

Video SimpleQA: Towards Factuality Evaluation in Large Video Language Models

Meng Cao^{1*}, Pengfei Hu^{1*}, Yingyao Wang², Jihao Gu², Haoran Tang³, Haoze Zhao¹,
Jiahua Dong¹, Wangbo Yu³, Ge Zhang⁴, Ian Reid¹, Xiaodan Liang^{1†}

¹MBZUAI ²Alibaba Group ³Peking University ⁴M-A-P

<https://videosimpleqa.github.io/>




Figure 1. (a) **The taxonomy** of Video SimpleQA benchmark; (b) **Illustrations of existing knowledge-based video benchmarks** [21, 28, 30, 84, 85] which may involve hypothetical or subjective reasoning; (c) **Illustrations of our Video SimpleQA benchmark** with the fact-seeking question and definitive & short-form answer with external-source verified.

Abstract

Recent advancements in Large Video Language Models (LVLMs) have highlighted their potential for multi-modal understanding, yet evaluating their factual grounding in video contexts remains a critical unsolved challenge. To address this gap, we introduce Video SimpleQA, the first comprehensive benchmark tailored for factuality evaluation of LVLMs. Our work distinguishes from existing video benchmarks through the following key features: 1) **Knowledge required**: demanding integration of external knowledge beyond the video’s explicit narrative; 2) **Fact-seeking question**: targeting objective, undisputed events or relationships, avoiding subjective interpretation; 3) **Definitive**

& short-form answer: Answers are crafted as unambiguous and definitively correct in a short format, enabling automated evaluation through LLM-as-a-judge frameworks with minimal scoring variance; 4) **External-source verified**: All annotations undergo rigorous validation against authoritative external references to ensure the reliability; 5) **Temporal reasoning required**: The annotated question types encompass both static single-frame understanding and dynamic temporal reasoning, explicitly evaluating LVLMs’ factuality under the long-context dependencies. We extensively evaluate 41 state-of-the-art LVLMs and summarize key findings as follows: 1) Current LVLMs exhibit notable deficiencies in factual adherence, particularly for open-source models. The best-performing model Gemini-1.5-Pro achieves merely an F-score of 54.4%; 2) Test-time compute

*Equal contributions. †Corresponding author.

paradigms show insignificant performance gains, revealing fundamental constraints for enhancing factuality through post-hoc computation; 3) Retrieval-Augmented Generation demonstrates consistent improvements at the cost of additional inference time overhead, presenting a critical efficiency-performance trade-off. We position Video SimpleQA as the cornerstone benchmark for video factuality assessment, with the explicit goal of directing LLM development toward verifiable real-world grounding.

1. Introduction

The substantial advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs) [1, 6, 58, 63, 64] over the past few years have inaugurated a new frontier in artificial intelligence. Despite their remarkable capabilities, the factuality concern [2, 65, 70] remains a critical challenge, *i.e.*, how to ensure that the generated contents are consistent with factual knowledge and grounded in credible sources*. Existing research has primarily focused on evaluating factuality in text-based [15, 22, 29, 40, 56, 72, 78] and image-based [31, 49, 66, 67, 80] scenarios. However, extending factuality evaluation to video contexts is under-explored and presents unique challenges due to the inherent temporal dynamics, causal relationships, and procedural knowledge.

To bridge this gap, we present Video SimpleQA, a comprehensive factuality evaluation benchmark tailored for Large Video Language Models (LVLMs). As shown in Figure 2, Video SimpleQA is composed of short, fact-seeking questions and short-form, undisputed answers. Compared to previous video benchmarks, Video SimpleQA stands out with the following advancements:

- *Knowledge required*: Beyond comprehending the visual content, Video SimpleQA necessitates the integration of external knowledge that is not explicitly presented in the video narrative, *e.g.*, domain-specific information, contextual background, commonsense, *etc.* As illustrated in Figure 1(c), recognizing the Pythagorean theorem demonstrated in the video necessitates understanding its dynamic content combined with external geometric and mathematical knowledge.
- *Fact-seeking question*: Questions necessitate strict adherence to factual grounding principles, eliminating any hypothetical constructs and subjective inferences.
- *Definitive answer*: All the answers are unambiguous, universally agreed upon, consistent over time and invariant to individual perspectives.
- *Short-form answer*: In contrast to LLMs’ propensity for lengthy completions containing multiple factual statements, the short-form answer paradigm of Video

*Please refer to [65, 70] for the differentiation between the *factuality* and the similar *hallucination* concepts.

Table 1. **Comparisons with existing video benchmarks** regarding the video domain, their knowledge-driven focus, emphasis on factuality, and provision of supporting evidence.

Benchmarks	Video Domain	Knowledge driven	Factuality based	Evidence Source
Video-MME [20]	Open	✗	✗	✗
MMBench-Video [19]	Open	✗	✗	✗
Video-Bench [51]	Open	✗	✗	✗
TempCompass [45]	Open	✗	✗	✗
MVBench [37]	Open	✗	✗	✗
AutoEval-Video [12]	Open	✗	✗	✗
Video-MMMU [30]	Professional	✓	✗	✗
MMVU [85]	Discipline	✓	✗	✗
MMWorld [28]	Discipline	✓	✗	✗
WorldQA [84]	Open	✓	✗	✗
KnowIT-VQA [21]	TV shows	✓	✗	✗
Video SimpleQA	Open	✓	✓	✓

SimpleQA constrains responses to verifiable atomic facts, which establishes a reliable framework for factual assessment with low run-to-run variance.

- *External-source verified*: All question-answer (QA) pairs are rigorously validated against external sources to ensure the accuracy and reliability of reference answers. Specifically, each question is accompanied by a link to a credible webpage (*e.g.*, the Wikipedia page) that substantiates the provided answer.
- *Temporal reasoning required*: The task types of our annotated questions encompass both static single-frame understanding and those requiring long-context temporal comprehension (*e.g.*, causal reasoning and process verification shown in Figure 5b).

Table 1 delineates the distinctions between our Video SimpleQA and existing video understanding benchmarks. While knowledge-based benchmarks [21, 28, 30, 84, 85] may appear superficially analogous, several critical limitations emerge: KnowIT-VQA [21] is constrained by TV show-specific content. WorldQA [84] incorporates subjective knowledge assessments (*e.g.*, the analysis of the future ability of Atlas in Figure 1(b) that inherently lack definitive answers due to interpretive subjectivity. Video-MMMU [30] focuses on cross-modal knowledge transfer from videos to images. The recent pre-prints MMVU [85] and MMWorld [28] restrict their scope to discipline-specific knowledge comprehension. In contrast, our benchmark emphasizes factuality by aligning more closely with fact-grounding, *i.e.*, verifying whether model outputs reflect real-world facts. Moreover, Video SimpleQA provides an external evidence source for validation, further enhancing the fairness and reliability of factuality evaluation.

We conduct comprehensive evaluations of 41 state-of-the-art LVLMs on Video SimpleQA, revealing sev-




Figure 2. Sampled examples in Video SimpleQA and the responses of typical LVLMs [5, 53, 62].

eral critical insights through detailed experimental analysis: 1) *Significant performance gap*: Both proprietary and open-source LVLMs substantially underperform compared to human expertise; 2) *Overconfidence bias*: LVLMs exhibit systematic overconfidence in their predictions despite output inaccuracies; 3) *Ineffective test-time compute*: Test-time compute [61] yields minimal performance gains; 4) *Efficiency-performance tradeoff*: Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) yields significant gains at the cost of inference efficiency; 5) *Persistent scaling benefits*: Model size and frame number scaling remain effective; 6) *Temporal reasoning required*: Long-term context modeling is critical.

2. Related Work

Factuality Benchmarks. Factuality is the capability of LLMs to generate content that aligns with factual information, which can be substantiated by authoritative sources such as Wikipedia or textbooks [2, 70]. Evaluating LLM factuality presents a non-trivial challenge and various benchmarks are proposed in the text-based [15, 22, 29, 40, 56, 72, 78] and image-based scenarios [25, 31, 49, 66, 67, 80]. As one of the pioneering works, TruthfulQA [40] specifically targets imitative falsehoods in LLM-generated responses, which stem from erroneous preconceptions or knowledge gaps. Recently, the SimpleQA series of works [14, 25, 29, 72] facilitate factuality evaluation by constraining the scope to short, fact-seeking questions with single answers, making factuality assessment more tractable compared to previous long, open-ended model outputs.

Despite the progress, there is still a lack of a dedicated benchmark for assessing factuality in video LLMs. A well-designed video-based factuality evaluation benchmark is crucial for measuring the ability of LLMs to generate factually grounded contents based on dynamic spatio-temporal information and complex event sequences. Our proposed Video SimpleQA bridges this gap by incorporating videos from diverse domains, questions covering various factual knowledge types, and answers in the easily verifiable short-form format.

Video Understanding Benchmarks. The primary video benchmarks are primarily designed for task-specific video

understanding tasks such as action recognition [23, 33], grounding [59, 79], captioning [35, 76], etc. More recently, video benchmarks designed for LLM evaluation have shifted towards more comprehensive tasks, including temporal perception [37, 38, 46, 57], reasoning [8, 9, 12, 16, 34, 45, 47, 51, 60, 75, 82], navigation [10, 77], long-form comprehension [11, 18–20, 69, 73], etc. However, current video benchmarks largely overlook factuality evaluation, resulting in a lack of assessment for video LLMs’ ability to generate factually accurate responses. Compared to video hallucination benchmarks [26, 71, 83] which primarily assesses models’ adherence to video contents, the factuality evaluation focuses on the model’s alignment with verifiable external world knowledge [65, 70].

Differentiation from Knowledge-based Benchmarks. Existing knowledge-based video understanding benchmarks [21, 28, 30, 84, 85] either contain hypothetical/subjective reasoning (e.g., the categories of `societal norms` and `social interactions` in WorldQA [84]) or narrow their scopes to single TV show or discipline-related knowledge [21, 85]. Our Video SimpleQA addresses these limitations by enforcing *objective* verification through the factually grounded questions, and ensuring *diversity* via the systematic organization across 4 primary categories, 15 secondary categories, and 84 tertiary categories.

3. Video SimpleQA

We introduce Video SimpleQA to benchmark factuality evaluation in LVLMs. The dataset construction pipeline is illustrated in Figure 3, which includes the procedures of video & encyclopedia collection (Sec 3.1), QA annotations (Sec 3.2), and quality control (Sec 3.3). The dataset statistics are illustrated in Sec 3.4.

3.1. Video & Encyclopedia Collection

Video Collection: To ensure broad coverage across different domains, we curate the knowledge-intensive videos from the “Media of the Day” page of Wikimedia Commons[†]

[†]https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Commons:Media_of_the_day




Figure 3. An overview of the construction pipeline of Video SimpleQA including the video & encyclopedia collection (Sec. 3.1), QA annotation (Sec. 3.2), and quality control (Sec. 3.3).




Figure 4. The encyclopedia collection process including the raw associated description in Wikimedia and the RAG results[†] for the specialized terms extracted by GPT-4o.

together with the accompanied brief descriptions or scientific illustrations. Note that files on the “Media of the Day” page are freely licensed, which avoids introducing any potential copyright concerns.

Encyclopedia Collection: As shown in Figure 4, although the associated textual descriptions in the Wikimedia page provide related descriptions, the explanations for the specialized terms (e.g., Barbary Ground Squirrel, Fuerteventura) still lack formal definitions. To construct a more comprehensive encyclopedia, we leverage GPT-4o [53] to extract key terms from the original descriptions and then obtain detailed explanations for these terms via RAG. Specifically, we apply LlamaIndex [42] as the RAG method, with search results from Google and Bing as data sources.

3.2. QA Annotations

The annotation pipeline for Video SimpleQA follows a two-stage process: (1) automated LLM-based iterative generation and (2) human-in-the-loop verification refinement.

LLM-based Iterative Generation: The iterative generation process involves two LLMs, a *generator* LLM for initial QA pair synthesis and a *critic* LLM for quality assessment. The generator receives video content and encyclopedic knowledge (Sec 3.1) along with manually crafted seed QA pairs spanning diverse video types and questioning patterns, which serve as in-context learning exemplars. Sub-

sequently, the critic systematically evaluates output compliance with predefined quality criteria, providing targeted feedback for refinement. This iterative process continues for up to three refinement cycles, with non-compliant outputs being discarded post-final iteration to ensure rigorous quality control. Both components leverage GPT-4o [53] implementations, enabling scalable verification while maintaining evaluation consistency.

The explicit construction criteria are as follows: 1) *Knowledge required:* The questions should necessitate both video content and relevant external factual knowledge. Those that can be answered solely based on either source should be excluded. For example, two questions that should be eliminated are: “What color is the insect in the video?” (which relies solely on video content) and “Which president of the United States was Obama?” (which relies solely on external knowledge); 2) *Fact-seeking question:* The generated question should be factually grounded without any hypothetical or subjective reasoning; 3) *Definitive answer:* To ensure a rigorous evaluation, each question must have a single, unambiguous, and indisputable answer. To achieve this, we explicitly define the level of granularity in question phrasing. For example, we use “which year” instead of “when” and “which city” instead of “where” to eliminate ambiguity; 4) *Short-form answer:* The answers should be in a short-form format; 5) Answers should be time-invariant and reflect enduring facts.

Human-in-the-loop Verification: Through the iterative generation, we obtain QA annotations of reasonable quality. To further enhance the reliability, we train expert annotators to refine the LLM-generated QA annotations. The expert annotators are first required to watch the complete video and examine the collected encyclopedic knowledge. They then evaluate whether the LLM-generated QA annotations meet the specified criteria and manually revise them if necessary. Additionally, annotators are required to provide verifiable evidence sources for each QA pair, documenting the knowledge provenance essential for factual validation.

3.3. Quality Control

Difficulty Filtering. To ensure an appropriate level of assessment difficulty, we establish filtering rules to exclude questions that are easy to answer. In particular, questions




Figure 5. (a) **Video distribution** at the secondary level; (b) **Question type distribution**; (c) **Key statistics** of Video SimpleQA.

correctly answered by all four state-of-the-art models including GPT-4o [53], Claude 3.5 Sonnet [3], Gemini 1.5 Pro [62] and Qwen-VL-Max [4] are deemed insufficiently challenging and consequently excluded from our benchmark. This filtering strategy ensures our dataset maintains a sufficient level of difficulty for meaningful model evaluation.

Human Cross-verification. To further enhance dataset quality, a rigorous human validation process is implemented. Each question is independently evaluated by two annotators for compliance with our predefined criteria. Questions are discarded if either annotator deems them non-compliant. Meanwhile, annotators are required to verify answers against authoritative sources (such as Wikipedia). Finally, the final dataset undergoes security auditing to address potential security issues. All these stringent human verification processes ensure both the accuracy of our dataset and its adherence to established criteria.

3.4. Dataset Statistics

The key statistics of Video SimpleQA are demonstrated in Table 5c. As shown, it consists of 1293 videos with 2,030 expert-annotated QA pairs. The video distribution spans 4 primary categories, 15 secondary categories and 84 tertiary categories. The average lengths of questions and answers are 9.71 and 1.98 words, respectively, aligning with our intended short-form design. The video distribution at the secondary level is demonstrated in Figure 5a. The question type distribution is visualized in Figure 5b.

4. Experiments

4.1. Setup

Evaluated Models. With Video SimpleQA, we benchmark a diverse array of state-of-the-art LVLMs including **14 proprietary models**, including o1-preview [55], Gemini-2.0-Flash series [17], Doubao-vision series [7], GPT-4o-mini [54], GPT-4o [53], GPT-4V [52], Claude-3.5-Sonnet series [3], Gemini-1.5-Pro series [62] and Qwen-VL-MAX [4], and **27 open-source models**, including DeepSeek-VL2 series [74], LLaVA-OneVision series [36], Qwen2.5-VL se-

ries [5], Qwen2-VL series [68], InternVL2.5 series [13], LLaVA-NeXT-Video series [41], ST-LLM [43], Chat-UniVi [32], PPLaVA series [44], VideoLLaMA3 [81] and VideoLLaVA [39]. Following Video-MME [20], we maximize frame utilization of each model by inputting the maximum number of frames that fit within its context window.

Evaluation Metrics. Following SimpleQA [72], we evaluate the performance using five metrics: (1) **Correct**: The predicted answer comprehensively contains all key information from the reference answer while containing no contradictory elements. (2) **Incorrect**: The predicted answer contradicts the reference answer. The indirect or equivocal responses (e.g., “possibly”, “I think, although I’m not sure”) are also considered incorrect. (3) **Not attempted**: The reference answer is not fully given in the predicted answer, and no statements in the answer contradict the gold target. (4) **Correct given attempted**: The ratio of correctly answered questions among attempted ones. (5) **F-score**: The harmonic mean between *correct* and *correct given attempted* metrics. We follow the paradigm of *LLM-as-a-Judge* [24] and employ GPT-4o-0806 as the judge model. The specific prompts are available in the supplementary material.

4.2. Experimental Findings

The evaluation results on Video SimpleQA are presented in Table 2 and key findings are summarized as follows:

Video SimpleQA is challenging: To assess human performance levels on Video SimpleQA, we randomly sample 200 instances and recruit five participants to independently complete the tasks under two distinct conditions: with access to external resources (e.g., internet or textbooks) and without such access. These configurations correspond to the *human open-book* and *human closed-book* settings documented in Table 2.

Compared to the human open-book performance, both open-source and closed-source models demonstrate suboptimal performance. Specifically, the top-performing proprietary model, Gemini-1.5-Pro [62], achieves an F-score of 54.4%. Open-source models exhibit even poorer results, with the best-performing one, Qwen2.5-VL-72B [68] at-

Table 2. **Evaluation results (%) of open-source and proprietary multi-modal LLMs on Video SimpleQA**. For metrics, CO, NA, IN, and CGA denote “Correct”, “Not attempted”, “Incorrect”, and “Correct given attempted”, respectively. For subtopics, ENG, NAT, SCI and SAC represent “Engineering”, “Nature”, “Science” and “Society and Culture”.

Model	Overall results on 5 metrics					F-score on 4 primary categories			
	CO	IN↓	NA↓	CGA	F-score	ENG	NAT	SCI	SAC
<i>Human Performance</i>									
Human Open-book	66.7	11.7	21.7	85.1	74.8	78.6	66.7	66.7	85.7
Human Closed-book	25.0	13.3	61.7	65.2	36.1	38.1	30.0	28.6	47.6
<i>Proprietary Multi-modal LLMs</i>									
o1-preview [55]	47.1	35.3	17.6	57.1	51.6	80.0	47.1	33.3	50.0
Gemini-2.0-Flash [17]	41.5	28.7	29.8	59.1	48.8	56.8	41.8	30.6	55.8
Gemini-2.0-Flash-Thinking [17]	45.9	41.0	13.1	52.8	49.1	41.7	42.4	34.8	70.6
Doubao-1.5-vision-pro [7]	29.6	18.5	51.9	61.6	40.0	39.4	35.1	29.8	50.1
Doubao-vision-pro [7]	37.0	38.1	24.9	49.2	42.2	46.8	35.5	27.3	52.3
Doubao-vision-lite [7]	17.3	15.2	67.5	53.3	26.2	28.4	24.7	14.0	29.0
GPT-4o-mini [54]	38.9	50.6	10.5	43.4	41.0	45.5	35.9	19.2	50.0
GPT-4o [53]	49.9	35.8	14.3	58.2	53.7	58.1	47.3	33.3	63.9
GPT-4V [52]	29.7	28.0	42.2	51.5	37.7	39.8	33.4	27.5	45.2
Claude-3.5-Sonnet [3]	36.9	40.2	22.9	47.8	41.7	49.2	35.2	29.7	47.9
Claude-3.5-SonnetV2 [3]	42.1	38.1	19.8	52.5	46.7	57.5	38.0	33.7	53.9
Gemini-1.5-Pro [62]	50.1	34.2	15.7	59.4	54.4	57.0	50.3	44.1	60.6
Gemini-1.5-Pro-Flash [62]	40.5	29.2	30.3	58.1	47.7	50.7	46.2	36.9	49.5
Qwen-VL-MAX [4]	36.7	43.3	19.9	45.9	40.8	47.7	33.0	23.5	51.1
<i>Open-source Multi-modal LLMs</i>									
DeepSeek-VL2 [74]	23.6	57.7	18.8	29.0	26.0	30.0	21.6	19.0	31.0
Deepseek-VL2-Small [74]	24.0	57.8	18.2	29.3	26.4	31.0	22.0	14.7	31.4
Deepseek-VL2-Tiny [74]	20.0	57.5	22.5	25.8	22.5	27.1	17.8	14.8	27.5
LLaVA-OneVison-72B [36]	27.8	55.9	16.2	33.2	30.3	37.9	24.0	20.7	35.5
LLaVA-OneVision-7B [36]	19.6	33.1	47.3	37.2	25.7	29.7	20.1	20.0	32.3
LLaVA-OneVison-0.5B [36]	16.5	58.6	24.9	22.0	18.8	26.9	12.3	14.0	23.4
Qwen2.5-VL-72B [5]	36.1	31.6	32.3	53.3	43.1	46.4	37.9	27.0	51.8
Qwen2.5-VL-7B [5]	33.0	45.8	21.2	41.9	36.9	38.2	35.3	23.1	41.2
Qwen2.5-VL-3B [5]	28.0	52.2	19.9	34.9	31.0	32.3	29.3	18.6	35.1
Qwen2-VL-72B [68]	28.0	40.1	31.9	41.1	33.3	35.3	28.7	25.0	40.4
Qwen2-VL-7B [68]	26.3	40.6	33.1	39.3	31.5	36.8	28.3	23.0	33.5
Qwen2-VL-2B [68]	26.6	47.0	26.4	36.2	30.7	35.0	27.4	19.6	34.2
InternVL2.5-78B [13]	31.2	53.7	15.1	36.8	33.8	38.7	28.2	24.6	40.3
InternVL2.5-38B [13]	29.3	51.1	19.6	36.4	32.4	38.5	27.2	21.2	37.5
InternVL2.5-26B [13]	28.0	50.5	21.5	35.7	31.4	35.9	27.6	19.9	35.2
InternVL2.5-8B [13]	22.1	64.0	13.9	25.6	23.7	26.9	19.1	13.8	30.1
InternVL2.5-4B [13]	21.2	64.0	14.8	24.9	22.9	28.1	17.5	17.2	28.2
InternVL2.5-2B [13]	16.7	65.6	17.7	20.3	18.3	22.5	13.9	12.6	22.7
InternVL2.5-1B [13]	15.7	60.1	24.2	20.7	17.8	24.3	13.2	10.6	21.1
LLaVA-NeXT-Video-34B [41]	16.1	61.3	22.6	20.8	18.1	25.3	11.3	14.5	23.4
LLaVA-NeXT-Video-7B [41]	10.9	43.0	46.1	20.3	14.2	19.6	9.2	9.1	19.7
ST-LLM [43]	26.6	59.9	13.6	30.7	28.5	31.5	23.4	18.8	35.8
Chat-UniVi [32]	8.5	58.5	33.0	12.6	10.1	11.1	8.4	5.6	13.1
PPLaVA-Qwen [44]	20.1	48.8	31.2	29.2	23.8	26.2	17.8	14.4	33.1
PPLaVA-Vicuna [44]	10.0	41.4	48.6	19.4	13.2	15.4	6.6	14.0	22.4
VideoLLaMA3 [81]	25.3	60.8	13.9	29.4	27.2	36.9	18.4	20.0	34.5
Video-LLaVA [39]	15.6	64.6	19.8	19.5	17.3	23.9	9.7	11.0	24.2




Figure 6. **Calibration curves** based on the self-stated confidence scores and interval-level accuracy; **Brier scores** to quantify the deviation from the ideal calibration line.

taining only 43.1% F-score. This demonstrates that LVLMS still exhibit limited capability in factuality adherence within video contexts, while also highlighting the necessity of establishing Video SimpleQA.

LVLMS are overconfident in what they generate: Among all the 41 evaluated models, 32 models exhibit higher IN values (incorrect predictions) than NA values (non-attempted responses), indicating a prevalent tendency to generate answers despite insufficient factual knowledge.

To further investigate this overconfidence phenomenon, we conduct *calibration* experiments [27] to examine whether language models “know what they know”, *i.e.*, whether the models’ assessed confidence scores align with the actual likelihood of its responses being correct. Specifically, we instruct LVLMS to self-assess confidence scores (0-100) for their predictions. Responses are grouped into confidence intervals (10-point bins), and we calculate *interval accuracy* (correct predictions per bin). As shown in Figure 6, all models fall below the perfect calibration line, further demonstrating systematic overconfidence.

To measure the overconfidence degree, we additionally compute Brier scores [50] (lower is better) to quantify the deviation from ideal calibration. Specifically, for the stated confidence score, the Brier score is computed as the mean squared error between the predicted accuracy and ideal values. As shown in the left-top part of Figure 6, GPT-4o achieves the best calibration among the evaluated LVLMS, while Claude-3.5-Sonnet exhibits the poorest alignment.

Test-Time compute yields limited benefits: We empirically investigate the effectiveness of test-time compute [61] strategies on Video SimpleQA by conducting experiments with 200 randomly sampled instances. Two ap-




Figure 7. **Evaluations of test-time compute** including Best-of-N and Self-refine.

Table 3. **The comparisons between vanilla models and models with RAG** in terms of F-score and the total inference time (min).

Model	F-score		Inference Time	
	vanilla	w/ RAG	vanilla	w/ RAG
GPT-4o	53.7	53.8	37.2	63.9
Claude-3.5-SonnetV2	46.7	56.7	28.0	51.2
GPT-4V	37.7	50.0	24.1	51.6
Gemini-1.5-Pro-Flash	47.7	54.6	31.5	51.8
Qwen-VL-MAX	40.8	51.1	16.3	53.9

proaches are evaluated: 1) **Best-of-N**: The model independently generates N responses and selects the one it considers the best as the final answer; 2) **Self-refine**: The model is prompted to iteratively refine the initial outputs using self-generated feedback [48].

Figure 7 presents the accuracy (*i.e.*, the proportion of correct answers) under varying inference-time N (for Best-of-N) and different refinement iterations (for Self-refine). Experimental results reveal that both strategies fail to produce significant or consistent accuracy improvements. In some cases, these strategies even degrade performance. For instance, when increasing N from 8 to 16 in Best-of-N trials, Qwen-VL-Max [4], GPT-4V [52], and Gemini-1.5-Pro [58] exhibit reduced accuracy, suggesting that these models struggle to reliably select the best answer from multiple inferences. These findings highlight the challenges in improving factuality through post-hoc test-time compute strategies.

RAG yields significant gains at the cost of inference efficiency: We explore RAG to enhance knowledge-intensive Video SimpleQA benchmark comprehension. Specifically, we implement RAG using LlamaIndex [42] with Google and Wikipedia as retrieval sources, where retrieved documents are appended to the original LLM input to generate RAG-enhanced responses. As shown in Table 3, RAG achieves consistent and significant F-score improvements




Figure 8. The relationship between model size and F-score.

over vanilla models. For instance, when integrated with Qwen-VL-Max [4], RAG delivers an absolute improvement of 10.3% (40.8% vs. 51.1%). However, this performance gain comes with substantial computational overhead. Table 3 also quantifies the total inference time, demonstrating that RAG significantly impairs inference efficiency. Our findings highlight the critical trade-off between performance gains and computational practicality.

Model size scaling remains effective: As evidenced by the experiments across various model sizes in the InternVL2.5, Qwen2.5-VL, Qwen2-VL, and LLaVA-Onevision series presented in Table 2, model size scaling continues to demonstrate effectiveness, where larger architectures exhibit consistently superior performance. This observation aligns with the widely recognized scaling law principle.

Figure 8 delineates the relationship between model size and F-score. Notably, Qwen2.5-VL-7B [5] demonstrates remarkable performance that surpasses even larger models (e.g., InternVL2.5-78B [13] and InternVL2.5-38B [13]). This counter-intuitive observation suggests that while the model size scaling law persists, model scale cannot serve as the sole determinant of model capability.

Frame number scaling remains effective: In Figure 9, we demonstrate the impact of the number of sampled frames on performance. The results reveal a positive correlation between the video frame number and the F-score, thereby validating the effectiveness of frame number scaling.

Temporal understanding is critical for Video SimpleQA: To investigate the necessity of temporal understanding in the Video SimpleQA benchmark, we randomly sampled 200 QA pairs and instructed expert annotators to categorize them based on the temporal scope needed for accurate answers: 1) *single-frame* dependency; 2) *short-term* scope required (<10 seconds); 3) *medium-term* scope required (10s-1min); or 4) *long-term* scope required (>1min). It should be emphasized that our definitions of short/medium/long-




Figure 9. Frame number scaling experiments.

Table 4. **The proportion and performance** for QA pairs requiring single-frame or short/medium/long-term understanding.

Type	Prop	CO	IN↓	NA↓	CGA	F-score
Single-frame	13.0	57.7	23.1	19.2	71.4	63.8
Short-term	37.0	51.4	32.4	16.2	61.3	55.9
Medium-term	34.0	47.1	36.8	16.1	56.1	51.2
Long-term	16.0	37.5	40.6	21.9	48.0	42.1

term specifically denote the temporal scope required to correctly answer QA pairs, distinct from the absolute video duration referenced in existing long-form video understanding benchmarks [20, 69].

Table 4 summarizes the proportion of videos requiring different temporal reasoning scopes, which reveals that half of cases require either short-term or medium-term temporal understanding to answer correctly, while only 13% depend solely on single-frame information. This distribution demonstrates that our Video SimpleQA benchmark indeed necessitates temporal reasoning capabilities rather than simple frame-level understanding. Furthermore, as indicated in Table 4, videos with long-term temporal scope exhibit significantly lower performance metrics compared to the other three categories, which highlights the importance of long-context temporal understanding.

5. Conclusions

We present Video SimpleQA, the first benchmark explicitly designed for evaluating factual grounding in video contexts. Distinct from prior works, our framework introduces five diagnostic dimensions: knowledge integration, fact-seeking questioning, short-form unambiguous evaluation, external-source verification, and temporal reasoning demands. Through an extensive evaluation of 41 state-of-the-art LVLMS, we reveal notable deficiencies in factual adherence, limited improvements from test-time compute paradigms, and the trade-offs associated with RAG.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023. 2
- [2] Mubashara Akhtar, Michael Schlichtkrull, Zhijiang Guo, Oana Cocarascu, Elena Simperl, and Andreas Vlachos. Multimodal automated fact-checking: A survey. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 5430–5448, 2023. 2, 3
- [3] Anthropic. Claude 3.5 sonnet, 2024. 5, 6, 13
- [4] 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. 5, 6, 7, 8, 13
- [5] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, et al. Qwen2. 5-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923*, 2025. 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 15
- [6] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020. 2
- [7] ByteDance. Doubao. <https://www.volcengine.com/product/doubao>, 2024. 5, 6
- [8] Mu Cai, Reuben Tan, Jianrui Zhang, Bocheng Zou, Kai Zhang, Feng Yao, Fangrui Zhu, Jing Gu, Yiwu Zhong, Yuzhang Shang, et al. Temporalbench: Benchmarking fine-grained temporal understanding for multimodal video models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.10818*, 2024. 3
- [9] Meng Cao, Haoran Tang, Haoze Zhao, Hangyu Guo, Jiaheng Liu, Ge Zhang, Ruyang Liu, Qiang Sun, Ian Reid, and Xiaodan Liang. Physgame: Uncovering physical commonsense violations in gameplay videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.01800*, 2024. 3
- [10] Keshigeyan Chandrasegaran, Agrim Gupta, Lea M Hadzic, Taran Kota, Jimming He, Cristóbal Eyzaguirre, Zane Durante, Manling Li, Jiajun Wu, and Li Fei-Fei. Hourvideo: 1-hour video-language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04998*, 2024. 3
- [11] Keshigeyan Chandrasegaran, Agrim Gupta, Lea M Hadzic, Taran Kota, Jimming He, Cristóbal Eyzaguirre, Zane Durante, Manling Li, Jiajun Wu, and Li Fei-Fei. Hourvideo: 1-hour video-language understanding. In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2024. 3
- [12] Xiuyuan Chen, Yuan Lin, Yuchen Zhang, and Weiran Huang. Autoeval-video: An automatic benchmark for assessing large vision language models in open-ended video question answering. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 179–195. Springer, 2024. 2, 3
- [13] Zhe Chen, Weiyun Wang, Yue Cao, Yangzhou Liu, Zhangwei Gao, Erfei Cui, Jinguo Zhu, Shenglong Ye, Hao Tian, Zhaoyang Liu, et al. Expanding performance boundaries of open-source multimodal models with model, data, and test-time scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.05271*, 2024. 5, 6, 8, 13
- [14] Xianfu Cheng, Wei Zhang, Shiwei Zhang, Jian Yang, Xiangyuan Guan, Xianjie Wu, Xiang Li, Ge Zhang, Jiaheng Liu, Yuying Mai, et al. Simplevqa: Multimodal factuality evaluation for multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13059*, 2025. 3
- [15] I Chern, Steffi Chern, Shiqi Chen, Weizhe Yuan, Kehua Feng, Chunting Zhou, Junxian He, Graham Neubig, Pengfei Liu, et al. Factool: Factuality detection in generative ai—a tool augmented framework for multi-task and multi-domain scenarios. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13528*, 2023. 2, 3
- [16] Daniel Cores, Michael Dorkenwald, Manuel Mucientes, Cees GM Snoek, and Yuki M Asano. Tvbench: Redesigning video-language evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.07752*, 2024. 3
- [17] Google DeepMind. Introducing gemini 2.0: our new ai model for the agentic era. *Google Blog*, 2024. 5, 6
- [18] Yifan Du, Kun Zhou, Yuqi Huo, Yifan Li, Wayne Xin Zhao, Haoyu Lu, Zijia Zhao, Bingning Wang, Weipeng Chen, and Ji-Rong Wen. Towards event-oriented long video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.14129*, 2024. 3
- [19] Xinyu Fang, Kangrui Mao, Haodong Duan, Xiangyu Zhao, Yining Li, Dahua Lin, and Kai Chen. Mmbench-video: A long-form multi-shot benchmark for holistic video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.14515*, 2024. 2
- [20] Chaoyou Fu, Yuhan Dai, Yondong Luo, Lei Li, Shuhuai Ren, Renrui Zhang, Zihan Wang, Chenyu Zhou, Yunhang Shen, Mengdan Zhang, et al. Video-mme: The first-ever comprehensive evaluation benchmark of multi-modal llms in video analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.21075*, 2024. 2, 3, 5, 8
- [21] Noa Garcia, Mayu Otani, Chenhui Chu, and Yuta Nakashima. Knowit vqa: Answering knowledge-based questions about videos. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, pages 10826–10834, 2020. 1, 2, 3
- [22] Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, Yelong Shen, Yujie Yang, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. Critic: Large language models can self-correct with tool-interactive critiquing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11738*, 2023. 2, 3
- [23] Raghav Goyal, Samira Ebrahimi Kahou, Vincent Michalski, Joanna Materzynska, Susanne Westphal, Heuna Kim, Valentin Haebel, Ingo Fruend, Peter Yianilos, Moritz Mueller-Freitag, et al. The “something something” video database for learning and evaluating visual common sense. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 5842–5850, 2017. 3
- [24] Jiawei Gu, Xuhui Jiang, Zhichao Shi, Hexiang Tan, Xuehao Zhai, Chengjin Xu, Wei Li, Yinghan Shen, Shengjie Ma, Honghao Liu, et al. A survey on llm-as-a-judge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15594*, 2024. 5
- [25] Jihao Gu, Yingyao Wang, Pi Bu, Chen Wang, Ziming Wang, Tengtao Song, Donglai Wei, Jiale Yuan, Yingxiu Zhao, Yancheng He, et al. “see the world, discover knowledge”: A chinese factuality evaluation for large vision language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.11718*, 2025. 3
- [26] Tianrui Guan, Fuxiao Liu, Xiyang Wu, Ruiqi Xian, Zongxia Li, Xiaoyu Liu, Xijun Wang, Lichang Chen, Furong Huang,

- Yaser Yacoob, et al. Hallusionbench: an advanced diagnostic suite for entangled language hallucination and visual illusion in large vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14375–14385, 2024. 3
- [27] Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1321–1330. PMLR, 2017. 7
- [28] Xuehai He, Weixi Feng, Kaizhi Zheng, Yujie Lu, Wanrong Zhu, Jiachen Li, Yue Fan, Jianfeng Wang, Linjie Li, Zhengyuan Yang, et al. Mmworld: Towards multi-discipline multi-faceted world model evaluation in videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08407*, 2024. 1, 2, 3
- [29] Yancheng He, Shilong Li, Jiaheng Liu, Yingshui Tan, Weixun Wang, Hui Huang, Xingyuan Bu, Hangyu Guo, Chengwei Hu, Boren Zheng, et al. Chinese simpleqa: A chinese factuality evaluation for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.07140*, 2024. 2, 3
- [30] Kairui Hu, Penghao Wu, Fanyi Pu, Wang Xiao, Yuanhan Zhang, Xiang Yue, Bo Li, and Ziwei Liu. Video-mmmu: Evaluating knowledge acquisition from multi-discipline professional videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.13826*, 2025. 1, 2, 3
- [31] Aman Jain, Mayank Kothiyari, Vishwajeet Kumar, Preethi Jyothi, Ganesh Ramakrishnan, and Soumen Chakrabarti. Select, substitute, search: A new benchmark for knowledge-augmented visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the 44th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 2491–2498, 2021. 2, 3
- [32] Peng Jin, Ryuichi Takanobu, Wancai Zhang, Xiaochun Cao, and Li Yuan. Chat-univi: Unified visual representation empowers large language models with image and video understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13700–13710, 2024. 5, 6
- [33] Will Kay, Joao Carreira, Karen Simonyan, Brian Zhang, Chloe Hillier, Sudheendra Vijayanarasimhan, Fabio Viola, Tim Green, Trevor Back, Paul Natsev, et al. The kinetics human action video dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.06950*, 2017. 3
- [34] Ilker Kesen, Andrea Pedrotti, Mustafa Dogan, Michele Cafagna, Emre Can Acikgoz, Letitia Parcalabescu, Iacer Calixto, Anette Frank, Albert Gatt, Aykut Erdem, et al. Vilma: A zero-shot benchmark for linguistic and temporal grounding in video-language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 3
- [35] Ranjay Krishna, Kenji Hata, Frederic Ren, Li Fei-Fei, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Dense-captioning events in videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 706–715, 2017. 3
- [36] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Dong Guo, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Yanwei Li, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-onevision: Easy visual task transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03326*, 2024. 5, 6, 13
- [37] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yinan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Ping Luo, et al. Mvbench: A comprehensive multi-modal video understanding benchmark. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 22195–22206, 2024. 2, 3
- [38] Shicheng Li, Lei Li, Shuhuai Ren, Yuanxin Liu, Yi Liu, Rundong Gao, Xu Sun, and Lu Hou. Vitatecs: A diagnostic dataset for temporal concept understanding of video-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17404*, 2023. 3
- [39] Bin Lin, Bin Zhu, Yang Ye, Munan Ning, Peng Jin, and Li Yuan. Video-llava: Learning united visual representation by alignment before projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10122*, 2023. 5, 6
- [40] Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. Truthfulqa: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3214–3252, 2022. 2, 3
- [41] 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
- [42] Jerry Liu. LlamaIndex, 2022. 4, 7
- [43] Ruyang Liu, Chen Li, Haoran Tang, Yixiao Ge, Ying Shan, and Ge Li. St-llm: Large language models are effective temporal learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00308*, 2024. 5, 6
- [44] Ruyang Liu, Haoran Tang, Haibo Liu, Yixiao Ge, Ying Shan, Chen Li, and Jiankun Yang. Ppllava: Varied video sequence understanding with prompt guidance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.02327*, 2024. 5, 6
- [45] Yuanxin Liu, Shicheng Li, Yi Liu, Yuxiang Wang, Shuhuai Ren, Lei Li, Sishuo Chen, Xu Sun, and Lu Hou. Tempcompass: Do video llms really understand videos? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.00476*, 2024. 2, 3
- [46] Ye Liu, Zongyang Ma, Zhongang Qi, Yang Wu, Ying Shan, and Chang Wen Chen. Et bench: Towards open-ended event-level video-language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.18111*, 2024. 3
- [47] Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Rasheed, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Video-chatgpt: Towards detailed video understanding via large vision and language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05424*, 2023. 3
- [48] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, et al. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:46534–46594, 2023. 7
- [49] 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*, pages 3195–3204, 2019. 2, 3
- [50] Matthias Minderer, Josip Djolonga, Rob Romijnders, Frances Hubis, Xiaohua Zhai, Neil Houlsby, Dustin Tran, and Mario Lucic. Revisiting the calibration of modern neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:15682–15694, 2021. 7

- [51] Munan Ning, Bin Zhu, Yujia Xie, Bin Lin, Jiayi Cui, Lu Yuan, Dongdong Chen, and Li Yuan. Video-bench: A comprehensive benchmark and toolkit for evaluating video-based large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16103*, 2023. 2, 3
- [52] OpenAI. Gpt-4v(ision) system card. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:263218031>, 2023. 5, 6, 7
- [53] OpenAI. Hello gpt-4o. *OpenAI Blog*, 2024. 3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 15
- [54] OpenAI. Gpt-4o mini: advancing cost-efficient intelligence. *OpenAI Blog*, 2024. 5, 6, 13
- [55] OpenAI. Introducing openai o1-preview. *OpenAI Blog*, 2024. 5, 6
- [56] Shirui Pan, Linhao Luo, Yufei Wang, Chen Chen, Jiapu Wang, and Xindong Wu. Unifying large language models and knowledge graphs: A roadmap. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2024. 2, 3
- [57] Viorica Patraucean, Lucas Smaira, Ankush Gupta, Adria Recasens, Larisa Markeeva, Dylan Banarse, Skanda Koppula, Mateusz Malinowski, Yi Yang, Carl Doersch, et al. Perception test: A diagnostic benchmark for multimodal video models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 3
- [58] Machel Reid, Nikolay Savinov, Denis Teplyashin, Dmitry Lepikhin, Timothy Lillicrap, Jean-baptiste Alayrac, Radu Soricut, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, Julian Schrittwieser, et al. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*, 2024. 2, 7
- [59] Anna Rohrbach, Marcus Rohrbach, Wei Qiu, Annemarie Friedrich, Manfred Pinkal, and Bernt Schiele. Coherent multi-sentence video description with variable level of detail. In *Pattern Recognition: 36th German Conference, GCPR 2014, Münster, Germany, September 2-5, 2014, Proceedings 36*, pages 184–195. Springer, 2014. 3
- [60] Ziyao Shanguan, Chuhan Li, Yuxuan Ding, Yanan Zheng, Yilun Zhao, Tesca Fitzgerald, and Arman Cohan. Tomato: Assessing visual temporal reasoning capabilities in multimodal foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.23266*, 2024. 3
- [61] Charlie Snell, Jaehoon Lee, Kelvin Xu, and Aviral Kumar. Scaling llm test-time compute optimally can be more effective than scaling model parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03314*, 2024. 3, 7
- [62] Gemini Team, Petko Georgiev, Ving Ian Lei, Ryan Burnell, Libin Bai, Anmol Gulati, Garrett Tanzer, Damien Vincent, Zhufeng Pan, Shibo Wang, et al. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*, 2024. 3, 5, 6, 13, 15
- [63] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023. 2
- [64] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023. 2
- [65] Cunxiang Wang, Xiaoze Liu, Yuanhao Yue, Xiangru Tang, Tianhang Zhang, Cheng Jiayang, Yunzhi Yao, Wenyang Gao, Xuming Hu, Zehan Qi, et al. Survey on factuality in large language models: Knowledge, retrieval and domain-specificity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07521*, 2023. 2, 3
- [66] Peng Wang, Qi Wu, Chunhua Shen, Anton van den Hengel, and Anthony Dick. Explicit knowledge-based reasoning for visual question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.02570*, 2015. 2, 3
- [67] Peng Wang, Qi Wu, Chunhua Shen, Anthony Dick, and Anton Van Den Hengel. Fvqa: Fact-based visual question answering. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 40(10):2413–2427, 2017. 2, 3
- [68] 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. 5, 6
- [69] Weihang Wang, Zehai He, Wenyi Hong, Yean Cheng, Xiaohan Zhang, Ji Qi, Shiyu Huang, Bin Xu, Yuxiao Dong, Ming Ding, et al. Lvbench: An extreme long video understanding benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08035*, 2024. 3, 8
- [70] Yuxia Wang, Minghan Wang, Muhammad Arslan Manzoor, Fei Liu, Georgi Georgiev, Rocktim Das, and Preslav Nakov. Factuality of large language models: A survey. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 19519–19529, 2024. 2, 3
- [71] Yuxuan Wang, Yueqian Wang, Dongyan Zhao, Cihang Xie, and Zilong Zheng. Videohalluciner: Evaluating intrinsic and extrinsic hallucinations in large video-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.16338*, 2024. 3
- [72] Jason Wei, Nguyen Karina, Hyung Won Chung, Yunxin Joy Jiao, Spencer Papay, Amelia Glaese, John Schulman, and William Fedus. Measuring short-form factuality in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04368*, 2024. 2, 3, 5
- [73] Haoning Wu, Dongxu Li, Bei Chen, and Junnan Li. Longvideobench: A benchmark for long-context interleaved video-language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.15754*, 2024. 3
- [74] Zhiyu Wu, Xiaokang Chen, Zizheng Pan, Xingchao Liu, Wen Liu, Damai Dai, Huazuo Gao, Yiyang Ma, Chengyue Wu, Bingxuan Wang, et al. Deepseek-vl2: Mixture-of-experts vision-language models for advanced multimodal understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.10302*, 2024. 5, 6
- [75] Junbin Xiao, Xindi Shang, Angela Yao, and Tat-Seng Chua. Next-qa: Next phase of question-answering to explaining temporal actions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9777–9786, 2021. 3
- [76] Jun Xu, Tao Mei, Ting Yao, and Yong Rui. Msr-vtt: A large video description dataset for bridging video and language. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5288–5296, 2016. 3

- [77] Jihan Yang, Shusheng Yang, Anjali W Gupta, Rilyn Han, Li Fei-Fei, and Saining Xie. Thinking in space: How multimodal large language models see, remember, and recall spaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.14171*, 2024. 3
- [78] Wenhao Yu, Dan Iter, Shuohang Wang, Yichong Xu, Mingxuan Ju, Soumya Sanyal, Chenguang Zhu, Michael Zeng, and Meng Jiang. Generate rather than retrieve: Large language models are strong context generators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.10063*, 2022. 2, 3
- [79] Zhou Yu, Dejing Xu, Jun Yu, Ting Yu, Zhou Zhao, Yuet-ing Zhuang, and Dacheng Tao. Activitynet-qa: A dataset for understanding complex web videos via question answering. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 9127–9134, 2019. 3
- [80] Rowan Zellers, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. From recognition to cognition: Visual commonsense reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6720–6731, 2019. 2, 3
- [81] Boqiang Zhang, Kehan Li, Zesen Cheng, Zhiqiang Hu, Yuqian Yuan, Guanzheng Chen, Sicong Leng, Yuming Jiang, Hang Zhang, Xin Li, et al. Videollama 3: Frontier multimodal foundation models for image and video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.13106*, 2025. 5, 6
- [82] Haoran Zhang, Hangyu Guo, Shuyue Guo, Meng Cao, Wenhao Huang, Jiaheng Liu, and Ge Zhang. Ing-vp: Mllms cannot play easy vision-based games yet. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.06555*, 2024. 3
- [83] Jiacheng Zhang, Yang Jiao, Shaoxiang Chen, Jingjing Chen, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Eventhallusion: Diagnosing event hallucinations in video llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.16597*, 2024. 3
- [84] Yuanhan Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Bo Li, Fanyi Pu, Christopher Arif Setiadharm, Jingkang Yang, and Ziwei Liu. Worldqa: Multimodal world knowledge in videos through long-chain reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.03272*, 2024. 1, 2, 3
- [85] Yilun Zhao, Lujing Xie, Haowei Zhang, Guo Gan, Yitao Long, Zhiyuan Hu, Tongyan Hu, Weiyuan Chen, Chuhan Li, Junyang Song, et al. Mmvu: Measuring expert-level multi-discipline video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12380*, 2025. 1, 2, 3




Figure 10. Results with different judge models.

6. Supplementary

This supplementary material is organized as follows. First, we provide a more detailed experimental setup (Sec 6.1). Then we present more experimental results in Sec 6.2. The error type analysis and visualizations are respectively presented in Sec 6.3 and Sec 6.4.

6.1. Experiment Setup

Configuration of Evaluated Models. Table 5 details the configuration of each evaluated models. We use the default settings from the official implementation of each model to process vision input. All inferences are reproducible on a workstation equipped with 8 NVIDIA A100 GPUs.

Prompts. The prompts for the grader, along with instructions guiding the model to output answers and confidence levels, are illustrated in Figure 14, Figure 15 and Figure 16, respectively.

The taxonomy of videos in Video SimpleQA. In Table 6 and Table 7, we present the detailed taxonomy of Video SimpleQA including 4 primary categories, 15 secondary categories, and 84 tertiary categories.

6.2. More Experiments

Results with different judge models. The short-form answer paradigm of Video SimpleQA enables automated evaluation through LLM-as-a-judge frameworks with low run-to-run variance. To demonstrate this, we select five typical LVLMs, and evaluate them using various judge models including Gemini-1.5-Pro-Flash [62], Gemini-1.5-Pro [62], Claude-3.5-SonnetV2 [3], GPT-4o [53], and GPT-4o-mini [54]. As shown in Figure 10, while the specific scores from different judge models vary, the relative rankings of the evaluated models remain consistent. This demonstrates the robustness of our evaluation, indicating that smaller judge models (such as GPT-4o-mini[54]) can achieve high consistency rates, enabling efficient evaluation even with limited resources.

Performance across secondary categories. Figure 11 demonstrates the F-score performance across 15 secondary




Figure 11. The performance of different models across 15 secondary categories in Video SimpleQA.

categories. As shown, we observe distinct performance patterns among the compared LVLMs.

- *Capability distribution:* Gemini-1.5-Pro [62] demonstrates the most consistent performance with superior F-scores across domains, particularly excelling in Language & Material Culture and Meteorology. GPT-4o [53] and Claude-3.5-SonnetV2 [3] follow with complementary strengths, where GPT-4o [53] exhibits notable advantages in Beliefs & Institutions compared to other LVLMs.
- *Imbalanced performance profiles:* Qwen2.5-VL-72B [5] and Qwen-VL-MAX [4] show significant performance variance, with Qwen-VL-MAX [4] severely underperforming in Applied sciences compared to its moderate capabilities in other domains. LLaVA-Onevision-72B [36] and InternVL2.5-78B [13] consistently underperform across most domains, with particularly low F-scores in technical areas.
- *Disciplinary performance gap:* All models exhibit systematically lower F-scores in scientific domains (Physical/Applied Sciences) compared to humanities-oriented categories (History & Heritage, Civil & Architecture), with LLaVA-Onevision-72B [36] and InternVL2.5-78B [13] showing the most pronounced disparities.

6.3. Error Types Analysis

This section presents a case study analyzing error patterns in GPT-4o [53], Gemini-1.5-pro [62], and Qwen2.5-VL-72B [5] through a systematic examination of 200 randomly selected samples per model spanning diverse question types. We categorize observed errors into four primary classes, each illustrated with representative examples:

- **Perception Error:** Incorrect identification of objects. This occurs when LVLMs misidentify or fail to detect key visual elements in input frames (*cf.* Figure 12 (a)).

Table 5. **Configurations** of evaluated LVLMs in Video SimpleQA .

Organization	Model	Release	Version	Input Frames
<i>Proprietary Multi-modal LLMs</i>				
OpenAI	o1-preview	2024-9	o1-preview-2024-09-12	32
	GPT-4o	2024-8	gpt-4o-2024-08-06	32
	GPT-4o-mini	2024-7	gpt-4o-mini-2024-07-18	32
	GPT-4V	2023-9	gpt-4-vision	32
Google	Gemini-2.0-Flash-Thinking	2024-12	gemini-2.0-flash-thinking-exp-1219	32
	Gemini-2.0-Flash	2024-12	gemini-2.0-flash-exp	32
	Gemini-1.5-Pro	2024-9	gemini-1.5-pro	32
	Gemini-1.5-Pro-Flash	2024-9	gemini-1.5-pro-flash	32
Anthropic	Claude-3.5-Sonnet	2024-6	claude-3-5-sonnet	32
	Claude-3.5-SonnetV2	2024-10	claude-3-5-sonnetV2	32
Alibaba	Qwen-VL-MAX	2024-1	Qwen-VL-MAX	32
ByteDance	Doubao-1.5-vision-pro	2025-1	Doubao-1.5-vision-pro	32
	Doubao-vision-pro	2025-1	Doubao-vision-pro	32
	Doubao-vision-lite	2025-1	Doubao-vision-lite	32
<i>Open-source Multi-modal LLMs</i>				
Shanghai AI Lab	InternVL2.5-1B	2024-11	InternVL2.5-1B	4
	InternVL2.5-2B	2024-11	InternVL2.5-2B	4
	InternVL2.5-4B	2024-11	InternVL2.5-4B	4
	InternVL2.5-8B	2024-11	InternVL2.5-8B	4
	InternVL2.5-26B	2024-11	InternVL2.5-26B	4
	InternVL2.5-38B	2024-11	InternVL2.5-38B	4
	InternVL2.5-78B	2024-11	InternVL2.5-78B	4
Alibaba	Qwen2-VL-2B	2024-8	Qwen2-VL-2B-Instruct	16
	Qwen2-VL-7B	2024-8	Qwen2-VL-7B-Instruct	16
	Qwen2-VL-72B	2024-9	Qwen2-VL-72B-Instruct	16
	Qwen2.5-VL-3B	2025-2	Qwen2.5-VL-3B-Instruct	16
	Qwen2.5-VL-7B	2025-2	Qwen2.5-VL-7B-Instruct	16
DAMO	Qwen2.5-VL-72B	2025-2	Qwen2.5-VL-72B-Instruct	16
	VideoLLaMA3	2025-1	VideoLLaMA3	128
DeepSeek	DeepSeek-VL2	2024-12	deepseek-vl2	2
	DeepSeek-VL2-Small	2024-12	deepseek-vl2-small	2
	DeepSeek-VL2-Tiny	2024-12	deepseek-vl2-tiny	2
Llava Hugging Face	LLaVA-OneVision-0.5B	2024-9	llava-onevision-qwen2-0.5b-ov-chat-hf	16
	LLaVA-OneVision-7B	2024-9	llava-onevision-qwen2-7b-ov-chat-hf	16
	LLaVA-OneVision-72B	2024-9	llava-onevision-qwen2-72b-ov-chat-hf	4
	LLaVA-NeXT-Video-7B	2024-6	LLaVA-NeXT-Video-7B-hf	4
	LLaVA-NeXT-Video-34B	2024-6	LLaVA-NeXT-Video-34B-hf	4
PKU	ST-LLM	2024-3	ST-LLM	32
	Chat-UniVi	2023-11	Chat-UniVi	100
	PPLaVA-Qwen	2024-10	PPLaVA-Qwen	32
	PPLaVA-Vicuna	2024-10	PPLaVA-Vicuna	32
	Video-LLaVA	2023-11	Video-LLaVA	8

- **Lack of Knowledge:** Correct identification but lacking relevant knowledge. LVLMs accurately perceive the visual content but cannot provide accurate information due to knowledge limitations (*cf.* Figure 12 (b)).
- **Refusal to Answer:** LVLMs recognize their inability to make a confident determination and opts to abstain from answering (*cf.* Figure 12 (c)).
- **Failure to Follow Instructions:** LVLMs understand the

input but fail to properly execute the given instructions. This typically manifests in two ways: (1) the generated outputs do not conform to the specified format requirements, or (2) the responses are irrelevant to the question posed, *e.g.*, addressing different topics than what was actually requested (*cf.* Figure 12 (d)).

The error type distribution is depicted in Figure 13. Our analysis reveals the following critical insights: 1) Lack of knowledge emerges as the predominant error source. For all



Question: What animal is the person catching in the video?
Ground Truth: Bats.

Answer of GPT-4o: Sorry, there is no animal in the video.

Error Type: Perception Error

Error Reason: The model fails to recognize the animal in the video due to the limited capability of perception.

(a)



Question: Which country is the origin of the insect in the video?
Ground Truth: The United States.

Answer of Qwen2.5-VL-72B: The video does not provide any information about the origin of the insect. It only shows the beetle on a tree branch.

Error Type: Lack of Knowledge

Error Reason: The model can recognize that this is a beetle, but it does not have relevant knowledge about this beetle, leading to errors.

(b)



Question: What city is this building located in from the video?
Ground Truth: New York City.

Answer of GPT-4o: I'm sorry, but I can't answer the question.

Error Type: Refusal to Answer

Error Reason: The model recognizes that it cannot make a confident judgment and chooses to refrain from answering.

(c)



Question: In which country is the tower in the video located?
Ground Truth: Russia.

Answer of Qwen2.5-VL-72B: The tower in the video is the Shukhov Tower, located in Moscow.

Error Type: Failure to Follow Instructions

Error Reason: The model correctly identified the tower, but it did not follow the question. The question asks about the country, but it answers with a city.

(d)

Figure 12. **Visualizations of typical error types** including (a) perception error; (b) lack of knowledge; (c) refusal to answer; (d) failure to follow instructions.




Figure 13. **Error type distributions** across Qwen2.5-VL-72B [5], GPT-4o [53] and Gemini-1.5-Pro [62].

three LVLMs, it constitutes the largest error category. This highlights the urgent need to explore strategies for incorporating more accurate knowledge during pre-training and instruction tuning; 2) Qwen2.5-VL-72B demonstrates weaker instruction-following capabilities compared to its counterparts, as evidenced by its higher rate of failure to follow instructions errors (12%); 3) Perception errors remain relatively low across all models, underscoring the advanced visual comprehension abilities of modern LVLMs.

6.4. Visualizations

The visualization results of three typical LVLMs (GPT-4o [53], Gemini-1.5-Pro [62] and Qwen2.5-VL-72B [5]) are

illustrated in Figure 17 – Figure 21.

Your job is to look at some video frames generated from the video, a question generated from the video, a gold target, and a predicted answer, and then assign a grade of either ["CORRECT", "INCORRECT", "NOT_ATTEMPTED"]. First, I will give examples of each grade, and then you will grade a new example.

The following are examples of CORRECT predicted answers.

...

Question: What is the name of the man's child in the video?

Gold target: Malia Obama and Sasha Obama

Predicted answer 1: sasha and malia obama

Predicted answer 2: most people would say Malia and Sasha, but I'm not sure and would have to double check

Predicted answer 3: Barack Obama has two daughters. Their names are Malia Ann and Natasha Marian, but they are commonly referred to as Malia Obama and Sasha Obama. Malia was born on July 4, 1998, and Sasha was born on June 10, 2001.

...

These predicted answers are all CORRECT because:

- They fully contain the important information in the gold target.
- They do not contain any information that contradicts the gold target.
- Only semantic meaning matters; capitalization, punctuation, grammar, and order don't matter.
- Hedging and guessing are permissible, provided that the gold target is fully included and the response contains no incorrect information or contradictions.

The following are examples of INCORRECT predicted answers.

...

Question: What is the name of the man's child in the video?

Gold target: Malia and Sasha

Predicted answer 1: Malia.

Predicted answer 2: Malia, Sasha, and Susan.

Predicted answer 3: Barack Obama does not have any children.

Predicted answer 4: I think it's either Malia and Sasha. Or it could be Malia and Jackie. Or it could be Joey and Malia.

Predicted answer 5: While I don't know their exact names, I can tell you that Barack Obama has three children.

Predicted answer 6: It's possible you may mean Betsy and Olivia. However, you should clarify further details with updated references if necessary. Is that the correct answer?

Predicted answer 7: It may be the case that Obama's child is named James. However, it's recommended to confirm the most accurate and updated information since this could change over time. This model may not always reflect the most current information.

...

These predicted answers are all INCORRECT because:

- A factual statement in the answer contradicts the gold target. Incorrect statements that have some hedging (e.g., "it is possible that", "although i'm not sure, i think") are also considered incorrect.

The following are examples of NOT_ATTEMPTED predicted answers.

...

Question: What is the name of the man's child in the video?

Gold target: Malia and Sasha

Predicted answer 1: I don't know.

Predicted answer 2: I need more context about which Obama you are talking about.

Predicted answer 3: Without researching the web, I cannot answer this question. However, I can tell you that Barack Obama has two children.

Predicted answer 4: Barack Obama has two children. I know that one of them is Malia, but I'm not sure about the other one.

...

These predicted answers are all NOT_ATTEMPTED because:

- The important information in the gold target is not included in the answer.
- No statements in the answer contradict the gold target.

Figure 14. **Prompt** for grading: Part 1

Also note the following things:

- For grading questions where the gold target is a number, the predicted answer needs to be correct to the last significant figure in the gold answer. For example, consider a question "How many citations does the Transformer Paper have?" with gold target "120k".
- Predicted answers "120k", "124k", and "115k" are all CORRECT.
- Predicted answers "100k" and "113k" are INCORRECT.
- Predicted answers "around 100k" and "more than 50k" are considered NOT_ATTEMPTED because they neither confirm nor contradict the gold target.
- The gold target may contain more information than the question. In such cases, the predicted answer only needs to contain the information that is in the question.
- For example, consider the question "What episode did Derek and Meredith get legally married in Grey's Anatomy?" with gold target "Season 7, Episode 20: White Wedding". Either "Season 7, Episode 20" or "White Wedding" would be considered a CORRECT answer.
- Do not punish predicted answers if they omit information that would be clearly inferred from the question.
- For example, consider the question "What city is OpenAI headquartered in?" and the gold target "San Francisco, California". The predicted answer "San Francisco" would be considered CORRECT, even though it does not include "California".
- Consider the question "What award did A pretrainer's guide to training data: Measuring the effects of data age, domain coverage, quality, & toxicity win at NAACL '24?", the gold target is "Outstanding Paper Award". The predicted answer "Outstanding Paper" would be considered CORRECT, because "award" is presumed in the question.
- For the question "What is the height of Jason Wei in meters?", the gold target is "1.73 m". The predicted answer "1.75" would be considered CORRECT, because meters is specified in the question.
- For the question "What is the name of Barack Obama's wife?", the gold target is "Michelle Obama". The predicted answer "Michelle" would be considered CORRECT, because the last name can be presumed.
- Do not punish for typos in people's name if it's clearly the same name.
- For example, if the gold target is "Hyung Won Chung", you can consider the following predicted answers as correct: "Hyoong Won Choong", "Hyungwon Chung", or "Hyun Won Chung".

Grade the predicted answer of the question as one of:

A: CORRECT

B: INCORRECT

C: NOT_ATTEMPTED

Just return the letter "A", "B", or "C", with no text around it.

Figure 15. **Prompt** for grading: Part 2

Do not generate any intermediate reasoning process. Based on the video frames, directly output a short, accurate answer to the user's question and include a confidence score (0-100) in the following JSON format:

```
{"answer": "Your answer here", "confidence_score": number}
```

Do not include any additional text or explanations outside this JSON format.


Figure 16. **Prompt** for calibration experiments.

Table 6. **The taxonomy of videos** in Video SimpleQA (part 1).

Primary Category	Secondary Category	Tertiary Category	Count
Nature	Geology & Landscapes	Fossils	43
		Landscapes	19
		Rocks & Minerals	7
		Geomorphology	5
		Volcanic Features	7
		Coastal Landforms	6
Nature	Flora & Fauna	Animalia	18
		Marine Organisms	91
		Plantae	61
		Fungi	37
		Microorganisms	82
		Endangered Species	490
Nature	Meteorology	Weather	3
		Climate	6
		Atmospheric Phenomena	6
		Forecasting	3
Engineering	Civil & Architecture	Architecture	56
		Civil	65
		Structural Engineering	56
		Urban Planning	46
Engineering	Mechanical & Electrical	Mechanical	52
		Electrical	47
		Mechatronics	50
		Aerospace Engineering	43
Engineering	Chemical & Process	Chemical	4
		Process	3
		Biochemical Engineering	3
Engineering	Environmental & Geophysical	Polymer Engineering	3
		Environmental	22
		Geophysical	21
		Hydrology	26
Science	Physical sciences	Climate Engineering	20
		Physics	2
		Chemistry	4
		Astronomy	5
		Earth sciences	2
		Materials Science	9
		Atmospheric Science	3
		Geophysics	6
Science	Life sciences	Biology	10
		Medicine	11
		Ecology	11
		Genetics	10
		Neuroscience	7
Science	Formal sciences	Mathematics	3
		Computer Science	2
		Statistics	3
		Logic	1
Science	Applied sciences	Technology	6
		Robotics	3
		Agricultural Science	4
		Data Science	3

Table 7. **The taxonomy of videos** in Video SimpleQA (part 2).

Primary Category	Secondary Category	Tertiary Category	Count
Society & Culture	Arts & Recreation	Art	16
		Literature	6
		Music	30
		Entertainment	40
		Sports	12
		Dance	12
		Theatre	62
		Film	25
		Photography	10
		Games	31
Society & Culture	Beliefs & Institutions	Belief	5
		Religion	20
		Philosophy	7
		Ethics	9
		Politics	11
		Flags	8
		Government	3
		Law	3
		People	5
Society & Culture	History & Heritage	History	118
		Events	9
		Places	9
		Archaeology	24
		Heritage Sites	9
		Genealogy	9
Society & Culture	Language & Material Culture	Language	2
		Objects	9
		Food	7
		Clothing	2
		Transportation	5
		Instruments	3
		Tools	3



Video URL: <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Template:Motd/2012-02-20>


Question: Which sea's changes are documented in the video?

Ground Truth: The Aral Sea.

Answer of GPT-4o: The Aral Sea. **Correct**

Answer of Gemini-1.5-Pro: The Aral Sea. **Correct**

Answer of Qwen2.5-VL-72B: The video documents the changes in the Aral Sea. **Correct**



Video URL: <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Template:Motd/2011-10-19>

Question: What fluid dynamics phenomenon is demonstrated in the video?


Ground Truth: Tea leaf paradox.

Answer of GPT-4o: Tea leaf paradox. **Correct**

Answer of Gemini-1.5-Pro: Tea leaf paradox. **Correct**

Answer of Qwen2.5-VL-72B: It demonstrates the phenomenon of fluid dynamics, specifically the behavior of a liquid when it is disturbed and then allowed to come to rest. **Not Attempted**

Figure 17. Sampled examples in Video SimpleQA and the responses of typical LVLMS: part 1



Video URL: <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Template:Motd/2009-07-28>


Question: Who are the pioneers associated with the aircraft depicted at the beginning of the video?

Ground Truth: The Wright brothers, Orville and Wilbur Wright.

Answer of GPT-4o: The Wright brothers, Orville and Wilbur Wright. **Correct**

Answer of Gemini-1.5-Pro: The Wright brothers, Wilbur and Orville, are the pioneers associated with the aircraft shown at the beginning of the video. **Correct**

Answer of Qwen2.5-VL-72B: The pioneers associated with the aircraft depicted at the beginning of the video are the Wright brothers. **Correct**



Video URL: <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Template:Motd/2011-03-18>

Question: What physical principle is demonstrated in the video?


Ground Truth: Conservation of angular momentum.

Answer of GPT-4o: Conservation of angular momentum. **Correct**

Answer of Gemini-1.5-Pro: The video demonstrates the principle of conservation of angular momentum. **Correct**

Answer of Qwen2.5-VL-72B: The video demonstrates the principle of conservation of angular momentum. **Correct**

Figure 18. Sampled examples in Video SimpleQA and the responses of typical LVLMS: part 2



Video URL: <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Template:Motd/2013-01-08>


Question: What principle governs the arrangement of the microstructures in the video?

Ground Truth: Origami principles.

Answer of GPT-4o: Magnetic fields. **Incorrect**

Answer of Gemini-1.5-Pro: The arrangement of the microstructures in the video is governed by the principle of self-assembly. **Not Attempted**

Answer of Qwen2.5-VL-72B: The arrangement of the microstructures in the video is governed by the principles of self-assembly and capillary forces. **Incorrect**



Video URL: <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Template:Motd/2011-08-27>

Question: What physical principle is discussed in this video?


Ground Truth: Conservation of energy.

Answer of GPT-4o: Newton's Cradle and Conservation of Momentum and Energy. **Correct**

Answer of Gemini-1.5-Pro: This video demonstrates the principles of conservation of momentum and conservation of energy, as shown by the Newton's cradle. **Correct**

Answer of Qwen2.5-VL-72B: The video depicts a Newton's cradle, a device that demonstrates the principles of conservation of momentum and conservation of energy. **Correct**

Figure 19. Sampled examples in Video SimpleQA and the responses of typical LVLMs: part 3



Video URL: <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Template:Motd/2016-09-29>

Question: What principle underlies the phenomenon shown in the video?

Ground Truth: Spin stabilized magnetic levitation.

Answer of GPT-4o: Magnetic levitation. **Correct**

Answer of Gemini-1.5-Pro: The Levitron's levitation is based on magnetic repulsion. **Incorrect**

Answer of Qwen2.5-VL-72B: The phenomenon shown in the video is based on the principle of magnetic levitation. **Correct**



Video URL: <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Template:Motd/2017-04-07>

Question: What sports are displayed in the video?


Ground Truth: Bungee jumping.

Answer of GPT-4o: Bungee jumping. **Correct**

Answer of Gemini-1.5-Pro: The video shows bungee jumping from the Macau Tower. **Correct**

Answer of Qwen2.5-VL-72B: The video does not display any sports. **Incorrect**

Figure 20. Sampled examples in Video SimpleQA and the responses of typical LVLMs: part 4



Video URL: <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Template:Motd/2016-04-22>

Question: What set in mathematics is being visualized in the video?

Ground Truth: Mandelbrot Set.

Answer of GPT-4o: Mandelbrot set. **Correct**

Answer of Gemini-1.5-Pro: The video visualizes the Mandelbrot set. **Correct**

Answer of Qwen2.5-VL-72B: The video is visualizing the Mandelbrot set, a famous set in mathematics known for its intricate and self-similar fractal patterns. **Correct**



Video URL: <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Template:Motd/2016-05-09>

Question: What is the scientific name of the butterfly shown in the video?

Ground Truth: Thymelicus sylvestris.

Answer of GPT-4o: Small Skipper (Thymelicus sylvestris). **Correct**

Answer of Gemini-1.5-Pro: The butterfly in the video is a Ochlodes sylvanus. **Incorrect**

Answer of Qwen2.5-VL-72B: Based on the visual characteristics, the butterfly appears to be a type of skipper, possibly a Large Skipper (Ochlodes sylvanus) or a similar species. **Incorrect**

Figure 21. Sampled examples in Video SimpleQA and the responses of typical LVLMS: part 5