

TemporalVQA: Can Multimodal LLMs do Visual Temporal Understanding and Reasoning? The answer is No!

Mohamed Fazli Imam¹ Chenyang Lyu² Alham Fikri Aji¹

¹Mohamed bin Zayed University of Artificial Intelligence

²Alibaba International Digital Commerce

{mohamed.imam, alham.fikri}@mbzuai.ac.ae lyuchenyang.dcu@gmail.com

Abstract

Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) have achieved significant advancements in tasks like Visual Question Answering (VQA) by leveraging foundational Large Language Models (LLMs). However, their abilities in specific areas such as temporal understanding, which is crucial for comprehending real-world dynamics, remain underexplored. To address this, we propose a challenging evaluation benchmark named TemporalVQA, consisting of two parts: 1) **Temporal Order Understanding** and 2) **Time-lapse Estimation**. The first part requires MLLMs to determine the sequence of events by analyzing temporally consecutive video frames. The second part presents image pairs with varying time differences, framed as multiple-choice questions, asking MLLMs to estimate the time-lapse between images with options ranging from seconds to years. Our evaluations of advanced MLLMs, including models like GPT-4o and Gemini-1.5-Pro, reveal significant challenges: GPT-4o achieved only 43.8% average consistent accuracy in temporal order tasks and 70% in time-lapse estimation, with open-source models performing even less effectively. These findings underscore the limitations of current MLLMs in visual temporal understanding and reasoning, highlighting the need for further improvements for their temporal capability. Our dataset can be found at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/fazliimam/temporal-vqa>.

1 Introduction

Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) have achieved significant progress in various multimodal tasks, notably in Visual Question Answering (VQA), by leveraging the capabilities of foundational Large Language Models (LLMs) (Yin et al., 2023; Li et al., 2024). While these models are strong at understanding and interpreting visual scenes and information, their abilities in specific

areas such as temporal understanding and reasoning have not been thoroughly explored (Huang and Zhang, 2024). Temporal understanding is crucial because it evaluates how well MLLMs comprehend the motion and dynamics of real-world events (Wal-lat et al., 2024). Without effectively understanding the sequence and timing of events, MLLMs miss out on grasping the dynamics of real-world scenarios, which are crucial for tasks that involve interpreting changes over time and predicting future states accurately. Consequently, enhancing temporal reasoning in MLLMs is essential to bridge this gap, enabling them to perform more effectively in applications such as video analysis, autonomous navigation, and time-sensitive decision-making. By advancing their temporal comprehension, MLLMs can achieve a more holistic understanding of the world, leading to more accurate predictions and interactions in dynamic environments.

There have been some works discussing the temporal understanding capability for text-based LLMs (Chu et al., 2024; Fatemi et al., 2024; Wang and Zhao, 2024), but there still lacks a thorough examination of the temporal capabilities for MLLMs. The existing multimodal benchmarks (Yue et al., 2023; Cai et al., 2024) predominantly focus on single-image inputs or consist of straightforward questions that do not challenge the models' deeper understanding or reasoning capabilities. Most benchmarks mainly examine the relationship between the visual and textual components, lacking a thorough exploration of the interactions among elements within the visual input (Li et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024). These limitations mean these benchmarks (Fu et al., 2023, 2024) do not adequately assess the temporal reasoning skills of MLLMs, which are essential for accurately understanding sequences of events and dynamic contexts. The ability to discern the order and timing of events is vital for applications ranging from temporal visual analysis to real-time decision-making (Sun et al.,

2024).

To address this gap, we introduce a simple yet challenging evaluation benchmark named TemporalVQA, which consists of two parts: **Temporal Order Understanding** and **Time-lapse Estimation**. The first part is designed by sampling relevant and temporally consecutive frames from videos, where the task for MLLMs is to determine which frame comes first based on their understanding and reasoning. Specifically, two or more frames are drawn from the sourced videos, and we manually select frames to ensure sufficient distinction between pairs so that one frame clearly precedes or follows the other. In total, we compile 360 image pairs for this task. The second part of the benchmark, **Time-lapse Estimation**, comprises 125 image pairs, each composed of two images that show scenes or objects at different timestamps with varying durations ranging from seconds, minutes to years. This part is framed in a multiple-choice question (MCQ) format, asking MLLMs to estimate the possible time-lapse between the two images, with options such as seconds, minutes, hours, days, and years.

Our experimental results reveal that TemporalVQA poses a significant challenge for current advanced MLLMs. For the **Temporal Order Understanding** task, GPT-4o (Hurst et al., 2024), average across all three layouts, achieved only 43.8% consistent accuracy (same prediction for varied sequences of two images), which is worse than random guessing. Open-source models like LLaVA-NeXT (Liu et al., 2023b) performed even worse with less than 10% accuracy. For the **Time-lapse Estimation** task, advanced MLLMs such as GPT-4o and Gemini only achieved around 70% and 63.2% accuracy respectively. These results underscore the limitations of current MLLMs, particularly in their ability to perform satisfactory temporal understanding and reasoning.

In this paper, we aim to highlight the limitations of existing MLLMs in handling temporal understanding and reasoning tasks. We will discuss the present benchmarks, the challenges that MLLMs face in temporal tasks, and the need for more robust evaluation frameworks. Our study emphasizes the importance of developing advanced models and benchmarks to improve the temporal reasoning abilities of MLLMs.

2 TemporalVQA Benchmark Construction

2.1 Data Collection

We constructed the TemporalVQA benchmark to evaluate the temporal understanding capabilities of multimodal large language models (MLLMs). The benchmark consists of two main tasks: **Temporal Order Understanding** and **Time-lapse Estimation**.

2.1.1 Temporal Order Understanding

For the temporal order understanding task, we sourced videos from copyright-free platforms including Pixabay¹ and Pexels². These videos feature a variety of subjects, from humans engaging in daily activities to non-human content like plants and animals. From each video, we sampled pairs of frames that exhibit a clear sequence of events, ensuring sufficient variation to distinguish one frame from the other. Human intervention was required to select frames where it is possible to definitively classify one frame as preceding or following the other. For instance, in one pair, one frame shows an empty cup, while the other shows the cup filled with tea. In this pair, the empty cup clearly represents the first event, followed by the filled cup as the subsequent event.

2.1.2 Time-lapse Estimation

For the time-lapse estimation task, we curated a dataset of 125 image pairs by selecting copyright-free images from Flickr³, Google⁴, and images sampled from copyright-free videos from YouTube⁵. Each pair captures scenes or objects photographed at different time intervals, with durations varying from seconds and minutes to years. These images were carefully selected to provide visual cues indicative of the time elapsed between them. Examples include images showing a fruit before and after ripening, or a landscape scene during different seasons. The goal is to challenge MLLMs to estimate the time-lapse between the images accurately.

¹<https://pixabay.com/>

²<https://www.pexels.com/>

³<https://flickr.com/>

⁴<https://images.google.com/>

⁵<https://youtube.com/>




Figure 1: An introductory diagram illustrating the task setup for the Temporal VQA benchmark. In **Temporal Order Understanding**, the model is asked to determine which of the two images depicts the event that happened first. In **Time-lapse Estimation**, the model estimates the time duration between two images selecting from options like seconds, minutes, hours, days, weeks/months or years.

2.2 Benchmark Construction

2.2.1 Task Formulation

We designed our benchmark to evaluate state-of-the-art MLLMs including open-source and closed-source models. Since each data sample in our dataset consists of a pair of images, and while some models can process multiple images, others cannot. To facilitate testing the latter models and ensure a fair experimental setting across all models, we concatenated the two images into a single image, adding some space between them, before feeding it into the model. Additionally, for models capable of processing multiple images, we also tested them by feeding the individual images separately to evaluate their performance in that setting.

To evaluate the consistency of the models, we generated multiple versions of the crafted datasets. One version concatenates the image pairs horizontally, while another concatenates them vertically. Within each version, we also created additional sets by swapping the positions of the images to assess the models' sensitivity to spatial arrangement.

2.2.2 Prompt Design

Temporal Order Understanding we created two types of prompts. In one prompt, the task is framed as a true or false question:

Prompt #1

Did the event in the (left / top / first) image happen before the event in the (right / bottom / second) image? State true or false with reasoning.

In the other prompt, the task is to specify which image depicts the event that happened first:

Prompt #2

Between these two images, which one depicts the event that happened first? State (left or right / top or bottom / first or second) with reasoning.

Time-lapse Estimation For this task, we framed the questions in a multiple-choice format, asking MLLMs to estimate the time-lapse between the two images. The options provided include *seconds, minutes, hours, days, months and years*. To minimize ambiguity in cases where closely related timeframes could both be plausible, we rephrased the options to introduce a sufficient gap between them.

Additionally, since this task is framed as a multiple-choice problem, the images are presented to the model in a single layout, where the earlier image is positioned on the left and the more recent image is positioned on the right. An example

prompt is:

Prompt #3

In the given image, estimate the time that has passed between the first image (left) and the second image (right). Choose one of the following options:

- A. Less than 15 seconds*
- B. Between 2 minutes to 15 minutes*
- C. Between 1 hour to 12 hours*
- D. Between 2 days to 30 days*
- E. Between 4 months to 12 months*
- F. More than 3 years.*

2.2.3 Examples

We include examples of image pairs and the corresponding prompts in the supplementary materials to illustrate the tasks. The selected examples demonstrate the diversity of the dataset and the types of temporal reasoning required.

3 Evaluation Results

3.1 Evaluated MLLMs

In our experiments, we evaluated a series of MLLMs including the strongest closed-source models such as GPT-4o (Hurst et al., 2024) and Gemini-1.5-Pro (Team, 2023) as well as the state-of-the-art open-source MLLMs including LLaVA-NeXT (Liu et al., 2023a), InternVL (Chen et al., 2024), Qwen-VL (Bai et al., 2023) and Llama-3-Vision (Dubey et al., 2024) and LLaVA-CoT (Xu et al., 2024):

GPT-4o GPT-4o (Hurst et al., 2024)⁶ is the most advanced variant of the GPT series, designed to handle multimodal input more effectively. It supports multiple data types, including text and images, and it has achieved superior performance on various multimodal benchmarks.

Gemini1.5-Pro Gemini1.5-Pro (Team, 2023) is a highly flexible MLLM, which has obtained strong performance in multimodal processing, handling text, images, audio, and video, showcasing superior performance on various benchmarks⁷.

LLaVA-NeXT LLaVA-NeXT (Liu et al., 2023a) is the improved version of the LLaVA model (Liu

et al., 2023b), a large multimodal model that enhances visual reasoning and OCR capabilities. It supports various language models and achieves top performance among open-source LLMs, comparable to commercial models like Gemini Pro.

InternVL InternVL (Chen et al., 2024) is a model designed to bridge the gap between language and vision tasks, focusing on visual instruction tuning to achieve state-of-the-art capabilities. It supports large language and vision models, offering strong performance in multimodal tasks through zero-shot modality transfer.

Qwen-VL Qwen-VL (Bai et al., 2023) is a MLLM that supports extensive language and vision tasks. It is designed to handle complex multimodal interactions, providing robust performance across various benchmarks.

Llama-3-vision Llama-3-vision (Dubey et al., 2024) is an advanced MLLM that builds upon the capabilities of Llama-3, offering improved performance in natural language understanding and generation as well as multimodal tasks.

LLaVA-CoT LLaVA-CoT (Xu et al., 2024) is a MLLM that is capable of multistage reasoning using stage-level beam search. It leverages the Llama-3.2-11B-Vision-Instruct model and implements a systematic approach to address complex reasoning tasks.

3.2 Experimental Setup

In this study, we conducted a series of experiments on our TemporalVQA benchmark to evaluate the temporal reasoning capabilities of several state-of-the-art multimodal large language models (MLLMs). The models were tasked with determining the chronological sequence of actions depicted in paired images. Each pair of images was combined either vertically or horizontally to form a single input, challenging the models to discern which frame represents the earlier event and which one the later event. The "consistent accuracy" metric is determined by evaluating the model's predictions across different image layouts within the same mode (vertical or horizontal). For a prediction to be counted as consistent and true, the model must make identical predictions for both layouts in the specified mode. If the predictions differ between the two layouts, the result is marked as false. This approach ensures that the model's ability to

⁶<https://openai.com/index/gpt-4o-system-card/>

⁷<https://blog.google/technology/ai/google-gemini-ai>

	GPT-4o		Gemini1.5-Pro		LLaVA-NeXT		InternVL		Qwen-VL		Llama3-Vision		LLaVA-CoT	
	P1	P2	P1	P2	P1	P2	P1	P2	P1	P2	P1	P2	P1	P2
<i>Vertically Joined</i>														
Correct answer on the top (1st order)	93.9%	94.7%	30.8%	81.4%	25.3%	100%	71.4%	85.3%	6.1%	44.4%	6.4%	5.25%	84.2%	91.4%
Correct answer on the bottom (2nd order)	32.2%	40.6%	88.3%	41.9%	71.9%	0.0%	27.2%	17.8%	96.9%	66.4%	93.6%	46.1%	16.7%	13.3%
Average Accuracy	63.1%	67.6%	59.6%	61.7%	48.6%	50.0%	49.3%	51.5%	51.5%	55.4%	50.0%	49.3%	50.4%	52.4%
Consistent Accuracy	31.4%	39.2%	23.6%	35.0%	6.4%	0.0%	16.4%	13.6%	5.8%	19.2%	3.3%	7.8%	13.1%	12.8%
<i>Horizontally Joined</i>														
Correct answer on the left (1st order)	95.0%	92.8%	52.5%	70.8%	7.5%	100%	66.4%	79.4%	10.8%	100%	3.3%	33.3%	83.6%	89.7%
Correct answer on the right (2nd order)	29.4%	49.4%	62.8%	44.4%	89.2%	0.0%	39.4%	22.8%	92.8%	0.0%	95.6%	64.2%	18.6%	12.5%
Average Accuracy	62.2%	71.1%	57.6%	57.6%	48.3%	50.0%	52.9%	51.1%	51.8%	50.0%	49.4%	48.8%	51.1%	51.1%
Consistent Accuracy	30.6%	52.8%	21.4%	29.4%	4.2%	0.0%	25.6%	18.6%	8.3%	0.0%	1.9%	4.4%	14.2%	10.3%
<i>Separate Multiple Images</i>														
Correct answer is the first image (1st order)	81.9%	85.6%	-	-	0.3%	100%	72.5%	67.2%	0.6%	50.8%	-	-	35.0%	94.2%
Correct answer is the second image (2nd order)	54.2%	70.8%	-	-	99.4%	0.0%	28.6%	40.8%	99.4%	-	-	-	69.2%	6.7%
Average Accuracy	68.1%	78.2%	-	-	49.9%	50.0%	50.6%	54.0%	50.0%	55.1%	-	-	52.1%	50.4%
Consistent Accuracy	43.6%	65.3%	-	-	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	26.4%	0.6%	23.9%	-	-	14.7%	4.7%

Table 1: Temporal order understanding results across different models and prompting strategies. Models are evaluated on joined image pairs (vertically and horizontally) and separated image pairs (for applicable models). For each layout, we report the accuracy of temporal ordering in both directions (Top-to-Bottom/Bottom-to-Top for vertical; Left-to-Right/Right-to-Left for horizontal) and the consistent accuracy (when model predictions are consistent across both directions). P1 and P2 represent two different prompting strategies as described in Section 2.2.2.

maintain consistent temporal reasoning across different visual presentations is accurately assessed. For GPT-4o, Gemini-pro, InternVL, Qwen-VL and LLaVA-CoT model we extract their predictions from the response, for the LLaVA-NeXT and Llama-3-vision models, we treat the task as a multiple-choice question and select the option (A or B) with the highest likelihood as the prediction from the next token probability as the evaluation method in the original MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021).

3.3 Temporal Order Understanding Results

Overall, the experimental results shown in Table 1 reveal that all current MLLMs, including GPT-4o—the most advanced model in our evaluation—struggle with the proposed benchmark. Despite GPT-4o’s superior performance relative to other models, it fails to consistently demonstrate accurate temporal reasoning across different settings. The consistent accuracy scores are notably low for all models, indicating significant limitations in their ability to comprehend and interpret temporal sequences from visual inputs. These deficiencies are evident even when models are provided with multi-image inputs or optimized prompts, suggesting that current architectures and training methodologies are insufficient for robust temporal order understanding. The pervasive challenges faced by these models underscore the complexity of visual temporal reasoning tasks and highlight the need for continued research to enhance the visual temporal comprehension capabilities of MLLMs.

Effect of different prompts Our experiments reveal significant variations in model performance across different prompting strategies. GPT-4o demonstrates some sensitivity to prompt variations, with consistent accuracy improvements from P1 to P2 (31.0% to 46.0% in single-image and 43.6% to 65.3% in multi-image settings). However, even with optimized prompts, its performance remains below satisfactory levels (close to random guessing). In contrast, models like LLaVA-NeXT and Qwen-VL show high sensitivity to prompting, with performance degrading under alternate prompts. This suggests that while prompt engineering can influence outcomes, it does not fully address the underlying limitations in temporal reasoning abilities.

Effect of the layout of images within single-image input The layout of images (vertical vs. horizontal joining) significantly impacts model performance, further highlighting their limitations. GPT-4o demonstrates improved consistency in vertical arrangements, increasing from 39.2% to 52.8% with P2, although there is a slight decline with P1, dropping from 31.4% to 30.6%, which is essentially negligible and does not significantly affect the overall performance. Most models display a strong directional bias—for instance, LLaVA achieves perfect accuracy in certain orientations but fails completely when the order is reversed. This inconsistency indicates that models are not genuinely understanding temporal sequences but may be relying on superficial spatial cues. The low consistent accuracy across different layouts underscores the

Time Span	Human	GPT-4o	Gemini1.5-Pro	LLaVA-NeXT	Qwen-VL	InternVL	Llama3-Vision	LLaVA-CoT
Seconds	87.7%	89.5%	78.9%	78.9%	63.2%	26.3%	100%	94.7%
Minutes	78.9%	80.0%	90.0%	10.0%	65.0%	75.0%	5.0%	10.0%
Hours	76.5%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%	30.0%	20.0%	0.0%	30.0%
Days	85.2%	61.1%	44.4%	0.0%	77.8%	11.1%	0.0%	88.9%
Weeks/Months	85.4%	63.2%	47.4%	0.0%	21.1%	5.3%	0.0%	63.2%
Years	86.2%	86.2%	58.6%	24.1%	86.2%	0.0%	24.1%	44.8%
Average Acc.	83.3%	70.0%	63.2%	18.8%	57.2%	22.9%	21.5%	55.3%

Table 2: Time-lapse estimation accuracy across different temporal scales. Models are evaluated on their ability to estimate time intervals between image pairs, ranging from seconds to years. The task requires models to select the appropriate time scale that best describes the temporal gap between two given images.

models’ inability to generalize temporal reasoning beyond specific configurations, emphasizing the need for developing more robust and layout-invariant temporal understanding mechanisms in MLLMs.

Effect of multi-image input and single-image input

The comparison between multi-image and single-image approaches reveals interesting patterns. GPT-4o shows slight improvement with multi-image input (from 31.0% to 43.6% using P1 and from 46.0% to 65.3% using P2), yet the overall performance remains limited. Other models exhibit mixed results, with InternVL maintaining relatively stable but low performance across both settings, and Qwen-VL showing minor improvements in P2 with multi-image input (9.6% to 23.9%). These findings suggest that simply providing additional visual context through multiple images does not significantly enhance temporal reasoning capabilities. The models appear to struggle with integrating temporal information, regardless of the input format.

Comparison with human performance

We compared the best-performing MLLM against human performance to assess how closely it aligns with human-level accuracy. To achieve this, we conducted three surveys where participants were presented image-pairs with P2 as the question and asked to select either the left or right image.

Although we considered sampling a subset of the 360 compiled image pairs for multiple surveys, the varying difficulty of each pair could introduce bias. To ensure a fair comparison, each survey included all 360 image pairs.

Additionally, to avoid positional bias, the survey alternated the presentation order of image pairs. Specifically, 50% of the pairs were displayed in the *Correct answer on the left (1st order)*, while the remaining 50% were in the *Correct answer on the*

right (2nd order). This balanced design ensured a more rigorous and fair evaluation.

Upon analyzing the survey outcomes, there was no single case where **all** human evaluations made an incorrect prediction for the same image pair. While there were individual misclassifications, they can be attributed to human error. This goes on to show that the created dataset is highly reliable and consistent, with human evaluators largely agreeing on the correct predictions, further validating the quality of the data used for model evaluation.

As shown in Table 3, even the best-performing MLLM, GPT-4o, (using P2 with multiple image inputs), still falls significantly short of human performance. Specifically, humans outperform the model by **25%**. This underscores the substantial gap between MLLMs and human cognition in understanding and reasoning about complex visual-temporal tasks, emphasizing the need for further advancements in multimodal learning and reasoning capabilities.

Best Model (GPT-4o)	65.3%
Avg Human Evaluation	90.3%

Table 3: Accuracy comparison of the best performing MLLM with human performance.

3.4 Time-lapse Estimation Results

The task of time-lapse estimation tests the ability of MLLMs to infer temporal intervals between image pairs. As shown in Table 2, all MLLMs, including top performers like GPT-4o and Gemini1.5-Pro, struggle with this task, achieving only moderate accuracy levels of 60-70%. GPT-4o shows inconsistent performance, with strong performance in *Seconds* and *Years* but underperforming in *Hours*. Similarly, LLaVA-CoT demonstrates exceptional performance in the time spans of *Seconds* and *Days*, while showing notably poor performance in the




Figure 2: Only instance where **all** participants in the human evaluation provided incorrect responses, misjudging the time lapse between the images.

other time intervals. LLaVA-NeXT achieved competitive performance in estimating short intervals (*Seconds*) but struggled with longer time spans, indicating a reliance on fine visual details over temporal reasoning. Qwen-VL’s high accuracy in *Years* contrasts with its poor performance in shorter intervals, revealing a focus on significant temporal changes rather than fine-grained understanding. Other models, such as InternVL and Llama3-Vision, exhibit low overall accuracy, with isolated strengths like Llama3-Vision’s performance in *Seconds*. These results highlight a significant gap in the temporal reasoning abilities of current MLLMs, emphasizing the need for improved training and architecture to foster a more comprehensive understanding of time.

Comparison with human performance The human evaluation setup mirrored that of Task 1, Temporal Order Understanding, encompassing all 125 image pairs in the survey. The question posed was structured using P#3. Notably, in this task, the average human performance exceeded that of the best-performing model, GPT-4o, by 13.3%.

Upon analyzing the survey responses, there was only a single instance, illustrated in Figure 2, where **all** participants in the human evaluation provided incorrect answers. In this particular case, the correct answer was "Between 1-12 hours," yet all participants selected "Between 2-15 minutes," underscoring a limitation in human judgment.

3.5 Case Study

Among all the models and experimental setups, GPT-4o emerged as the best-performing model in the multi-image experimental setup with P2. Consequently, this configuration was chosen for further analysis to assess the soundness of the reasoning behind its predictions.

As shown in Table 4, the model achieves a consistent rate of 74.2%, the ability of the model to alter its predictions appropriately when the images are presented in a swapped manner, with the ma-

Consistency Rate	74.2% (267)
Consistent correctly classified	65.3% (235)
Consistently misclassified	8.9% (32)

Table 4: Breakdown of the consistency rate of GPT-4o in terms of correctly classified and incorrectly classified samples. **Blue** represents the accuracy rate, while **red** denotes the misclassification rate. The number of samples correctly/incorrectly classified is indicated within brackets.

majority (65.3%) attributed to its ability to correctly classify consistently.

To verify that consistent accuracy is a valid and reliable measure of the model’s performance, we sampled 30 instances from the 267 consistently correctly classified cases and evaluated the model’s reasoning when presented with image pairs in both layouts. In all 30 instances, the reasoning was deemed valid for both orders. This outcome aligns with the expectation that the model exhibits reasonably robust reasoning capabilities regardless of the order of the images. An example of this is illustrated in Figure 3 under Case 1.

Reasoning	1st ✓, 2nd ✗ (73)	2nd ✓, 1st ✗ (20)
Valid → Valid	10.0% (3)	31.6% (6)
Valid → Invalid	66.7% (20)	15.8% (3)
Valid → Hallucination	20% (6)	2.0% (1)
Invalid → Valid	0	31.6% (6)
Invalid → Invalid	3.3% (1)	20.0% (4)
Invalid → Hallucination	0	0

Table 5: Breakdown of changes in reasoning (valid or invalid) when the order of the image pairs fed to the model is swapped.

We manually evaluated the reasoning behind the model’s inconsistent predictions. Out of 93 image-pair cases where the model failed to produce consistent predictions when presented with reversed image pair layouts, 73 were correctly classified *only* in 1st order (Correct answer is the first image), while 20 were correctly classified *only* in the 2nd order (Correct answer is the second image).

Additionally, we analyzed the model’s reasoning for these inconsistent predictions. Specifically, we sampled 30 instances from the 73 pairs and analyzed all 20 pairs from the other category. The breakdown of this analysis is presented in Table 5. The reasoning provided by the model was categorized into three groups:

- Valid - The provided reasoning is completely valid to determine the order of occurrence.



Figure 3: Some qualitative cases illustrating the output predictions from GPT4o. **1st order** refers to cases where the image pairs are fed to the model in their original sequence (as shown in the first row), while **2nd order** refers to cases where the image pairs are fed in reverse (swapped) order. Text highlighted in **green** represents correct classifications by the model, whereas **red** indicates misclassifications. **Orange** denotes instances where the model hallucinated, and **brown** indicates cases where the model produced illogical or invalid reasoning.

- Invalid - The provided reasoning is invalid or illogical to determine the order of occurrence.
- Hallucination - The provided reasoning includes imagined details about the image.

Our analysis reveals that the model provides valid reasoning for the majority of cases (66.7%) when the image pairs are presented in the 1st order (with the correct answer corresponding to the first image). However, when the image pairs are presented in the 2nd order (with the correct answer corresponding to the second image), the reasoning is evenly split between valid and invalid. This highlights the model's sensitivity to the order of the input.

Interestingly, in cases where the model's predictions are correct in one order but incorrect in the other, there are instances where the model offers valid reasoning yet arrives at the wrong answer. This indicates that while the reasoning process may be sound, the model's decision-making is influenced by the input order, leading to inconsistencies in its predictions. An example of this can be seen in Figure 3, under case 2.

Alternatively, there were instances where the model's predictions were incorrect and supported by invalid reasoning. For example, in Figure 3,

Case 3 illustrates this scenario. The image pair shows a group of people initially near the beach in the first image and later closer to the photographer in the second image. Observing the group's actions, it is clear that they moved from the beach towards the photographer. When the image pair is presented in the correct order, the model provides valid reasoning and makes the correct prediction. However, when the images are swapped and presented in reverse order, the model incorrectly reasons that the group is moving towards the water, demonstrating flawed reasoning influenced by the reversed input order.

Additionally, the model exhibited instances of hallucination in its predictions. An example of this is shown in Figure 3, under Case 4. In this case, when the image pair is presented to the model in the 2nd order, the model hallucinates and claims that the cup in the first image contains less tea compared to the second image. However, upon inspection, it is evident that the quantity of tea in the cup remains unchanged between the two images, highlighting the model's tendency to generate inaccurate and imaginative reasoning in certain scenarios.

4 Conclusion

In this work, we introduced TemporalVQA, a novel benchmark designed to evaluate the temporal understanding and reasoning capabilities of MLLMs. Our comprehensive evaluation across multiple state-of-the-art MLLMs revealed significant limitations in their ability to perform visual temporal reasoning tasks. Even the most advanced models, such as GPT-4o and Gemini-1.5-Pro, struggled to achieve satisfactory performance, with GPT-4o reaching only 65.3% consistent accuracy in temporal order understanding and 70.0% in time-lapse estimation tasks, substantially below human performance of 90.3% and 83.3% respectively.

Our analysis exposed several critical challenges in current MLLMs: (1) high sensitivity to input order and layout, indicating a lack of robust temporal understanding; (2) inconsistent reasoning patterns, where models often provide valid reasoning but arrive at incorrect conclusions; and (3) tendency to derive illogical reasoning and hallucinate when making temporal judgments. These findings suggest that current MLLMs primarily rely on superficial visual cues rather than genuine temporal comprehension.

The significant gap between human and MLLM performance on our benchmark underscores the need for fundamental improvements in how these models process and reason about temporal information. Future work should focus on developing architectures and training methodologies that can better capture temporal relationships and maintain consistency across different input configurations. Our benchmark provides a valuable tool for measuring progress toward this goal and highlights the importance of temporal reasoning capabilities in advancing multimodal AI systems.

Limitations

While our proposed TemporalVQA benchmark provides a valuable resource for evaluating the temporal understanding and reasoning capabilities of MLLMs, it still has some limitations: 1) the size of the dataset is relatively small compared to other large-scale benchmarks in the field. This may limit the generalizability of the findings and to fully reflect the ability of models of temporal reasoning. Expanding the dataset to include a larger and more diverse set of examples could provide a more comprehensive evaluation of MLLMs' temporal capabilities. 2) our benchmark primarily focuses on

two specific tasks: temporal order understanding and time-lapse estimation. While these tasks are essential and crucial for temporal reasoning, more different task formats are needed to capture the full scope of temporal understanding required in real-world applications. Future work could explore additional temporal reasoning tasks, such as event duration estimation, temporal causality, and reasoning over long-term temporal dependencies. 3) our evaluations are limited to a subset of state-of-the-art MLLMs, including GPT-4o and Gemini-1.5-Pro. While these models represent the current state-of-the-art systems, some more sophisticated MLLMs can also be tested.

References

- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. [Qwen-vl: A versatile vision-language model for understanding, localization, text reading, and beyond](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2308.12966.
- Mu Cai, Reuben Tan, Jianrui Zhang, Bocheng Zou, Kai Zhang, Feng Yao, Fangrui Zhu, Jing Gu, Yiwu Zhong, Yuzhang Shang, Yao Dou, Jaden Park, Jianfeng Gao, Yong Jae Lee, and Jianwei Yang. 2024. Temporal-bench: Towards fine-grained temporal understanding for multimodal video models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.10818*.
- Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Muyan Zhong, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, Bin Li, Ping Luo, Tong Lu, Yu Qiao, and Jifeng Dai. 2024. [Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.14238.
- Zheng Chu, Jingchang Chen, Qianglong Chen, Weijiang Yu, Haotian Wang, Ming Liu, and Bing Qin. 2024. [TimeBench: A comprehensive evaluation of temporal reasoning abilities in large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1204–1228, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, and Aiesha Letman et al. 2024. [The llama 3 herd of models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.21783.
- Bahare Fatemi, Mehran Kazemi, Anton Tsitsulin, Karishma Malkan, Jinyeong Yim, John Palowitch, Sungyong Seo, Jonathan Halcrow, and Bryan Perozzi. 2024. [Test of time: A benchmark for evaluating llms on temporal reasoning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.09170.
- Chaoyou Fu, Peixian Chen, Yunhang Shen, Yulei Qin, Mengdan Zhang, Xu Lin, Jinrui Yang, Xiawu Zheng, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Yunsheng Wu, and Rongrong Ji.

2023. [Mme: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for multimodal large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2306.13394.
- Chaoyou Fu, Yuhan Dai, Yondong Luo, Lei Li, Shuhuai Ren, Renrui Zhang, Zihan Wang, Chenyu Zhou, Yunhang Shen, Mengdan Zhang, et al. 2024. [Video-mme: The first-ever comprehensive evaluation benchmark of multi-modal llms in video analysis](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.21075*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring massive multitask language understanding](#). *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Jiaxing Huang and Jingyi Zhang. 2024. [A survey on evaluation of multimodal large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2408.15769.
- Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, et al. 2024. [Gpt-4o system card](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*.
- Bohao Li, Rui Wang, Guangzhi Wang, Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, and Ying Shan. 2023. [Seed-bench: Benchmarking multimodal llms with generative comprehension](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.16125.
- Jian Li, Weiheng Lu, Hao Fei, Meng Luo, Ming Dai, Min Xia, Yizhang Jin, Zhenye Gan, Ding Qi, Chaoyou Fu, Ying Tai, Wankou Yang, Yabiao Wang, and Chengjie Wang. 2024. [A survey on benchmarks of multimodal large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2408.08632.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. 2023a. [Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning](#).
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. 2023b. [Visual instruction tuning](#). In *NeurIPS*.
- Haowei Liu, Xi Zhang, Haiyang Xu, Yaya Shi, Chaoya Jiang, Ming Yan, Ji Zhang, Fei Huang, Chunfeng Yuan, Bing Li, and Weiming Hu. 2024. [Mibench: Evaluating multimodal large language models over multiple images](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2407.15272.
- Li Sun, Liuan Wang, Jun Sun, and Takayuki Okatani. 2024. [Temporal insight enhancement: Mitigating temporal hallucination in multimodal large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2401.09861.
- Gemini Team. 2023. [Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.11805.
- Jonas Wallat, Adam Jatowt, and Avishek Anand. 2024. [Temporal blind spots in large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining, WSDM '24*, page 683–692, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Yuqing Wang and Yun Zhao. 2024. [TRAM: Benchmarking temporal reasoning for large language models](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*, pages 6389–6415, Bangkok, Thailand and virtual meeting. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Guowei Xu, Peng Jin, Hao Li, Yibing Song, Lichao Sun, and Li Yuan. 2024. [Llava-cot: Let vision language models reason step-by-step](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2411.10440.
- Shukang Yin, Chaoyou Fu, Sirui Zhao, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Tong Xu, and Enhong Chen. 2023. [A survey on multimodal large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2306.13549.
- Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoqi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, Cong Wei, Botao Yu, Ruibin Yuan, Renliang Sun, Ming Yin, Boyuan Zheng, Zhenzhu Yang, Yibo Liu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhua Chen. 2023. [Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2311.16502.