. Openeqa: Embodied question answering in the era of foundation models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 16488–16498, 2024. 2, 3, 5, 7
- [36] Karttikeya Mangalam, Raiymbek Akshulakov, and Jitendra Malik. Egoschema: A diagnostic benchmark for very long-form video language understanding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 2, 3, 5, 7
- [37] OpenAI. Openai-api. <https://openai.com/index/openai-api>. 4
- [38] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022. 8
- [39] Rui Qian, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Shuangrui Ding, Dahua Lin, and Jiaqi Wang. Streaming long video understanding with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16009*, 2024. 8
- [40] Santhosh K Ramakrishnan, Aaron Gokaslan, Erik Wijmans, Oleksandr Maksymets, Alex Clegg, John Turner, Eric Undersander, Wojciech Galuba, Andrew Westbury, Angel X Chang, et al. Habitat-matterport 3d dataset (hm3d): 1000 large-scale 3d environments for embodied ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.08238*, 2021. 3
- [41] Ruchit Rawal, Khalid Saifullah, Ronen Basri, David Jacobs, Gowthami Somepalli, and Tom Goldstein. Cinepile: A long video question answering dataset and benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.08813*, 2024. 2, 3
- [42] Machel Reid, Nikolay Savinov, Denis Teplyashin, Dmitry Lepikhin, Timothy Lillicrap, Jean-baptiste Alayrac, Radu Soricut, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, Julian Schrittwieser, et al. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*, 2024. 5, 6
- [43] Yuzhang Shang, Mu Cai, Bingxin Xu, Yong Jae Lee, and Yan Yan. Llava-prumerge: Adaptive token reduction for efficient large multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15388*, 2024. 8
- [44] Xiaoqian Shen, Yunyang Xiong, Changsheng Zhao, Lemeng Wu, Jun Chen, Chenchen Zhu, Zechun Liu, Fanyi Xiao, Balakrishnan Varadarajan, Florian Bordes, et al. Longvu: Spatiotemporal adaptive compression for long video-language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.17434*, 2024. 5, 6, 7, 8
- [45] 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 *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18221–18232, 2024. 2, 3, 8
- [46] Jianlin Su, Murtadha Ahmed, Yu Lu, Shengfeng Pan, Wen Bo, and Yunfeng Liu. Roformer: Enhanced transformer with rotary position embedding. *Neurocomputing*, 568:127063, 2024. 8
- [47] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023. 8
- [48] 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. 8
- [49] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruiti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023. 8
- [50] Weihan Wang, Zehai He, Wenyi Hong, Yean Cheng, Xiaohan Zhang, Ji Qi, Shiyu Huang, Bin Xu, Yuxiao Dong, Ming

- Ding, et al. Lvbench: An extreme long video understanding benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08035*, 2024. 8
- [51] Yi Wang, Kunchang Li, Yizhuo Li, Yinan He, Bingkun Huang, Zhiyu Zhao, Hongjie Zhang, Jilan Xu, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, et al. Internvideo: General video foundation models via generative and discriminative learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.03191*, 2022. 2
- [52] Yuxuan Wang, Cihang Xie, Yang Liu, and Zilong Zheng. Videollamb: Long-context video understanding with recurrent memory bridges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.01071*, 2024. 8
- [53] Rujie Wu, Xiaojian Ma, Qing Li, Wei Wang, Zhenliang Zhang, Song-Chun Zhu, and Yizhou Wang. Bongard-openworld: Few-shot reasoning for free-form visual concepts in the real world. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10207*, 2023. 8
- [54] Junbin Xiao, Xindi Shang, Angela Yao, and Tat-Seng Chua. Next-qa: Next phase of question-answering to explaining temporal actions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9777–9786, 2021. 2
- [55] Mingze Xu, Chenyou Fan, Yuchen Wang, Michael S. Ryoo, and David J. Crandall. Joint person segmentation and identification in synchronized first- and third-person videos. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2018. 3
- [56] Fuzhao Xue, Yukang Chen, Dacheng Li, Qinghao Hu, Ligeng Zhu, Xiuyu Li, Yunhao Fang, Haotian Tang, Shang Yang, Zhi-jian Liu, et al. Longvila: Scaling long-context visual language models for long videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.10188*, 2024. 8
- [57] Aiyuan Yang, Bin Xiao, Bingning Wang, Borong Zhang, Ce Bian, Chao Yin, Chenxu Lv, Da Pan, Dian Wang, Dong Yan, et al. Baichuan 2: Open large-scale language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10305*, 2023. 8
- [58] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, et al. Qwen2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10671*, 2024. 8
- [59] Jingkang Yang, Wenxuan Peng, Xiangtai Li, Zujin Guo, Liangyu Chen, Bo Li, Zheng Ma, Kaiyang Zhou, Wayne Zhang, Chen Change Loy, et al. Panoptic video scene graph generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18675–18685, 2023. 3
- [60] Hanrong Ye, Haotian Zhang, Erik Daxberger, Lin Chen, Zongyu Lin, Yanghao Li, Bowen Zhang, Haoxuan You, Dan Xu, Zhe Gan, et al. Mm-ego: Towards building egocentric multimodal llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.07177*, 2024. 2, 3
- [61] Qinghao Ye, Haiyang Xu, Guohai Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Yiyang Zhou, Junyang Wang, Anwen Hu, Pengcheng Shi, Yaya Shi, et al. mplug-owl: Modularization empowers large language models with multimodality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14178*, 2023. 5
- [62] Zhou Yu, Dejing Xu, Jun Yu, Ting Yu, Zhou Zhao, Yueting Zhuang, and Dacheng Tao. Activitynet-qa: A dataset for understanding complex web videos via question answering. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 9127–9134, 2019. 2
- [63] 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. 8
- [64] Hongjie Zhang, Yi Liu, Lu Dong, Yifei Huang, Zhen-Hua Ling, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Movqa: A benchmark of versatile question-answering for long-form movie understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04817*, 2023. 2, 3
- [65] Peiyuan Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Bo Li, Guangtao Zeng, Jingkang Yang, Yuanhan Zhang, Ziyue Wang, Haoran Tan, Chunyuan Li, and Ziwei Liu. Long context transfer from language to vision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.16852*, 2024. 5, 8
- [66] Yuanhan Zhang, Jinming Wu, Wei Li, Bo Li, Zejun Ma, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Video instruction tuning with synthetic data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02713*, 2024. 2, 3
- [67] Yuanhan Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Bo Li, Fanyi Pu, Christopher Arif Setiadharna, Jingkang Yang, and Ziwei Liu. Worldqa: Multimodal world knowledge in videos through long-chain reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.03272*, 2024. 2, 3, 5, 7
- [68] Xingyi Zhou, Anurag Arnab, Shyamal Buch, Shen Yan, Austin Myers, Xuehan Xiong, Arsha Nagrani, and Cordelia Schmid. Streaming dense video captioning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18243–18252, 2024. 8

LongViTU: Instruction Tuning for Long-Form Video Understanding

Supplementary Material

A. Limitation Statement

This paper focuses on the challenges of long-form video understanding and memory-based streaming video question-answering. Our automated pipeline demonstrates adaptability across diverse scenarios, with self-revision mechanisms that enhance data quality. However, some generated data may lack meaningful context, potentially impacting model performance. To mitigate this disadvantage, we propose refining the pipeline and incorporating manual inspection to better align the benchmark with real-world human annotations, and our work remains ongoing.

B. Additional Results

Due to space limitations, we defer more details about the ablation study, human study, and qualitative evaluation to this section.

B.1. Ablation Study

Varying Durations. Figure 4 illustrates LongViTU’s performance on LongVU with varying QA durations. As the QA duration (in seconds) increases, the performance gradually declines, consistent with the trends observed in VideoMME across all baseline models in Table 3.




Figure 4. **Duration Ablation.** After fine-tuned on LongViTU, LongVU’s performance exhibits a mitigated downward trend on longer subsets [300, 600) compared to shorter subsets.

Training Epochs. Figure 5 illustrates LongVU’s performance on Egoschema improves after SFT as the training epochs derived from LongViTU increase. The performance gains diminish as the training epochs approach the full scale of LongViTU, eventually plateauing at its optimal performance.




Figure 5. **Epoch Ablation.** Performance improvements during fine-tuning diminish as training epochs approach the full scale of LongViTU.

B.2. Human Study

We randomly selected 100 QA pairs from both LongViTU and VideoMME for a human study conducted by three evaluators, as shown in Figure 6.

Self-Evaluation. Each QA pair was assessed for its alignment with the video content. Good pairs were concise, accurate, and spatiotemporally relevant with video content. Fair pairs matched the video but lacked spatiotemporal relevance. Poor pairs included irrelevant or inaccurate information.

LongViTU vs. VideoMME. QA pairs were assessed for coherence, and alignment with video content, comparing their similarity to human-crafted pairs. The results were categorized as: VideoMME significantly better, LongViTU significantly better, or Tie for comparable quality.






Figure 6. **Human Preference.** In self-evaluation, approximately 91% of QA pairs were marked as correct. In comparison, around 64% of QA pairs were comparable in quality to VideoMME.

B.3. Qualitative Evaluation


A detailed qualitative analysis is provided in Section 3.4 and illustrated in Figure 7.



(a) **Spatial Details.** The dense arrangement of multiple foreground objects in the scene led to incorrect zero-shot predictions by both Video-LLaVA and LongVU. Fine-tuning with LongViTU enabled the model to focus on finer spatial features, resulting in correct answers.



(b) **Key Moments.** The fine-tuned models accurately identified the key moment, a brief appearance of "a plant on the windowsill", and provided a precise and concise response, achieving a perfect GPT-4 score of 100. In contrast, the Video-LLaVA zero-shot model failed to capture this brief key moment.



(c) **Temporal Localization.** Both Video-LLaVA and LongVU correctly recognized "two" plug-in sockets in the kitchen at the end of a lengthy video and provided accurate responses after fine-tuning. However, both models failed in the zero-shot setting. This highlights the difficulty of extracting temporal details from extended video sequences and emphasizes the contribution of LongViTU data in improving generalization for long-form temporal localization.

Figure 7. **Qualitative Results.** The yellow box indicates the key frame that contains the answer, while the red box highlights the relevant objects. For better illustration, only concise key information is presented in the predictions.

C. More Details on Building LongViTU

C.1. Hierarchical Video Tree Construction

This subsection outlines the hierarchical video tree construction process, with the details provided in [Section 2.1.1](#), and the algorithm elaborated in [Algorithm 1](#). The corresponding prompts for each stage are described in the following.

Frame Level. For dense captioning at the frame level, the "internlm-xcomposer2-v1-7b-4bit" model is employed with the following prompt:

<ImageHere>Identify each object in the image, describe their positions, and detail their appearance.

Event Level. We employ the ChatCompletion API of the "gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09" model with the following prompt to refine event level descriptions:

Write a concise narrative in one sentence, including visual details from "Frames" that depict an "Event", do not use any unrelated information.

"Event" describes an action in a video, with "C" representing me and other letters like 'X' and 'Y' standing for different people, transform these for a smoother narrative.

"Frames" show detailed visuals and space details of objects in each moment during the "Event".

Event: {event}
Frames: {frames}

Just return narrative that summarizes the episodic memory depicted in this video, only focuses on spatial details and temporal correlations.

Narrative:

Segment Level. We utilize the ChatCompletion API of the "gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09" model to generate segment level descriptions:

Integrate sequential event descriptions of video content into a very concise summary in one sentence, from my perspective for a smoother narrative. Each segment should capture a sequence of closely related actions, events, or scenes. Using "index" to represent the start and end of each segment, do not use any unrelated information.

Algorithm 1: Hierarchical Video Tree Construction

Require: Annotated events $Events$ in Ego4D

Ensure: Hierarchical video tree \mathcal{T}_{video}

```
1: Initialize  $\mathcal{T}_{video} = \emptyset$ ;  
2: Sample frames  $Frames$  at 1 fps across annotated events;  
3: for each frame  $f$  in  $Frames$  do  
4:    $d_f = \text{InternLM-XComposer2}(f)$ ;  
5:    $t_s^f = f.\text{timestamp}$ ;  $t_e^f = f.\text{timestamp}$ ;  
6:    $Frames[f] = \langle d_f, t_s^f, t_e^f \rangle$ ;  
7: end for  
8: for each event  $e$  in  $Events$  do  
9:   Collect frames  $\{\langle d_f, t_s^f, t_e^f \rangle\}$  within event  $e$ ;  
10:   $d_e = \text{GPT-4}(\{d_f\})$ ;  
11:   $t_s^e = e.\text{start}$ ;  $t_e^e = e.\text{end}$ ;  
12:   $Events[e] = \langle d_e, t_s^e, t_e^e, \{\langle d_f, t_s^f, t_e^f \rangle\} \rangle$ ;  
13: end for  
14: Group related events into segments  $\{Segments\}$  using GPT-4;  
15: for each segment  $s$  in  $Segments$  do  
16:   $d_s = \text{GPT-4}(\{d_e \text{ in } s\})$ ;  
17:   $t_s^s = \min\{t_s^e \text{ in } s\}$ ;  $t_e^s = \max\{t_e^e \text{ in } s\}$ ;  
18:   $\mathcal{S}[s] = \langle d_s, t_s^s, t_e^s, \{Events \text{ in } s\} \rangle$ ;  
19: end for  
20:  $\mathcal{T}_{video} = \langle R, \{\mathcal{S}[s]\} \rangle$ ;  
21: return  $\mathcal{T}_{video}$ ;
```

Step-by-step:

1. Review event descriptions and group consecutive events that are closely related into a segment.
2. For each group of events, write a brief summary.

"index" represents order of event, "event" outlines this moment.

Video Content:
{video content}

Return each segment in JSON format: "start": start index, "end": end index, "segment": brief description of video segment. Assemble all segments into a single Python list, ensuring output is neatly organized and strictly adheres to this JSON format.

Segments:

C.2. Long-Form QA Generation

QA Generation. We adopt the ChatCompletion API of the "gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09" model to generate QA pairs on the selected subtree:

Task:

Construct episodic memory of video content through question-answer pairs that encapsulate spatial and temporal aspects within selected events.

Step-by-Step Instructions:

1. **Selection of Events:** Select either a single specific event or a series of interrelated events from the video content ('Memory Content'). For each selected event or sequence of events, generate question-answer pairs that reflect their spatial and temporal characteristics. Use "index" to designate the chronological order of these memory events.
2. **Creation of Question-Answer Pairs:** From the selected events, formulate questions that will be posed later in the video related to a single, specific event ('Ask Content'). These pairs should mimic a retrospective dialogue between me and an AI assistant, where I pose questions and the AI provides answers based on the video content. Reference events and segments to make dialogue more naturally narrative, avoiding direct references "index" or timestamps.
3. **Categorization of Questions:** Categorize each question under a specific type such as: Object, Attribute, Location, Action, Function, Affordance, Comparison, Relationship, Causality, Motivation, Planning, Risk, or any other category you suggest.

Output Format:

Return question-answer pairs in JSON format: "memory": [list of memory events index], "ask": event index where question is posed, "type": question type, "question": question, "answer": answer. Assemble all pairs into a single Python list, ensuring the output is neatly organized and strictly adheres to this JSON format.

Term Definitions of Video Content:

- segment: a brief summary covering a sequence of related events.
- events: multiple related events within a segment.
- index: sequential position of an event within the overall video content.
- event: spatial-temporal details associated with each moment in the video.

Memory Content:

{memory content}

Ask Content:

{ask content}

Question-Answer pairs:

C.3. Self-Revision

Self-Revision. We utilize the ChatCompletion API of the "gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09" model to perform self-revision:

Please review and correct the following question-answer pair about video content. Simplify the pair to directly represent the core information without redundant details, ensuring the question is natural and concise, and the answer is direct and clear.

Identify the correct type of the QA pair: Object, Attribute, Location, Action, Function, Affordance, Comparison, Relationship, Causality, Motivation, Planning, Risk, or Other. Do not add or fabricate content. Remove redundant event numbers and express the event directly.

Original QA:

{original qa}

Return the Revised QA as a dict:

{"revised type": revised QA type, "revised question": revised question, "revised answer": revised answer}

Revised QA:

C.4. Evaluation Metrics

Scoring Criteria. We use the ChatCompletion API of the "gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09" model to perform evaluation by designed scoring criteria:

As a scoring expert, your responsibility is to evaluate the accuracy of a model's response to a specific question about video content. You will be provided with the 'question' asked about the video, the 'answer' which is the correct answer based on the video, and the 'prediction' which is the model's response. Your task is to assess how accurately the model's 'prediction' answers the 'question' in relation to the 'answer'.

Question:

{question}

Answer:

{answer}

Prediction:

{prediction}

Scoring Criteria:

Level 1: The 'prediction' is unrelated to the 'question' or unintelligible, containing significant errors or irrelevant characters. Score: 0.

Level 2: The 'prediction' is completely off-topic, not reflecting the factual content of the 'answer'. Score: 20.

Level 3: The 'prediction' somewhat response the 'question' but includes errors or irrelevant details not found in the 'answer'. Score: 40. Level 4: The 'prediction' generally response the 'question' but has some inaccuracies or irrelevant details compared to the 'answer'. Score: 60.

Level 5: The 'prediction' accurately response the 'question' and is mostly consistent with the 'answer', with only minor discrepancies. Score: 80.

Level 6: The 'prediction' perfectly response the 'question' and fully aligns with the facts provided in the 'answer'. Score: 100.

Only provide the numerical score based on the criteria above without any additional commentary.

Score:

D. Implementations and Hyperparameters

Table 4 presents the key training parameters of our primary fine-tuning models: LLaMA-VID, Video LLaVA, and LongVU. Pretraining and implementation details for these models are described below.

LLaMA-VID integrates the EVA-G visual encoder with the QFormer text decoder. Key strategies include freezing both the visual encoder and the text decoder during all stages, except for the uninitialized BERT module, which is optimized for one epoch per stage.

Video-LLaVA processes input images by resizing and cropping them to 224×224, with 8 frames sampled per video. Training is conducted in two stages: the first stage employs a batch size of 256, while the second stage reduces it to 128.

LongVU utilizes SigLIP and DINOv2 for visual encoding, combined with Qwen2-7B for language processing. Training involves cross-entropy loss for text generation, optimized using the AdamW optimizer with a cosine schedule. Image-language pretraining is performed with a batch size of 128 and a learning rate of 1e-5. During video-language fine-tuning, the batch size is reduced to 64, with adaptive compression techniques applied. The model employs sliding windows and spatio-temporal compression methods for efficient processing.

E. More LongViTU Examples

Table 4. **Fine-tuning Hyperparameters.** This table details the primary training parameters utilized for fine-tuning LLaMA-VID, Video-LLaVA, and LongVU. Parameters not explicitly listed here adhere to the default configurations of their respective implementations.

Parameter	Value
<i>LLaMA-VID</i>	
<i>Pretrained LLM</i>	<i>Vicuna_1.5_7B</i>
<i>max_length</i>	2048
<i>batch_size</i>	1
<i>gradient_accumulation</i>	64
<i>learning_rate</i>	$5e^{-6}$
<i>weight_decay</i>	0
<i>warmup_ratio</i>	0.03
<i>lr_scheduler</i>	<i>cosine</i>
<i>image_token</i>	2
<i>video_fps</i>	1
<i>Video-LLaVA</i>	
<i>Pretrained LLM</i>	<i>LLaMA_2_7B</i>
<i>max_length</i>	2048
<i>batch_size</i>	32
<i>gradient_accumulation</i>	2
<i>learning_rate</i>	$1e^{-5}$
<i>weight_decay</i>	0
<i>warmup_ratio</i>	0.03
<i>lr_scheduler</i>	<i>cosine</i>
<i>image_token</i>	256
<i>video_frames</i>	8
<i>LongVU</i>	
<i>Pretrained LLM</i>	<i>Qwen_2_7B</i>
<i>max_length</i>	8192
<i>batch_size</i>	32
<i>gradient_accumulation</i>	1
<i>learning_rate</i>	$5e^{-7}$
<i>weight_decay</i>	0
<i>warmup_ratio</i>	0.03
<i>lr_scheduler</i>	<i>cosine</i>
<i>image_token</i>	144
<i>video_fps</i>	1

Table 5. **Examples of LongViTU.** We demonstrate the ratio of each concept category and more examples of LongViTU. For a more intuitive perspective, you may refer to [Figure 3](#).

Category	Ratio	Question Example (Q)	Answer Example (A)
Object	12.2%	What am I holding in my hand? What items are on the table?	A cup. A pen and a notebook.
Attribute	10.7%	What is the color of that clothing? What is the material of the cup?	Blue. Porcelain.
Location	15.5%	Where am I in the house right now? Where is the key placed in?	In the kitchen. Inside the drawer.
Action	16.6%	What is that man doing? What am I doing by the counter?	He is cooking. Preparing coffee.
Transition	8.1%	Where did he go after leaving here? What change happened to that cup?	To the garden. It fell and broke.
Interaction	3.4%	Which hand did I use to pick up this wrench? What did I take out of the microwave?	The left hand. A bowl of soup.
Causality	5.4%	What happened after I pressed that button? What happened after I opened the box?	The light turned on. A toy popped out.
Motivation	7.5%	Why should I leave the room? Why does she want to open the cabinet?	There is smoke. To get a plate.
Planning	5.4%	How do I get to the backyard? How do I repair this house?	Through the kitchen door. By fixing the roof first.
Risk	2.7%	What dangers does that saw pose? What dangers are there in the kitchen?	It could cut your hand. Slippery floor.
Function	6.4%	What is the function of this tool? What is the function of this box?	To tighten bolts. To store items.
Affordance	4.6%	What can this stone be used for? What can this glass bottle be used for?	To grind spices. To store water.