

Personalization Toolkit: Training Free Personalization of Large Vision Language Models

Soroush Seifi* Vaggelis Dorovatas Daniel Olmeda Reino Rahaf Aljundi

Toyota Motor Europe

Hoge Wei 33B, 1930, Zaventem, Belgium

{firstname.lastname}@toyota-europe.com

Abstract

Large Vision Language Models (LVLMs) have significant potential to deliver personalized assistance by adapting to individual users' unique needs and preferences. Personalization of LVLMs is an emerging area that involves customizing models to recognize specific object instances and provide tailored responses. However, existing approaches rely on time-consuming test-time training for each user and object, rendering them impractical. This paper proposes a novel, training-free approach to LVLM personalization by leveraging pre-trained vision foundation models to extract distinct features, retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) techniques to recognize instances in the visual input, and visual prompting methods. Our model-agnostic vision toolkit enables flexible and efficient personalization without extensive retraining. We demonstrate state-of-the-art results, outperforming conventional training-based approaches and establish a new standard for LVLM personalization.

1. Introduction

Large Vision Language Models (LVLMs) [1, 7, 19, 21, 22, 35, 40] have demonstrated impressive capabilities in reasoning about visual content and answering visual questions across various domains. This suggests a great potential for deployment as visual assistants that can aid users in their daily

lives. However, current LVLMs are designed to provide generic, user-independent responses and recognize objects at the category level. This limits their ability to refer to specific instances of categories by their unique names. Figure 1 shows an example of LVLM generic inference - i.e. giving a generic response to a user query.

The task of personalizing vision-language models was recently introduced by [2] to enable LVLMs recognize specific object instances and answer relevant questions accordingly. However, existing approaches [2, 25] rely on training for a specific personalized object, which can be computationally expensive and limit the model's ability to incrementally learn new personalized concepts.

In this work, we build upon the strengths of pre-trained vision foundation models, the emerging capabilities of LLMs in in-context learning [9] and retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) [16]. Our training-free approach localizes instances using open-world object detectors [15, 24, 26] and stores reference instance-level features in memory banks, alongside their name and context. During inference, our retrieval module queries the memory bank and visual-prompts the LVLM. Storing only the feature embeddings additionally allows avoiding privacy concerns derived from training on user images. An overview of our approach is shown in Figure 1.

Our approach is evaluated using a video personalization dataset, converted to an LVLM personalization format, and further augmented with a chal-

*Providing contracted services for Toyota. E-mail address: soroush.seifi@external.toyota-europe.com




Figure 1. **Illustration of the personalization task and our PeKit.** A reference image is introduced to the LVLMM with information and possible context. The LVLMM should later be able to answer questions about the introduced object using only the name of the object in the query. Our approach, PeKit, extracts patch-level features from the reference image and stores them in a memory module, \mathcal{M} . During personalized inference, our retrieval module, \mathcal{R} , queries \mathcal{M} to detect the object. PeKit then informs the LVLMM via a visual prompt, providing the name and possible context.

lenging evaluation set, which reflects a realistic personalization scenario and highlights the difficulty of the personalization task. It also shows the effectiveness of patch-level features for robust instance personalization. We also discuss the limitations of existing benchmark datasets and highlight opportunities for future research.

Our contributions are as follows: 1) We demonstrate that LVLMM personalization can be achieved without extensive training, enabling fast and efficient deployment. 2) We propose a flexible approach that leverages pre-trained vision foundation models, RAG, and visual prompting to personalize any LVLMM. 3) We achieve state-of-the-art results on three personalization benchmarks, outperforming existing approaches. 4) We create a challenging evaluation set that pushes the limits of existing approaches and highlights opportunities for future research.

In the following we discuss the related work in Section 2 and present our vision toolkit for LVLMMs personalization in Section 3, evaluate our approach in Section 4 and conclude in Section 5.

2. Related Work

Personalization of Large Language Models The personalization of large language models [39] has been a significant research area, focusing on en-

hancing user-specific interactions without extensive fine-tuning. Various approaches have emerged, including prompt tuning, in-context learning, and fine-tuning, which have shown their importance for adaptability [20]. Notably, methods like in-context learning [4] and Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) offer feasible solutions for dynamic personalization without extensive model storage, as suggested in [41]. Similarly, our approach avoids storing new models or adapters for each new concept while being training-free.

Text-to-Image Personalization Personalizing text-to-image generation has been explored extensively, with early methods like Textual Inversion [10], Dreambooth [30], and HyperDreamVbooth [31] requiring training for each identity, leading to scalability issues. Recent approaches, such as InstantBooth [32], JeDi [38], and Imagine [13], avoid test-time fine-tuning by pretraining for personalization. However, we argue that in contrast to personalized image generation, which requires training, vision-language model personalization could be achieved without changing the large language model.

Large Vision Language Models Personalization The task of personalized vision language models was introduced in MyVLM [2] by training a concept head for specific objects on top of the CLIP

cls token. In a similar fashion as Dreambooth [30], MyVLM employs rare tokens to encode personalized concepts. This may have unintended consequences for language assistants, and requires optimizing the LLM caption loss for personalized conversations. YoLLaVA [25] adds an extra token to the LLM head for each personalized object, learning concept tokens to describe them. Although it surpasses MyVLM in performance, the additional tokens create a challenging incremental classification problem [8]. Both models need test-time training for each new concept, limiting them to personalizing one concept at a time. A concurrent work [12] eliminates test-time training by large-scale pretraining on personalized conversations, but uses a reference image closest to the query input in CLIP’s *cls* space, which may limit processing multiple images and hinder in-context learning. Our approach is the first training-free personalization solution, featuring a modular, plug-and-play design that eliminates the need for retraining or adaptation.

Vision Foundation Models. Our approach leverages vision foundation models, which have advanced through large-scale pretraining to become powerful generalist models for various tasks [3]. Vision-language models like CLIP [28] and Align [14] map objects to higher-level semantics using contrastive pretraining. In contrast, self-supervised models like DINO [6, 26] detect variations among subjects within the same class, fostering recognition of distinct characteristics. Grounding DINO [24] redefines object detection as phrase grounding, and SAM [15] excels in image segmentation with large-scale training.

Visual Prompting Visual prompting uses visual cues such as bounding boxes or arrows to guide Vision-Language Models. CLIP [27] interprets these marks to modify its *cls* token embedding accordingly [33]. Set of Mark Prompting [36] integrates GPT-4V with visual prompts using tools like MaskDINO [18], SAM [15], Semantic SAM [17], and SEEM [42]. ViPLLaVA [5] enhances LLaVA [22] to follow visual prompts by tuning on GPT-4V-labeled data. Contrastive Region Grounding (CRG) [34] improves LLaVA’s focus on objects by contrasting token probabilities

with and without target object masking. Our experiments show that LLaVA and other LVLMs can describe objects accurately with proper instruction and context. Training-free methods like CRG [34] can further enhance attention if needed.

3. Approach

This section outlines our personalization toolkit coined as *PeKit* for enabling any LVLM to perform personalized object detection and answer generation. We employ a three-stage pipeline: **View Extraction** to extract robust object-level features from reference images and store them in a memory module, **Personalized Objects Retrieval** to identify objects in the query image, and **Personalized Answer Generation** via visual prompting. We refer to Fig 1 for an illustration of our approach.

3.1. Preliminary

We consider a set P of all personalized objects introduced to a given LVLM. Each object $p \in P$ is associated with a set of reference images $\{I_p\}$. Our objective is to generate a personalized response for all images containing p during inference, while producing a general caption for any other image that does not contain any of the personalized objects. The LVLM, e.g., LLaVA [22] typically takes as input an image I_p , a text query Q and additional text as context or instruction.

3.2. Training-free View Extraction

Existing LVLM personalization techniques depend on image-level representations of the objects’ training views [2, 25], which can lead to overfitting to the background of each object in the reference images, particularly for training-based approaches. To avoid such a bias, our method localizes the object in the image and extracts only its corresponding features. We achieve this by utilizing an open-vocabulary segmentation network F_{ext} to extract object-level masks S_p based on each object’s semantic category k_p

$$S_p = F_{\text{ext}}(I_p, k_p). \quad (1)$$

We construct the average embedding vector e_p for object p by average pooling of the embedding

vectors produced by the image encoder F_{emb} on the image I_p over the region defined by the object-level mask S_p :

$$\mathbf{e}_p = \text{AvgPool}(F_{\text{emb}}(I_p), S_p) \in \mathbb{R}^{D_h}. \quad (2)$$

Considering N reference images, we concatenate all object embedding vectors \mathbf{e}_p^i (of the object p pooled over the i -th reference image I_p^i) into a matrix $E_p = [\mathbf{e}_p^1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_p^N] \in \mathbb{R}^{D_h \times N}$.

Memory module. The memory module is represented by a set \mathcal{M} of object-specific entries:

$$\mathcal{M} = \{(E_p, (n_p, c_p))\}_{p \in P}, \quad (3)$$

where n_p is the identifier or the name of the personalized object p , and c_p is the context of the object, which can contain prior knowledge such as characteristics, background story or even relation to other personalized objects. When the number of personalized objects scales, the memory module \mathcal{M} is easily converted into a Vector database, where nearest neighbor approximate search is deployed to retrieve instances matching a given query [11] ensuring the efficiency and scalability of our approach.

3.3. Personalized Object Retrieval

During inference, our goal is to determine whether a personalized object is present in the provided image I . We use any available object proposal technique F_{prop} to generate a set of proposals (e.g., bounding boxes) $O = \{o_i\}_i = F_{\text{prop}}(I)$ for potential object occurrences within the image I . Then for each proposal o_i , we calculate its object-level average embedding vector:

$$\mathbf{e}_{o_i} = \text{AvgPool}(F_{\text{emb}}(I), o_i). \quad (4)$$

We define the retrieval module \mathcal{R} that takes an object embedding vector \mathbf{e}_{o_i} and retrieves the memory entry $(E_j, (n_j, c_j))$ for some matching object j , matrix E_j of which contains the most similar to \mathbf{e}_{o_i} embedding (among all other entries) and $\max(\text{sim}(E_j, \mathbf{e}_{o_i})) = \max_{l=1, \dots, N} (\text{sim}(\mathbf{e}_j^l, \mathbf{e}_{o_i})) > \tau$. Any similarity measure (e.g., cosine similarity) can be employed for this purpose. We set a constant threshold τ to identify the personalized objects. We discard the

object proposals in which no matching object is found by the retrieval module \mathcal{R} .

Our method inherently supports the detection of multiple personalized objects (Fig 2, 3rd and 4th sub-figures) within the same image.

3.4. Personalized Answer Generation

Once a personalized object is identified, our method generates captions specifically about that object, distinct from general captions a standard LVLM would produce. This involves emphasizing the detected object and incorporating prior knowledge about it. We achieve this through visual prompting by overlaying bounding boxes on the image and querying the LVLM to generate captions or answer questions focused on these objects. We use distinctive colors to differentiate recognized objects. Figure 2 illustrates how the LVLM responds to the overlaid bounding box and our instruction differently from the default response on the raw image. We provide the LVLM with the object identifier n_j (e.g., the instance name) and possibly a context c_j for each personalized object. The LVLM incorporates this context and responds to queries using the given name n_j . For multiple personalized objects, we instruct the LVLM for each bounding box, name, and context. We refer to the Appendix for the exact prompt format used in this work. Generating answers using a context pool with varied information (e.g., monument history) is inherently supported by our method.

3.5. Choice of Vision Tools

In the remainder, we provide results using GroundedSAM [29] as the open-vocabulary segmentation network F_{ext} . We further ablate our method by using GroundingDINO [24] instead, where the mask is represented by the object’s bounding box. We use DINOv2 [26] as the image encoder F_{emb} to extract patch-level features of the personalized objects. Image encoders trained with a self-supervised objective, such as DINOv2, produce distinctive features that improve the re-identification of personalized objects. In the Appendix, we compare the use of DINOv2 to CLIP [27]. During deployment, Ground-




Figure 2. **Visual Prompting:** Top text: VLM’s general caption for the image. Bottom text (in bold): VLM’s captions when prompted to describe the objects within the bounding box. Our method detects multiple objects and directs VLM’s attention by overlaying the image with bounding boxes. The method is invariant to bounding box color. Captions are generated with LLaVA [23].

ingDINO [24] is used to extract object bounding boxes of known categories in the image.

3.6. Summary

To summarize our approach, there are two phases
Personalized object introduction: The user introduces first time an object to the LVLM with one or more reference images, name, and context. We extract robust patch-level features and store the object in our memory module \mathcal{M} as $(E_i, (n_i, c_i))$.
Personalized Inference: Given an image and a question Q , we extract object proposals and query our retrieval module \mathcal{R} with the bounding box features. If a match is found $(E_i, (n_i, c_i))$, we highlight the bounding box in the query image with a unique color and instruct the LVLM to respond using (n_j, c_j) . If no match is found, the LVLM responds without further instructions.

4. Experiments

This section evaluates our approach against existing methods for vision language personalization.

Datasets. We consider the datasets from **Yo’LLaVA** [25] and **MyVLM** [2]. Yo’LLaVA includes 40 categories of objects, buildings, and people, with 4–10 images per category for training and validation. MyVLM comprises 29 object categories, each with 7–17 images, using 4 images for training and the rest for validation, with final accuracies averaged over 5 runs. For both datasets, we use only the reference images and each object’s

semantic category for training-view extraction (see 3.2), discarding all other data like ground-truth captions and negative images.

This-Is-My-Img Dataset Yo’LLaVA and MyVLM datasets are simple and object-centric, lacking real-world complexity. To address this, we propose a new evaluation set for LVLM personalization based on *This-Is-My* dataset [37], originally created for video-level detection of personalized instances. It consists of YouTube video segments divided into training/validation, reflecting real-world scenarios where objects may be partially visible or in the background.

To make this dataset compatible with image-level training/evaluation, we process it as follows: We extract five reference frames per object from the training segments, ensuring the entire object is visible. For validation, we sample every 10th frame¹. Validation frames are categorized into: **Positives** (frames containing the personalized object) and **Negatives** (frames from the same validation segments where the object is not visible). Additionally, we introduce a **Fake Positives** validation set by generating images similar to the training frames with varied perspectives and environments using ChatGPT-4o (see Figure 3 for examples). Our evaluation set challenges LVLM personalization methods with images containing multi-

¹Due to privacy concerns, some original video segments are unavailable, limiting our benchmark to 14 categories. See the Appendix for more details.




Figure 3. **Our new evaluation set This-Is-My-Img based on This-Is-My dataset [37]** : Training and validation sets examples for the category *Reynard's Work Chair*.

ple foreground objects, background elements, some blurring, and synthetic images².

Implementation Details. Our method is generic regarding the choice of the LVLM model. We use LLaVA 1.6 with Mistral 7B [23] as our primary LVLM model. For view extraction, we use PeKit with G-SAM [29] as the default choice and report G-DINO [29] for comparison. We utilize Cosine Similarity with a constant threshold of $\tau=0.75$ for detecting personalized objects across all datasets (3.3). Refer to the Appendix for further details and results with object-specific thresholds using reference image similarity. We also report the compute and memory overhead of our personalization toolkit compared to the LVLM in the Appendix.

Evaluation Metrics. We follow the pipeline and notation of Yo'LLaVA [25] and MyVLM [2], reporting **Positive Accuracy** (Recall), **Negative Accuracy** (Specificity) and **Weighted Accuracy**³ for n personalized objects. We further report **Precision** for a more comprehensive evaluation recognizing the trade-off between the aforementioned metrics and precision. We refer to the Appendix for more details on the metrics.

4.1. Visual-Recognition

Table 1 presents the performance of our approach compared to current methods, MyVLM [2] and Yo'LLaVA [25], on their respective datasets. On MyVLM dataset, our method PeKit achieves SOTA

MyVLM Dataset				
Method/Metric	Precision	Accuracy		
		Positive	Negative	Weighted
MyVLM [2]	-	96.6	90.9	93.8
Yo' LLaVA [25]	-	97.0	95.7	96.4
PeKit (G-DINO)	79.1	94.3	98.8	96.55
PeKit (G-SAM)	82.3	97.6	99	98.3
Yo' LLaVA Dataset				
Yo' LLaVA [25]	-	94.9	89.8	92.4
PeKit (G-DINO)	77	89.9	98.9	94.4
PeKit (G-SAM)	74.8	91	98.7	94.9

Table 1. Visual Recognition performance on MyVLM and YoLLaVA datasets. Our approach PeKit achieves state of the art performance and improves significantly over existing methods.

This-Is-My-Img Dataset					
Method/Metric	Precision	Accuracy			
		Positive	Negative	Fake	Avg
MyVLM	8.0	88.1	4.7	54.2	49
PeKit	90.1	69.0	96.0	59.3	74.8

Table 2. Visual Recognition Accuracy (%) on This-Is-My-Img dataset. MyVLM tends to capture the dataset's bias and produces many false positives when the images are taken from similar scenes regardless of the object's presence. PeKit is more robust improving accuracy on average by $\sim 25\%$.

results, improving both positive and negative accuracy, with an average improvement of 1.9%. On Yo'LLaVA dataset, our method significantly improves negative accuracy by 8.9% while having a lower positive accuracy than Yo'LLaVA [25], resulting in an average improvement of 2.5% on weighted accuracy, hence achieving best results on average. Our PeKit might miss a few challenging appearances of personalized objects but has a very low false positive rate, meaning we avoid incorrect

²This-Is-My-Img will be made publicly available.

³We have used the same metric namings as previous work for consistency reasons. However, we believe the correct name for such metrics should be Recall, Specificity and their average.

recognition of personalized objects. We believe it is better to resort to generic captions than to provide incorrect personalized answers.

Next, we examine the performance on our introduced benchmark This-Is-My-Img. Table 2 reports the recognition accuracy compared to MyVLM [2]. Yo’LLaVA’s [25] final code was not available in time for this paper. MyVLM tends to provide positive responses to test images, resulting in very high positive accuracy but very low negative accuracy (< 5%). This indicates that MyVLM learns the scene in which the object occurs rather than the specific object, due to training on the CLIP cls token with limited training views (5). Note that we followed exactly the training pipeline and requirements for positive and negative images of MyVLM. Our PeKit shows striking robustness and balanced behavior on both positive and negative accuracy. Moreover, the high negative accuracy achieved by PeKit compared to MyVLM highlights the advantages of patch-level over image-level features.

Even on the challenging fake images, our method better identifies instances of personalized objects compared to MyVLM, achieving a 5% improvement. The fake images sometimes contain very similar objects to the personalized object in terms of style, resulting in confusion by the methods, indicating room for future work. Overall, this evaluation set illustrates the difficulty of the personalization task beyond object-centric images, moving closer to realistic scenarios for intelligent visual assistants. This opens the door for future research on this challenging benchmark.

4.2. Visual-Question Answering

We evaluate our method’s ability to answer questions about personalized objects using the Yo’LLaVA benchmark [25]. This VQA benchmark includes 171 multiple choice questions (A/B) designed to assess a method’s understanding of the visual appearance of personalized objects, their relationship to their environment, and reasoning about them. Table 3 compares our results with those from Yo’LLaVA. We also added the best results of GPT4+Prompt and LLaVA+Prompt from Yo’LLaVA [25] with human-engineered prompts.

Our PeKit outperforms Yo’LLaVA without re-

quiring training, special tokens, or modifications to the original LVLM. PeKit performs on par with the GPT4 + human prompts. Additionally, because our method localizes the personalized object within the image precisely, it does not suffer from performance degradation with increasing token length, unlike Yo’LLaVA.

Method	VQA Accuracy
GPT-4V + Prompt [25]	93.6
LLaVA [25]	89.9
LLaVA + Prompt [25]	92.5
Yo’LLaVA [25]	92.9
PeKit (LLaVA)	93.4
PeKit (InternVL)	95.9

Table 3. Visual Question Answering Accuracy (%) on YoLLaVA. PeKit achieves SOTA performance and improves over GPT-4V, showing the strength of open source foundation model when integrated correctly in PeKit.

4.3. Ablations and Analysis

Choice of F_{ext} . Our method employs an open-vocabulary approach to localize personalized objects in reference images. In Table 1, we ablate the choice of an open-world object detector, G-DINO [24], compared to the open-world semantic segmentation model, G-SAM [29], for F_{ext} in Eq. 1. The results show that our method outperforms previous methods in both cases. However, the more precise segmentation model, which extracts only patches of the object of interest, achieves the best accuracy on average. This improvement is more pronounced on the MyVLM dataset, where objects are less centered in the training views compared to the Yo’LLaVA dataset.

Other LVLM. The modularity of our method allows for straightforward plug-and-play integration with any LVLM without tuning. We pair PeKit with InternVL2-26B [7], a state-of-the-art LVLM. Table 3 shows VQA accuracy on the Yo’LLaVA dataset for PeKit with LLaVA [21] and InternVL [7]. With both backbones, our approach achieves SOTA results. The improved quality of InternVL [7] significantly boosts VQA accuracy, increasing the margin over GPT4V + human prompts.




Figure 4. **Qualitative Results:** Comparison of our training-free method with original LLaVA captions. Right: Our method detects personalized objects and integrates prior knowledge in caption generation. Left: While the original model struggles with specific questions about named objects, our method easily identifies the referred object.

Number of Reference Images. Since our approach doesn't require a training phase, a key question is how many reference images are needed for robust visual recognition of personalized objects. Figure 5 shows that our method performs well with just one reference image and matches state-of-the-art performance with two images on MyVLM dataset. On Yo'LLaVa dataset, we achieve comparable performance to Yo'LLaVa [25] with only three images, even though the full set includes up to 10 images for some objects.




Figure 5. Average weighted visual recognition accuracy as a function of number of reference images. Increasing the number of reference images improves performance, but PeKit is robust with just one reference image.

Qualitative Results Figure 4 shows examples of our PeKit compared to the base LLaVA [23] model on VQA and personalized captioning tasks. When

LLaVA doesn't recognize an object from the given name in the query, it guesses, leading to hallucinations or incorrect statements. In contrast, PeKit accurately identifies objects and uses in-context information to guide LLaVA in answering questions or providing details about the image, successfully incorporating in-context information and object appearance in the image. While more advanced prompting or personalized response examples could improve PeKit, we chose simplicity and standard design, leaving such enhancements for future work.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

In this work, we leverage vision foundation models combined with retrieval-augmented generation and visual prompting to build a training-free plug-and-play toolkit for the task of LVLm personalization called PeKit. We first show that our approach can surpass existing training-based methods while not requiring any tuning and not relying on any additional images other than those used to introduce the personalized concept. We further present a challenging benchmark that mimics more realistic scenarios and increases the complexity of the visual recognition challenge. While our approach shows robustness, there is room for improvement in future works. We believe that our PeKit is a strong baseline that future, more sophisticated methods should surpass to justify any extra training or tuning of the PeKit.

References

- [1] Pravesh Agrawal, Szymon Antoniak, Emma Bou Hanna, Baptiste Bout, Devendra Chaplot, Jessica Chudnovsky, Diogo Costa, Baudouin De Monicault, Saurabh Garg, Theophile Gervet, Soham Ghosh, Amélie Héliou, Paul Jacob, Albert Q. Jiang, Kartik Khandelwal, Timothée Lacroix, Guillaume Lample, Diego Las Casas, Thibaut Lavril, Teven Le Scao, Andy Lo, William Marshall, Louis Martin, Arthur Mensch, Pavankumar Muddireddy, Valera Nemychnikova, Marie Pellat, Patrick Von Platen, Nikhil Raghuraman, Baptiste Rozière, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Lucile Saulnier, Romain Sauvestre, Wendy Shang, Roman Soletskyi, Lawrence Stewart, Pierre Stock, Joachim Studnia, Sandeep Subramanian, Sagar Vaze, Thomas Wang, and Sophia Yang. Pixtral 12b, 2024. [1](#)
- [2] Yuval Alaluf, Elad Richardson, Sergey Tulyakov, Kfir Aberman, and Daniel Cohen-Or. Myvlm: Personalizing vlms for user-specific queries. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14599*, 2024. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [3] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*, 2021. [3](#)
- [4] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. [2](#)
- [5] Mu Cai, Haotian Liu, Siva Karthik Mustikovela, Gregory P Meyer, Yuning Chai, Dennis Park, and Yong Jae Lee. Vip-llava: Making large multi-modal models understand arbitrary visual prompts. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12914–12923, 2024. [3](#)
- [6] Mathilde Caron, Hugo Touvron, Ishan Misra, Hervé Jégou, Julien Mairal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Emerging properties in self-supervised vision transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 9650–9660, 2021. [3](#)
- [7] Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Muyan Zhong, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 24185–24198, 2024. [1](#), [7](#)
- [8] Matthias De Lange, Rahaf Aljundi, Marc Masana, Sarah Parisot, Xu Jia, Aleš Leonardis, Gregory Slabaugh, and Tinne Tuytelaars. A continual learning survey: Defying forgetting in classification tasks. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 44(7):3366–3385, 2021. [3](#)
- [9] Qingxiu Dong, Lei Li, Damai Dai, Ce Zheng, Jingyuan Ma, Rui Li, Heming Xia, Jingjing Xu, Zhiyong Wu, Baobao Chang, et al. A survey on in-context learning. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1107–1128, 2024. [1](#)
- [10] Rinon Gal, Yuval Alaluf, Yuval Atzmon, Or Patashnik, Amit H Bermano, Gal Chechik, and Daniel Cohen-Or. An image is worth one word: Personalizing text-to-image generation using textual inversion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.01618*, 2022. [2](#)
- [11] Yikun Han, Chunjiang Liu, and Pengfei Wang. A comprehensive survey on vector database: Storage and retrieval technique, challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11703*, 2023. [4](#)
- [12] Haoran Hao, Jiaming Han, Changsheng Li, Yufeng Li, and Xiangyu Yue. Remember, retrieve and generate: Understanding infinite visual concepts as your personalized assistant, 2024. [3](#)
- [13] Zecheng He, Bo Sun, Felix Juefei-Xu, Haoyu Ma, Ankit Ramchandani, Vincent Cheung, Siddharth Shah, Anmol Kalia, Harihar Subramanyam, Alireza Zareian, et al. Imagine yourself: Tuning-free personalized image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.13346*, 2024. [2](#)
- [14] Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4904–4916. PMLR, 2021. [3](#)

- [15] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, et al. Segment anything. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4015–4026, 2023. 1, 3
- [16] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474, 2020. 1
- [17] Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Peize Sun, Xueyan Zou, Shilong Liu, Jianwei Yang, Chunyuan Li, Lei Zhang, and Jianfeng Gao. Semantic-sam: Segment and recognize anything at any granularity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04767*, 2023. 3
- [18] Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Huaizhe Xu, Shilong Liu, Lei Zhang, Lionel M Ni, and Heung-Yeung Shum. Mask dino: Towards a unified transformer-based framework for object detection and segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3041–3050, 2023. 3
- [19] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR, 2023. 1
- [20] Xiaoxi Li, Jiajie Jin, Yujia Zhou, Yuyao Zhang, Peitian Zhang, Yutao Zhu, and Zhicheng Dou. From matching to generation: A survey on generative information retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14851*, 2024. 2
- [21] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 26296–26306, 2023. 1, 7
- [22] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2023. 1, 3
- [23] 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. 5, 6, 8
- [24] Shilong Liu, Zhaoyang Zeng, Tianhe Ren, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Jie Yang, Qing Jiang, Chunyuan Li, Jianwei Yang, Hang Su, et al. Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for open-set object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05499*, 2023. 1, 3, 4, 5, 7
- [25] Thao Nguyen, Haotian Liu, Yuheng Li, Mu Cai, Utkarsh Ojha, and Yong Jae Lee. Yo’llava: Your personalized language and vision assistant. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09400*, 2024. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8
- [26] Maxime Oquab, Timothée Darcet, Théo Moutakanni, Huy Vo, Marc Szafraniec, Vasil Khalidov, Pierre Fernandez, Daniel Haziza, Francisco Massa, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, et al. Dinov2: Learning robust visual features without supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07193*, 2023. 1, 3, 4
- [27] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 3, 4
- [28] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 3
- [29] Tianhe Ren, Shilong Liu, Ailing Zeng, Jing Lin, Kunchang Li, He Cao, Jiayu Chen, Xinyu Huang, Yukang Chen, Feng Yan, et al. Grounded sam: Assembling open-world models for diverse visual tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14159*, 2024. 4, 6, 7
- [30] Nataniel Ruiz, Yuanzhen Li, Varun Jampani, Yael Pritch, Michael Rubinstein, and Kfir Aberman. Dreambooth: Fine tuning text-to-image diffusion models for subject-driven generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 22500–22510, 2023. 2, 3
- [31] Nataniel Ruiz, Yuanzhen Li, Varun Jampani, Wei Wei, Tingbo Hou, Yael Pritch, Neal Wadhwa, Michael Rubinstein, and Kfir Aberman. Hyperdreambooth: Hypernetworks for fast personalization of text-to-image models. In *Proceedings of*

- the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6527–6536, 2024. [2](#)
- [32] Jing Shi, Wei Xiong, Zhe Lin, and Hyun Joon Jung. Instantbooth: Personalized text-to-image generation without test-time finetuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8543–8552, 2024. [2](#)
- [33] Aleksandar Shtedritski, Christian Rupprecht, and Andrea Vedaldi. What does clip know about a red circle? visual prompt engineering for vlms. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 11987–11997, 2023. [3](#)
- [34] David Wan, Jaemin Cho, Elias Stengel-Eskin, and Mohit Bansal. Contrastive region guidance: Improving grounding in vision-language models without training. In *ECCV*, 2024. [3](#)
- [35] Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, et al. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*, 2024. [1](#)
- [36] Jianwei Yang, Hao Zhang, Feng Li, Xueyan Zou, Chunyuan Li, and Jianfeng Gao. Set-of-mark prompting unleashes extraordinary visual grounding in gpt-4v. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11441*, 2023. [3](#)
- [37] Chun-Hsiao Yeh, Bryan Russell, Josef Sivic, Fabian Caba Heilbron, and Simon Jenni. Meta-personalizing vision-language models to find named instances in video. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 19123–19132, 2023. [5](#), [6](#)
- [38] Yu Zeng, Vishal M Patel, Haochen Wang, Xun Huang, Ting-Chun Wang, Ming-Yu Liu, and Yogesh Balaji. Jedi: Joint-image diffusion models for finetuning-free personalized text-to-image generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6786–6795, 2024. [2](#)
- [39] Zhehao Zhang, Ryan A. Rossi, Branislav Kveton, Yijia Shao, Diyi Yang, Hamed Zamani, Franck Dernoncourt, Joe Barrow, Tong Yu, Sungchul Kim, Ruiyi Zhang, Jiuxiang Gu, Tyler Derr, Hongjie Chen, Junda Wu, Xiang Chen, Zichao Wang, Subrata Mitra, Nedim Lipka, Nesreen Ahmed, and Yu Wang. Personalization of large language models: A survey, 2024. [2](#)
- [40] 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](#)
- [41] Thomas P. Zollo, Andrew Wei Tung Siah, Naimeng Ye, Ang Li, and Hongseok Namkoong. Personal-llm: Tailoring llms to individual preferences, 2024. [2](#)
- [42] Xueyan Zou, Jianwei Yang, Hao Zhang, Feng Li, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Lijuan Wang, Jianfeng Gao, and Yong Jae Lee. Segment everything everywhere all at once. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. [3](#)