



LLaVA-Octopus: Unlocking Instruction-Driven Adaptive Projector Fusion for Video Understanding

Jiaxing Zhao^{1*} Boyuan Sun^{2,1*} Xiang Chen¹ Xihan Wei¹ Qibin Hou^{2†}

¹Tongyi Group, Alibaba ²VCIP, CS, Nankai University

{zjx244036, xchen.cx, xihan.wxh}@alibaba-inc.com,

boyuansun@mail.nankai.edu.cn,

<https://github.com/Jiaxing-star/LLaVA-Octopus>

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce LLaVA-Octopus, a novel video multimodal large language model. LLaVA-Octopus adaptively weights features from different visual projectors based on user instructions, enabling us to leverage the complementary strengths of each projector. We observe that different visual projectors exhibit distinct characteristics when handling specific tasks. For instance, some projectors excel at capturing static details, while others are more effective at processing temporal information, and some are better suited for tasks requiring temporal coherence. By dynamically adjusting feature weights according to user instructions, LLaVA-Octopus dynamically selects and combines the most suitable features, significantly enhancing the model’s performance in multimodal tasks. Experimental results demonstrate that LLaVA-Octopus achieves excellent performance across multiple benchmarks, especially in tasks such as multimodal understanding, visual question answering, and video understanding, highlighting its broad application potential.

1. Introduction

In recent years, the rapid advancement of multimodal large language models (MLLMs) [2, 7, 15, 20, 38, 49–51, 61, 76, 92] has led to significant progress in leveraging large language models [1, 9, 17, 23, 49, 53, 64] for image understanding. However, human-computer interaction based solely on images is insufficient for many application scenarios, as most real-world interactions occur in video form. The primary challenge in video understanding lies in managing temporal dynamics, as models must capture and interpret actions and events that evolve over time. Semantic understanding presents another major obstacle, as videos

*Equal contribution.

†Corresponding author.




Figure 1. **Comparison of Different MLLM Paradigms.** In the classical paradigm, user instructions are fed into the LLM solely as text tokens. While the instruction-involved paradigm facilitates interaction between instructions and visual features, it is constrained by a single projector. Our proposed instruction-driven projector fusion paradigm designs a projector fusion gate, which dynamically adjusts the weights of different types of visual projectors based on user instructions to produce the fused visual tokens.

contain not only objects and actions but also complex semantic elements, such as character intentions and emotional expressions. Furthermore, the inherent complexity of video data, combined with the scarcity of high-quality annotated data, results in substantial computational costs and limits the model’s learning capabilities. These factors make video understanding a more complex task than image understanding, attracting widespread research interest.

As shown in Fig. 1, a typical video MLLM [30, 34, 39, 45, 67] consists of a visual encoder for feature extraction, a text encoder for textual representation, a visual projector to map visual features into a compatible space, and a large language model (LLM) decoder to generate contextually relevant text based on the combined representations. Among them, the visual projector is crucial as it bridges the visual encoder and LLM, enabling visual understanding by mapping visual features into a space compatible with LLMs. Therefore, designing an appropriate visual projector for LLMs is a central focus in many MLLM works.




Figure 2. Comparisons of three representative methods under different video understanding scenarios. LLaVA-OneVision [27] uses image-based projector while VideoLLaMa2 [16] and LLaMA-VID [33] use spatial-temporal projector and token-compress projector, respectively. The results indicate that different visual projectors perform well in their appropriate domains while exhibiting poorer performance in other scenarios. More examples will be provided in the supplementary materials.

However, due to the varying video understanding scenarios that different MLLMs are designed to address, the projectors tailored for them exhibit distinct forms and characteristics. In Fig. 2, we present three representative video understanding tasks, offering an intuitive illustration of the characteristics of three typical approaches that employ different specifically designed visual projectors. Each approach demonstrates unique advantages within its specialized domain. Therefore, we further categorize the visual projectors employed by these approaches into three types: image-based projectors, spatial-temporal projectors, and token-compress projectors.

The first type [27] independently processes each frame and concatenates the results as visual tokens for LLM, offering an advantage in the comprehension of scene detail. The second type [16] utilizes a dedicated spatial-temporal module to capture inter-frame relationships, demonstrating strong performance on spatial-temporal related tasks. However, due to efficiency constraints and limitations of LLMs, these two projectors often require frame sampling [16, 28, 89] before video input, resulting in the loss of many intermediate frames. The third type [33] attempts to tackle this issue by compressing and reducing the number of tokens per frame, enabling the model to handle more frames and proving more effective for tasks requiring temporal coherence, such as counting problems. Although projectors designed for specific tasks perform well in their domains of expertise, they struggle to handle complex video scenarios and diverse user instructions. In addition, some methods use the instruction-involved paradigm shown in Fig. 1 to emphasize the interaction between user instructions and visual

features. However, these approaches are limited by their reliance on a single type of projector and tend to fail to handle scenarios outside the projector’s strengths.

Inspired by the aforementioned observations, we propose the instruction-driven projector fusion paradigm as shown in Fig. 1(c) and a model called LLaVA-Octopus. This model introduces a projector fusion gate that integrates the strengths of different visual projectors based on user instructions. LLaVA-Octopus is able to adaptively adjust the feature weights of various visual projectors according to user instructions, thereby capitalizing on the complementary advantages of each projector. By dynamically combining the most appropriate features guided by user instructions, LLaVA-Octopus substantially enhances the model’s performance in multimodal tasks. In the experimental section, we conduct extensive ablation studies to demonstrate the feasibility of our proposed model. The results show that our model, LLaVA-Octopus, can achieve state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance on most benchmarks and comparable performance on some benchmarks.

2. Related Work

2.1. Multimodal Large Language Model

Currently, multimodal large language models can be categorized into community models and proprietary models. Proprietary models [3, 49–51, 61] often achieve better performance but are not open-sourced. Meanwhile, community models [16, 22, 25, 27, 28, 33, 35, 36, 77, 78, 82, 88], which have seen rapid performance improvements, are garnering increasing attention due to their open-source nature, including model architecture, weights, and even training




Figure 3. **Pipeline of the proposed LLaVA-Octopus model.** Our LLaVA-Octopus proposes an instruction-driven adaptive projector that involves three types of visual projectors to enhance the model’s ability in multimodal tasks.

data. LLaVA [36] was the first to combine the powerful capabilities of LLMs with visual encoders like CLIP, enabling it to understand multimodal instructions and take actions accordingly, thus achieving comprehensive understanding and processing of visual and linguistic inputs. LLaVA1.5 [35] encodes different types of data into vectors of the same dimension, allowing for the handling of more modalities. LLaVA-Next [26, 88] focuses more on processing video data, while LLaVA-One-Vision [27] proposes a unified model capable of handling single images, multiple images, videos, audio, and other modalities simultaneously.

Based on the ideas of LLaVA, several variant series have emerged, such as the mPLUG-owl series. mPLUG-owl [77] introduces a new paradigm for training large language models through modularity, and the latest version, mPLUG-owl3 [75], can even understand 2-hour movie videos. Additionally, several methods have explored the extraction of video features. VideoLLaMA2 [16] proposes a temporal modeling module to further process video features. BLIP-2 [29] uses Q-Former [85] to connect the visual and linguistic modalities. In BLIP-3 [73], Q-Former is replaced by more scalable visual token samplers, such as perceptual resamplers. We observe that numerous methods have explored various visual projectors. However, to the best of our knowledge, we are the first to classify these projectors and analyze their complementarity.

2.2. Projector for Video MLLMs

As described in Sec. 1, the specific designed visual projectors are crucial for LMMs. We categorize them into three categories and select a representative method from each category to illustrate their strengths in Fig. 2.

Image-based projector refers to a projector that extracts features from every frame of the input video. Consider-

ing the success of simple projectors such as linear projection [12, 13, 36, 38] and cross-attention [6, 65, 78] in Image LLMs, many Video LLMs [4, 27, 30, 34, 46, 62] directly adopt similar schemes as image-based projectors. Besides, some more complex image-based projectors, such as Q-Former [2, 18, 29, 93], have also found applications in video MLLMs [31, 82]. The image-based projector can capture detailed information within individual frames, thereby leading to superior performance in tasks related to scene details. However, limited to the high computational cost and the absence of temporal modeling, the image-based projector faces challenges dealing with temporal related task.

Spatial-temporal projector aims to consider the relationships between video frames and attempt to reduce the number of visual tokens. VideoLLaMa2 [16] introduces 3D convolution as the Spatial-Temporal Convolution Connector for spatial-temporal aggregation. PLLaVA [72] integrates pooling strategies in both temporal and spatial dimensions. VideoLLaMB [68] designs recurrent memory bridge layers to preserve crucial visual information and semantic coherence. Those spatial-temporal projectors provide significant advantages in handling spatial-temporal related question. However, the fusion of spatial and temporal information may lead to a loss of detailed image perception.

Token-compress projector is designed for enhancing the model’s capacity to handle more input frames. As a typical approach, LLaMa-VID [33] attempt to tackle the computation and memory challenges by compressing visual features. BLIP-3-Video [56] integrate adaptive pooling strategies to compress visual tokens. LongVA [84], on the other hand, addresses the issue by expanding the capacity of LLMs, increasing the number of tokens they can process. Some approaches [66, 69, 81] also consider agent-based

techniques to convert visual inputs into textual descriptions. Despite the token-compress projector’s ability to increase the number of frames supported by LLMs and excel at handling videos with rapidly changing content, the compression of tokens per frame limits the perception of scene details and temporal information.

3. Method

In this section, we first introduce the motivation of LLaVA-Octopus then describe its architecture, the detailed training process, and the implementation specifics.

3.1. Motivation

As discussed in Sec. 1, each type of visual projector excels in specific domains tailored to different user instructions. However, in practical scenarios, complex and multifaceted user instructions frequently transcend the boundaries of a single task, leading to unsatisfactory user experiences. Motivated by this, we propose a video MLLM that can handle various scenarios based on user instructions.

To achieve this, we first selected representative methods from each category of projectors as candidates. Specifically, we chose the basic MLP2x_GELU as the image-based projector, the STC module from VideoLLaMA2 [16] as the spatial-temporal projector, and LLaMA-VID’s [33] token-compress projector. This selection ensures a comprehensive coverage of the diverse requirements posed by user instructions. Then, we design an instruction-driven adaptive projector based on the selection, and build the LLaVA-Octopus upon it.

3.2. LLaVA-Octopus

In Fig. 3, we present a detailed architecture diagram of LLaVA-Octopus. LLaVA-Octopus primarily consists of four key components: the visual encoder, the text encoder, the instruction-driven adaptive projector, and the large language model decoder. Among these components, the Instruction-Driven Adaptive Projector is the core innovation of LLaVA-Octopus. Specifically, for user instructions, we use BERT [19] to encode the instructions, generating textual features of the commands. In particular, we focus on the [CLS] token output by BERT, which contains the semantic information of the instruction. We choose BERT as the text encoder as it is a powerful pre-trained language model that can capture deep semantic information in text. BERT encodes input text using a bidirectional Transformer structure, and the generated [CLS] token can effectively represent the semantics of the entire sentence, providing a solid foundation for subsequent weight generation.

Then, we use two multi-layer perceptrons (MLPs) to generate feature weights. The first MLP takes the [CLS] token as input and, after processing through multiple layers




Figure 4. Detailed Architecture of Projector Fusion Gate.

of the neural network, generates intermediate feature representations. This MLP is capable of capturing high-level semantic information from the instruction. The second MLP then takes the output of the first MLP as input and further processes it to generate the final weight values, with each weight value corresponding to one of the visual projectors. We demonstrate the detailed architecture of projector fusion gate in Fig. 4. The generated weights are then used to weight the visual features extracted by the three different projectors, dynamically selecting and combining the most suitable features. Specifically, suppose the three projectors extract features F_1 , F_2 and F_3 , and the generated weights are w_1 , w_2 and w_3 , respectively. Then, the final visual representation F is given by:

$$F = w_1 \cdot F_1 + w_2 \cdot F_2 + w_3 \cdot F_3. \quad (1)$$

To ensure that the features obtained from the three different types of projectors are consistent in terms of token numbers, we make the following adjustments to the MLP, STC, and LLaMA-VID projectors. First, for the MLP, the original setting extracts 8 video frames, resulting in a token count of $14 \times 14 \times 8 + 8 = 1576$. To align the token counts, we remove the separators between each image, reducing the token count to 1568. Second, for STC, the original setting results in a token count of $13 \times 13 \times 4 = 676$ for 8 video frames. To ensure token consistency, we modify the sampler parameters in the STC module. Specifically, we use a stride of (2, 2, 2) and (1, 2, 2), with padding of (1, 1, 1). These modifications ensure that the STC projector produces a token count of 1568. Finally, for the LLaMA-VID projector, we use 128 frames to represent the video. For each frame, we use 6 context tokens and 6 content tokens. To ensure token consistency, we add a separator token every 4 frames. Specifically, the number of tokens for every 4 frames is 49, and the total token count for 128 frames is $49 \times 32 = 1568$.

Modality	Dataset	Original	Used	Ratio (%)
Multi-task Pre-training Stage				
Image-Text	CC-3M [57]	3M	558K	18.6%
	RealWorldQA [70]	0.77K	0.77K	100%
Video-Text	WebVid-10M [8]	10M	702K	7.02%
	CLVERER [79]	300K	224K	74.8%
	NEXT-QA [71]	52K	39K	75.2%
	Youcook2 [91]	2K	1.79K	89.5%
	Charades [58]	27.8K	19.7K	70.7%
	Charades-Ego [59]	66.5K	14.0K	21.1%
	TGIF [32]	120K	120K	100%
ShareGPT4Video [14]	4.8M	902K	18.8%	
Instruction Tuning				
Hybrid	Oryx [42]	1.2M	631K	52.6%

Table 1. Data Statistics of Training Process.

Through the above adjustments, we align the visual token counts from different projectors. Then, we dynamically select and combine the most suitable features based on user instructions, significantly improving the model’s performance and adaptability.

3.3. Model Training

The training process of our LLaVA-Octopus consists of two main phases: multi-task pre-training and instruction tuning. In the Fig. 5, we show the proportions of video-text pairs and image-text pairs in both stages, as well as the composition of our instruction data. We provide detailed descriptions of these two phases in the following.

Multi-task pre-training. During the multi-task pre-training phase, we primarily focus on training the three visual projectors. In this phase, we only adjust the parameters of these three projectors while keeping all other parameters frozen. We utilize two types of data: image-text pairs and video-text pairs. For image-text data, we utilize CC-3M [57] and RealWorldQA [70], totaling 559K samples. As for video-text data, we use WebVid-10M [8], CLVERER [79], NEXT-QA [71], Youcook2 [91], Charades [58], Charades-Ego [59], TGIF [32], and ShareGPT4Video [14], totaling 2.04M samples. The total number of samples used for multi-task pre-training is 2.6M, and none of the datasets contain test data. The detailed distribution of multi-task pre-training phase is shown in Tab. 1.

Instruction tuning. We use the three pre-trained projectors and leverage the pre-trained BERT [19] features in instruction tuning. The weights of the projector fusion gate are initialized randomly. During the instruction tuning phase, we train the parameters of all three projectors, the projector fusion gate, and the large language model decoder. Meanwhile, we keep the parameters of the visual encoder and

Modality	Task	Dataset
Question Answering		VideoChatGPT-Plus [47]
		LLaVA-Hound [87]
		ScanQA [5]
Video-Text	Video Caption	ShareGPT4Video [14]
	Multi-choice QA	NEXT-QA [71] Cinepile [55] PerceptionTest [54]

Table 2. Detailed Data Sources of Instruction Tuning.




Figure 5. **Multimodal Data Distribution and Data Format.** <image> and <video> represent visual tokens from image and video data, respectively.

BERT frozen to maintain their stability and consistency.

The instruction data we utilized are derived from Oryx [42], as detailed in Table 2. The open-source portion of the Oryx dataset encompasses question answering (QA) data, video caption data, and multiple-choice QA data. Specifically, we integrate comprehensive datasets that include question-answering and captioning tasks from VideoChatGPT-Plus [47], ShareGPT4Video [14], and LLaVA-Hound [87]. To enhance performance on multiple-choice benchmarks, we have also incorporated Cinepile [55], NextQA [71], and PerceptionTest [54] into our training dataset.

On one hand, current large models use different datasets, and some methods even use private data, making it difficult to objectively evaluate the capabilities of model architectures. On the other hand, full-scale multi-task pre-training and instruction tuning require substantial computational resources and time costs. Therefore, we not only use the full dataset for multi-task pre-training and instruction tuning but also provide a simplified setup where we only use VideoLLAVA [34] data for these stages. The multi-task pre-training data for VideoLLAVA consist of a subset of 558K LAION-CC-SBU image-text pairs and 702K video-text pairs provided by Valley [43]. For the instruction tuning stage, the data includes 665K image-text instruction pairs from LLaVA1.5 [36] and 100K video-text instruction pairs from Video-ChatGPT [46]. Under this setup, we conduct

Method	Vison	LLM	MSVD		ActivityNet		Video-ChatGPT					
	Encoder	Size	Acc.	Score	Acc.	Score	Correctness	Detail	Context	Temporal	Consistency	Avg.
GPT4-V [50]	GPT-4	-	-	-	59.5	-	4.09	3.88	4.37	3.94	4.02	4.06
Video-LLaVA† [34]	ViT-L	7B	71.8	3.9	45.3	3.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
LLaMA-VID† [33]	CLIP-G	7B	69.7	3.7	47.4	3.3	2.96	3.00	3.53	2.46	2.51	2.90
VideoLLaMA2† [16]	ViT-L	7B	68.4	3.8	46.4	3.2	2.98	2.58	3.25	2.33	2.97	2.82
LLaVA-Octopus†	SIGLIP	7B	73.4	4.0	48.8	3.5	3.24	2.76	3.51	2.60	3.06	3.03
FrozenBiLM [74]	ViT-L	1.3B	33.8	-	25.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Video-LLaMA [82]	CLIP-G	7B	51.6	2.5	12.4	1.1	1.96	2.18	2.16	1.82	1.79	1.98
LLaMA-Adapter [86]	ViT-B	7B	54.9	3.1	34.2	2.7	2.03	2.32	2.30	1.98	2.15	2.16
VideoChat [30]	ViT-L	7B	56.3	2.8	26.5	2.2	2.33	2.50	2.53	1.94	2.24	2.31
Video-ChatGPT [46]	ViT-L	7B	64.9	3.3	35.2	2.7	2.50	2.57	2.69	2.16	2.20	2.42
Chat-UniVi [24]	ViT-L	7B	65.0	3.6	45.8	3.2	2.89	2.91	3.46	2.89	2.81	2.99
MovieChat [60]	CLIP-G	7B	75.2	3.8	45.7	3.4	2.76	2.93	3.01	2.24	2.42	2.67
VideoChat [30]	CLIP-G	7B	56.3	2.8	26.5	2.2	2.23	2.50	2.53	1.94	2.24	2.29
BT-Adapter [40]	CLIP-G	7B	67.7	3.7	45.7	3.2	2.68	2.69	3.27	2.34	2.46	2.20
VideoChat2 [31]	UMT-L	7B	70.0	3.9	49.1	3.3	3.02	2.88	3.51	2.66	2.81	2.98
VideoLLaMA2	ViT-L	7B	70.9	3.8	50.2	3.3	3.16	3.08	3.69	2.56	3.14	3.13
Vista-LLaMA [44]	CLIP-G	7B	65.3	3.6	48.3	3.3	2.44	2.64	3.18	2.26	2.31	2.57
ST-LLM [41]	BLIP2	7B	74.6	3.9	50.9	3.3	3.23	3.05	3.74	2.93	2.81	3.15
PLLaVA [72]	ViT-L	7B	76.6	4.1	56.3	3.5	3.21	2.86	3.62	2.33	2.93	2.99
LLaVA-Octopus	SIGLIP	7B	74.3	4.1	53.4	3.6	3.43	2.95	3.68	2.65	3.24	3.19

Table 3. Results on Video Question-Answering Benchmarks. † denotes the use of the same training data as Video-LLaVA [34].

detailed ablation studies to validate the effectiveness of various components of the model.

The reason for choosing the VideoLLaVA dataset is that several methods have conducted experiments on VideoLLaVA, and some of these methods that use more data also provide partial results using only VideoLLaVA data. This makes it convenient for us to compare model performance. Additionally, the VideoLLaVA dataset is relatively small, making it more efficient to conduct ablation studies.

It is important to note that the fine-tuning data for VideoLLaVA includes both video and image data. We only use the weighted fusion of multiple projectors when the input is a video. For image inputs, we use only the MLP as the projector for processing.

4. Experiments

4.1. Experimental Setup

Implementation Details. We employ the Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct model [63] as the LLM and SigLIP (so400m-patch14-384) [80] as the visual backbone. All experiments are performed on 8 NVIDIA A100 GPUs.

4.2. Main Results

Results on Video Question Answering Benchmark. In Tab. 3, we demonstrate the performance of our LLaVA-

Method	EgoSchema	MLVU	VideoMME
GPT4-V [50]	55.6	-	60.7
GPT4-O [52]	72.2	66.2	77.2
Video-LLaVA† [34]	38.4	47.3	40.4
LLaMA-VID† [33]	38.5	33.2	-
VideoLLaMA2† [16]	34.6	42.9	42.7
LLaVA-Octopus†	50.2	55.3	55.7
Chat-UniVi [24]	-	-	45.9
VideoChat2 [31]	54.4	47.9	54.6
ShareGPT4Video [14]	-	46.4	43.6
LLaVA-NeXT-Video [37]	43.9	-	46.5
VideoLLaMA2 [16]	51.7	48.5	46.6
LongVA [83]	-	56.3	54.3
LLaVA-Octopus	59.2	57.5	54.7

Table 4. Results on Long Video Understanding Benchmarks. † denotes the use of the same training data as Video-LLaVA [34].

Octopus against state-of-the-art methods on three zero-shot video QA benchmarks. MSVD-QA [11] is a dataset comprising questions about short real-world video clips, typically lasting 10-15 seconds. ActivityNet-QA [10] consists of human-annotated action-related QA pairs derived from the ActivityNet dataset, with an average duration of 2 minutes. Additionally, we evaluate our model on the Video-based Generative Performance benchmark introduced by

Method	Vison Encoder	LLM Size	AS	AP	AA	FA	UA	OE	OI	OS	MD	AL	ST	AC	MC	MA	SC	FP	CO	EN	ER	CI	Avg.
GPT-4V [50]	GPT4-V	-	55.5	63.5	72.0	46.5	73.5	18.5	59.0	29.5	12.0	40.5	83.5	39.0	12.0	22.5	45.0	47.5	52.0	31.0	59.0	11.0	43.5
VideoLLaMA2† [16]	ViT-L	7B	59.5	46.5	64.5	45.4	58.6	47.7	48.0	37.3	23.5	31.0	75.0	40.5	32.5	46.0	38.0	36.5	49.0	27.5	43.5	38.5	44.5
LLaMA-VID† [33]	CLIP-G	7B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41.9
LLaVA-Octopus†	SIGLIP	7B	58.9	51.3	75.4	47.6	73.0	57.1	66.5	36.0	19.4	47.8	90.0	48.5	32.0	52.5	46.5	44.0	63.0	30.5	54.0	38.5	51.7
Video-LLaMA [82]	CLIP-G	7B	27.5	25.5	51.0	29.0	39.0	48.0	40.5	38.0	22.5	22.5	43.0	34.0	22.5	32.5	45.5	32.5	40.0	30.0	21.0	37.0	34.1
LLaMA-Adapter [86]	ViT-B	7B	23.0	28.0	51.0	30.0	33.0	53.5	32.5	33.5	25.5	21.5	30.5	29.0	22.5	41.5	39.5	25.0	31.5	22.5	28.0	32.0	31.7
Video-ChatGPT [46]	ViT-L	7B	23.5	26.0	62.0	22.5	26.5	54.0	28.0	40.0	23.0	20.0	31.0	30.5	25.5	39.5	48.5	29.0	33.0	29.5	26.0	35.5	32.7
VideoChat [30]	CLIP-G	7B	33.5	26.5	56.0	33.5	40.5	53.0	40.5	30.0	25.5	27.0	48.5	35.0	20.5	42.5	46.0	26.5	41.0	23.5	23.5	36.0	35.5
VideoChat2 [31]	UMT-L	7B	66.0	47.5	83.5	49.5	60.0	58.0	71.5	42.5	23.0	23.0	88.5	39.0	42.0	58.5	44.0	49.0	36.5	35.0	40.5	65.5	51.1
ST-LLM [41]	BLIP2	7B	66.0	53.5	84.0	44.0	58.5	80.5	73.5	38.5	42.5	31.0	86.5	36.5	56.5	78.5	43.0	44.5	46.5	34.5	41.5	58.5	54.9
PLLaVA [72]	ViT-L	7B	58.0	49.0	55.5	41.0	61.0	56.0	61.0	36.0	23.5	26.0	82.0	39.5	42.0	52.0	45.0	42.0	53.5	30.5	48.0	31.0	46.6
VideoLLaMB [68]	ViT-L	7B	54.5	47.0	86.5	44.5	52.0	79.0	58.5	32.0	47.0	33.0	82.5	40.5	52.0	82.0	40.5	37.5	43.0	31.0	42.5	60.0	52.5
VideoLLaMA2 [16]	ViT-L	7B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	54.6
LLaVA-Octopus	SIGLIP	7B	71.4	63.2	80.8	51.2	78.1	92.4	78.5	39.5	62.7	54.5	95.5	53.5	78.5	91.0	67.0	50.5	74.0	35.0	57.0	64.5	66.9

Table 5. Results on MVBench. † denotes the use of the same training data as Video-LLaVA [34].

Image-based	Spatial-temporal	Token-compress	MVBench
✓			48.6
	✓		49.1
		✓	45.8
✓		✓	50.4
✓	✓		51.3
	✓	✓	50.7
✓	✓	✓	51.7

Table 6. Ablation study on the effectiveness of different type of visual projectors.

VideoChatGPT [46], which assesses five key aspects of video understanding: correctness of information, detail orientation, context understanding, temporal understanding, and consistency.

Results on Long Video Understanding Benchmark. To demonstrate that our method can handle various video scenarios, we present several relatively long video understanding benchmarks in Tab. 4. Among these, EgoSchema [48] consists of egocentric videos with an average duration of 180 seconds. MLVU [90] focuses on long video understanding, with video lengths ranging from 3 to 120 minutes. VideoMME [21], containing diverse video domains and durations (ranging from minutes to hours), is a relatively comprehensive video understanding benchmark.

Results on MVBench. Besides the VQA benchmarks mentioned above, we also conduct experiments on MVBench [31], a comprehensive video understanding benchmark covering 20 tasks organized in the form of multiple-choice questions in Tab. 5. LLaVA-Octopus achieves state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance in almost all tasks, demonstrating that our instruction-driven adaptive projector fusion strategy effectively leverages the strengths of different projectors and overcomes the limitations of a

single projector in specific domains.




Figure 6. Comparison of Various Projector Fusion Strategies.

4.3. Ablation Study

Effectiveness of Each Projectors. To demonstrate the impact of different projectors, in Tab. 6, we first conduct ablation studies using various numbers and types of projectors. We know that when weighting the visual tokens obtained from three different projectors, the tokens derived from the image-based and spatial-temporal projectors are temporally and spatially alignable. However, the tokens generated by the token-compress projector, due to the compression of tokens, cannot be directly aligned in terms of temporal and spatial dimensions with those from the other two projectors. The features resulting from the token-compress projector, when added to those from the other two projectors, can to some extent disrupt the spatial and temporal relationships. Nevertheless, incorporating the tokens from the token-compress projector significantly preserves the temporal integrity, as experimental results have demonstrated that




Figure 7. **Qualitative Results of LLaVA-Octopus.** Compared to using a single type of projector, LLaVA-Octopus is capable of leveraging the strengths of different projectors, thereby transcending the limited advantages of a single projector. This enables LLaVA-Octopus to achieve excellent performance across various tasks.

Method	MVBench	VideoMME
Average	50.4	53.6
Concat	51.2	54.8
Random weights	50.1	52.9
Random choose	50.9	53.4
Projector Fusion Gate	51.7	55.7

Table 7. Ablation study on the projector fusion strategies.

this temporal integrity brings substantial benefits. It can be observed that compared to using a single type of projector, each addition of a new type of projector results in performance improvements on the MVBench benchmark.

Impact of Different Projector Fusion Strategies. To demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed projector fusion gate, we conduct ablation studies using different projector fusion strategies in Tab. 7. Specifically, we perform experiments under average, concatenation, random weight, and random choose settings, in addition to our proposed method. We demonstrate the random weight and concatenation paradigm in Fig. 6. The results show that our projector fusion gate outperforms other strategies on both the MVBench and Video MME benchmarks. This demonstrates that our projector fusion gate can effectively determine the weight of each projector’s contribution to the final visual embedding based on user instructions, thereby better adapting to different task scenarios.

4.4. Qualitative analysis

In Fig. 7, we demonstrate some qualitative examples of LLaVA-Octopus include scene detail-related questions, spatial-temporal-related questions, and dynamic counting questions. LLaVA-Octopus achieves correct responses in each of these scenarios, illustrating its ability to integrate the strengths of different visual projectors and overcome the inherent limitations imposed by a single projector. This versatility allows our method to perform well not only on specific types of problems but also in a wide range of comprehensive instruction scenarios.

5. Conclusions

In this paper, we introduce LLaVA-Octopus, a novel video multimodal large language model. LLaVA-Octopus dynamically adjusts the feature weights from different visual projectors based on user instructions, effectively leveraging the unique strengths of each projector. By dynamically selecting and combining the most suitable features, LLaVA-Octopus significantly enhances its performance in various multimodal tasks. Our experimental results demonstrate that LLaVA-Octopus achieves outstanding performance across multiple benchmarks, particularly in tasks such as multimodal understanding, visual question answering, and video understanding, highlighting its promising application potential.

LLaVA-Octopus: Unlocking Instruction-Driven Adaptive Projector Fusion for Video Understanding

Supplementary Material

6. More Comparisons of Different Projectors

As discussed in Sec. 1, the significance of visual projectors and the applicability of different types of visual projectors to various visual task scenarios constitute a crucial motivation for LLaVA-Octopus. We have provided some examples in Fig. 2 to illustrate this phenomenon. To further demonstrate its generalizability and reinforce our motivation, we supplement more additional examples in Fig. 8, Fig. 9 and Fig. 10.

Specifically, in Fig. 8, we present examples of Scene Details Related Questions using representative methods of the three types of projectors. In complex backgrounds, when questions require a more detailed understanding of the scene, the Image-based Projector demonstrates superior performance. In Fig. 9, we show examples of Spatial-temporal Related Questions using representative methods of the three types of projectors. It can be seen that the method based on the Spatial-temporal Projector, VideoL-LaMA2 [16], shows a clear advantage. In Fig. 10, we demonstrate the effectiveness of different projector methods in problems that require temporal consistency. Similar to the discussion in the paper, we chose Dynamic Counting Problems to represent this category. It is evident that the temporal consistency of both the Image-based Projector and the Spatial-temporal Projector is severely compromised, leading to poor performance in this type of problem. In contrast, the method with Token-compress Projector shows good performance in this category.

7. More Qualitative Results

In our main paper, we claim that proposed LLaVA-Octopus can tackle different video understanding scenarios and comprehensive user instructions. We have verified this through both extensive quantitative and qualitative experiments in Sec. 4. Here, we present more qualitative results in Fig. 11 and Fig. 12 to further support our conclusion.

Specifically, in Fig. 11 and Fig. 12, we present the performance of our LLaVA-Octopus on three types of questions: Scene Details Related Questions, Spatial-temporal Related Questions, and Dynamic Counting Problems. It can be seen that due to the reasonable integration of image-based projector, spatial-temporal projector, and token-compress projector in our model architecture, our LLaVA-Octopus is capable of providing accurate answers to all three types of questions.

Scene Details Related Question

Q: What color is the car being repaired in the movie?



LLaVA-OneVision: White [Correct] VideoLLaMa2: Black [Wrong] LLaMA-VID: Black [Wrong]

Q: What color is the clothes of the person wearing a floral hat at the staircase in the video?



LLaVA-OneVision: Green [Correct] VideoLLaMa2: Red [Wrong] LLaMA-VID: Purple [Wrong]

Q: What does the cartoon cat use to drag the cartoon mouse?



LLaVA-OneVision: Fishing rod [Correct] VideoLLaMa2: Rope [Wrong] LLaMA-VID: Rope [Wrong]

Q: What did the old man in the video receive as a gift from the police?



LLaVA-OneVision: Sunglasses [Correct] VideoLLaMa2: Money [Wrong] LLaMA-VID: Money [Wrong]

Q: What color is the bag placed on the table?



LLaVA-OneVision: Green [Correct] VideoLLaMa2: White [Wrong] LLaMA-VID: Blue [Wrong]

Figure 8. More examples of scene details related question.

Spatial-temporal Related Question

Q: Please describe the cooking process in the video in step-by-step order.



LLaVA-OneVision: The cooking process begins with slicing an **onion** on a wooden **cutting board**, followed by mixing the **onion slices** in a bowl. The next step involves blending the onion mixture in a **Magic Bullet blender**. The blended mixture is then poured onto a **baking sheet** lined with parchment **paper**. A **breadcrumb** mixture is added to the onions and mixed together. The **coated onion rings** are placed on the **baking sheet**, **ready for baking**. The video concludes with the onion rings being baked in an oven. ✗[Missing step]

VideoLLaMa2: Certainly! The video showcases the process of preparing and cooking onion rings. Here are the steps:

1. **Preparing the onions:** The video begins with a close-up shot of a pile of **onions**. The onions are then **sliced** into rings and placed in a bowl of water.
2. **Preparing the batter:** In a separate bowl, the **batter** is prepared. The ingredients for the batter are not explicitly shown, but it typically includes **flour, milk, eggs, and seasonings**.
3. **Coating the onions:** The **onion rings** are then **coated** in the **batter**, ensuring they are evenly covered.
4. **Frying the onions:** The **coated onion rings** are **fried** in **hot oil** until they turn **golden brown**. The video shows the onion rings being carefully placed in the fryer and cooked to perfection.
5. **Plating the onions:** Once the **onion rings** are cooked, they are **removed** from the fryer and placed on a plate lined with **paper towels** to **drain** any excess oil.
6. **Serving the onions:** The final step is to **serve** the **onion rings**. The video shows the onion rings being arranged on a plate and garnished with a side of **dipping sauce**.

Overall, the video provides a detailed demonstration of the process of preparing and cooking onion rings, from slicing the onions to serving them on a plate. ✔[Correct]

LLaMA-VID: The video shows a person preparing a dish by cutting **potatoes** into rings and **frying them in a pan**. The person then adds **seasoning** to the **potatoes** and continues **frying them**. Afterward, the person adds **eggs and cheese** to the **potatoes** and mixes them together. The dish is then **baked** in the oven. ✗[Wrong content]

Q: Please describe the cooking process in the video in step-by-step order.



LLaVA-OneVision: The cooking process begins with a person stirring **scrambled eggs** in a frying pan on a stove. The scene transitions to the person transferring **cooked rice** from a bowl into the same frying pan, using a **spatula** to **scrape out the rice**. Various ingredients are then added to the pan, including **shrimp, vegetables, and meat**. The person continues to **stir the mixture**, **incorporating** all the ingredients together. The video wraps up with the person adding more ingredients, including **scrambled eggs**, and stirring the mixture thoroughly to ensure everything is well combined. ✗[Missing step]

VideoLLaMa2: Certainly! The cooking process in the video involves the following steps

1. The person starts by frying a **mixture of eggs** and rice in a pan
2. They then add a variety of ingredients, including **meat, vegetables, and shrimps**, to the pan
3. The person **stirs** the ingredients together and continues to cook the dish
4. As the dish cooks, the person occasionally **checks the heat and adjusts it** as needed
5. Once the dish is fully cooked, the person **serves** it onto a **plate** and presents it to the camera

Overall, the video showcases the process of cooking a delicious and flavorful dish using a variety of ingredients and techniques. ✔[Correct]

LLaMA-VID: The video shows a person cooking a dish by adding **ingredients** to a pan, **stirring** them, and then **serving** the dish on a plate. The person is seen adding ingredients to a pan, stirring them, and then serving the dish on a plate. ✗[Missing step & Missing content]

Figure 9. More examples of spatial-temporal related question.

Dynamic Counting Problem

Q: How many times did the person show objects to the camera?




LLaVA-OneVision: 6 ❌[Wrong]

VideoLLaMa2: 5 ❌[Wrong]

LLaMA-VID: 7 ✅[Correct]

Q: How many objects enter the scene?




LLaVA-OneVision: 2 ❌[Wrong]

VideoLLaMa2: 0 ❌[Wrong]

LLaMA-VID: 3 ✅[Correct]

Q: How many times did the person launch the object on the slanted plane?




LLaVA-OneVision: 2 ❌[Wrong]

VideoLLaMa2: 2 ❌[Wrong]

LLaMA-VID: 3 ✅[Correct]

Q: How many collisions happen?



LLaVA-OneVision: 2 ❌[Wrong]

VideoLLaMa2: 2 ❌[Wrong]

LLaMA-VID: 3 ✅[Correct]

Q: The person makes sets of repeated actions. How many distinct repeated actions did the person do?



LLaVA-OneVision: 2 ❌[Wrong]

VideoLLaMa2: 2 ❌[Wrong]

LLaMA-VID: 3 ✅[Correct]

Figure 10. More examples of dynamic counting question.

Scene Details Related Question



User: What is seen in the background while the man is playing the bagpipe?



LLaVA-Octopus: In the background, there is a bar setting with bottles and glasses visible.



User: What is the color of the toothbrush used in the video?



LLaVA-Octopus: The toothbrush used in the video is blue.



User: What color is the clothing worn by the two boys playing squash on the squash court?



LLaVA-Octopus: The two boys playing squash on the court are dressed in athletic attire, with one wearing a red shirt and white shorts, while the other is in a blue shirt and white shorts.



User: Where are the people playing cricket in the beginning of the video?



LLaVA-Octopus: The people are playing cricket in a backyard with a white house and a white fence in the background.

Dynamic Counting Problem



User: How many times does the butterfly occur in this video?



LLaVA-Octopus : 4



User: How many times does the instructor in the video appear in different scenarios?



LLaVA-Octopus : 4



User: How many different guitar-shaped instruments are there in the video?



LLaVA-Octopus : 7



User: How many times did the two athletes dive together at the same time in the video?




LLaVA-Octopus : 3

Figure 11. More qualitative results of LLaVA-Octopus.

Scene Details Related Question




User: What is the first shot of in the video and what is written on it? 



LLaVA-Octopus: The first shot of the video is a close-up of a black case with 'GUNS N' ROSES' written on it.

Dynamic Counting Problem



User: How many times does the person in the video transfer the phone to another person? 



LLaVA-Octopus : 3


Spatial-temporal Related Question




User: What is the temporal sequence of events in the video? 



LLaVA-Octopus : The video captures the man's actions in a sequential manner, starting with him standing before the barbell, then bending over to lift it, lifting the barbell above his head, and finally dropping it back onto the ground.




User: What did the barber do after the boy gestures towards his head while looking at himself in the mirror? 



LLaVA-Octopus : After the boy gestures towards his head while looking at himself in the mirror, the barber continues to trim and style the boy's hair.



User: What task did the man perform after gesturing toward the window in the dimly lit room? 



LLaVA-Octopus : After gesturing toward the window, the man proceeded to spray the window with Windex.

Figure 12. More qualitative results of LLaVA-Octopus.

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. 1
- [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. 1, 3
- [3] Anthropic. Claude-3.5, 2024. 2
- [4] Kirolos Ataallah, Xiaoqian Shen, Eslam Abdelrahman, Essam Sleiman, Deyao Zhu, Jian Ding, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigt4-video: Advancing multimodal llms for video understanding with interleaved visual-textual tokens. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03413*, 2024. 3
- [5] Daichi Azuma, Taiki Miyanishi, Shuhei Kurita, and Motoaki Kawanabe. Scanqa: 3d question answering for spatial scene understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022. 5
- [6] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-vl: A versatile vision-language model for understanding, localization, text reading, and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12966*, 2023. 3
- [7] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-vl: A frontier large vision-language model with versatile abilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12966*, 2023. 1
- [8] Max Bain, Arsha Nagrani, Gül Varol, and Andrew Zisserman. Frozen in time: A joint video and image encoder for end-to-end retrieval. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021. 5
- [9] Tom B Brown. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*, 2020. 1
- [10] Fabian Caba Heilbron, Victor Escorcia, Bernard Ghanem, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Activitynet: A large-scale video benchmark for human activity understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 961–970, 2015. 6
- [11] David Chen and William B Dolan. Collecting highly parallel data for paraphrase evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 49th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies*, pages 190–200, 2011. 6
- [12] Jun Chen, Deyao Zhu, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, Zechu Liu, Pengchuan Zhang, Raghuraman Krishnamoorthi, Vikas Chandra, Yunyang Xiong, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigt-v2: large language model as a unified interface for vision-language multi-task learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09478*, 2023. 3
- [13] Keqin Chen, Zhao Zhang, Weili Zeng, Richong Zhang, Feng Zhu, and Rui Zhao. Shikra: Unleashing multi-modal llm’s referential dialogue magic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15195*, 2023. 3
- [14] 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. 5, 6
- [15] Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Zhong Muyan, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.14238*, 2023. 1
- [16] Zesen Cheng, Sicong Leng, Hang Zhang, Yifei Xin, Xin Li, Guanzheng Chen, Yongxin Zhu, Wenqi Zhang, Ziyang Luo, Deli Zhao, and Lidong Bing. Videollama 2: Advancing spatial-temporal modeling and audio understanding in video-llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07476*, 2024. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 1
- [17] Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality, 2023. 1
- [18] 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. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. 3
- [19] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018. 4, 5
- [20] 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. 1
- [21] Chaoyou Fu, Yuhang 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. 7
- [22] Peng Gao, Jiaming Han, Renrui Zhang, Ziyi Lin, Shijie Geng, Aojun Zhou, Wei Zhang, Pan Lu, Conghui He, Xiangyu Yue, et al. Llama-adapter v2: Parameter-efficient visual instruction model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.15010*, 2023. 2
- [23] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024. 1
- [24] Peng Jin, Ryuichi Takanobu, Caiwan Zhang, Xiaochun Cao, and Li Yuan. Chat-univi: Unified visual representation empowers large language models with image and video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08046*, 2023. 6

- [25] Bo Li, Hao Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Dong Guo, Yuanhan Zhang, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-next: What else influences visual instruction tuning beyond data?, 2024. [2](#)
- [26] Bo Li, Kaichen Zhang, Hao Zhang, Dong Guo, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-next: Stronger llms supercharge multimodal capabilities in the wild, 2024. [3](#)
- [27] 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](#), [3](#)
- [28] 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](#)
- [29] 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, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR, 2023. [3](#)
- [30] 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. [1](#), [3](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [31] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yinan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Ping Luo, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Mvbench: A comprehensive multimodal video understanding benchmark, 2024. [3](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [32] Yuncheng Li, Yale Song, Liangliang Cao, Joel Tetreault, Larry Goldberg, Alejandro Jaimes, and Jiebo Luo. Tgif: A new dataset and benchmark on animated gif description. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4641–4650, 2016. [5](#)
- [33] Yanwei Li, Chengyao Wang, and Jiaya Jia. Llama-vid: An image is worth 2 tokens in large language models. 2024. [2](#), [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [34] 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. [1](#), [3](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [35] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03744*, 2023. [2](#), [3](#)
- [36] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. 2023. [2](#), [3](#), [5](#)
- [37] 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. [6](#)
- [38] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2024. [1](#), [3](#)
- [39] Hao Liu, Wilson Yan, Matei Zaharia, and Pieter Abbeel. World model on million-length video and language with ringattention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08268*, 2024. [1](#)
- [40] Ruyang Liu, Chen Li, Yixiao Ge, Thomas H Li, Ying Shan, and Ge Li. Bt-adapter: Video conversation is feasible without video instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13658–13667, 2024. [6](#)
- [41] Ruyang Liu, Chen Li, Haoran Tang, Yixiao Ge, Ying Shan, and Ge Li. St-llm: Large language models are effective temporal learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00308*, 2024. [6](#), [7](#)
- [42] Zuyan Liu, Yuhao Dong, Ziwei Liu, Winston Hu, Jiwen Lu, and Yongming Rao. Oryx mllm: On-demand spatial-temporal understanding at arbitrary resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12961*, 2024. [5](#)
- [43] Ruipu Luo, Ziwang Zhao, Min Yang, Junwei Dong, Minghui Qiu, Pengcheng Lu, Tao Wang, and Zhongyu Wei. Valley: Video assistant with large language model enhanced ability, 2023. [5](#)
- [44] Fan Ma, Xiaojie Jin, Heng Wang, Yuchen Xian, Jiashi Feng, and Yi Yang. Vista-llama: Reliable video narrator via equal distance to visual tokens. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.08870*, 2023. [6](#)
- [45] 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. [1](#)
- [46] Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Rasheed, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Video-chatgpt: Towards detailed video understanding via large vision and language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2024)*, 2024. [3](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [47] Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Rasheed, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Videogpt+: Integrating image and video encoders for enhanced video understanding. *arxiv*, 2024. [5](#)
- [48] 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. [7](#)
- [49] OpenAI. ChatGPT. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>, 2023. [1](#), [2](#)
- [50] OpenAI. Gpt-4v(ision) system card. 2023. [6](#), [7](#)
- [51] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023. [1](#), [2](#)
- [52] OpenAI. Gpt-4o system card, 2024. [6](#)
- [53] 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. [1](#)
- [54] Viorica Pătrăucean, Lucas Smaira, Ankush Gupta, Adria Recasens Contente, Larisa Markeeva, Dylan Banarse, Skanda Koppula, Joseph Heyward, Mateusz Malinowski, Yi Yang, Carl Doersch, Tatiana Matejovicova, Yury Sulsky, Antoine Miech, Alex Frechette, Hanna Klimczak, Raphael Koster, Junlin Zhang, Stephanie Winkler, Yusuf Aytar, Simon Osindero, Dima Damen, Andrew Zisserman, and João Carreira. Perception test: A diagnostic benchmark for multimodal video models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. [5](#)

- [55] 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. 5
- [56] Michael S. Ryoo, Honglu Zhou, Shrikant Kendre, Can Qin, Le Xue, Manli Shu, Silvio Savarese, Ran Xu, Caiming Xiong, and Juan Carlos Niebles. xgen-mm-vid (blip-3-video): You only need 32 tokens to represent a video even in vlms, 2024. 3
- [57] Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, Sebastian Goodman, and Radu Soricut. Conceptual captions: A cleaned, hypernymed, image alt-text dataset for automatic image captioning. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2556–2565, 2018. 5
- [58] Gunnar A Sigurdsson, Gül Varol, Xiaolong Wang, Ali Farhadi, Ivan Laptev, and Abhinav Gupta. Hollywood in homes: Crowdsourcing data collection for activity understanding. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part I 14*, pages 510–526. Springer, 2016. 5
- [59] Gunnar A Sigurdsson, Abhinav Gupta, Cordelia Schmid, Ali Farhadi, and Karteek Alahari. Charades-ego: A large-scale dataset of paired third and first person videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.09626*, 2018. 5
- [60] Enxin Song, Wenhao Chai, Guanhong Wang, Yucheng Zhang, Haoyang Zhou, Feiyang Wu, Xun Guo, Tian Ye, Yan Lu, Jenq-Neng Hwang, et al. Moviechat: From dense token to sparse memory for long video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16449*, 2023. 6
- [61] Gemini Team. Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models, 2024. 1, 2
- [62] Qwen team. Qwen2-vl. 2024. 3
- [63] Qwen Team. Qwen2.5: A party of foundation models, 2024. 6
- [64] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023. 1
- [65] Weihang Wang, Qingsong Lv, Wenmeng Yu, Wenyi Hong, Ji Qi, Yan Wang, Junhui Ji, Zhuoyi Yang, Lei Zhao, Xixuan Song, Jiazheng Xu, Bin Xu, Juanzi Li, Yuxiao Dong, Ming Ding, and Jie Tang. Cogvlm: Visual expert for pretrained language models, 2023. 3
- [66] Xiaohan Wang, Yuhui Zhang, Orr Zohar, and Serena Yeung-Levy. Videoagent: Long-form video understanding with large language model as agent, 2024. 3
- [67] Yi Wang, Kunchang Li, Xinhao Li, Jiashuo Yu, Yinan He, Guo Chen, Baoqi Pei, Rongkun Zheng, Jilan Xu, Zun Wang, et al. Internvideo2: Scaling video foundation models for multimodal video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15377*, 2024. 1
- [68] Yuxuan Wang, Cihang Xie, Yang Liu, and Zilong Zheng. Videollamb: Long video understanding with recurrent memory bridges. *arxiv*, 2024. 3, 7
- [69] Ying Wang, Yanlai Yang, and Mengye Ren. Lifelongmemory: Leveraging llms for answering queries in long-form egocentric videos, 2024. 3
- [70] X. Grok 1.5 vision. <https://x.ai/blog/grok-1.5v>, 2024. 5
- [71] 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 (CVPR)*, pages 9777–9786, 2021. 5
- [72] Lin Xu, Yilin Zhao, Daquan Zhou, Zhijie Lin, See Kiong Ng, and Jiashi Feng. Pllava: Parameter-free llava extension from images to videos for video dense captioning, 2024. 3, 6, 7
- [73] Le Xue, Manli Shu, Anas Awadalla, Jun Wang, An Yan, Senthil Purushwalkam, Honglu Zhou, Viraj Prabhu, Yutong Dai, Michael S Ryoo, Shrikant Kendre, Jieyu Zhang, Can Qin, Shu Zhang, Chia-Chih Chen, Ning Yu, Juntao Tan, Tulika Manoj Awalgaoankar, Shelby Heinecke, Huan Wang, Yejin Choi, Ludwig Schmidt, Zeyuan Chen, Silvio Savarese, Juan Carlos Niebles, Caiming Xiong, and Ran Xu. xgen-mm (blip-3): A family of open large multimodal models, 2024. 3
- [74] Antoine Yang, Antoine Miech, Josef Sivic, Ivan Laptev, and Cordelia Schmid. Zero-shot video question answering via frozen bidirectional language models. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 6
- [75] 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 multimodal large language models, 2024. 3
- [76] Qinghao Ye, Haiyang Xu, Guohai Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Yi Zhou, Junyan Wang, Anwen Hu, Pengcheng Shi, Yaya Shi, Chenliang Li, Yuanhong Xu, Hehong Chen, Junfeng Tian, Qiang Qi, Ji Chao Zhang, and Feiyan Huang. mplug-owl: Modularization empowers large language models with multimodality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14178*, 2023. 1
- [77] 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. 2, 3
- [78] Qinghao Ye, Haiyang Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Haowei Liu, Qi Qian, Ji Zhang, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. mplug-owl2: Revolutionizing multi-modal large language model with modality collaboration, 2023. 2, 3
- [79] Kexin Yi, Chuang Gan, Yunzhu Li, Pushmeet Kohli, Jiajun Wu, Antonio Torralba, and Joshua B Tenenbaum. Clevrer: Collision events for video representation and reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01442*, 2019. 5
- [80] Xiaohua Zhai, Basil Mustafa, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. Sigmoid loss for language image pre-training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 11975–11986, 2023. 6
- [81] Ce Zhang, Taixi Lu, Md Mohaiminul Islam, Ziyang Wang, Shoubin Yu, Mohit Bansal, and Gedas Bertasius. A simple llm framework for long-range video question-answering, 2023. 3

- [82] 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. 2, 3, 6, 7
- [83] 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. 6
- [84] 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, 2024. 3
- [85] Qiming Zhang, Jing Zhang, Yufei Xu, and Dacheng Tao. Vision transformer with quadrangle attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15105*, 2023. 3
- [86] Renrui Zhang, Jiaming Han, Chris Liu, Peng Gao, Aojun Zhou, Xiangfei Hu, Shilin Yan, Pan Lu, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Qiao. Llama-adapter: Efficient fine-tuning of language models with zero-init attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16199*, 2023. 6, 7
- [87] Ruohong Zhang, Liangke Gui, Zhiqing Sun, Yihao Feng, Keyang Xu, Yuanhan Zhang, Di Fu, Chunyuan Li, Alexander Hauptmann, Yonatan Bisk, et al. Direct preference optimization of video large multimodal models from language model reward. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.01258*, 2024. 5
- [88] Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, haotian Liu, Yong jae Lee, Liangke Gui, Di Fu, Jiashi Feng, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-next: A strong zero-shot video understanding model, 2024. 2, 3
- [89] Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, haotian Liu, Yong jae Lee, Liangke Gui, Di Fu, Jiashi Feng, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-next: A strong zero-shot video understanding model, 2024. 2
- [90] Junjie Zhou, Yan Shu, Bo Zhao, Boya Wu, Shitao Xiao, Xi Yang, Yongping Xiong, Bo Zhang, Tiejun Huang, and Zheng Liu. Mlvu: A comprehensive benchmark for multi-task long video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04264*, 2024. 7
- [91] Luowei Zhou, Chenliang Xu, and Jason Corso. Towards automatic learning of procedures from web instructional videos. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018. 5
- [92] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592*, 2023. 1
- [93] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592*, 2023. 3