

VLM-Eval: A General Evaluation on Video Large Language Models

Shuailin Li^{1*}, Yuang Zhang^{2*†}, Yucheng Zhao^{1*}, Qiuyue Wang¹, Fan Jia¹, Yingfei Liu¹, Tiancai Wang^{1 ‡}
¹MEGVII Technology ²Shanghai Jiao Tong University

Abstract

Despite the rapid development of video Large Language Models (LLMs), a comprehensive evaluation is still absent. In this paper, we introduce a unified evaluation that encompasses multiple video tasks, including captioning, question and answering, retrieval, and action recognition. In addition to conventional metrics, we showcase how GPT-based evaluation can match human-like performance in assessing response quality across multiple aspects. We propose a simple baseline: Video-LLaVA, which uses a single linear projection and outperforms existing video LLMs. Finally, we evaluate video LLMs beyond academic datasets, which show encouraging recognition and reasoning capabilities in driving scenarios with only hundreds of video-instruction pairs for fine-tuning. We hope our work can serve as a unified evaluation for video LLMs, and help expand more practical scenarios. The evaluation code will be available soon.

1. Introduction

Video understanding is pivotal to real-world applications, including embodied robotic agents, disability services, and autonomous driving. Previous paradigms mainly adopt pre-trained foundation models [30, 37, 40] and finetune them for specific tasks. They require extensive data annotation and hand-crafted strategies, which limit their adaptability to open-ended applications. Recent efforts in connecting video and Large Language Models (LLMs) [7, 26, 36, 38] have significantly enhanced general video understanding in zero-shot settings. Without specific training, current video LLMs [13, 16, 49] can interact with humans through a natural language interface and perform spatial-temporal perception, reasoning, and causal inference tasks.

However, evaluating video LLMs is a significant challenge. It requires evaluating open-ended responses and considering relevance to video content and user prompts. A high-quality response should meet multiple criteria. First,

*Equal contribution.

†This work was done during the internship at MEGVII Technology.

‡Corresponding author.




Figure 1. Evaluation of video Large Language Models (LLMs): a multidimensional study of their video understanding capabilities.

it should be comprehensive and cover all aspects of the user’s query while fully reflecting video content. Second, the response must be precise and grounded on video content and user prompts without any hallucination. In addition, it should be focused on addressing user prompts directly without generating excessive or irrelevant responses.

Existing research [16, 25, 49] primarily focuses on qualitative evaluation, resulting in a lack of objectivity, comprehensiveness, and automation. In this paper, we pro-




Figure 2. Comparison of Video LLMs. The snow icon denotes frozen parameters and the fire icon indicates parameters tuned in training.

pose a thorough evaluation that covers GPT-based, retrieval-based, and conventional metrics across various tasks and datasets. To tackle the challenge of evaluating open-ended conversations, we evaluate and incorporate ChatGPT [26] as a quality assessment agent. In contrast to previous efforts using GPT-based scoring, our focus is on the validity of GPT-based metrics for question-answer and video captioning tasks. We evaluate video LLMs based on their response comprehensiveness, correctness, and conciseness. More importantly, we chose the criteria that GPT scores are consistent with human scores. After validating ChatGPT’s ability to evaluate video LLMs, we relieve the human burden with ChatGPT. Our evaluation, summarized in Fig. 1, aims to serve as a groundwork for future study and facilitate a deeper understanding of existing video LLMs.

To further explore the impact of video-to-text connector between visual encoder and LLM, we propose a simple video LLM baseline following LLaVA [22]. The proposed model is named Video-LLaVA, where we directly feed multi-frame features into the LLM without Q-former [13] or spatial/temporal pooling [25]. The proposed baseline outperforms prior methods in numerous video-related tasks, indicating that connecting video features to LLMs is of essence, while the design of adapters is less significant.

Finally, we look beyond academic datasets to see how they apply to specific industries. We present a case study in driving scenarios to better understand the capabilities of video LLMs. Our research focuses on investigating the few-shot capability of video LLMs through supervised fine-tuning. We collect hundreds of video clips of roads and then annotate them with detailed captions such as vehicle location, traffic signs, causes of traffic accidents, and driving advice. These make up the video-instruction pairs for the supervised fine-tuning phase. Using such a small dataset, our model demonstrates perception, understanding, reasoning, and planning capabilities in traffic scenarios. This suggests that video LLM is a promising path to autonomous driving.

In summary, our contributions are as follows,

- We conducted a comprehensive evaluation of video LLMs, verifying the effectiveness of the ChatGPT score,

while also using retrieval-based and conventional metrics.

- We build Video-LLaVA as a baseline archiving SoTA performance to show that a simple connector can work well.
- We demonstrate the effectiveness of video LLMs in a specific industrial scenario beyond academic datasets.

2. Related Work

2.1. LLMs and Multimodal LLMs

LLMs Large language models [4, 7, 9, 26, 27, 29, 31, 36, 38, 48, 50] have gained significant interest in many natural language processing (NLP) tasks, featuring extraordinary performance and adaptability. LLMs excel at textual understanding, generation, and reasoning capabilities through large-scale pre-training, and show exceptional zero-shot and emergent capabilities [41] when scaling up model size.

Image LLMs Besides NLP tasks, many researchers leverage LLMs for general image understanding. Some works [18, 33, 42] employ the detection models to provide the perception results for LLMs. They suffer from low efficiency and performance. Others [1, 13, 21, 22, 52] take an end-to-end approach, first projecting the visual features to the language embeddings, then feeding them to the LLM. Flamingo [1] bridges vision-only and language-only models through cross-attention, and trains on multimodal web corpora. BLIP-2 develops a Query Transformer (Q-Former) to bridge the modality gap and bootstraps vision-language pre-training. MiniGPT-4 [52] utilizes a projection layer to align the visual encoder with LLM. InstructBLIP [21] utilizes the instruction-aware Q-Former for visual feature extraction. Notably, LLaVA [22] demonstrates multimodal conversational capabilities via a simple linear layer connecting the visual encoder to the LLM.

Video LLMs Incorporating LLMs for video understanding presents more challenges than images. Recent works mainly focus on constructing conversational video understanding datasets and bridging video features to LLMs through Q-former [16, 49] or a simple linear projection with pooling [25], as illustrated in Fig. 2. Video-LLaMA [49] aligns the features of both visual and audio encoders with LLM’s embedding space using a video Q-former and an au-

dio Q-former. It is trained on massive video/image-caption pairs and visual-instruction-tuning datasets. VideoChat [16] utilizes a learnable module to combine video foundation models and LLMs. It also proposes a video-centric instruction dataset, and the model exhibits numerous capabilities such as spatial-temporal reasoning and event localization. Video-ChatGPT [25] first computes spatial-temporal features of videos, then projects them into LLMs’ embedding space via a simple linear layer. This framework is trained on a collected dataset consisting of 100K video-instruction pairs.

2.2. Evaluation of Video LLMs

Evaluation of the LLMs [8] and multimodal LLMs [10, 12, 14, 23, 34, 46, 47, 51] reports dozens of metrics across various datasets. Image LLMs have been evaluated on multiple vision-language tasks, such as image captioning, visual question answering, image editing, etc. However, video LLMs are highly underdeveloped. Current works mainly demonstrate their performance through examples or rely solely on ChatGPT for evaluation without verification. Video-LLaMA [49] demonstrates two video understanding cases focusing on relevance to sound and visual content, and action recognition ability. VideoChat [16] emphasizes its descriptive, temporal, and causal ability through examples, and also demonstrates versatile ability through meme explanation, counting, etc. Video-ChatGPT [25] utilizes GPT-3.5 to evaluate response quality using existing video datasets. However, they did not verify the GPT’s ability to assess response quality using the metrics they designed.

3. Method

We first review the existing video LLMs in Sec 3.1. Then, we present our evaluation pipeline in Sec 3.2. Last, we discuss our Video-LLaVA baseline in Sec 3.3.

3.1. Revisiting Video LLMs

In this section, we look at the interaction between visual (video) and linguistic elements. Existing video LLMs, as shown in Fig. 2 (a-d), all consist of three main components: a visual encoder, LLM, and a video-to-text connector. Video LLMs additionally adapt video features into tokens and add them to the head of the user prompt.

Video LLMs first sample multiple frames and extract visual features using a frozen visual encoder, which is a pre-trained foundation model. Then, the connector is trained to align the video features with language tokens on video-text pairs in video-language datasets. Existing video LLMs adopts different design of connectors: Video-LLaMA [49] adopts video/audio Q-Former, VideoChat [16] employs Q-Former with Global Multi-Head Relation Aggregator (GMHRA), and Video-ChatGPT [16] uses a simple linear layer with spatial and temporal pooling. Finally,




Figure 3. Pipelines of GPT-based and retrieval-based evaluations.

video LLMs concatenate the adapted visual token with user text prompts and feed into an LLaMA-based [38] LLM for detailed textual response generation.

3.2. Evaluation

We employ GPT-based and retrieval-based evaluations to comprehensively assess video LLMs. GPT-based evaluations aim to assess multiple aspects of open-ended responses at a human level. Retrieval-based evaluation, on the other hand, focuses on assessing abilities in downstream applications through action recognition and video text retrieval tasks.

GPT-based evaluation While the ability to generate open and diverse response is an impressive and distinguishing feature of LLM-based models, it also makes evaluating video LLMs challenging since the response is open-ended and conversational. An ideal approach for evaluation is using human feedback, but this method suffers from high labor costs and inconsistent standards. To overcome these challenges, we use a powerful LLM model GPT-3.5 [26] and design human-validated metrics and prompts to improve the evaluation. We will refer to GPT-3.5 as GPT in the following sections.

Fig. 3 (a) illustrates our GPT-based evaluation pipeline. GPT scoring is suitable for open-answer tasks such as video question answering (VideoQA) and video captioning. We build our evaluation on existing VideoQA datasets (MSVD [43], MSRVT [45], TGIF [17], and ActivityNet-QA [5]) as well as MSVD and MSRVT caption datasets. During evaluation, we provide GPT with the response from the video LLMs, the correct answer, the task context, and instructions in the prompt. The exact GPT prompts for the evaluations are included in the Supplementary Material. We

use the average of all videos as the final score.

We assess the ability to simultaneously understand video and text prompts through the VideoQA task. For this task, we focus on the correctness and degree of matching: (a) *Correctness*. Open-ended answers require a certain degree of intelligence to determine their correctness. We leverage GPT to understand the question context and provide a true or false judgment for each QA pair. (b) *Match score*. It is not practical to expect the model to produce an identical response. Since open-ended answers have no clear boundaries of correctness, a match score is necessary to assess the degree of matching between the ground truth answer and the predicted answer. The match score is a relative scale ranging from 1 to 5.

We further assess the ability to accurately understand and describe the video through the video captioning task. Inspired by the widely accepted metrics of recall and precision [3], we propose to evaluate video captions based on coverage and precision scores scaling from 1 to 5. (a) *Coverage*. High recall is essential for the model to accurately identify the primary content in the video. The coverage score assesses the extent to which the predicted caption contains elements of the ground truth caption. (b) *Precision*. While having a high recall is desirable, the model must not make redundant guesses. The precision score assesses the extent to which the predicted caption can be verified by the ground truth caption.

Notably, our evaluation penalizes two common failure modes of video LLMs: *verbose output* and *hallucinations*. First, some models produce lengthy responses that contain irrelevant information to the given question or give verbose captions. The match score and precision metrics encourage concise responses by penalizing extra information that is not present in the ground truth. Second, video LLMs can suffer from hallucinations [20] and output content that is not present in the original video. This situation cannot be correctly evaluated by traditional n-gram matching evaluations [20]. In our design, hallucinations will be penalized in the precision metric.

Retrieval-based evaluation While GPT-based evaluation focuses on open-ended responses, we employ retrieval-based evaluations to assess the capability of VideoLLMs in downstream applications. Video-text retrieval consists of video-to-text and text-to-video subtasks. We first use the video LLMs to generate video descriptions, then encode predicted descriptions and ground truth candidates using a CLIP [30] text encoder. Finally, we use similarity matching for retrieval. The Text-to-video (T2V) task uses the ground truth text to retrieve the predicted caption, while video-to-text (V2T) uses the predicted caption to retrieve ground truth text.

To evaluate action recognition capability, we perform a retrieval-based evaluation on standard action recognition

Dataset	Task Domain	# Clips
WebVid [15]	Video captioning	10M
NExT-QA [44]	Video QA	5K
DiDemo [32]	Video captioning, temporal localization	10K
MSRVTT [45]	Video QA, video captioning	10K
MSVD [43]	Video QA, video captioning	2K
TGIF-QA [17]	Video QA	72K
HMDB51 [11]	Action recognition	7K
UCF101 [35]	Action recognition	13K

Table 1. Summary of datasets used in the fine-tuning stage, which are with different kinds of video-related tasks and different lengths. Note that these datasets are used optionally during performance evaluation to maintain a zero-shot setting.

datasets. As shown in Fig. 3 (b), we query video LLMs for an action label and encode the prediction with the CLIP text encoder. The similarity between the encoded predicted action label and predefined action labels determines action recognition confidence, which is employed to assess action recognition accuracy.

3.3. Video-LLaVA

As we discussed in 3.1, the architectural difference between video LLMs mainly lies in the video-to-text connector. To better understand the effect of connector design, we construct a simple baseline using the image LLM LLaVA [22].

Unlike previous designs that compress video tokens through Q-former or pooling, we adopt a simple approach of feeding all projected visual tokens into the LLM. The proposed model is named Video-LLaVA, which utilizes pre-trained LLaVA to accelerate the training of videos. Our model consists of a visual encoder that processes the video input into visual tokens, a linear projector that aligns the different modalities, and an LLM that generates textual responses. This simple design allows for an end-to-end video interaction system. Fig. 2 (a,e) illustrates our design. Following LLaVA, we adopt CLIP ViT-L/14 [30] as the visual encoder and Vicuna-7B [7] as the LLM decoder. We uniformly sample 5 frames, and encode each frame individually. We directly use the LLaVA linear projector to transform visual tokens and concatenate all visual tokens with language tokens as the input to the LLM.

Tab. 1 presents the datasets used for supervised fine-tuning. We transform the video-text pairs from different tasks into the unified input sequence template:

User : < Token_{vid} > < Token_{ins} > < STOP >
 Assistant : < Token_{res} > < STOP >

where Token_{vid}, Token_{ins}, Token_{res} are video tokens, instruction tokens, and response tokens, respectively. Since the models and adapter are inherited from LLaVA, we use pre-trained weights from LLaVA and finetune the adapter

	V-LLaMA		VideoChat		VChatGPT		V-LLaVA	
<i>VideoQA</i>	<i>acc</i>	<i>mat</i>	<i>acc</i>	<i>mat</i>	<i>acc</i>	<i>mat</i>	<i>acc</i>	<i>mat</i>
MSVD	53.3	3.00	57.2	3.17	57.2	3.22	62.8	3.55
MSRVTT	24.3	1.99	46.6	2.77	42.4	2.67	41.6	2.70
TGIF	41.5	2.70	44.8	2.82	60.6	3.46	61.1	3.47
A-Net	9.8	1.33	17.8	1.74	24.5	2.01	29.5	2.19
<i>Average</i>	32.2	2.26	41.6	2.63	46.2	2.84	48.8	2.98
<i>V-Caption</i>	<i>prec</i>	<i>cov</i>	<i>prec</i>	<i>cov</i>	<i>prec</i>	<i>cov</i>	<i>prec</i>	<i>cov</i>
MSVD	2.04	2.21	2.12	2.30	2.69	2.89	3.13	3.25
MSRVTT	1.93	1.95	1.92	2.02	2.29	2.40	2.36	2.46
<i>Average</i>	1.99	2.08	2.02	2.16	2.49	2.65	2.75	2.86
<i>T2V Rtv.</i>	<i>acc₁</i>	<i>acc₅</i>	<i>acc₁</i>	<i>acc₅</i>	<i>acc₁</i>	<i>acc₅</i>	<i>acc₁</i>	<i>acc₅</i>
MSVD	17.8	34.6	18.7	36.3	20.4	40.4	24.8	49.9
MSRVTT	5.0	12.2	6.6	15.3	6.8	16.0	8.3	17.0
<i>Average</i>	11.4	23.4	12.7	25.8	13.6	28.2	16.6	33.5
<i>V2T Rtv.</i>	<i>acc₁</i>	<i>acc₅</i>	<i>acc₁</i>	<i>acc₅</i>	<i>acc₁</i>	<i>acc₅</i>	<i>acc₁</i>	<i>acc₅</i>
MSVD	17.2	35.8	23.4	44.2	24.5	49.1	27.2	48.4
MSRVTT	4.3	11.0	7.3	16.4	6.4	16.5	6.9	15.3
<i>Average</i>	10.8	23.4	15.4	30.3	15.5	32.8	17.1	31.9
<i>Act Recog</i>	<i>acc₁</i>	<i>acc₅</i>	<i>acc₁</i>	<i>acc₅</i>	<i>acc₁</i>	<i>acc₅</i>	<i>acc₁</i>	<i>acc₅</i>
K-400	21.7	37.5	30.6	49.2	33.4	56.0	34.0	55.0
HMDB51	20.1	44.2	27.4	53.1	33.0	61.8	40.4	62.0
UCF101	42.8	61.0	50.0	68.2	54.4	75.8	54.6	76.0
<i>Average</i>	28.2	47.6	36.0	56.8	40.3	64.5	43.0	64.3

Table 2. Quantitative comparison of video LLMs on zero-shot video QA, captioning, retrieval, and action recognition. We use the abbreviations V for video, mat for match score, prec for precision, cov for coverage, acc₁ and acc₅ for top-1 and top-5 accuracy respectively. Evaluation datasets include MSVD [43], MSRVTT [45], TGIF [17], ActivityNet (A-Net) [5], Kinetics-400 (K-400) [6], HMDB51 [11] and UCF101 [35].

and LLM decoder using video-instruction pairs. Specifically, we finetune the model for 10,000 iterations, with a batch size of 64, the AdamW [24] optimizer, and a learning rate of 2e-5 with cosine decay. After training with the above sequences, the model learns to adapt to the video input and generate responses according to the given instructions.

4. Results

Video LLMs feature generalization capabilities when handling unseen data, unlike specialized models that primarily utilize abundant supervised data. To evaluate their zero-shot video understanding ability, we conduct experiments on four video understanding tasks: VideoQA, Video Captioning, Videotext Retrieval, and Action Recognition. For a fair comparison, we use the 7B versions for all models.

4.1. Zero-shot Video Question Answering

In the VideoQA task, we aim to evaluate the model’s ability to answer open-ended questions based on a given video




Figure 4. Confusion matrices of GPT scores versus human scores. GPT scores show a high degree of agreement with human scores on the selected criteria.

and question, which requires fine-grained multimodal understanding.

We evaluate four public open-ended VideoQA datasets: MSVD-QA [43], MSRVTT-QA [45], TGIF-QA [17], and ActivityNet-QA [5]. MSVD-QA and MSRVTT-QA contain five fine-grained types of questions: what, who, how, when, and where. In TGIF-QA, there are several tasks, including counting objects, identifying an action, recognizing color, localizing, and so on. ActivityNet-QA features long videos that require obvious spatial-temporal reasoning in QA pairs.

Though different models generate answers in different styles, a human-like GPT assistant is able to assess accurately and flexibly. Utilizing the GPT-based assessment approach, we compare our proposed model with recent models in Tab. 2. As shown in the table, our Video-LLaVA outperforms previous methods in terms of accuracy and matching score for most datasets. Specifically, these models perform well on short videos, while exhibiting degraded performance on ActivityNet with long videos, indicating the weakness of current models in dealing with long temporal frames.

Among these models, VideoChat usually produces an extremely long answer with overly detailed descriptions, regardless of questions. Video-LLaMA and Video-ChatGPT also fail to produce short responses following the user prompt. On the contrary, our Video-LLaVA is able to answer following the prompt format. In Fig. 5, we give a



[Question]

What are a couple of boys climbing an indoor rock climbing? Answer in one word or phrase.

[Ground truth]

Wall.

[Model answers]

Ours: Wall.

Video-LLaMA: The video shows a couple of boys climbing an indoor rock climbing wall. They are climbing up the wall using their hands and feet to reach the top. The camera angle is from the bottom looking up.

Video-ChatGPT: A couple of boys are climbing an indoor rock climbing wall. They are using ropes and harnesses to climb the wall.

VideoChat: In the video, we see a couple of boys climbing an indoor rock climbing wall. They are wearing shirts and are climbing up and down the rock wall. **One boy is wearing a red shirt and the other boy is wearing a striped shirt.** We can see them climbing on the **left side** of the wall, starting at the bottom and working their way up to the top.

Figure 5. A VideoQA example. We mark factual errors in red.

typical example to compare the answer modes of different models. We attribute this ability to crowd-sourced training and formatted prompts [21].

4.2. Zero-shot Video Captioning

Video captioning is a cross-modal open-ended task that generates caption texts to describe the given videos. It is unrealistic to expect a standard answer, as it is possible to describe the video at different levels of granularity. Therefore, instead of measuring accuracy, we assess caption texts with the precision and coverage metric on a scale of 1-5. As shown in Tab. 2, our Video-LLaVA achieves the highest precision and coverage compared to other methods, implying that its response is more concise and has fewer hallucinations.

Moreover, we compute the conventional metrics such as CIDEr [39], BLEU-4 [28], METEOR [2] and ROUGE-L [19], shown in Tab. 3. Most methods exhibit very low performance in the zero-shot setting, which also reflects the weakness of these metrics for open-ended captions. On the other hand, our Video-LLaVA achieves the highest performance and outperforms them by a large margin, due to our training in diverse tasks.

4.3. Zero-shot Video-Text Retrieval

Video-text retrieval aims to retrieve the matched video or caption from inter-modality candidates. It consists of video-to-text (V2T) and text-to-video (T2V) subtasks. We calculate the text-similarity of generated descriptions and candidates and report Top-1 and Top-5 accuracy metrics in Tab. 2. Our method outperforms other approaches in the T2V task.

Method	MSVD-Caption				MSRVTT-Caption			
	C	B4	M	R	C	B4	M	R
Video-LLaMA	0.0	3.7	11.3	11.5	0.0	2.8	10.5	10.6
VideoChat	3.3	3.4	13.0	25.7	2.1	3.1	12.8	22.2
Video-ChatGPT	26.2	17.4	30.2	51.0	13.7	12.4	23.9	39.8
Video-LLaVA	123.1	35.2	39.7	78.4	44.1	33.8	25.3	54.7

Table 3. Performance of conventional metrics on video captioning datasets. Higher metric values indicate better results. ‘C’, ‘B4’, ‘M’, and ‘R’ refer to CIDEr [39], BLEU-4 [28], METEOR [2] and ROUGE-L [19], respectively.

In the V2T task, VideoChat, Video-ChatGPT, and Video-LLaVA show comparable performance. However, the relatively low metrics suggest room for future improvement.

4.4. Zero-shot Action Recognition

The goal of action recognition tasks is to classify and categorize human actions in videos into a close set of classes. To evaluate the action recognition capability, we use a retrieval-based approach discussed in Sec. 3.2. In Tab. 2, we report the top-1 accuracy and top-5 accuracy on the Kinetics-400 [6], HMDB51 [11], and UCF101 [35] datasets. Surprisingly, the results show that our simple baseline Video-LLaVA outperforms other counterparts.

4.5. GPT Scores versus Human Scores

To validate the GPT evaluation, we collect 200 human feedback samples for each GPT-based metric: precision, coverage, correctness, and match score. We compare these scores with the GPT-rated scores. As depicted in Fig. 4, the confusion matrices demonstrate the strength of the GPT-based evaluation in capturing the performance of video LLMs on selected metrics. For video captioning evaluation, there is a strong correlation between GPT scores and human scores in terms of precision and coverage. This validates GPT’s ability to evaluate video captions. In VideoQA, since the ground truth answer is typically a single word, it is more difficult for GPT and humans to evaluate. Fig. 4 (b) shows the confusion matrix of correctness and the average human match scores for given GPT scores. Results show that GPT and humans mostly agree on correctness, and the average human match scores increase monotonically with GPT scores. The consistent agreement between human and GPT scores verifies the effectiveness of our GPT-based evaluations of video captioning and question answering.

5. Application: Driving Scene Understanding

To inspect how video LLMs apply to specific industrial applications beyond academic datasets, we take our Video-LLaVA and driving scenarios as an example and perform an evaluation to exploit the applicability of video LLMs



Question: This is a video of a driving scene. Please provide a detailed description of the video's content and assess its safety. If it's not safe, please explain the reasons and provide suggestions.

Answer: The video shows a man riding a motorcycle on a road, while a woman is sitting on the back of the motorcycle. The motorcycle is moving through the traffic, which includes cars and other vehicles. The man is riding the motorcycle with the woman on the back, which is not a safe practice. Riding with a passenger on a motorcycle can lead to increased risk of accidents, as the passenger's weight and position can affect the motorcycle's stability and control. It is essential to follow safety guidelines and wear appropriate protective gear, such as helmets and gloves, when riding a motorcycle.

Figure 6. An example response in a dangerous driving scene. Our model reads the dangerous scenario of a motorcycle crossing the road in the video and advises not to carry two people and to wear a helmet.



Question: Kindly observe and provide an elaborate description of the contents presented in this driving scene video. Also, evaluate the safety levels depicted in the video. Should any safety concerns arise, please state these concerns clearly and suggest possible remedies.

Answer: The video shows a driving scene where a car is passing a large parking lot with many cars and trucks parked. The car is driving on a road, and there are several vehicles parked in the lot. The scene appears to be a busy parking area, and the driver needs to be cautious while navigating through the lot.

The safety of the scene depends on the driver's ability to maintain a safe distance from the parked vehicles and to be aware of the surroundings. The driver should also be attentive to any pedestrians or other vehicles that might be entering or exiting the parking lot.

Suggestions for improving safety in this situation include:

1. Maintaining a safe distance from the parked vehicles to avoid collisions.
2. Keeping an eye on the surroundings, including pedestrians and other vehicles, to anticipate potential hazards.
3. Slowing down and being more cautious when approaching the parking lot to avoid accidents.

...

Figure 7. An example response in a normal driving scene. The model reports that the car is passing the parking lot and warns to watch out for pedestrians and other cars and trucks.

in the real world. Qualitative results verify its diverse capability, as shown in Fig. 6 and 7. We observe that our model demonstrates proficiency in open-set object recognition, spatial-temporal modeling, safety reasoning, and practical suggestions.

Open-set object recognition. Beyond the limitations of traditional closed-set models that can only recognize previously trained objects, open-set object recognition is a pivotal ability for a wide range of pragmatic applications. Experimental dialogues in Fig. 6 and 7 show that our model can recognize most vehicles (such as cars, trucks, motorcycles, and bicycles), humans, traffic signs, and roads. Since we only provide a small dataset during the fine-tuning stage, we believe this ability comes from the pre-training stage where the model is trained on abundant open-world datasets. The ability of open-set recognition can be applied to many tasks, from autonomous driving and industrial robotics to security systems and healthcare diagnostics. In a dynamic and unpredictable world, this potential is significant, making it not only beneficial but also essential.

Spatial-temporal modeling. Unlike image-based models, spatial-temporal modeling is a core capability of video models. From the keyframes and generated descriptions, we can see that the model exhibits exceptional potential in perceiving and tracking driving scenes. For example, the model says that *the motorcycle is moving through the traffic and a car is passing a large parking lot with many cars and trucks parked*. With its keen perception, the model can accurately detect and interpret complex dynamics within the driving environment, contributing significantly to enhanced safety and predictive decision-making. In essence, our Video-LLaVA leverages general knowledge acquired through large-scale pre-training to understand and reason about the interplay of space and time in driving scenes, thereby offering valuable insights.

Safety reasoning and suggestions. Besides accurate perception, the model also presents exceptional ability to provide safety reasoning and practical suggestions. Specifically, it notes the risk when the motorcycle moves through the traffic in Fig. 6, and gives concrete advice on following safety guidelines and wearing a protective helmet. In Fig. 7, it alerts drivers to watch out for pedestrians and other vehicles entering and exiting the parking lot. This feature not only enhances the reliability and accuracy of decision-making processes but also significantly contributes to risk mitigation and operational efficiency.

In a nutshell, the Video-LLaVA can be equipped with various capabilities in a unified framework, providing an efficient and comprehensive way for real-world applications. Predictably, this paradigm can also be extended to broader scenarios such as scene prediction and driving planning. It validates the generalization and feasibility of Video-LLaVA in the real world.

6. Limitation and Future Work

Despite the promising results of video LLMs, there are several limitations that should be recognized and addressed in future work.

The first is the ability to process long videos. Under the constraints of memory and computation time, VideoLLM models usually try to select video frames or use feature pooling to reduce the computational burden. However, such an approach can hardly adapt to long videos of several minutes due to the loss of intermediate information. For example, we observe in Table 2 that the performance of ActivityNet is significantly lower than other datasets with short videos, indicating a large room for model improvement. A promising approach might be to design a memory-based paradigm that allows streaming input and addresses catastrophic forgetting. In this way, both long and short videos can be processed in a unified framework at an acceptable computational cost.

Second, we can only feed frames with small resolutions into the model due to a limited number of tokens. Video with large resolution contains more spatial context, which is significant for real-world scenarios. In the future, VideoLLM models are supposed to be compatible with different scales of inputs to meet the needs of practical tasks, improving their accuracy and adaptability.

Furthermore, most LLM-based models have the phenomenon of hallucination, which means that the model may falsely describe something that does not appear in the videos. The risk of hallucinations comes from the pre-training datasets. For example, Video-LLaVA occasionally describes a virtual dog on the road for driving scenes. This phenomenon can seriously affect utility and safety, especially for autonomous driving applications.

Given these limitations, future research will focus on optimizing these aspects to improve the model’s capacity, speed, accuracy, and generalization ability.

7. Conclusion

In this work, we provide a general and comprehensive evaluation of video large language models. A unified GPT-based pipeline is established and verified to assess the open-ended video tasks. Besides, we build a Video-LLaVA model trained on diverse video datasets, achieving SoTA results. Moreover, through our extensive work, we have broadened the horizons of video LLMs in practical applications, with a particular concentration on driving scene comprehension. By collecting driving videos and meticulous labeling, our model performs well in recognizing real-world objects, reasoning safety, and giving suggestions. Our work illustrates that the video LLM model can be integrated with versatile capabilities within a unified structure, enabling a highly effective and holistic approach for practical applications.

References

- [1] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:23716–23736, 2022. **2**
- [2] Satyanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. Meteor: An automatic metric for mt evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the acl workshop on intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation measures for machine translation and/or summarization*, pages 65–72, 2005. **6**
- [3] Christopher M Bishop and Nasser M Nasrabadi. *Pattern recognition and machine learning*. Springer, 2006. **4**
- [4] 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**
- [5] Fabian Caba Heilbron, Victor Escorcia, Bernard Ghanem, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Activitynet: A large-scale video benchmark for human activity understanding. In *Proceedings of the ieee conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 961–970, 2015. **3, 5**
- [6] Joao Carreira and Andrew Zisserman. Quo vadis, action recognition? a new model and the kinetics dataset. In *proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6299–6308, 2017. **5, 6**
- [7] Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E Gonzalez, et al. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality. See <https://vicuna.lmsys.org> (accessed 14 April 2023), 2023. **1, 2, 4**
- [8] OpenCompass Contributors. Opencompass: A universal evaluation platform for foundation models. <https://github.com/open-compass/opencompass>, 2023. **3**
- [9] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018. **2**
- [10] 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. **3**
- [11] Hildegard Kuehne, Hueihan Jhuang, Estíbaliz Garrote, Tomaso Poggio, and Thomas Serre. Hmdb: a large video database for human motion recognition. In *2011 International conference on computer vision*, pages 2556–2563. IEEE, 2011. **4, 5, 6**
- [12] 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. **3**
- [13] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.12597*, 2023. **1, 2**
- [14] Juncheng Li, Kaihang Pan, Zhiqi Ge, Minghe Gao, Hanwang Zhang, Wei Ji, Wenqiao Zhang, Tat-Seng Chua, Siliang Tang, and Yueting Zhuang. Empowering vision-language models to follow interleaved vision-language instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.04152*, 2023. **3**
- [15] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yanan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Uniformerv2: Spatiotemporal learning by arming image vits with video uniformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09552*, 2022. **4**
- [16] KunChang Li, Yanan He, Yi Wang, Yizhuo Li, Wenhai Wang, Ping Luo, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Videochat: Chat-centric video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06355*, 2023. **1, 2, 3**
- [17] Yuncheng Li, Yale Song, Liangliang Cao, Joel Tetreault, Larry Goldberg, Alejandro Jaimes, and Jiebo Luo. Tgif: A new dataset and benchmark on animated gif description. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4641–4650, 2016. **3, 4, 5**
- [18] Yaobo Liang, Chenfei Wu, Ting Song, Wenshan Wu, Yan Xia, Yu Liu, Yang Ou, Shuai Lu, Lei Ji, Shaoguang Mao, et al. Taskmatrix. ai: Completing tasks by connecting foundation models with millions of apis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16434*, 2023. **2**
- [19] Chin-Yew Lin. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81, 2004. **6**
- [20] Hui Liu and Xiaojun Wan. Models see hallucinations: Evaluating the factuality in video captioning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.02961*, 2023. **4**
- [21] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03744*, 2023. **2, 6**
- [22] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08485*, 2023. **2, 4**
- [23] Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhnag, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, Kai Chen, and Dahua Lin. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player? *arXiv:2307.06281*, 2023. **3**
- [24] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.05101*, 2017. **5**
- [25] Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Rasheed, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Video-chatgpt: Towards detailed video understanding via large vision and language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05424*, 2023. **1, 2, 3**
- [26] OpenAI. Chatgpt. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>, 2023. **1, 2, 3**
- [27] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022. **2**

- [28] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, 2002. 6
- [29] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019. 2
- [30] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 1, 4
- [31] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):5485–5551, 2020. 2
- [32] Anna Rohrbach, Marcus Rohrbach, Niket Tandon, and Bernt Schiele. A dataset for movie description. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3202–3212, 2015. 4
- [33] Yongliang Shen, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Dongsheng Li, Weiming Lu, and Yueting Zhuang. Hugginggpt: Solving ai tasks with chatgpt and its friends in huggingface. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17580*, 2023. 2
- [34] Zhelun Shi, Zhipin Wang, Hongxing Fan, Zhenfei Yin, Lu Sheng, Yu Qiao, and Jing Shao. Chef: A comprehensive evaluation framework for standardized assessment of multimodal large language models, 2023. 3
- [35] Khurram Soomro, Amir Roshan Zamir, and Mubarak Shah. Ucf101: A dataset of 101 human actions classes from videos in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.0402*, 2012. 4, 5, 6
- [36] Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model, 2023. 1, 2
- [37] Zhan Tong, Yibing Song, Jue Wang, and Limin Wang. Videomae: Masked autoencoders are data-efficient learners for self-supervised video pre-training. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:10078–10093, 2022. 1
- [38] 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. 1, 2, 3
- [39] Ramakrishna Vedantam, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. Cider: Consensus-based image description evaluation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4566–4575, 2015. 6
- [40] Yi Wang, Kunchang Li, Yizhuo Li, Yanan He, Bingkun Huang, Zhiyu Zhao, Hongjie Zhang, Jilan Xu, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, et al. Internvideo: General video foundation models via generative and discriminative learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.03191*, 2022. 1
- [41] Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. Emergent abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682*, 2022. 2
- [42] Chenfei Wu, Shengming Yin, Weizhen Qi, Xiaodong Wang, Zecheng Tang, and Nan Duan. Visual chatgpt: Talking, drawing and editing with visual foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.04671*, 2023. 2
- [43] Zuxuan Wu, Ting Yao, Yanwei Fu, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Deep learning for video classification and captioning. In *Frontiers of multimedia research*, pages 3–29. 2017. 3, 4, 5
- [44] 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. 4
- [45] 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, 4, 5
- [46] Peng Xu, Wenqi Shao, Kaipeng Zhang, Peng Gao, Shuo Liu, Meng Lei, Fanqing Meng, Siyuan Huang, Yu Qiao, and Ping Luo. Lvlm-ehub: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09265*, 2023. 3
- [47] 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. 3
- [48] Aohan Zeng, Xiao Liu, Zhengxiao Du, Zihan Wang, Hanyu Lai, Ming Ding, Zhuoyi Yang, Yifan Xu, Wendi Zheng, Xiao Xia, et al. Glm-130b: An open bilingual pre-trained model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02414*, 2022. 2
- [49] Hang Zhang, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. Video-llama: An instruction-tuned audio-visual language model for video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02858*, 2023. 1, 2, 3
- [50] Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*, 2022. 2
- [51] Wenxuan Zhang, Sharifah Mahani Aljunied, Chang Gao, Yew Ken Chia, and Lidong Bing. M3exam: A multilingual, multimodal, multilevel benchmark for examining large language models. 2023. 3
- [52] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592*, 2023. 2