

Bridging Writing Manner Gap in Visual Instruction Tuning by Creating LLM-aligned Instructions

Dong Jing, Nanyi Fei, Zhiwu Lu[†]

Gaoling School of Artificial Intelligence, Renmin University of China

{jingdong98, luzhiwu}@ruc.edu.cn

Abstract—In the realm of Large Multi-modal Models (LMMs), the instruction quality during the visual instruction tuning stage significantly influences the performance of modality alignment. In this paper, we assess the instruction quality from a unique perspective termed **Writing Manner**, which encompasses the selection of vocabulary, grammar and sentence structure to convey specific semantics. We argue that there exists a substantial writing manner gap between the visual instructions and the base Large Language Models (LLMs) within LMMs. This gap forces the pre-trained base LLMs to deviate from their original writing styles, leading to capability degradation of both base LLMs and LMMs. To bridge the writing manner gap while preserving the original semantics, we propose directly leveraging the base LLM to align the writing manner of soft-format visual instructions with that of the base LLM itself, resulting in novel LLM-aligned instructions. The manual writing manner evaluation results demonstrate that our approach successfully minimizes the writing manner gap. By utilizing LLM-aligned instructions, the baseline models LLaVA-7B and QwenVL demonstrate enhanced resistance to hallucinations and non-trivial comprehensive improvements across all 15 visual and language benchmarks.

Index Terms—visual languages, image analysis, data processing

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent visual-aligned Large Multi-modal Models (LMMs) like MiniGPT4 [1] and LLaVA [2] have shown impressive capabilities in instruction-following and visual reasoning. Most LMMs are built upon pre-trained Large Language Models (LLMs) and typically undergo a two-stage training process. The pre-training stage establishes initial image-text alignment by training the LMM on large-scale image-text pairs, while the post-training stage—including visual instruction tuning and reinforcement-learning alignment [3], [4]—better aligns LMMs with human intent. During the visual instruction tuning stage, the pre-trained LLM within the LMM is unlocked to participate in training, facilitating a faster and more thorough alignment of modalities. Consequently, visual instructions play a crucial role in shaping the capabilities of both the LMM and its underlying LLM, making the quality of these instructions critical for developing robust and powerful LMMs.

To enhance instructions, there are many efforts worked on building novel high-quality instruction datasets [5] or correcting factual errors in existing datasets [6], [7]. In this paper, different from them, we focus on assessing the instruction quality from a unique perspective called **Writing**




Fig. 1: The instance of word-level and sentence-level writing manner gap.

Manner. The writing manner refers to the specific habits of vocabulary selection, grammar usage, and sentence structuring used to express particular semantics. We highlight a long-overlooked issue: there exists a severe **Writing Manner Gap** between the visual instructions and the inner pre-trained LLM, undermining the efficacy of LMMs.

In Figure 1, we present the instance of writing manner gap at both the word and sentence levels for illustration. Pre-trained LLM has its own unique writing style preferences, which are explicitly expressed in output probabilities of candidate tokens when generating new token. The word-level gap arises when there are candidate words with similar meaning but higher probabilities than the labeled word. Since LMMs are token-by-token probability predictors, the accumulation of word-level gap leads to the sentence-level gap, which is reflected in aspects of phrase, grammar, and sentence structure. During the visual instruction tuning phase, the writing manner gap forces the LLM to change its original writing style, which may cause performance degradation or even catastrophic forgetting. Therefore, to maintain the LLM performance and further build the robust LMM, it is essential to minimize the writing manner gap between the LLM and training instructions.

In this paper, we propose a simple yet effective instruction processing approach to address this problem, as illustrated in Figure 2. We leverage the pre-trained LLM within LMM to align the writing manner of soft-format visual instructions with that of the LLM itself, under the promise of keeping

This work was completed in November 2023.

[†] Corresponding Author




Fig. 2: The brief diagram of our LLM-aligned trainset construction.

the original semantics of these instructions unchanged. Soft-format visual instructions refer to open-ended question-answer pairs characterized by a high degree of freedom in textual expression, offering ample opportunities for adjustments and improvements. Specifically, the answer part of soft-format visual instructions is first rewritten by the inner LLM to match its writing manner, and then reviewed by the inner LLM to ensure the alignment of writing manner is completed while preserving the original meaning. If the revised answer is deemed unqualified during the review, the original answer is retained. By combining these writing manner-aligned visual instructions with other remaining instructions, the proposed LLM-aligned trainset is created.

We adopt well-known LLaVA-1.5 [8] along with its trainset and QwenVL [9] as baseline models and trainset. We design a human assessment procedure regard writing manner, and corresponding results demonstrate that our approach successfully realizes writing manner alignment. By utilizing our LLM-aligned trainset, both LLaVA-7B and QwenVL achieve non-trivial comprehensive improvements across 15 visual and language benchmarks. Furthermore, careful cross-evaluation and ablation studies confirm that most improvements are brought by writing manner alignment rather than instruction revision.

Our contribution is three-folds: **1)** To our knowledge, we are the first to identify the problem of writing manner gap between training instructions and pre-trained LLMs within LMMs. **2)** Without introducing any external data or models, we leverage the inner LLM of LMM to reduce writing manner gap by rewriting and reviewing soft-format visual instructions. **3)** Extensive experiments based on LLaVA-1.5 and QwenVL demonstrate the importance of reducing writing manner gap and the effectiveness of our approach.

II. RELATED WORK

Various approaches have been proposed using traditional small models, such as detectors and OCR tools, to reduce factual errors and visual hallucinations or to create specialized visual instructions [10]–[12]. For example, HalluciDoctor [7] designed a cross-checking paradigm to cut down visual hallucinations, while LURE [13] evaluated underlying hallucinations based on co-occurrence, uncertainty and object position, and reconstructs less hallucinatory descriptions. Another strategy related to ours leverages LLMs or LMMs to improve existing instructions. In vision-language representation domain, LaCLIP [14] and VeCLIP [15] employed LLMs to rewrite or

amalgamate image captions to enhance CLIP training. Additionally, some methods [16], [17] utilized powerful external LLMs or LMMs to clean or synthesize visual instructions.

In this paper, we focus on reducing the writing manner gap by rewriting visual instructions with the inner LLM of LMM. Considering that our method ensures the original semantics remain unchanged, the proposed method complements other data augmentation and enhancement approaches.

III. THE PROBLEM OF WRITING MANNER GAP

A. Cause

The writing manner refers to the manifestation of writing style in terms of vocabulary, grammar, sentence structures, and other stylistic choices used to express particular semantics.

The writing manner of LLM is typically shaped during its post-training process, heavily influenced by the data and training methods used in this phase. Different LLMs often exhibit distinct writing manners, which are mainly reflected in the following two aspects. On one hand, when express particular meanings, LLMs perform differently in using vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, and many other aspects. On the other hand, given the same input context, responses generated by different LLMs may differ in semantic, length, writing level and so on. A straightforward example is that some LLMs provide concise answers, while others are more verbose.

Therefore, when selecting a particular LLM to build the LMM, the inherent output characteristics of the LLM should not be overlooked. However, existing strategies of multi-modal instruction trainset construction have not taken the above LLM properties into account. Typically, the visual instruction datasets primarily originate from three sources: expert manual annotation; generation by advanced LLMs based on visual-related textual information; and the collection of outputs from LMMs. Researchers directly employ the mixture of these data to directly train various kinds of LMMs, leading to an evident conflict between the writing manner of the training data and the inner LLM.

B. Impact

During the visual instruction tuning stage, most LMMs facilitate the training of inner LLM to achieve faster and more thorough alignment between vision and language. In this situation, the writing manner gap forces the LLM to change its original writing habits to match the writing style of the training data, which may cause severe capability degradation and even catastrophic forgetting. Intuitively, the more pronounced the writing manner gap, the more the LLM is changed, leading to more severe capability degradation.

Furthermore, since the LLM within the LMM plays a central role in processing and integrating multi-modal information, it's crucial to preserve its capabilities to build robust LMMs. When the writing manner gap causes LLM degradation, it also harms the LMM's ability to generalize and respond accurately. This leads to more incorrect answers and visual hallucinations, especially when handling unfamiliar, open-domain visual tasks.

Therefore, the writing manner gap is detrimental to the performance of both the inner LLM and the LMM. Bridging the writing manner gap is an emergent and meaningful task.

IV. METHODOLOGY

A. Overall Processing

To narrow the writing manner gap, we propose directly utilizing the inner LLM to transfer the writing manner of soft-format visual instructions to align with that of the inner LLM itself under the promise of not changing original semantics.

This approach is feasible for two main reasons. On one hand, thanks to excellent instruction-following and reasoning capabilities, LLM can intelligently answer questions posed by prompts that contain requirements and input information. On the other hand, the responses generated by LLM naturally fall within the high probability regions of its output distribution space, which exactly meets with the purpose of reducing writing manner gap.

The specific instruction alignment process includes two stages: LLM rewriting and review. The former realizes the writing manner transfer of original answers, while the latter is utilized for quality control, aimed at eliminating errors and anomalies in the modified answers. Both of these processes operate at the level of single-round conversation, and do not require the input of visual features. Figure 3 presents a detailed positive instance for illustration.

B. Trainset Partition

As shown in Figure 2, depending on the strictness of format requirements, the vision-text instructions in the trainset can be categorized into hard-format and soft-format instructions.

Hard-format instructions require answers written in a strict format, such as a single word or letter, a phrase, a coordinate, or a brief one-sentence description. Many tasks, such as visual multiple-choice questions, true/false questions, OCR, and visual grounding, fall into this category. Under the premise of not changing semantics, the room for modification in hard-format data is quite limited. In contrast, soft-format instructions, such as open-ended questions and visual reasoning tasks, are tolerant of length, grammar, structure, as long as the content is logical and coherent. Therefore, soft-format instructions have greater flexibility and are more amenable to be modified in writing manner. Consequently, we perform writing manner alignment on soft-format instructions, and further mix them with hard-format instructions and text-only instructions to construct the LLM-aligned trainset.

C. Align Instructions with LLM

LLM Rewriting Stage. The input text in LLM rewriting stage consists of three parts: the requirement for writing manner alignment, the question, and the answer. Note that because the question in conversation represents the user’s intent, it does not need to be modified. Providing the question to LLM enables it to better understand the context of the conversation. As shown in Figure 3, the task requirement part should include four key points: 1) Request the rewriting of the original answer to align

with the writing manner of the LLM; 2) Emphasize that such rewriting must not change the semantic meaning; 3) Specify that if the original answer already conforms to the LLM’s writing manner, no modification is necessary; 4) Specify the format of responses. Afterwards, the post-processing operation is designed to separate the revised answer from the LLM response. The status yielded by post-processing step indicates whether the desired answer has been obtained.

LLM Review Stage. Due to the randomness of LLM’s output and the risk of rewriting failure, we utilize the LLM to review the modified answers for quality assurance. To ensure the certainty of the review, sampling operations are disabled during LLM inference. The review prompt includes four parts: the review requirement, the question, the original answer, and the revised answer. A positive review judgement must meet two criteria: 1) The revised answer does not change the semantics of the original answer, nor does it omit or add content; 2) The revised answer is well-aligned with the writing manner of the LLM. Notably, when making a decision, we require the LLM to output specific judgement sentences, rather than just a word like “Yes/No”, to improve the accuracy of review determinations. Only when the revised answer passes the review is it used to replace the original answer.

V. EXPERIMENTS

A. Setting

Baseline Models and Dataset. In this paper, we utilize the well-known LLaVA-1.5 and QwenVL as the baseline model. LLaVA-1.5 employs the Vicuna-1.5 as the inner LLM, offering two versions of 7B and 13B parameters, while the QwenVL deploys the Qwen-7B as the inner LLM.

Considering LLaVA-1.5’s exceptional performance and its recognition within the industry, we uniformly adopt the LLaVA-1.5’s trainset as the visual instruction trainset for both LLaVA-1.5 and QwenVL pre-trained models. The writing manner of soft-format visual instructions in trainset are aligned with inner LLMs for quality enhancement.


LLaVA’s training dataset is a mixture of public available academic task-oriented data [18]–[24]. According to answer format, we split the visual instructions into five types, which are visual conversations, one word/phrase VQA, choice questions, short captions, and groundings. Visual conversations are open-ended, belong to the soft-format category, while the latter four types are restricted or brief, falling into hard-format category. Therefore, the data eligible for adjustment is visual conversation data, totaling 158K, which approximately constitutes a quarter of overall visual instructions.

Implementation Details. We implement the visual instruction alignment and model training using $8 \times$ A800s. To increase the throughput and accelerate inference speed, we utilize the vLLM framework [25] to load and run LLMs. There are a total of 361K rounds of conversations for soft-format visual instructions. By combining original text-only instructions, hard-format visual instructions and LLM-aligned soft-format visual instructions, the novel LLM-aligned trainset is formed. To ensure fairness, the order of training instructions is consistent

(a) Rewrite Instructions for Writing Manner Alignment

Given the following Question and Answer, you are required to revise the Answer in your writing style without changing the semantic meaning. If you think the original answer is clear and consistent with your writing style, just leave it unchanged. The response should contain just the revised answer and the explanation of revision, formatted as: 'Revised Answer:', and 'Explanation:'.

Question: What is the overall theme of the decoration on the table?
 Answer: **The overall theme of the decoration on the table is a floral and colorful design. The objects on display showcase flower motifs and various colors, which together creates a cohesive and visually appealing arrangement.**



Revised Answer:

The main theme of the table decoration is a floral and colorful design. The items on display showcase flower motifs and a range of colors, which come together to form a harmonious and visually pleasing arrangement.


Explanation:

The original answer is clear and concise, but I made a few changes to make it more consistent with my writing style. I changed "the objects on display" to "the items on display" to add variety in my language. I also changed "which together creates" to "which come together to form" for better flow. Finally, I changed "a cohesive and visually appealing arrangement" to "a harmonious and visually pleasing arrangement" to use more descriptive language.

(b) Review the Revised Answer

Given the following Question, Original Answer, and the Revised Answer, if the Revised Answer is inconsistent with your writing style, or deviates from the semantics of Original Answer, or adds or lacks any information, output "There is something wrong with the Revised Answer." Otherwise, output "The Revised Answer is fine." After making your decision, please provide a detailed explanation of your reasoning.

Question: ①
 Original Answer: ②
 Revised Answer: ③



The Revised Answer is fine.

The Revised Answer maintains the original meaning and conveys the same information as the Original Answer. It uses similar language to describe the overall theme of the table decoration, emphasizing the floral and colorful design. The Revised Answer also highlights the cohesiveness and visual appeal of the arrangement, which is consistent with the Original Answer.

Fig. 3: **One positive instance generation process for the illustration of writing manner alignment.** The important information are highlighted in non-black colors for clarity.

LMM	inner LLM	IT	VQA ^{v2}	GQA	VisWiz	SQA ^l	VQA ^T	POPE	MME	MMB	MMB ^{CN}	SEED ^I	LLaVA ^W	MM-Vet
LLaVA	Vicuna-7B	Ori	78.5	62.0	50.0	66.8	58.2	85.9	1510.7	64.3	58.3	66.2	63.4	30.5
LLaVA	Vicuna-7B	Ours	79.1	62.9	51.3	71.3	58.8	87.2	1513.0	66.6	59.7	67.0	67.5	31.9
LLaVA	Vicuna-13B	Ori	80.0	63.3	53.6	71.6	61.3	85.9	1531.3	67.7	63.6	68.2	70.7	35.4
LLaVA	Vicuna-13B	Ours	80.0	63.6	54.3	71.6	61.3	87.4	1569.7	67.3	63.0	68.5	72.9	36.6
QwenVL	Qwen-7B	Ori	81.2	63.0	50.8	71.5	62.6	87.1	1576.8	71.8	64.6	68.4	70.5	41.7
QwenVL	Qwen-7B	Ours	81.4	63.1	51.0	71.6	62.9	87.2	1589.3	72.0	65.0	68.9	72.3	44.3
LLaVA	Vicuna-7B*	Ori	69.5	47.2	40.3	57.3	39.7	84.1	1104.1	45.5	32.6	50.2	58.8	28.9
LLaVA	Vicuna-7B*	Ours	69.7	47.6	43.3	58.1	39.8	85.2	1161.1	46.8	34.7	50.6	59.4	29.8

TABLE I: **Performance comparisons of baseline models on 12 visual benchmarks.** "IT" indicates the trainset used in instruction tuning stage, where "Ori" refers to the original trainset of LLaVA-1.5 and "Ours" means the LLM-aligned trainset proposed in this paper. The * represents the inner LLM is frozen during the fine-tuning.

with LLaVA-1.5, and the training hyper-parameters are same with official settings of LLaVA-1.5 and QwenVL.

B. Writing Manner Alignment Assessment

We conduct human evaluation to verify whether the inner LLM can reliably achieve writing manner alignment during the rewriting stage in the following three steps: i) Selecting samples to represent the respect writing manner of inner LLM and original dataset: For the inner LLM, we randomly select 20 responses to questions from the Alpaca-eval benchmark; for the original instruction dataset, we randomly select 20 soft-format visual instructions. ii) Selecting samples to be evaluated: We randomly selected 100 soft-format visual instructions modified by inner LLM as evaluation samples. iii) Human evaluation: We invite four human experts to determine which writing manner the samples are more similar to. The options include: "inner LLM", "original dataset" and "none of both".

According to Table II, both inner LLMs participating in this assessment achieved a success rate of over 90% in writing manner alignment task, indicating that utilizing inner LLM for writing manner alignment is highly reliable. Additionally, Qwen-7B outperforms Vicuna-7B, possibly due to the more significant writing manner gap between Qwen-7B and original visual instruction dataset.

C. Visual Performance Comparisons

Comparison with Baseline. The quantitative comparison results are shown in Table I. By training with our LLM-aligned trainset, LLaVA-7B and QwenVL significantly improve the performance on all benchmarks, while LLaVA-13B achieves performance enhancements in 10 out of 12 benchmarks.

The soft-format training instructions directly impact model performance in open-ended question-answering scenarios. The improvements observed in two baseline models on LLaVA^W

		Voting Options		
LMM	Inner LLM	inner LLM	original dataset	none of both
LLaVA	Vicuna-7B	90.5%	8.5%	1.0%
QwenVL	Qwen-7B	94.5%	5.5%	0%

TABLE II: The average voting results of manual writing manner assessment.

Model	IT	POPE	HallusionBench	
			Figure Acc	Question Acc
LLaVA-7B	Ori	85.9	14.16	44.82
LLaVA-7B	Ours	87.2	16.19	46.32
QwenVL	Ori	87.1	16.47	42.69
QwenVL	Ours	87.2	19.08	43.14

TABLE III: Visual and textual hallucination evaluation.

Model	IT	MTBench	Alpaca-eval
LLaVA-7B	Ori	5.98	5.19
LLaVA-7B	Ours	6.04	5.28
QwenVL	Ori	4.89	2.99
QwenVL	Ours	5.01	3.16

TABLE IV: Performance comparisons on LLM evaluation benchmarks.

Model	w/o Soft Rewrite	Review	VQA ^{v2}	GQA	VisWiz	SQA ¹	VQA ^T	POPE	MME	MMB	MMB ^{CN}	SEED ^I	LLaVA ^W	MM-Vet
LLaVA-7B	✓		78.5	62.0	50.0	66.8	58.2	85.9	1510.7	64.3	58.3	60.1	63.4	30.5
			78.8	62.2	48.4	68.1	57.5	86.6	1502.6	66.8	58.8	66.1	50.0	29.0
		✓	79.1	62.8	50.7	69.6	58.6	87.1	1488.5	67.0	60.4	66.2	68.6	33.1
		✓	79.1	62.9	51.3	71.3	58.8	87.2	1513.0	66.6	59.7	67.0	67.5	31.9

TABLE V: The ablation study of soft-format visual instructions, LLM rewrite and review stage.

and MM-Vet benchmarks demonstrate the efficacy of our approach in enhancing data quality, which positively influences the training process. Furthermore, improvements on academic benchmarks indicate a reduction in domain conflicts between different instruction sources in trainset, and might also be attributed to the strengthened maintenance effect of our LLM-aligned trainset on the capabilities of LLM, thereby bolstering the comprehension abilities of LMM.

Moreover, we also investigate the impact of LLM-aligned trainset to the LMM with frozen inner LLM. According to the last two lines in Table I, LLaVA-7B achieves comprehensive improvements once again, which indicates that LLaVA-7B performs better convergence extent to LLM-aligned trainset than original trainset.

Hallucination Evaluation. Hallucinations seriously impair the usability of LMMs. To investigate the impact of the proposed LLM-aligned instruction set on model hallucinations, we conduct hallucination assessments using POPE and HallusionBench [26], with the corresponding results presented in Table III. The comparisons indicate that our method effectively enhances the LMM’s accuracy in both visual and textual scenarios. Recalling the analysis in Subsection III-B, our method successfully reduces the writing manner gap, thereby mitigating the disturbances to the inner LLM during the visual instruction tuning stage and improving the LMM performance.

D. Textual Performance Comparisons

Comparison with Baseline. We evaluate the performance of LMMs in textual scenarios by using MTBench [27] and Alpaca-eval [28]. There two benchmarks utilize GPT-4 to score or rank model answers compared with reference answers. Table IV displays the scores of LMMs trained with different instruction sets on MTBench (where the mean score of two assessments is taken here to mitigate the randomness of GPT-4 scoring), as well as win rates on Alpaca-eval. On both benchmarks, LLM-aligned trainset bring improvements to all baseline models compared with original instructions, demonstrating that our approach effectively alleviates the LLM degradation caused by soft-format visual instructions.

LMM	IT	GQA	VQA ^T	MMB	LLaVA ^W
LLaVA-7B	Original	62.0	58.2	64.3	63.4
LLaVA-7B	Self-aligned	62.9	58.8	66.6	67.5
LLaVA-7B	Cross-aligned	62.4	57.9	64.4	63.8
QwenVL	Original	63.0	62.6	71.6	70.5
QwenVL	Self-aligned	63.1	62.9	72.0	72.3
QwenVL	Cross-aligned	61.8	61.9	71.3	71.0

TABLE VI: Cross-evaluation results for sanity check. The “Cross-aligned” means the trainset is aligned by the other LMM, either LLaVA-7B or QwenVL.

E. Ablation Study

The Influence of Soft-Format Instructions. We deploy the combination of text-only and hard-format instructions for fine-tuning to explore the influence of soft-format visual instructions. We keep the same training steps to ensure comparison fairness. According to results in Line 2 of Table V, without soft-format training instructions, the model achieves comparable or even better performance in VQA benchmarks, but drops a lot in open-ended benchmarks. The result indicates the soft-format visual instructions primarily contribute to enhancing the model’s performance in open-ended scenarios. Moreover, there are domain conflicts between the soft-format and hard-format instructions, lies in aspects such as task type, correctness, and writing manner. Minimizing the domain conflict is beneficial for improving the model’s general capabilities.

The Effectiveness of Rewrite & Review. Table V presents the ablation results of LLM rewrite and review stages. With the rewritten instructions, model performs better on all benchmarks except MME. The LLM review stage further filtered out unqualified rewritten instructions, leading to better performance in VQA tasks. There are slight declines in open-ended visual tasks compared to with only rewriting stage, which may attributed to the potential conflicts caused by directly replacing unqualified revised answers with original answers.

Sanity Check by Cross-Evaluation. We design a cross-evaluation experiment to determine whether the improvements are primarily due to bridging the writing manner gap rather than enhancements from LLM revision. Specifically, we train

LLaVA-7B using the Qwen-7B-aligned trainset and Qwen-VL using the Vicuna-7B-aligned trainset, with the results shown in Table VI. In this cross-evaluation setup, there is noticeable writing manner gap between trainsets and models. Given that both models are improved by their respective aligned trainsets, if the cross-evaluation shows better performance, we can infer that the LLM revision is the key factor. If not, it indicates that reducing the writing manner gap is crucial. As seen in Table VI, compared to using the original trainset, the LLaVA-7B in the cross-evaluation setting shows slight fluctuations, while Qwen-VL with cross-aligned trainset exhibits significant performance drop on GQA and VQA^T benchmarks. This result strongly demonstrates the importance and effectiveness of reducing writing manner gap.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we highlight the issue of the writing manner gap between the visual instruction trainset and the inner LLM of LMM. The writing manner gap severely hinder the development of robust LMMs. Without introducing any external data or models, we leverage the inner LLM to bridge writing manner gap. Experimental results validate the effectiveness of our motivation and methodology.

REFERENCES

- [1] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed El-hoseiny, “Minigt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592*, 2023.
- [2] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee, “Visual instruction tuning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08485*, 2023.
- [3] Tianyu Yu, Yuan Yao, Haoye Zhang, Taiwen He, Yifeng Han, Ganqu Cui, Jinyi Hu, Zhiyuan Liu, Hai-Tao Zheng, Maosong Sun, and Tat-Seng Chua, “Rlhf-v: Towards trustworthy mllms via behavior alignment from fine-grained correctional human feedback,” *CVPR*, 2024.
- [4] Tianyu Yu, Haoye Zhang, Yuan Yao, Yunkai Dang, Da Chen, Xiaoman Lu, Ganqu Cui, Taiwen He, Zhiyuan Liu, Tat-Seng Chua, and Maosong Sun, “Rlaif-v: Aligning mllms through open-source ai feedback for super gpt-4v trustworthiness,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17220*, 2024.
- [5] Yanda Li, Chi Zhang, Gang Yu, Zhibin Wang, Bin Fu, Guosheng Lin, Chunhua Shen, Ling Chen, and Yunchao Wei, “Stablelava: Enhanced visual instruction tuning with synthesized image-dialogue data,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10253*, 2023.
- [6] Bin Wang, Fan Wu, Xiao Han, Jiahui Peng, Huaping Zhong, Pan Zhang, Xiaoyi Dong, Weijia Li, Wei Li, Jiaqi Wang, et al., “Vigc: Visual instruction generation and correction,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12714*, 2023.
- [7] Qifan Yu, Juncheng Li, Longhui Wei, Liang Pang, Wentao Ye, Bosheng Qin, Siliang Tang, Qi Tian, and Yueting Zhuang, “Hallucidoctor: Mitigating hallucinatory toxicity in visual instruction data,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.13614*, 2023.
- [8] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee, “Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03744*, 2023.
- [9] 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.
- [10] Yanzhe Zhang, Ruiyi Zhang, Jiuxiang Gu, Yufan Zhou, Nedim Lipka, Diyi Yang, and Tong Sun, “Llavar: Enhanced visual instruction tuning for text-rich image understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.17107*, 2023.
- [11] Jiabo Ye, Anwen Hu, Haiyang Xu, Qinghao Ye, Ming Yan, Yuhao Dan, Chenlin Zhao, Guohai Xu, Chenliang Li, Junfeng Tian, et al., “mplug-docowl: Modularized multimodal large language model for document understanding,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02499*, 2023.
- [12] Fuxiao Liu, Kevin Lin, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Yaser Yacoob, and Lijuan Wang, “Mitigating hallucination in large multi-modal models via robust instruction tuning,” 2023.
- [13] Yiyang Zhou, Chenhang Cui, Jaehong Yoon, Linjun Zhang, Zhun Deng, Chelsea Finn, Mohit Bansal, and Huaxiu Yao, “Analyzing and mitigating object hallucination in large vision-language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00754*, 2023.
- [14] Lijie Fan, Dilip Krishnan, Phillip Isola, Dina Katabi, and Yonglong Tian, “Improving clip training with language rewrites,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20088*, 2023.
- [15] Zhengfeng Lai, Haotian Zhang, Wentao Wu, Haoping Bai, Aleksei Timofeev, Xianzhi Du, Zhe Gan, Jiulong Shan, Chen-Nee Chuah, Yinfei Yang, et al., “From scarcity to efficiency: Improving clip training via visual-enriched captions,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07699*, 2023.
- [16] Zhiyuan Zhao, Linke Ouyang, Bin Wang, Siyuan Huang, Pan Zhang, Xiao wen Dong, Jiaqi Wang, and Conghui He, “Mllm-dataengine: An iterative refinement approach for mllm,” *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2308.13566, 2023.
- [17] Yifan Du, Hangyu Guo, Kun Zhou, Wayne Xin Zhao, Jinpeng Wang, Chuyuan Wang, Mingchen Cai, Ruihua Song, and Ji-Rong Wen, “What makes for good visual instructions? synthesizing complex visual reasoning instructions for visual instruction tuning,” *ArXiv*, vol. abs/2311.01487, 2023.
- [18] Kenneth Marino, Mohammad Rastegari, Ali Farhadi, and Roozbeh Mottaghi, “Ok-vqa: A visual question answering benchmark requiring external knowledge,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/cvf conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 3195–3204.
- [19] Dustin Schwenk, Apoorv Khandelwal, Christopher Clark, Kenneth Marino, and Roozbeh Mottaghi, “A-okvqa: A benchmark for visual question answering using world knowledge,” in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2022, pp. 146–162.
- [20] Anand Mishra, Shashank Shekhar, Ajeet Kumar Singh, and Anirban Chakraborty, “Ocr-vqa: Visual question answering by reading text in images,” in *2019 international conference on document analysis and recognition (ICDAR)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 947–952.
- [21] Oleksii Sidorov, Ronghang Hu, Marcus Rohrbach, and Amanpreet Singh, “Textcaps: a dataset for image captioning with reading comprehension,” in *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part II 16*. Springer, 2020, pp. 742–758.
- [22] Ranjay Krishna, Yuke Zhu, Oliver Groth, Justin Johnson, Kenji Hata, Joshua Kravitz, Stephanie Chen, Yannis Kalantidis, Li-Jia Li, David A Shamma, et al., “Visual genome: Connecting language and vision using crowdsourced dense image annotations,” *International journal of computer vision*, vol. 123, pp. 32–73, 2017.
- [23] Sahar Kazemzadeh, Vicente Ordonez, Mark Matten, and Tamara Berg, “Referitgame: Referring to objects in photographs of natural scenes,” in *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*, 2014, pp. 787–798.
- [24] “Sharegpt,” <https://sharegpt.com/>, 2023.
- [25] Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica, “Efficient memory management for large language model serving with pagedattention,” in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, 2023.
- [26] Tianrui Guan, Fuxiao Liu, Xiyang Wu, Ruiqi Xian, Zongxia Li, Xiaoyu Liu, Xijun Wang, Lichang Chen, Furong Huang, Yaser Yacoob, Dinesh Manocha, and Tianyi Zhou, “Hallusionbench: An advanced diagnostic suite for entangled language hallucination & visual illusion in large vision-language models,” 2023.
- [27] Lianmin Zheng, Wei-Lin Chiang, Ying Sheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Zhanghao Wu, Yonghao Zhuang, Zi Lin, Zhuohan Li, Dacheng Li, Eric Xing, et al., “Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05685*, 2023.
- [28] Xuechen Li, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto, “AlpacaEval: An automatic evaluator of instruction-following models,” https://github.com/tatsu-lab/alpaca_eval, 2023.
- [29] Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh, “Making the v in vqa matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in visual question answering,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 6904–6913.

- [30] Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning, "Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 6700–6709.
- [31] Danna Gurari, Qing Li, Abigale J Stangl, Anhong Guo, Chi Lin, Kristen Grauman, Jiebo Luo, and Jeffrey P Bigham, "Vizwiz grand challenge: Answering visual questions from blind people," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 3608–3617.
- [32] Pan Lu, Swaroop Mishra, Tanglin Xia, Liang Qiu, Kai-Wei Chang, Song-Chun Zhu, Oyvind Tafjord, Peter Clark, and Ashwin Kalyan, "Learn to explain: Multimodal reasoning via thought chains for science question answering," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 2507–2521, 2022.
- [33] Amanpreet Singh, Vivek Natarajan, Meet Shah, Yu Jiang, Xinlei Chen, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Marcus Rohrbach, "Towards vqa models that can read," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 8317–8326.
- [34] Yifan Li, Yifan Du, Kun Zhou, Jinpeng Wang, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen, "Evaluating object hallucination in large vision-language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10355*, 2023.
- [35] Chaoyou Fu, Peixian Chen, Yunhang Shen, Yulei Qin, Mengdan Zhang, Xu Lin, Zhenyu Qiu, Wei Lin, Jinrui Yang, Xiawu Zheng, Ke Li, Xing Sun, and Rongrong Ji, "Mme: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for multimodal large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13394*, 2023.
- [36] Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhang, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, et al., "Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player?," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06281*, 2023.
- [37] Bohao Li, Rui Wang, Guangzhi Wang, Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, and Ying Shan, "Seed-bench: Benchmarking multimodal llms with generative comprehension," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16125*, 2023.
- [38] Weihao Yu, Zhengyuan Yang, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Kevin Lin, Zicheng Liu, Xinchao Wang, and Lijuan Wang, "Mm-vet: Evaluating large multimodal models for integrated capabilities," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02490*, 2023.

LMM	LLM	Rewrite	Review	Instruction Tuning
LLaVA	Vicuna-7B	~ 10h	~ 10h	~ 10h
LLaVA	Vicuna-13B	~ 15h	~ 15h	~ 20h
QwenVL	Qwen-7B	~ 5h	~ 5h	~ 22h

TABLE VII: **Time overheads** for soft-format visual instruction writing manner alignment and visual instruction tuning by using $8 \times$ A800s.

LLM	Stage	Temperature	top_p	top_k	max_length
Vicuna	rewriting	0.4	0.6	5	2048
Qwen	rewriting	0.2	0.6	5	2048

TABLE VIII: Generation configurations of writing manner alignment.

APPENDIX

A. Setting

1) *Evaluation Benchmarks*: By utilizing LLM to transfer writing manner of visual instructions, our approach involves a trade-off between minimizing the writing manner gap and introducing noise. To validate that our method prioritizes the former and that the impact of noise is limited, we evaluated models on 12 benchmarks for thorough assessment.

VQA^{v2} [29], GQA [30], VisWiz [31], SQA^T [32], VQA^T [33] are academic benchmarks in the realm of traditional Visual Question Answering (VQA) tasks. POPE [34] is a polling-based query benchmark for evaluating the vision hallucination. The MME [35] benchmark evaluates LMM’s perception and cognition capabilities through a series of carefully crafted questions across 14 sub-tasks. MMBench and MMBench-CN [36] manually design questions in English and Chinese to evaluate model’s vision reasoning ability. SEED [37] benchmark is constructed with the assistance of GPT4, covering scenes in images and videos. Due to the absence of some video sources, we employ SEED’s image part for evaluation. LLaVA (in the wild) [2] and MM-Vet [38] are open-ended benchmarks, which use GPT4 for LMM capability assessment.

2) *Hyperparameters*: In Table VIII, we show the generation hyperparameters in LLM rewriting and review stage. During the instruction tuning stage, we use the same set of hyperparameters as the original LLaVA-1.5 [8] and QwenVL [9].

3) *Post-process Step: Procedure*. The objective of post-processing is to separate the desired answers from the responses of LLM and to filter out apparent errors. The post-process step in LLM rewriting step contains two aspects. Firstly, based on the prompt depicted in Fig.3, the response of LLM is expected to contain two segments, starting with “Revised Answer:” and “Explanations:”. The portion between these two keywords is the desired modified answer. If these keywords are absent, the attempt is considered a rewrite failure. Secondly, we detect the presence of certain sensitive words that indicate obvious errors in the modified answer. If these sensitive words are found, this rewrite is deemed a fail-

Model	LLM	Total QA	Failures	Unqualified Samples
LLaVA	Vicuna-7B	361K	0.4K (0.11%)	2K (0.55%)
LLaVA	Vicuna-13B		0.7K (0.19%)	3.5K (0.97%)
QwenVL	Qwen-7B		0.3K (0.08%)	0.8K (0.22%)

TABLE IX: The quantity of failure cases in rewriting stage and unqualified samples in review stage.

ure. The sensitive words include “revised answer”, “original answer”, “revision”, “semantic meaning”, and “Question”. In cases of rewrite failure, the original answers are reserved.

Statistics. Table IX presents numbers of failures in the rewriting stage and unqualified samples from the review stage. The statistics reveal a extremely high success rate for data rewriting, with a tiny proportion of revised answers (less than 1%) being deemed unqualified during review. Upon examining the quality of the revised answers, we found that Vicuna13B tend to over-elaborate, producing redundant words or sentences that were difficult to segment. As reflected in the Table IX, compared to Vicuna-7B and Qwen-7B, Vicuna-13B has a higher error probability, leads to relatively lower improvement of LLaVA. These findings suggest that our method places high demands on the instruction-following ability of LLMs.

4) *Details of Trainset*: We present specific compositions and quantities of trainset for instruction tuning in Table X. According to the answer format, we could split the visual instructions into five types, which are visual conversations, one word/phrase VQA, choice questions, short captions, and groundings. In this work, visual conversations are aligned by inner LLM.

B. More Experiments

1) *Quantitative Measurement of Writing Manner Gap: Perplexity-Based Indicator*. To quantitatively measure the writing manner gap between the visual instruction set and the inner LLM, we propose a PPL-based indicator. To begin with, given a tokenized sequence $X = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_t)$, the PPL of X is computed as

$$PPL(X) = \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{t} \sum_i^t \log p_{\theta}(x_i | x_{<i})\right\}, \quad (1)$$

where $\log p_{\theta}(x_i | x_{<i})$ is the log-likelihood of the i -th token conditioned on the preceding tokens $x_{<i}$ according to model. Intuitively, the PPL evaluates the model’s ability to predict uniformly among the set of specified tokens in a corpus.

Assuming there is a pre-trained LMM M and a visual instruction set S which is divided into training set S_t and evaluation set S_e , the proposed metric is obtained in two steps. We first freeze the inner LLM of M and train M on S_t till convergence to get M' , and then calculate the PPL score of the M' only on the answer part of S_e .

Type	Soft-Format visual instructions			Hard-Format visual instructions					Text-Only		
	Visual Conversations			One word or phrase VQA		Choice	Short Caption	Grounding	Conversation		
Data Size	LLaVA Conv 58K	LLaVA Detail 23K	LLaVA Complex 77K	VQAv2 83k	GQA 72K	OKVQA 9K	OCRVQA 80K	A-OKVQA 50K	TextCaps 22K	RefCOCO VG 30K 86K	ShareGPT 40K

TABLE X: Data compositions of LLaVA-1.5 trainset.

Model	Soft-format Instructions	
	Original	LLM-aligned
LLaVA-7B	3.413	3.298
QwenVL	4.208	3.932

TABLE XI: PPL indicator of writing manner gap.

Why can this indicator represent the writing manner gap? When the inner LLM is frozen, its inherent writing manner remains unchanged during training. In this way, the LMM controls the subsequent output of the inner LLM solely by adjusting visual prompts. When the LMM converges on the training set S_t , it indicates that the model has aligned as closely as possible with the content and style of the training set. At this point, the PPL measures how well the inner LLM accepts the style of the dataset. Therefore, for a specific LMM, the smaller the PPL score brought by dataset, the closer that dataset’s writing manner is to that of the inner LLM.

Results and Analysis. We utilize only the original and LLM-aligned soft-format visual instructions to conduct the aforementioned evaluation to the LLaVA-7B and QwenVL, where the last 3,000 data entries serve as the S_e , and the remaining instructions constitutes the S_t .

According to the results in Table XI, both LLaVA-7B and QwenVL achieve lower PPL scores on the LLM-aligned instructions compared with the original instructions, indicating that our approach effectively reduces the writing manner gap. Additionally, there is an interesting contrast that QwenVL exhibits higher PPL scores compared to LLaVA-7B. This is because the trainset of LLaVA-7B’s inner LLM Vicuna and the current soft-format visual instruction set both originate from ChatGPT, whereas QwenVL’s inner LLM Qwen-7B performs a significant writing manner difference from soft-format visual instructions.

2) *The Stability Validation:* Consider that outputs of LLMs have randomness and are heavily affected by prompts, we employ three different prompts with same meaning but varied wording in the rewriting stage to assess the stability of the proposed method. The prompts are shown in Table XII in Appendix, with corresponding results shown in Table XIII. The evaluation results on four representative benchmarks indicate that the LLM-aligned trainset consistently improves LLaVA’s performance, although the extent of the improvement exhibits some variability.

3) *Comparison with Other Revision Strategies.:* To further validate the effectiveness of bridging the writing manner gap, we compare the default setting with two different rewriting prompts.

Prompt Number	Content
No.1	Given the following Question and Answer, you are required to revise the Answer in your writing style without changing the semantic meaning. If you think the original answer is clear and consistent with your writing style, just leave it unchanged. The response should contain just the revised answer and the explanation of revision, formatted as: 'Revised Answer:', and 'Explanation:'.
No.2	Giving the following Question and Answer, you are required to accurately revise the answer to align with your writing style. Do not change its meaning. If you think the answer is clear, do not change it. The response should contain both the revised answer and corresponding explanation, formatted as 'Revised Answer:', and 'Explanation:'.
No.3	Giving the following Question and Answer, you are required to accurately revise the answer to align with your writing style. Do not change its meaning. If you think the answer is clear and consistent with your writing style, do not change it. The response should contain both the revised answer and corresponding explanation, formatted as 'Revised Answer:', and 'Explanation:'.

TABLE XII: Rewriting prompts in stability validation.

Model	Prompt Num	SQA	POPE	MMB	LLaVA ^W
LLaVA-1.5 7B	-	66.8	85.9	64.3	63.4
	No.1	71.3	87.2	66.6	67.5
	No.2	68.7	86.9	67.3	69.8
	No.3	68.7	86.7	66.3	67.4

TABLE XIII: The stability validation results of using rewriting prompts in same meaning but different expressions.

The first strategy specifies a particular writing style of “plain English” by replacing the “your writing style” in default prompt with “plain English as you explain it to your children”. In Table XIV, we see that aligning the trainset’s style to “plain English” results in larger PPL score than using the original trainset, from 3.413 to 3.465, which indicates that this style significantly differs from the default writing style of inner LLM. As for downstream evaluations, this revision method leads to poor performance on LLaVA^W benchmark.

The second strategy lets LLM just revise the answer without any writing manner alignment requirements for ablation. In this setting, we remove “in your writing style” and “and consistent with your writing style” in default prompt. As shown in Table XIV, the inner LLM naturally generates responses similar to its default writing manner when there is no writing style constraint, indicated by PPL score drops from 3.413 to 3.395. However, this PPL decrease is not as significant as using the proposed rewriting prompt, confirms the necessity of adding writing manner alignment constraints for better reducing writing manner gap. The downstream evaluations show that this strategy enhances the model performance on most downstream tasks, except for VQA^T benchmark. By comparison, the overall improvement brought by these two

LMM	IT	PPL↓	GQA	VQA ^T	MMB	LLaVA ^W
LLaVA-7B	Original	3.413	62.0	58.2	64.3	63.4
LLaVA-7B	“Plain English” Style	3.465	62.2	58.3	64.6	62.5
LLaVA-7B	Revision & No Align	3.395	62.4	57.9	66.4	66.2
LLaVA-7B	Self-aligned (Ours)	3.298	62.9	58.8	66.6	67.5

TABLE XIV: **Comparison with two other revision strategies:** 1) Specific writing style of “plain English”; 2) Just revision with no writing manner alignment requirement.

competing strategies is far more lower than that of the proposed method, which strongly validates the importance of writing manner alignment.

C. Discussion on Implementation Details

1) *Why the generated explanations in LLM rewriting stage are not used afterward?*: We have attempted to instruct LLMs to directly output the rewritten answers without any additional information, but their instruction-following abilities are not strong enough. LLMs always append some extra explanations after outputting the revised answer, which hinders the subsequent extraction of the desired answers from the LLMs’ responses. Therefore, we have decided to require LLMs to output in current format.

2) *Why are text-only instructions not subject to going through the proposed method?*: It is not feasible for two main reasons. Firstly, the adopted LLMs are not powerful enough to achieve this goal. The text-only instruction set is somewhat chaotic, lengthy, diverse in task types, and encompasses various languages. For the LLM, simply maintaining the original content is challenging, let alone achieving writing manner alignment. Secondly, refining the text-only instructions would affect the analysis of the effect of improving the multi-modal instructions, which is the focus of this paper. To be honest, the quality of text-only instructions is poor. It is no doubt that improving the quality of these text-only instructions can improve the model’s performance. Given that the difficulty of rewriting text-only instructions, even if the LLM successfully rephrases the text and brings improvement, it is still hard to determine whether this improvement stems from aligning writing manner or eliminating errors.

3) *Why does QwenVL perform better than LLaVA-7B even though the perplexity of QwenVL is higher than that of LLaVA-7B in Table XI?*: The ultimate performance of LMM depends on multiple factors such as parameters, scale and pre-training data, etc, rather than just fitting to instructions. Qwen-VL’s pre-training is far more comprehensive than LLaVA’s (1.4B v.s. 558K image-text-pairs in pre-training stage). Therefore, comparing the PPL scores across different models and then mapping it to their performance on downstream tasks is unreasonable. Moreover, PPL scores are computed with frozen inner LLM, it cannot reflect the fitting ability of LMM with unlocked LLM.

D. Pseudo Code of Writing Manner Alignment

Algorithm 1 provides a concise pseudocode of our instruction alignment process.

Algorithm 1 Instruction Alignment Pseudocode

```

# f: generate rewrite prompt
# g: generate review prompt
# post_process: split answer content from LLM response

for (q, a) in loader: # load a round of conversation
    # Stage 1: LLM Rewrite
    rewrite_prompt = f(q, a)
    rewrite_response = LLM(rewrite_prompt)
    modified_a, status = post_process(rewrite_response)
    if status == False:
        continue

    # Stage 2: LLM Review
    review_prompt = g(q, a, modified_a)
    review_response = LLM(review_prompt)
    if "The Revised Answer is fine" in review_response:
        replace(a, modified_a) # replace a with modified_a

```

E. Case Study

1) *Positive LLM-aligned Samples.*: In Figure 4, we show-case several examples of writing manner alignment, primarily categorized into four types: 1) Keep unchanged; 2) Slight adjustment in word choices; 3) Adjustment in grammar; 4) Changes in sentence structure.

2) *Unqualified LLM-aligned Samples.*: Figure 5 describes three samples deemed unqualified during the review stage, showing that the LLM can filter out obvious errors in the rewritten answers. Combined with the quantitative statistics in Table IX, the error rate of LLM-based writing manner alignment is low.


3) *Qualitative Comparisons.*: In Figure 6, Figure 7, and Figure 8, we present three representative complex visual dialogues. By comparison, the proposed LLM-aligned dataset enhances LLaVA-7B’s capabilities on text recognition, logical reasoning and instruction-following, while also reducing visual hallucinations.

Revision Type	Original Answer	Revised Answer
a) <i>No Change</i>	<p>Sample 1: The cat and the laptop computer are both located on a bed.</p> <p>Sample 2: The people in the image are located on top of a small boat floating on a river.</p>	<p>Sample 1: The cat and the laptop computer are both located on a bed.</p> <p>Sample 2: The people in the image are located on top of a small boat floating on a river.</p>
b) <i>Words</i>	<p>Sample 1: The chair is pulled up to a table, indicating that it is part of a furniture set, likely for dining or working at the table.</p> <p>Sample 2: The wine glass is half full.</p>	<p>Sample 1: The chair is situated next to a table, suggesting that it is a part of a furniture ensemble, designed for dining or working at the table.</p> <p>Sample 2: The wine glass is partially filled.</p>
c) <i>Grammar</i>	<p>Sample 1: There are buildings and businesses alongside the road, suggesting a commercial or urban setting.</p> <p>Sample 2: A large multicolored umbrella is visible in the image.</p>	<p>Sample 1: The structures visible alongside the road in the image are buildings and businesses, indicating a commercial or urban setting.</p> <p>Sample 2: In the image, a large multicolored umbrella can be seen.</p>
d) <i>Sentence Structure</i>	<p>Sample 1: To make this living room less cramped, a few changes to the layout can be made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Rearrange the furniture: In the image, the couch is occupying a large part of the room. Consider repositioning it along the wall preferably near the window to create more walking space. If there are two different colored couches, you could potentially remove one couch or swap it with a smaller love seat to open up more space in the room. Optimize the seating area: If there are additional chairs in the living room, only keep the necessary ones, and consider storing or repurposing the extra chairs in other parts of the house. Declutter the room: In the image, there are multiple books on the couch and other surfaces. Organize the books by placing them on a bookshelf or a side table with storage to clear up precious space on the couch and other surfaces. Combine furniture functions: The room has a desk and a chair that are occupying space. Instead, you could use a smaller desk that can double as a coffee table or consider adding a combined desk and shelf unit that takes up vertical space rather than spreading horizontally. <p>By implementing these changes, the living room may appear less cramped and more spacious, offering better functionality and comfort to its occupants.</p> <p>Sample 2: Giraffes and zebras possess distinct features that make them easily identifiable among other animals.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Giraffes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long neck: Giraffes have an elongated neck, allowing them to reach leaves and branches at great heights, which is an advantage for feeding in the wild. Unique pattern: Giraffes are covered in a distinctive patchwork pattern, which varies from individual to individual. The coat patterns consist of irregularly shaped patches of various shades of brown, separated by white or cream-colored lines. Long legs: Giraffes have long legs, which allows them to have a fast, loping gait for covering large distances in their natural habitat. Zebras: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Striped pattern: Zebras are easily recognized by their unique black and white stripes. These stripes serve multiple purposes, such as camouflage and thermoregulation. Body shape: Zebras have a relatively small, compact body shape, often compared to that of a horse or a donkey. They have a strong, muscular build, well-suited for running at high speeds. Mane: Zebras have a short, erect mane that runs from the back of their head down their neck, similar to that of a horse but more upright. <p>These unique features of giraffes and zebras not only make them identifiable but also serve essential functions for their survival in the wild.</p>	<p>Sample 1: To make the living room less cramped, consider the following changes to the layout:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Rearrange the furniture: The couch occupies a significant portion of the room in the image. Move it to the wall near the window to create more walking space. If there are two different colored couches, remove one or swap it with a smaller love seat to open up more space in the room. Optimize the seating area: Keep only necessary chairs in the living room and store or repurpose extra chairs in other parts of the house. Declutter the room: Books on the couch and other surfaces should be organized by placing them on a bookshelf or a side table with storage to clear up space on the couch and other surfaces. Combine furniture functions: Use a smaller desk that can double as a coffee table or add a combined desk and shelf unit that takes up vertical space instead of spreading horizontally. <p>By implementing these changes, the living room may appear less cramped and more spacious, offering better functionality and comfort to its occupants.</p> <p>Sample 2: Giraffes and zebras boast a variety of characteristics that set them apart from the rest.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Giraffes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long neck: Giraffes are renowned for their elongated neck, which allows them to reach leaves and branches at great heights, providing a significant advantage in their natural habitat for feeding. Unparalleled pattern: Giraffes are characterized by a distinctive patchwork pattern that varies from individual to individual. Their coats feature irregularly shaped patches of brown, separated by white or cream-colored lines, making them easily identifiable. Extraordinary legs: Giraffes possess long legs, which enable them to maintain a fast, loping gait for covering large distances in the wild. Zebras: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Striking striped pattern: Zebras are unmistakable due to their black and white striped pattern. These stripes serve multiple purposes, including camouflage and thermoregulation. Compact body shape: Zebras have a small, horse-like body shape with a strong, muscular build, making them well-suited for running at high speeds. Erect mane: Zebras have a short, upright mane that runs from the back of their head down their neck, similar to that of a horse but more pronounced. <p>These unique features of giraffes and zebras not only make them easily distinguishable but also serve essential functions for their survival in the wild.</p>

Fig. 4: Positive LLM-aligned samples in different revision types.

Original Answer	Wrong Modified Answer
<p>Sample 1: The two skiers in the image are females.</p> <p>Sample 2: The street signs above the stop sign are green.</p> <p>Sample 3: The man in the image is wearing a plaid shirt.</p>	<p>Sample 1: The two skiers in the image are males.</p> <p>Sample 2: The street signs above the stop sign are red.</p> <p>Sample 3: The man in the image is wearing a striped shirt.</p>

Fig. 5: Unqualified samples filtered out during the review stage.



Describe this sketch in detail.



LLaVA-7B

The image features a handwritten list of jokes on a piece of paper. The jokes are written in a comical manner, with some of them being quite funny. The list includes a total of 13 jokes, each with varying levels of humor. The jokes are spread across the paper, with some jokes being more prominent than others. The handwriting style suggests that the jokes were written by someone who enjoys humor and has a creative approach to writing.



LLaVA-7B
(Ours)

The sketch is a handwritten list of instructions for creating a joke website. The list is divided into several sections, each with a different topic. The first section is titled "My Joke Website," while the second section is titled "Really Dumb Joke." The third section is titled "Punch to Reveal Punchline," and the fourth section is titled "Punchline." The fifth section is titled "Isama, Batman, Joke 2," and the sixth section is titled "Earth to Reveal Punchline."

Fig. 6: **Quality comparison in sketch recognition.** Our model performs more accurate understanding in sketch structure.



In what other ways might someone express the same sentiment that this meme is expressing?



LLaVA-7B

There are several ways someone might express the sentiment of "just Monday" in a different context. For example, they could use a quote or a saying like "Monday, Monday, can't trust that day" or "Monday, the day that starts the work week with a groan." Another option is to use a humorous image or meme that represents the feeling of being tired or overwhelmed on a Monday, such as a person sleeping or a cartoon character expressing exhaustion. Additionally, someone might simply express their feelings by saying "I hate Mondays" or "I'm so tired today, it's just Monday."



LLaVA-7B
(Ours)

There are several ways someone might express the sentiment of feeling tired or exhausted on a Monday, similar to the meme of the dog lying on the floor with the words "Just Monday" above it. Some possible expressions include:

1. "Monday, why you gotta be like that?"
2. "Another Monday, another week of work."
3. "Monday, the day that always feels like a Monday."
4. "Just Monday, trying to survive the week."
5. "Monday, the day that starts the workweek blues."
6. "Monday, the day that makes me want to take a nap."
7. "Monday, the day that feels like a marathon."
8. "Monday, the day that needs a caffeine boost."
9. "Monday, the day that feels like a chore."
10. "Monday, the day that needs a pep talk."

Fig. 7: **Quality comparison in meme recognition.** Our model more closely follows the user's intent, and generates responses in a more clear format.



Explain all the cues that indicate the current traffic conditions.



LLaVA-7B

The image depicts a busy highway with heavy traffic, as evidenced by the numerous cars and trucks traveling in both directions. The traffic is congested, with vehicles occupying all lanes, and some cars are even driving on the shoulder. The high volume of vehicles on the road, combined with the presence of multiple traffic lights, indicates that the traffic conditions are challenging and require extra caution from drivers. The traffic lights are scattered throughout the scene, with some closer to the foreground and others further away, suggesting that they are controlling the flow of traffic at various points along the highway.



*LLaVA-7B
(Ours)*

The image depicts a bustling highway with heavy traffic, as evidenced by the numerous cars and trucks moving in both directions. The traffic is congested, with vehicles stopped or moving at a slow pace, indicating a high level of congestion. The presence of multiple lanes and the large number of vehicles on the road further emphasizes the heavy traffic conditions. The image also captures the nighttime setting, which may contribute to the congestion as people commute home from work or engage in nighttime activities.

Fig. 8: **Quality comparison in complex scene understanding.** The answer of our model contains fewer visual hallucinations.