

X-InstructBLIP: A Framework for aligning X-Modal instruction-aware representations to LLMs and Emergent Cross-modal Reasoning

Artemis Panagopoulou^{1*}, Le Xue^{2†}, Ning Yu^{2†}, Junnan Li², Dongxu Li², Shafiq Joty², Ran Xu², Silvio Savarese^{2,3}, Caiming Xiong², Juan Carlos Nieves^{2,3}

¹ University of Pennsylvania, ² Salesforce Research, ³ Stanford University

Abstract

Vision-language pre-training and instruction tuning have demonstrated general-purpose capabilities in 2D visual reasoning tasks by aligning visual encoders with state-of-the-art large language models (LLMs). In this paper, we introduce a simple, yet effective, cross-modality framework built atop frozen LLMs that allows the integration of various modalities without extensive modality-specific customization. To facilitate instruction-modality fine-tuning, we collect high-quality instruction tuning data in an automatic and scalable manner, composed of 24K QA samples for audio and 250K QA samples for 3D. Leveraging instruction-aware representations, our model performs comparably with leading-edge counterparts without the need of extensive modality-specific pre-training or customization. Furthermore, our approach demonstrates cross-modal reasoning abilities across two or more input modalities, despite each modality projection being trained individually. To study the model’s cross-modal abilities, we contribute a novel **Discriminative Cross-modal Reasoning (DisCRn)** evaluation task, comprising 9K audio-video QA samples and 28K image-3D QA samples that require the model to reason discriminatively across disparate input modalities.

1. Introduction

Humans inherently utilize multiple senses to interpret their surroundings and formulate decisions. By equipping artificial agents with cross-modal reasoning,¹ we can foster the development of systems with a more comprehensive understanding of their environment, allowing them to discern patterns and make inferences that are not apparent when analyzing modalities separately. This has motivated the advent of Multimodal Language Models (MLMs) [3, 19, 23, 37,

*Work done while interning at Salesforce Research

†Equal mentorship.

¹ *Cross-modal reasoning* is the ability to integrate and discriminate information from multiple modalities over text, in contrast to “multimodal reasoning,” traditionally reserved for vision-language tasks.




Figure 1. X-InstructBLIP utilizes distinct pre-trained encoders for each modality, aligning them into the language domain through independently trained, instruction-aware Q-Formers. Despite the individual training of each modality, X-InstructBLIP demonstrates emergent capabilities in cross-modal comprehension.

42, 49, 57], which transfer the remarkable abilities of Large Language Models (LLMs) [7, 16, 18, 22, 26, 74, 78, 80, 89] to static vision.

Recent advancements seek to extend the reasoning capabilities of MLMs by incorporating audio and video, either through the introduction of pre-trained cross-modal representations mapped through their transitive relation to images [30, 34], training foundation models across multiple modalities [12, 62, 94] or by training projection modules to align multimodalities to the representation space of LLMs [98, 104]. While effective, the former often necessitates task-specific fine-tuning and the latter refines models on joint-modality data which can be high-resource demanding in terms of collection and computational resources.

We present X-InstructBLIP², a scalable and extendable

² github.com/artemisp/LAVIS-XInstructBLIP.git

framework (Figure 1) that enables learning with uni-modal data without constraints imposed by pre-training a universal cross-modal embedding space or the computational cost and potential over-fitting risks associated with unfreezing the LLM parameters. X-InstructBLIP seamlessly incorporates a multitude of modalities in an independent manner, eliminating the necessity for joint modality datasets while preserving the capacity to execute cross-modality tasks.

Our approach foregoes the need for extensive modality specific-pre-training and joint-modality data by utilizing the Q-Former [49] module, initialized with image-text pre-trained weights from BLIP-2 [49] and finetuned on uni-modal datasets to map inputs from the separate modality embedding spaces to a frozen LLM.

Given the scarcity of instruction tuning data for a spectrum of modalities, we introduce a simple yet potent approach: a three-stage query data augmentation technique to leverage open-source LLMs to extract instruction-tuning data from captioning datasets.

Figure 2 shows illustrative results, highlighting the versatility of our framework. Quantitatively, X-InstructBLIP performs comparably to existing single modality models, and exhibits emergent competence in cross-modality tasks. To quantify and challenge this emergent ability we introduce `DisCRn`, an automatically curated **D**iscriminatory **C**ross-modal **R**easoning challenge dataset, which requires models to distinguish between diverse combinations of modalities, such as audio-video and 3D-image.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

(i) We present a simple and effective, scalable cross-modal framework to empower LLMs to handle a diverse range of tasks across a variety of modalities, without requiring modality-specific pre-training. Our results show that in spite of each modality (images, video, audio, and 3D) undergoing individual alignment to LLMs, our instruction-aware representations generalize to cross-modality tasks, enabling a seamless integration of more modalities.

(ii) We introduce an approach for crafting instruction-tuning datasets from a variety of modalities, leveraging only readily available captioning data and open-source language models. Illustratively, we transform the established Cap3D [63] and AudioCaps [40] datasets into QA collections, resulting in $\sim 250k$ and $\sim 24k$ entries, respectively.

(iii) We construct `DisCRn`, the first dataset designed for evaluating instruction-based cross-modal discriminative reasoning. It includes $\sim 36k$ examples across various modalities such as video, audio, 3D, and images; and introduces a novel task: to discern among various input modalities rather than integrating them, thereby providing a fresh and demanding benchmark in this intricate area of study.

2. Related Work

Cross-modal Language Models: Recent years have seen a surge in models capable of executing a spectrum of vision-

language tasks, leading to the creation of Multimodal Language Models (MLMs). These models align multimodal inputs and the LLM’s latent space through various techniques, such as unified pre-training [17, 37, 44, 85–87, 99], vision-to-language alignment through textual feature extraction [33, 55, 77, 100], vision-encoder optimization [81], and linear [23, 42, 57], transformer-based [11, 64, 69], or auto-encoder based projections [58, 102]. More relevant to this work are approaches that learn intermediate vision-informed language token representations either interleaved in LLM layers [3] or as direct inputs [19, 48, 49].

Such approaches have been expanded beyond images to learning separate audio [21, 41] and video [20, 104] projections to pre-trained LLMs. In 3D, Hong et al. [36] project point-cloud scenes to LLMs through rendered image features. Cross-modal approaches focus on joint audio-video such as unified pre-training [94] and, more pertinently to our work, projection learning [98]. In this work, we show that the multimodal *instruction tuning* framework [60] from InstructBLIP [19] can be effectively adapted to encompass video, audio, and 3D point cloud modalities.

Multimodal Multi-Input Language Tasks: The advancements in single input vision-language tasks have paved the way for the development of tasks necessitating models to concurrently reason about multiple non-linguistic inputs, such as engaging in spatial reasoning across multiple images [5], deliberating over a series of slides [79], responding to queries necessitating cross-modal reasoning across images and tables [51], or executing a range of instruction-based tasks involving multiple image inputs [51]. Despite their complexity, these tasks predominantly operate within the realms of image-text modalities.

Even though cross-modal tasks exist, predominantly requiring models to reason over joint audio and video [2, 46], there is a gap in the evaluation of models’ generative capabilities in reasoning about cross-modal inputs *contrastively*. While models are often optimized on contrastive objectives [14, 15, 35, 39, 47, 49, 50, 73], even in cross-modal settings [30, 34, 68], their evaluation is predominantly confined to classification tasks or utilizing the contrastively learned representations for downstream tasks. To address this gap, we introduce `DisCRn`, a task requiring contrastive reasoning across cross-modal inputs in a practical open generation setting, providing a way to evaluate a model’s ability to translate features of various modalities from its internal representations to its generative output distribution.

3. Method

Figure 1 depicts an overview of the model’s architecture which extends the instruction-aware projection method introduced in Dai et al. [19] to an arbitrary number of modalities through independent fine-tuning of modality specific Q-Former projections to a frozen LLM. Figure 3(a) illustrates the modality-to-LLM alignment procedure by highlighting




Figure 2. Qualitative Examples: X-InstructBLIP demonstrates multifaceted capabilities across the four examined modalities

all the components associated with each modality.

Algorithm 1 outlines the X-InstructBLIP alignment framework. In essence, it involves the following steps for each example of a text instruction paired with an extra-linguistic input: (1) Tokenization of the text instruction and embedding of the non-textual input using a frozen pre-trained encoder. (2) Feeding both the normalized encoding of the extra-linguistic input and the tokenized instruction into a Q-Former module, accompanied by a set of learnable query embeddings. (3) Transformation of these query embeddings by the Q-Former, through cross-attention layers in alternate layers of the transformer blocks to conditionally adapt to the inputs. (4) Projection of the modified query embeddings into the embedding space of the frozen LLM through a trainable linear layer.

Formally, for any given modality M , a frozen pre-trained encoder Enc_M embeds the raw input from the modality's input space \mathcal{X}_M into an embedding space \mathcal{Z}_M . This encoding process is represented as $z_M = Enc_M(x_M)$, where $x_M \in \mathcal{X}_M$ is an instance from the raw input of M .

The encoder's output $z_M \in \mathcal{Z}_M$ is subsequently fed into the Q-Former module, specifically to its cross-attention layers. This Q-Former module also receives a set of K learnable embeddings $\mathbf{Q}_M = \{\mathbf{q}_{M_1} \dots \mathbf{q}_{M_K}\}$ and the task in-

Algorithm 1 X-InstructBLIP Optimization Framework

Require: Set of modalities \mathbb{M} , each associated with a set of datasets \mathbb{D}_M , and set of templates $\mathbb{I} = \{I_{M_t} : M \in \mathbb{M}, t \in \mathbb{T}\}$ for each task $t \in \mathbb{T}$

- 1: Initialize tokenizer h , embedding layer E
- 2: **for** each modality M in \mathbb{M} **do**
- 3: Initialize modality-specific pre-trained encoder Enc_M
- 4: Initialize Q-Former module QF_M with BLIP-2_{stage-1} weights
- 5: Initialize modality-specific linear projection layer LP_M
- 6: **for** each step in number of iterations **do**
- 7: Sample (x, y) from $\bigcup \mathbb{D}_M$
- 8: Sample i_M from I_{M_t} where t is the task mapping x to y
- 9: $z_M \leftarrow Enc_M(x)$ \triangleright Encode input to embedding space
- 10: $\mathbf{Q}'_M \leftarrow QF_M(\mathbf{Q}_M, z_M, i_M)$ \triangleright Transform query
- 11: $x_{LLM} \leftarrow E(h(c_M)) \parallel LP_M(\mathbf{Q}'_M) \parallel E(h(i_M)) \parallel E(h(x))$
- 12: Prediction $\leftarrow LLM(x_{LLM})$ \triangleright Get LLM's prediction
- 13: Loss $\leftarrow \mathcal{L}_{CE}(\text{Prediction}, h(y))$ \triangleright Calculate cross-entropy loss
- 14: $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \alpha \nabla_{\theta} \text{Loss}$ \triangleright Update Q-Former parameters
- 15: **end for**
- 16: **end for**

struction $i_M \in \mathbb{I}_{M_t}$, where \mathbb{I}_{M_t} is the predefined space of instruction templates for task t and modality M . These learnable embeddings are referred to as *input query tokens*.

Each modality Q-Former QF_M transforms the query embeddings \mathbf{Q}_M conditioned on both (z_M, i_M) into instruction-aware language representations of x_M . The Q-Former module consists of two transformer submodules that




Figure 3. Visual illustration of the multimodal instruction-aware Q-Former architecture. Each modality Q-Former transforms a set of K trainable query tokens conditioned on the modality embedding and task instruction which are then linearly projected to the frozen LLM’s space next to a modality-specific prefix.

share the same self-attention layers: one submodule interacts with the output of the modality encoder \mathcal{Z}_M and the other is a BERT_{base} text transformer that serves as both an encoder and decoder, hence the use of the term *tokens* to refer to the learnable representation. Each Q-Former is initialized with the pre-trained weights from BLIP-2 [49], without the cross-attention layers due to a dimension mismatch between the image encoder in BLIP-2 and the other modality encoders. The modality embedding z_M interacts with the instruction text i_M and input query tokens Q_M via cross-attention layers inserted every other transformer block. The transformed result Q'_M is termed *output query tokens*.

$$Q'_M = \text{QF}_M(Q_M, z_M, i_M) \quad (1)$$

For sequential data, such as video and audio, we extract $N \times K$ query tokens; each frame is encoded and then processed separately by the Q-Former module. For the sake of readability we omit the iteration over N from the equations.

The output query tokens Q'_M are linearly projected to the frozen LLM’s space through a learnable projection layer LP_M specific to each modality. This is necessary since the Q-Former’s tokenization space differs from that of the frozen pretrained LLM. Let h be the LLM’s tokenizer, E the LLM’s embedding layer, c_M the modality cue, x the example text input, and y the corresponding target phrase. The resulting *LLM input tokens* x_{LLM} is formed by

$$x_{\text{LLM}} = E(h(c_M)) \parallel \text{LP}_M(Q'_M) \parallel E(h(i_M)) \parallel E(h(x)) \quad (2)$$

where \parallel denotes concatenation. The model is optimized under a causal language modeling objective [59]:

$$\min_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_{\text{CE}}(\text{LLM}(x_{\text{LLM}}), h(y)) \quad (3)$$

\mathcal{L}_{CE} is the cross entropy loss, θ the Q-Former parameters, y is the target sequence, $\text{LLM}(x_{\text{LLM}})$ is the LLM’s prediction.

Note that the parameters of the LLM remain frozen during the alignment learning process and are therefore not a part of the optimization objective. We recognize the potential significance of investigating scenarios where the LLM parameters are subjected to either full or partial optimization. This could encompass both independent and




Figure 4. Instruction Tuning and Evaluation Datasets: Oval-enclosed datasets are training datasets, while square cells signify out-of-domain evaluation sets. Datasets with a dashed outline are derived automatically from existing public datasets.

joint optimization strategies with the Q-Former modules across diverse modalities. However, such an investigation falls outside the purview of our current study. Our focus is primarily on assessing the performance and adaptability of the Q-Former module in various modalities, specifically within the framework of using a frozen LLM. This approach strategically avoids issues related to catastrophic forgetting [28, 52], both in the language and cross-modal contexts through the integration of new modalities.

4. Datasets

X-InstructBLIP is optimized and evaluated on a collection of pre-existing and automatically generated datasets succinctly presented in figure 4, discussed in section 4.1, with more details available in the supplementary material. Section 5.3.3 introduces the Discriminatory Cross-modal Reasoning challenge dataset DisCRn^3 used to evaluate the emergent capabilities of X-InstructBLIP (section 4.2).

4.1. Fine-tuning Datasets

Existing Datasets: Figure 4 illustrates the datasets utilized for both instruction fine-tuning and evaluation. A detailed breakdown of the dataset statistics and formats can be found in the supplementary material. For each dataset in \mathbb{D}_M , the collection of held-in datasets specific to modality M , a modified sampling strategy from Dai et al. [19] is adopted, extended to accommodate a broader range of modalities. The sampling probability for any given dataset $D_{M_d} \in \mathbb{D}_M$

³ The term *discriminative reasoning*, adapted from Xu et al. [96], refers to the ability to distinguish between sets of inputs, as opposed to *joint reasoning*, the synthesis of information from aligned sources.

is given by the equation $\frac{\sqrt{|D_{M_d}|}}{\sum_{d \in [1, \dots, |D_M|]} \sqrt{|D_{M_d}|}}$. Similarly to InstructBLIP we empirically adjust the sampling ratio for a portion of the datasets. In particular, in the final 40k iterations of the Vicuna 7b image Q-Former, COCO [9] is up-sampled to 3. and MSRVT [54] is up-sampled to 1 throughout the optimization of the video Q-Former. These adjustments guide the model to learn from a more refined, yet diverse dataset. Refer to the supplementary material for more ablations and discussions for these decisions.

Instruction Data Augmentation: Extracting instruction-aware representations necessitates diverse instruction-related tasks across all modalities. Notably, datasets for 3D and audio modalities are marjorly caption-centric. To address this, we leverage the open-source large language model `google/flan-t5-xxl` [89] to automatically generate question-answer pairs for the 3D and audio modalities from their corresponding captions. The process begins by prompting the model with captions to generate potential answers. These answers are then used to prompt the model to generate candidate questions. If the model’s response to a question, using the caption as context aligns closely with the initial answer (achieving a Levenshtein similarity score [103] above 0.9), the example is added to our dataset. This procedure yields $\sim 250k$ examples using 3D data from Cap3D [63]⁴ and $\sim 24k$ examples for audio data from AudioCaps [40]. See the supplementary material for a breakdown of the data generation process and data distribution.

4.2. Discriminative Cross-modal Reasoning

X-InstructBLIP offers a distinct emergent capability: reasoning across different modalities, despite individual modality training. This highlights the model’s versatility and potential scalability across numerous modalities. To study this cross-modal reasoning capability, we present a discriminatory cross-modal reasoning (DisCRn) challenge dataset. As Figure 5 shows, this task requires the model to discern between the properties of two entities across modalities by selecting which one satisfies a queried property. This task mandates the model to not only discriminate the inherent characteristics of the involved modalities but also to consider their relative positioning in the input. This strategic imposition serves to diminish reliance on simplistic text-matching heuristics, order bias, or potential deceptive correlations between modalities.

To generate the dataset, we employed the same `google/flan-t5-xxl` model, utilized for instruction data augmentation. The process is initiated by prompting the language model in a Chain-of-Thought [90] manner to generate a set of properties for each dataset instance. Each instance is then paired with a random entity from the dataset

⁴ A subset consisting of 5k point clouds is deliberately held-out from Cap3D for the construction of DisCRn, as introduced in section 4.2. This exclusion is maintained both in the captioning and QA configurations.




Figure 5. Examples from DisCRn. Given two distinct modality inputs, select the one that best fits the queried property.

to form a (question, answer, explanation) triplet by prompting the language model with three in-context examples to leverage in-context-learning [7]. A pivotal step in this creation process is a round-trip-consistency check: an example is integrated into the final dataset only when the model’s predictions on the generated question, given the captions, match the example answer, exhibiting a Levenshtein distance above 0.9. This refined dataset encompasses 8,802 audio-video samples sourced from the AudioCaps validation set, and 29,072 image-point cloud instances from a reserved subset of 5k point clouds from Cap3D [63]. Each instance in the dataset is coupled with two representations corresponding to the captions: (audio, video) from AudioCaps and (point cloud, images) from Cap3D. Given that the arrangement of the data can be altered, this allows for maintaining a balanced set of answers. This balance pertains not only to the position of the answers but also to the answer modality. Human performance on the task stands at 90% indicating its high quality. More dataset creation and distribution details are in the supplementary material.

5. Experiments

We study the effectiveness of X-InstructBLIP as a comprehensive solution for incorporating cross-modality into pre-trained frozen LLMs. Following a debrief on the implementation details in section 5.1, we establish a set of comparisons to evaluate X-InstructBLIP’s effectiveness as a general framework (section 5.2). We also verify the model’s competitiveness in individual modality-to-text tasks (section 5.3.1). More notably, we explore X-InstructBLIP’s emergent cross-modality reasoning ability (sections 5.3.2 and 5.3.3) even in the absence of joint optimization.

5.1. Implementation Details

X-InstructBLIP is built on the LAVIS library’s framework [45] atop of the Vicuna v1.1 7b and 13b models [16]. Each Q-Former optimizes 188M trainable parameters and learns $K = 32$ query tokens with a hidden dimension of size 768. Table 1 lists the frozen pre-trained encoders used for each modality. Raw inputs undergo standardized pre-processing prior to encoding: images are resized to 224×224 resolution with random cropping and normalization; audio files undergo mono conversion and filter bank pre-processing followed by normalization as in Chen

Modality	Encoder
Video, Image	EVA-CLIP-ViT-G/14 [27]
Audio	BEATs _{iter3+} [13]
3D	ULIP-2 [PointBERT backbone] [75]

Table 1. Pre-trained Encoders for each Modality

et al. [13] over two 5-second frames; videos are uniformly sampled to 5 frames subject to the same pre-processing as images, and 3D point clouds are uniformly sampled and normalized to 8k points as in Salesforce [75], Xue et al. [97]. All modality Q-Formers are pre-initialized with BLIP-2 [19] stage-1 weights except for the video Q-Former which is initialized from the last iteration of the corresponding image Q-Former and optimized for 15k/5k steps for the Vicuna 7b and 13b models respectively.

We optimize the model on 8 A100 40GB GPUs using AdamW [61] with parameters $\beta_1=0.9$ and $\beta_2=0.999$, and a weight decay of 0.05. The learning rate warms up linearly over the initial 1,000 steps from 10^{-8} to 10^{-5} , followed by a cosine decay to a minimum of 0. Consistent hyperparameters and templates are maintained for the evaluated tasks, with small modifications tailored to each modality. A *single best model* is selected for each modality. See details in the supplementary material.

5.2. Baselines

Our primary aim is to demonstrate the adaptability of our framework across various modalities without relying on large-scale pre-training stages or joint modality data. To ensure our approach’s effectiveness and comparability, we juxtapose its performance to other *methods that employ projections to pre-trained frozen or partially frozen LLMs*, wherever possible. This serves as a mere *sanity check*, verifying that our method is both effective and competitive.

Linear Projection: Although Dai et al. [19] have shown the benefits of instruction-aware Q-Formers over their base setup, there is limited prior work directly comparing Q-Formers with simpler architectures. To address this, we implemented a linear projection baseline to effectively replace the 3D and Audio Q-Formers. This projection maps the outputs of the 3D and Audio encoders to 32 outputs, otherwise maintaining the same training setup.

X-InstructBLIP §: We also explore the effectiveness of the BLIP-2 initialization process by training the audio Q-Former in X-InstructBLIP (7b) using a random initialization approach. This experiment demonstrates improved performance, indicating that it’s possible to integrate new modalities into our framework without the necessity for extensive pre-training, since from the modalities considered, audio is the least likely to benefit from image-text pre-training. Future research should delve into the effects of modality-specific pre-training, as they are outside of our scope.

X-InstructBLIP †: Trained similarly to X-InstructBLIP (7b), with the distinction that the modality type is not prepended to the modality’s LLM input tokens before feed-

	Modelnet40 _{test}	
	Classification	Open Generation
InstructBLIP (7b) [Single View] [19]	31.4	23.7
InstructBLIP (13b) [Single View]	31.5	25.5
Linear Projection (7b)	46.4	30.2
X-InstructBLIP (7b)†	60.9(↑ 14.5)	46.7(↑ 16.5)
X-InstructBLIP (7b)	62.8(↑ 16.4)	49.4(↑ 19.2)
X-InstructBLIP (13b)	65.1	50.0

Table 2. Zero-Shot 3D-Quantitative Results.

ing into the LLM for training and inference.

5.3. Results

Across the paper we reserve the following notation in presenting the results: Underlined numbers indicate in-domain evaluations. **Bold** numbers indicate the top zero-shot performance. **Blue** numbers indicate the second best zero-shot performance. Models denoted with 7b and 13b indicate the underlying Vicuna model size. Gray shaded rows correspond to current work. Numbers in (parentheses) show improvement over the linear projection baseline. In terms of evaluation, we report CIDEr [84] for captioning, and Top-1 accuracy for question answering and classification tasks.

5.3.1 Individual Modality Understanding

We evaluate X-InstructBLIP’s performance across a range of single modality to text tasks, illustrating its versatility and efficacy across all four explored modalities. Tables 2, 3, 4, and 6 summarize X-InstructBLIP’s out-domain performance across 3D, audio, image, and silent video modalities.

3D: Table 2 shows the results on zero-shot classification on ModelNet40 [91] under two setups: classification in closed vocabulary using loss ranking [47] and open generation where the model is prompted to describe the 3d model and correctness is validated if a *single* class from the 40 candidates is present in the generation. X-InstructBLIP significantly outperforms the InstructBLIP baseline, which processes a single view rendering of the point cloud, achieving twice its accuracy.

This is further bolstered by Figure 6 where we employ TSne decomposition [82] to visualize the ULIP-2, X-InstructBLIP and Linear Projection representations respectively. The Linear Projection seems to break the separation of the classes, a result supported by its lower performance of 16.0 and 19.5 points in classification and open generation accuracy compared to X-InstructBLIP.

Audio: In Table 3, X-InstructBLIP’s performance in audio classification, question answering, and captioning tasks is detailed, utilizing datasets from ESC50 [72], ClothoAQA [56], and Clotho [24]. Classification is evaluated both in close (cls) and open generation settings, similar to 3D. X-InstructBLIP effectively distinguishes audio with high accuracy, surpassing ImageBind [30] a multimodal contrastive method that aligns audio to multiple modalities though transitive correspondence to images by 10 points.




Figure 6. TSne visualization of flattened *output query tokens* for 10 randomly sampled Modelnet40 classes after optimization.

	Cls	ESC50	ClothoAQA	v1	Clotho
		Open	test		v2
MWAFM [32]	-	-	22.2	-	-
Kim et al. [41]	-	-	-	-	19.2
ImageBind [30]	66.9	-	-	-	-
Linear Projection (7b)	52.0	26.5	12.0	23.7	20.5
X-InstructBLIP (7b) †	67.5(↑15.5)	36.0(↑9.5)	9.9(↓2.1)	26.9(↑3.2)	24.5(↑4.0)
X-InstructBLIP (7b) §	70.0(↑18.0)	37.8(↑11.3)	11.9(↓0.1)	29.3(↑5.6)	27.4(↑6.9)
X-InstructBLIP (7b)	75.9(↑23.9)	38.2(↑11.7)	15.4(↑3.4)	29.4(↑5.7)	26.7(↑6.2)
X-InstructBLIP (13b)	77.1	34.6	21.7	28.7	27.4

Table 3. Out-Domain Audio Quantitative Results.

Notably, X-InstructBLIP§ trails by 6 points, suggesting initial challenges in audio class representation. However, this gap narrows in open generation and captioning tasks, indicating nuanced differences in model performance. The most significant improvement is observed in question answering, indicating that BLIP-2 weight initialization appears to enhance instruction awareness more than direct audio-language alignment, corroborated by the gap in closed vocabulary classification performance.

Prefix Effect: Tables 2 and 3 show that cuing the model with the modality benefits even single modality performance. This is likely due to the fact that the Q-Former is relieved from the extra burden to encode the type of modality and instead reserves bandwidth for semantic information.

Image: While we do not expect large variations in performance compared to InstructBLIP, we present results on image captioning and visual question answering in Table 4 as a sanity check. X-InstructBLIP outperforms InstructBLIP on VizWiz [6], but we note a small drop in performance compared to InstructBLIP despite the similar fine-tuning setup. We hypothesize that this minor decrement in performance is attributed to the expanded template space which introduces a trade-off of generalization and performance. Table 5 compares performance between InstructBLIP (7b) and X-InstructBLIP (7b) on NoCaps [1], using prompts not encountered in the optimization of either model. While X-InstructBLIP exhibits some performance variability, it maintains more than half the standard deviation of InstructBLIP. This variance can be attributed to the expanded vocabulary in our templates, allowing the Q-Former to better associate an instruction with a specific task. For example, in the case of prompt P2: *Provide a recap of what is happening in the picture*", InstructBLIP maintains high performance as it closely resembles an in-domain prompt *“Use a few words to illustrate what is happening in the picture”*. Note that the

	Flickr30k	NoCaps	VizWiz	GQA
	test	val all	testdev	bal.testdev
Flamingo 9B[3]	61.5	-	28.8	-
BLIP-2[49]	76.1	107.5	29.8	44.7
InstructBLIP [19]	84.5	123.1	34.5	49.5
LLaVA (7b) [57]	27.7	33.1	-	41.3
X-InstructBLIP (7b)	82.1	117.7	34.9	48.1
X-InstructBLIP (13b)	74.7	114.5	36.0	49.2

Table 4. Out-Domain Image Quantitative Results

	InstructBLIP (7b)	X-InstructBLIP (7b)
P1	1.0	88.0
P2	121.9	109.7
P3	0.9	54.9
P4	5.4	112.7
P5	0.8	111.5
Avg	26.3	83.0
Std.	43.8	20.8

- P1 In a few words describe the basic features of this image.
P2 Provide a recap of what is happening in the picture.
P3 I'd like to hear your interpretation of this image. What do you see?
P4 Provide a verbal snapshot of what's happening in this image.
P5 Please articulate the elements and context of this image

Table 5. Robustness to unseen prompts on NoCaps (val) [1].

	Video	MSVD	VATEX	MSVD QA
	pre-training	test	val	test
FrozenBiLM [98]	✓	-	-	33.8
VideoLLaMA [104]	✓	-	-	51.6
InstructBLIP[19]	×	87.2	57.6	41.2
X-InstructBLIP (7b)	×	116.1	59.2	51.7
X-InstructBLIP (13b)	×	124.3	52.0	49.2

Table 6. Out-Domain Silent Video Quantitative Results.

performance drop in InstructBLIP is mostly attributed to the language model resorting to generating longer descriptions when the Q-Former outputs have not captured the task, resulting in hallucinations in later stages of generation.

Silent Video: Table 6 evaluates X-InstructBLIP on out-of-domain video tasks. We compare performance with prominent baselines that rely on *frozen or partially frozen* LLMs and show comparable or improved performance on Video Question Answering (VQA).

However, due to the nature of the instruction aware setup, X-InstructBLIP is tuned on other QA tasks, thus having an advantage over VideoLLaMA [104] and FrozenBiLM [98]. As we show in the supplementary, the Video Q-Former component of X-InstructBLIP, initialized with the Image Q-Former’s weights, reaches convergence in performance remarkably fast, within about 1,000 iterations. This rapid convergence underscores the importance of fine-tuning the Video Q-Former with high-quality data. We observe that prioritizing MSRVT data over the noisier WebVideo2M dataset is crucial, as the latter quickly leads to a decline in performance due to its less reliable captions. For context, VideoLLaMA is pre-trained on the entire WebVideo dataset of 2 million videos, in addition to BLIP-2 image pre-training. FrozenBiLM, on the other hand, undergoes two epochs of training on the larger WebVideo10M.

	A	V	A+V	Δ
Music AVQA <i>test</i>				
X-InstructBLIP(7b)	13.4	27.2	28.1	1.3
X-InstructBLIP(7b) [†]	8.9	27.3	22.3	-5.0
X-InstructBLIP(13b)	22.7	43.5	44.5	1.0
VATEX <i>test</i>				
X-InstructBLIP(7b)	6.7	59.2	60.9	1.7
X-InstructBLIP(7b) [†]	6.8	59.5	58.3	-1.2
X-InstructBLIP(13b)	6.1	52.0	58.2	6.2

Table 7. Emergent Joint Audio-Video Reasoning. Δ denotes the difference between joint modality and best single modality score.

5.3.2 Cross-Modal Joint Reasoning

Despite each modality projection being trained individually, X-InstructBLIP shows strong joint modality reasoning. Table 7 demonstrates X-InstructBLIP’s capability to reason jointly over video (V) and audio (A). Notably, X-InstructBLIP (7b) is capable of synergizing inputs, displaying an improvement in performance compared to utilizing a single modality when the model is cued with the different modalities both in MusicAVQA [46] and VATEX Captioning [88] tasks. However, this behavior is not consistent for the model without prefix cues. Initially, it was theorized that the model’s inability to differentiate tokens corresponding to each modality, treating them instead as a continuous stream, might be the cause. However, the results from the image-3D crossmodal reasoning task where the prefixless model outperforms the prefixed one by 10 points challenge this view. It appears that the inclusion of cues may be prompting the model to encode modality-specific information, which is beneficial in joint reasoning scenarios. This specialized encoding does not, however, prime the model to recognize and process characteristics usually associated with other modalities, required for enhanced performance in contrastive tasks. The underlying rationale is that the language model, already tuned to generate modality-relevant outputs, leads the Q-Former to primarily receive feedback on modality-specific generation during training. This mechanism could also account for the unexpectedly improved performance in individual modality tasks.

5.3.3 Cross-Modal Discriminative Reasoning

We assess the ability of X-InstructBLIP in executing discriminatory reasoning across different modalities using our newly introduced `DisCRn` benchmark, detailed in section 4.2. We frame the problem as a realistic open generation problem. The LLM is prefixed with the instruction:

You are given two inputs. Select exactly one of the two by reference to its relative position (first or second, left or right) that best answers the question.

In prompting X-InstructBLIP (7b) we found that using a Q-Former captioning prompt different from the comparative prompt provided to the LLM model induced a more general representation that was more applicable for the comparative task, as such we employ this approach for the

DisCRn	Image-3D	Audio-Video
Caption Baseline (7b)	41.8	30.8
Linear Projection _{3D/Audio}	19.7	22.3
X-InstructBLIP (7b) [†]	57.7(↑38.0)	31.4(↑9.1)
X-InstructBLIP (7b)	48.1(↑28.4)	34.0(↑11.7)
X-InstructBLIP (13b)	48.8	45.5

Table 8. `DisCRn` evaluation.

results in Table 8. This is likely due to the lack of comparative data in fine-tuning since each modality Q-Former is trained separately. Future work can explore the effect of different prompts conditioned on different parameters in the instruction-aware training setup (e.g. data, templates, joint training, and LLM partial or full optimization). For the video-audio comparison, we select two frames for each modality to allow for a more balanced generation influence.

To benchmark our model’s capabilities, we incorporate a robust captioning baseline by substituting the query outputs with captions corresponding to the modalities using the Vicuna 7b model.⁵ For images, 3D, and video modalities, we elicit captions by prompting InstructBLIP [19] to Describe the image/video. For 3D inputs, a randomly chosen rendering view of the point cloud served to InstructBLIP. For video we follow Dai et al. [19] and sample four frames and encode them as separate images whose output token representations are concatenated as input to the model. Audio is captioned using WavCaps [92].

X-InstructBLIP outperforms the audio-video and image-3D baselines by 3.2 and 7.7 points in accuracy respectively. Replacing one of the Q-Formers for with an equivalent linear projection module drops the performance to over half in image-3D and more than 10 points in audio-video.

It is worth noting that using a small sub-sample of the data we observed that the task is prompt sensitive, mainly in the language only setting. We leave it to future work to systematically evaluate the model’s ability on the task based on different prompts and in context examples.

6. Conclusion

This study introduces X-InstructBLIP, a scalable framework for independently aligning multiple modalities to a frozen LLM demonstrating competitive results compared to leading methods across all addressed modalities. The framework exhibits emergent crossmodal reasoning, despite separate optimization of each modality. To test the model’s ability a new crossmodal discriminatory reasoning task `DisCRn` is introduced and show that the model can outperform strong captioning baselines across all four examined modalities. Despite the effectiveness of the method, the task remains an open challenge. We also find complexities and unanswered questions within each modality, paving the way for future explorations across and within modalities.

⁵ The 13b model baseline yields below 5% accuracy, due to inability to produce short responses required for the task, hence is omitted.

References

- [1] Harsh Agrawal, Karan Desai, Yufei Wang, Xinlei Chen, Rishabh Jain, Mark Johnson, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, Stefan Lee, and Peter Anderson. nocaps: novel object captioning at scale. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 8948–8957, 2019. [7](#), [5](#)
- [2] Huda Alamri, Chiori Hori, Tim K Marks, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Audio visual scene-aware dialog (avsd) track for natural language generation in dstc7. In *DSTC7 at AAI2019 Workshop*, 2018. [2](#)
- [3] 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. [1](#), [2](#), [7](#)
- [4] Max Bain, Arsha Nagrani, Gül Varol, and Andrew Zisserman. Frozen in time: A joint video and image encoder for end-to-end retrieval. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1728–1738, 2021. [6](#)
- [5] Ankan Bansal, Yuting Zhang, and Rama Chellappa. Visual question answering on image sets. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XXI 16*, pages 51–67. Springer, 2020. [2](#)
- [6] Jeffrey P Bigham, Chandrika Jayant, Hanjie Ji, Greg Little, Andrew Miller, Robert C Miller, Robin Miller, Aubrey Tatarowicz, Brandyn White, Samuel White, et al. Vizwiz: nearly real-time answers to visual questions. In *Proceedings of the 23rd annual ACM symposium on User interface software and technology*, pages 333–342, 2010. [7](#), [5](#)
- [7] 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. [1](#), [5](#)
- [8] Shyamal Buch, Cristóbal Eyzaguirre, Adrien Gaidon, Jiajun Wu, Li Fei-Fei, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Revisiting the "video" in video-language understanding, 2022. [2](#)
- [9] Soravit Changpinyo, Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, and Radu Soricut. Conceptual 12m: Pushing web-scale image-text pre-training to recognize long-tail visual concepts. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3558–3568, 2021. [5](#), [3](#), [6](#)
- [10] David Chen and William B Dolan. Collecting highly parallel data for paraphrase evaluation. In *Proceedings of the 49th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies*, pages 190–200, 2011. [2](#), [5](#)
- [11] Jun Chen, Han Guo, Kai Yi, Boyang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Visualgpt: Data-efficient adaptation of pretrained language models for image captioning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18030–18040, 2022. [2](#)
- [12] Sihan Chen, Handong Li, Qunbo Wang, Zijia Zhao, Mingzhen Sun, Xinxin Zhu, and Jing Liu. VAST: A vision-audio-subtitle-text omni-modality foundation model and dataset. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. [1](#), [4](#)
- [13] Sanyuan Chen, Yu Wu, Chengyi Wang, Shujie Liu, Daniel Tompkins, Zhuo Chen, Wanxiang Che, Xiangzhan Yu, and Furu Wei. BEATs: Audio pre-training with acoustic tokenizers. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5178–5193. PMLR, 2023. [6](#)
- [14] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. Simclr: A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. [2](#)
- [15] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1597–1607. PMLR, 2020. [2](#)
- [16] 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](#), [5](#)
- [17] Jaemin Cho, Jie Lei, Hao Tan, and Mohit Bansal. Unifying vision-and-language tasks via text generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1931–1942. PMLR, 2021. [2](#)
- [18] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Ben Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier Garcia, Vedant Misra, Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pilla, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24 (240):1–113, 2023. [1](#)
- [19] Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale Fung, and Steven Hoi. InstructBLIP: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. [1](#), [2](#), [4](#), [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [3](#)

- [20] Yuanyuan Deng, Xiaolong Liu, Liyu Meng, Wenqiang Jiang, Youqiang Dong, and Chuanhe Liu. Multi-modal information fusion for action unit detection in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5854–5861, 2023. 2
- [21] Soham Deshmukh, Benjamin Elizalde, Rita Singh, and Huaming Wang. Pengi: An audio language model for audio tasks. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. 2
- [22] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. 1
- [23] Danny Driess, Fei Xia, Mehdi S. M. Sajjadi, Corey Lynch, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Brian Ichter, Ayzaan Wahid, Jonathan Tompson, Quan Vuong, Tianhe Yu, Wenlong Huang, Yevgen Chebotar, Pierre Sermanet, Daniel Duckworth, Sergey Levine, Vincent Vanhoucke, Karol Hausman, Marc Toussaint, Klaus Greff, Andy Zeng, Igor Mordatch, and Pete Florence. PaLM-e: An embodied multimodal language model. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 8469–8488. PMLR, 2023. 1, 2, 4
- [24] Konstantinos Drossos, Samuel Lipping, and Tuomas Virtanen. Clotho: An audio captioning dataset. In *ICASSP 2020-2020 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 736–740. IEEE, 2020. 6, 5
- [25] Simone Fabbrizzi, Symeon Papadopoulos, Eirini Ntoutsi, and Ioannis Kompatsiaris. A survey on bias in visual datasets. *Computer Vision and Image Understanding*, 223: 103552, 2022. 4
- [26] facebookresearch. llama. <https://github.com/facebookresearch/llama>, 2023. Accessed: 2023-07-1. 1
- [27] Yuxin Fang, Wen Wang, Binhui Xie, Quan Sun, Ledell Wu, Xinggang Wang, Tiejun Huang, Xinlong Wang, and Yue Cao. Eva: Exploring the limits of masked visual representation learning at scale. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 19358–19369, 2023. 6
- [28] Robert M French. Catastrophic forgetting in connectionist networks. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 3(4):128–135, 1999. 4
- [29] Jort F Gemmeke, Daniel PW Ellis, Dylan Freedman, Aren Jansen, Wade Lawrence, R Channing Moore, Manoj Plakal, and Marvin Ritter. Audio set: An ontology and human-labeled dataset for audio events. In *2017 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*, pages 776–780. IEEE, 2017. 6
- [30] Rohit Girdhar, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, Zhuang Liu, Mannat Singh, Kalyan Vasudev Alwala, Armand Joulin, and Ishan Misra. Imagebind: One embedding space to bind them all. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 15180–15190, 2023. 1, 2, 6, 7
- [31] Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Making the V in VQA matter: Evaluating the role of image understanding in Visual Question Answering. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2017. 6
- [32] Di Hu Guangyao li, Yixin Xu. Multi-scale attention for audio question answering. *Proc. INTERSPEECH*, 2023. 7
- [33] Liangke Gui, Borui Wang, Qiuyuan Huang, Alexander G Hauptmann, Yonatan Bisk, and Jianfeng Gao. Kat: A knowledge augmented transformer for vision-and-language. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 956–968, 2022. 2
- [34] Andrey Guzhov, Federico Raue, Jörn Hees, and Andreas Dengel. Audioclip: Extending clip to image, text and audio. In *ICASSP 2022-2022 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 976–980. IEEE, 2022. 1, 2
- [35] Kaiming He, Haoqi Fan, Yuxin Wu, Saining Xie, and Ross Girshick. Momentum contrast for unsupervised visual representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9729–9738, 2020. 2
- [36] Yining Hong, Haoyu Zhen, Peihao Chen, Shuhong Zheng, Yilun Du, Zhenfang Chen, and Chuang Gan. 3d-LLM: Injecting the 3d world into large language models. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. 2
- [37] Shaohan Huang, Li Dong, Wenhui Wang, Yaru Hao, Saksham Singhal, Shuming Ma, Tengchao Lv, Lei Cui, Owais Khan Mohammed, Barun Patra, Qiang Liu, Kriti Aggarwal, Zewen Chi, Johan Bjorck, Vishrav Chaudhary, Subhojit Som, Xia Song, and Furu Wei. Language is not all you need: Aligning perception with language models. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. 1, 2
- [38] Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning. Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6700–6709, 2019. 5
- [39] Chaoya Jiang, Wei Ye, Haiyang Xu, Songfang Huang, Fei Huang, and Shikun Zhang. Vision language pre-training by contrastive learning with cross-modal similarity regulation. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 14660–14679, Toronto, Canada, 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2
- [40] Chris Dongjoo Kim, Byeongchang Kim, Hyunmin Lee, and Gunhee Kim. Audiocaps: Generating captions for audios in the wild. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 119–132, 2019. 2, 5, 1, 6

- [41] Minkyu Kim, Kim Sung-Bin, and Tac-Hyun Oh. Prefix tuning for automated audio captioning. In *ICASSP 2023-2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2023. [2](#), [7](#)
- [42] Jing Yu Koh, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Daniel Fried. Grounding language models to images for multimodal inputs and outputs. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 17283–17300. PMLR, 2023. [1](#), [2](#)
- [43] Ranjay Krishna, Yuke Zhu, Oliver Groth, Justin Johnson, Kenji Hata, Joshua Kravitz, Stephanie Chen, Yannis Kalantidis, Li-Jia Li, David A Shamma, et al. Visual genome: Connecting language and vision using crowdsourced dense image annotations. *International journal of computer vision*, 123:32–73, 2017. [6](#)
- [44] Chenliang Li, Haiyang Xu, Junfeng Tian, Wei Wang, Ming Yan, Bin Bi, Jiabo Ye, He Chen, Guohai Xu, Zheng Cao, Ji Zhang, Songfang Huang, Fei Huang, Jingren Zhou, and Luo Si. mPLUG: Effective and efficient vision-language learning by cross-modal skip-connections. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7241–7259, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. [2](#), [4](#)
- [45] Dongxu Li, Junnan Li, Hung Le, Guangsen Wang, Silvio Savarese, and Steven C.H. Hoi. LAVIS: A one-stop library for language-vision intelligence. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 3: System Demonstrations)*, pages 31–41, Toronto, Canada, 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. [5](#)
- [46] Guangyao Li, Yake Wei, Yapeng Tian, Chenliang Xu, Ji-Rong Wen, and Di Hu. Learning to answer questions in dynamic audio-visual scenarios. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 19108–19118, 2022. [2](#), [8](#), [5](#)
- [47] Junnan Li, Ramprasaath Selvaraju, Akhilesh Gotmare, Shafiq Joty, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Chu Hong Hoi. Align before fuse: Vision and language representation learning with momentum distillation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:9694–9705, 2021. [2](#), [6](#)
- [48] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. BLIP: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022. [2](#)
- [49] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023. [1](#), [2](#), [4](#), [7](#), [6](#)
- [50] Xiujun Li, Xi Yin, Chunyuan Li, Pengchuan Zhang, Xiaowei Hu, Lei Zhang, Lijuan Wang, Houdong Hu, Li Dong, Furu Wei, et al. Oscar: Object-semantics aligned pre-training for vision-language tasks. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XXX 16*, pages 121–137. Springer, 2020. [2](#)
- [51] Yongqi Li, Wenjie Li, and Liqiang Nie. MMCoQA: Conversational question answering over text, tables, and images. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4220–4231, Dublin, Ireland, 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. [2](#)
- [52] Zhizhong Li and Derek Hoiem. Learning without forgetting. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 40(12):2935–2947, 2017. [4](#)
- [53] Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, Benjamin Newman, Binhang Yuan, Bobby Yan, Ce Zhang, Christian Alexander Cosgrove, Christopher D Manning, Christopher Re, Diana Acosta-Navas, Drew Arad Hudson, Eric Zelikman, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Frieda Rong, Hongyu Ren, Huaxiu Yao, Jue WANG, Keshav Santhanam, Laurel Orr, Lucia Zheng, Mert Yuksekgonul, Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Kim, Neel Guha, Niladri S. Chatterji, Omar Khattab, Peter Henderson, Qian Huang, Ryan Andrew Chi, Sang Michael Xie, Shibani Santurkar, Surya Ganguli, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Thomas Icard, Tianyi Zhang, Vishrav Chaudhary, William Wang, Xuechen Li, Yifan Mai, Yuhui Zhang, and Yuta Koreeda. Holistic evaluation of language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. Featured Certification, Expert Certification. [5](#)
- [54] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2014: 13th European Conference, Zurich, Switzerland, September 6–12, 2014, Proceedings, Part V 13*, pages 740–755. Springer, 2014. [5](#)
- [55] Yuanze Lin, Yujia Xie, Dongdong Chen, Yichong Xu, Chenguang Zhu, and Lu Yuan. Revive: Regional visual representation matters in knowledge-based visual question answering. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:10560–10571, 2022. [2](#)
- [56] Samuel Lipping, Parthasaarathy Sudarsanam, Konstantinos Drossos, and Tuomas Virtanen. Clotho-aqa: A crowd-sourced dataset for audio question answering. In *2022 30th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, pages 1140–1144. IEEE, 2022. [6](#), [5](#)
- [57] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. [1](#), [2](#), [7](#), [6](#)
- [58] Hao Liu, Wilson Yan, and Pieter Abbeel. Language quantized autoencoders: Towards unsupervised text-image alignment. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. [2](#)
- [59] Peter J. Liu*, Mohammad Saleh*, Etienne Pot, Ben Goodrich, Ryan Sepassi, Lukasz Kaiser, and Noam Shazeer. Generating wikipedia by summarizing long sequences. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018. [4](#)

- [60] Shayne Longpre, Le Hou, Tu Vu, Albert Webson, Hyung Won Chung, Yi Tay, Denny Zhou, Quoc V. Le, Barret Zoph, Jason Wei, and Adam Roberts. The flan collection: Designing data and methods for effective instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*. JMLR.org, 2023. 2
- [61] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018. 6
- [62] Jiasen Lu, Christopher Clark, Rowan Zellers, Roozbeh Mottaghi, and Aniruddha Kembhavi. UNIFIED-IO: A unified model for vision, language, and multi-modal tasks. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. 1
- [63] Tiange Luo, Chris Rockwell, Honglak Lee, and Justin Johnson. Scalable 3d captioning with pretrained models. In *Proceedings of the NeurIPS 2023*, 2023. 2, 5, 1, 6
- [64] Oscar Mañas, Pau Rodriguez Lopez, Saba Ahmadi, Aida Nematzadeh, Yash Goyal, and Aishwarya Agrawal. MAPL: Parameter-efficient adaptation of unimodal pre-trained models for vision-language few-shot prompting. In *Proceedings of the 17th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 2523–2548, Dubrovnik, Croatia, 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. 2
- [65] Kenneth Marino, Mohammad Rastegari, Ali Farhadi, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. Ok-vqa: A visual question answering benchmark requiring external knowledge. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2019. 5, 6
- [66] Anand Mishra, Shashank Shekhar, Ajeet Kumar Singh, and Anirban Chakraborty. Ocr-vqa: Visual question answering by reading text in images. In *ICDAR*, 2019. 6
- [67] Fabio Motoki, Valdemar Pinho Neto, and Victor Rodrigues. More human than human: Measuring chatgpt political bias. *Public Choice*, pages 1–21, 2023. 4
- [68] Arsha Nagrani, Paul Hongsuck Seo, Bryan Seybold, Anja Hauth, Santiago Manen, Chen Sun, and Cordelia Schmid. Learning audio-video modalities from image captions. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 407–426. Springer, 2022. 2
- [69] Ivona Najdenkoska, Xiantong Zhen, and Marcel Worring. Meta learning to bridge vision and language models for multimodal few-shot learning. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. 2
- [70] Vicente Ordonez, Girish Kulkarni, and Tamara Berg. Im2text: Describing images using 1 million captioned photographs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. Curran Associates, Inc., 2011. 6
- [71] Bhargavi Paranjape, Matthew Lamm, and Ian Tenney. Retrieval-guided counterfactual generation for qa. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1670–1686, 2022. 1
- [72] Karol J Piczak. Esc: Dataset for environmental sound classification. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM international conference on Multimedia*, pages 1015–1018, 2015. 6, 5
- [73] 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. 2
- [74] 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. 1
- [75] Salesforce. Ulip. <https://github.com/salesforce/ULIP>, 2022. Accessed: 2023-07-1. 6
- [76] Dustin Schwenk, Apoorv Khandelwal, Christopher Clark, Kenneth Marino, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. A-okvqa: A benchmark for visual question answering using world knowledge. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 146–162. Springer, 2022. 6
- [77] Zhenwei Shao, Zhou Yu, Meng Wang, and Jun Yu. Prompting large language models with answer heuristics for knowledge-based visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14974–14983, 2023. 2
- [78] stanford_alpaca. alpaca. https://github.com/tatsu-lab/stanford_alpaca, 2023. Accessed: 2023-07-1. 1
- [79] Ryota Tanaka, Kyosuke Nishida, Kosuke Nishida, Taku Hasegawa, Itsumi Saito, and Kuniko Saito. Slidevqa: A dataset for document visual question answering on multiple images. In *AAAI*, 2023. 2
- [80] Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, Vinh Q Tran, Xavier Garcia, Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Hyung Won Chung, Dara Bahri, Tal Schuster, Steven Zheng, et al. U12: Unifying language learning paradigms. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 1
- [81] Maria Tsimpoukelli, Jacob L Menick, Serkan Cabi, SM Eslami, Oriol Vinyals, and Felix Hill. Multimodal few-shot learning with frozen language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:200–212, 2021. 2
- [82] Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. Visualizing data using t-sne. *Journal of machine learning research*, 9(11), 2008. 6
- [83] Roelof Van Zwol. Flickr: Who is looking? In *IEEE/WIC/ACM International Conference on Web Intelligence (WI'07)*, pages 184–190. IEEE, 2007. 5
- [84] 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
- [85] Jianfeng Wang, Zhengyuan Yang, Xiaowei Hu, Linjie Li, Kevin Lin, Zhe Gan, Zicheng Liu, Ce Liu, and Lijuan Wang. Git: A generative image-to-text transformer for vision and language. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022. 2
- [86] Peng Wang, An Yang, Rui Men, Junyang Lin, Shuai Bai, Zhikang Li, Jianxin Ma, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, and Hongxia Yang. Ofa: Unifying architectures, tasks, and

- modalities through a simple sequence-to-sequence learning framework. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 23318–23340. PMLR, 2022.
- [87] Teng Wang, Yixiao Ge, Feng Zheng, Ran Cheng, Ying Shan, Xiaohu Qie, and Ping Luo. Accelerating vision-language pretraining with free language modeling. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 23161–23170, 2023. **2**
- [88] Xin Wang, Jiawei Wu, Junkun Chen, Lei Li, Yuan-Fang Wang, and William Yang Wang. Vatex: A large-scale, high-quality multilingual dataset for video-and-language research. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2019. **8, 2, 5**
- [89] Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M. Dai, and Quoc V Le. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. **1, 5**
- [90] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022. **5**
- [91] Zhirong Wu, Shuran Song, Aditya Khosla, Fisher Yu, Linguang Zhang, Xiaoou Tang, and Jianxiong Xiao. 3d shapenets: A deep representation for volumetric shapes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1912–1920, 2015. **6, 5**
- [92] XinhaoMei. Wavcaps. <https://github.com/XinhaoMei/WavCaps>, 2023. Accessed: 2023-07-1. **8, 6**
- [93] Dejing Xu, Zhou Zhao, Jun Xiao, Fei Wu, Hanwang Zhang, Xiangnan He, and Yueting Zhuang. Video question answering via gradually refined attention over appearance and motion. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, pages 1645–1653, 2017. **1, 5, 6**
- [94] Haiyang Xu, Qinghao Ye, Ming Yan, Yaya Shi, Jiabo Ye, Yuanhong Xu, Chenliang Li, Bin Bi, Qi Qian, Wei Wang, Guohai Xu, Ji Zhang, Songfang Huang, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. Mplug-2: A modularized multi-modal foundation model across text, image and video. In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*. JMLR.org, 2023. **1, 2, 4**
- [95] 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. **2, 3, 5, 6**
- [96] Wang Xu, Kehai Chen, and Tiejun Zhao. Discriminative reasoning for document-level relation extraction. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 1653–1663, Online, 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. **4**
- [97] Le Xue, Mingfei Gao, Chen Xing, Roberto Martín-Martín, Jiajun Wu, Caiming Xiong, Ran Xu, Juan Carlos Niebles, and Silvio Savarese. Ulip: Learning a unified representation of language, images, and point clouds for 3d understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1179–1189, 2023. **6**
- [98] Antoine Yang, Antoine Miech, Josef Sivic, Ivan Laptev, and Cordelia Schmid. Zero-shot video question answering via frozen bidirectional language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:124–141, 2022. **1, 2, 7**
- [99] Zhengyuan Yang, Zhe Gan, Jianfeng Wang, Xiaowei Hu, Faisal Ahmed, Zicheng Liu, Yumao Lu, and Lijuan Wang. Unitab: Unifying text and box outputs for grounded vision-language modeling. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 521–539. Springer, 2022. **2**
- [100] Zhengyuan Yang, Zhe Gan, Jianfeng Wang, Xiaowei Hu, Yumao Lu, Zicheng Liu, and Lijuan Wang. An empirical study of gpt-3 for few-shot knowledge-based vqa. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 3081–3089, 2022. **2**
- [101] Kai-Ching Yeh, Jou-An Chi, Da-Chen Lian, and Shu-Kai Hsieh. Evaluating interfaced llm bias. In *Proceedings of the 35th Conference on Computational Linguistics and Speech Processing (ROCLING 2023)*, pages 292–299, 2023. **4**
- [102] Lijun Yu, Yong Cheng, Zhiruo Wang, Vivek Kumar, Wolfgang Macherey, Yanping Huang, David A Ross, Irfan Essa, Yonatan Bisk, Ming-Hsuan Yang, Kevin Patrick Murphy, Alexander G Hauptmann, and Lu Jiang. SPAE: Semantic pyramid autoencoder for multimodal generation with frozen LLMs. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023. **2**
- [103] Li Yujian and Liu Bo. A normalized levenshtein distance metric. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 29(6):1091–1095, 2007. **5**
- [104] Hang Zhang, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. Video-llama: An instruction-tuned audio-visual language model for video understanding. *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing 2023, Demo Track*, 2023. **1, 2, 7**

X-InstructBLIP: A Framework for aligning X-Modal instruction-aware representations to LLMs and Emergent Cross-modal Reasoning

Supplementary Material

7. Data Generation

7.1. Instruction Tuning Data Augmentation

For the audio and 3D modalities, the available range of tasks for instruction tuning is relatively limited. To address this challenge we follow a common paradigm in the literature [93] and extract question-answer pairs are derived from captioning datasets, specifically from captions consisting of 10 words or more. Figure 7 delineates the procedure to automatically generate question answering data from captioning datasets. The `google/flan-t5-xxl` model from `huggingface-transformers` is employed, and is prompted to produce candidate single-word answers based on the caption. Subsequently, the model is tasked with generating a relevant question using the answer and context as inputs. The method of round-trip-consistency [71] is utilized to sift through and retain only those question-answer pairs that align with the context. This alignment is verified by ensuring that the Levenshtein partial similarity between the predicted and initial answers is greater than 0.90, calculated using the `Fuzzy Wuzzy` Python package. Subsequently, we apply a string matching post-processing to filter out instances that do not conform to the prescribed format. As a result, 250,070/1,157 suitable training/validation examples are derived from an initial 661,576/5,000 3D-caption samples from the Cap3D [63] dataset, and 24,156/1,653 training/validation examples are derived from 38,695/1,900 original audio-caption samples from the AudioCaps [40] dataset. Moreover, for 3D data, it is imperative to ensure that the question-answer pairs do not allude to color. This is due to the fact that the 3D encoder does not capture color characteristics. To achieve this, the language model is directed to reformulate the captions by omitting any references to color, prompted as: Rewrite the sentence `{caption}` by eliminating any color mentions, prior to implementing the round-trip-consistency check. A short human evaluation on 50 samples for each modality shows that 90% of the generated audio and 82% of the 3D data is correct. Table 9 presents a random sample of the generated data and table 10 provides an overview of the datasets’s distribution statistics. It is worth noting that the error cases are typically due to non-sensical questions, rather than wrong answers. For example the following pairs were marked as non-sensical: *What is the sewing machine running at? speed*, *What does the steam whistle do? hisses*, *What is the 3D model of a brick wall with holes and stacked cubes, resembling? elements*, and *What is the hat with? pattern*.




Figure 7. Round-Trip-Consistency Prompting for QA Datasets in 3D and Audio Modalities.

7.2. Cross-modal Discriminative Reasoning Data Generation

To assess the cross-modal reasoning capabilities of X-InstructBLIP, we devised a unique task that repurposes existing captioning datasets, specifically focusing on data representable in multiple modalities. We chose the AudioCaps [40] validation dataset and reserved a subset of 5k examples from Cap3D [63] as our validation dataset, ensuring that the 3D Q-Former is not exposed to this subset during the training phase in either captioning or 3DQA settings.

The audio data from AudioCaps originates from `Youtube` videos, allowing us to download the corresponding video files using their YouTube IDs. For Cap3D, we employed the associated point clouds and randomly selected one rendered image from the available eight view angles.

A depiction of the data generation procedure, also outlined in the main text, is provided in Figure 8. During the evaluation, we maintain a balance, ensuring each option (A or B) serves as the ground truth 50% of the time. Given that this problem is structured as an open vocabulary generation task, we expanded the ground truth answer space to include synonyms and equivalent expressions, such as `[{answer modality}, left, 1st, 1, first, input 1, entity 1, object 1, input A, entity A, object A]` and `[{answer modality}, right, 2nd, second, input 2, entity 2, object 2, input B, entity B, object B]`, corresponding to whether the first or the second input is the ground truth. The human performance on a subsample of 100 examples of the dataset is 90%. Figure 5 in the main paper presents a sample of the generated data and

Modality	Caption	Question	Answer
Audio	A woman speaks while types a keyboard;	What is the woman typing on?	Keyboard
	A man are talking while multiple dogs are barking around them;	What is the dog doing?	Barking
	A man speaks and a crowd applauds, he continues talking;	What does the crowd do after the man speaks?	Applauds
	A plane flies in the distance as a man speaks and metal clinks.	What does the metal do?	Clinks
3D	A 3D model of a wooden chair and stool with a chained bucket on it	What is on the stool?	Bucket
	A 3D model of a moss-covered stone, resembling a leaf, paper map, and rock	What is covering the stone?	Moss
	A balloon with a string attached, featuring a teddy bear and a cat face on it	What is the object with a string attached?	Balloon
	A 3D model of various food items,including an oyster, a piece of fruit, and different forms of eggs.	What is the food item that is a shellfish?	oyster

Table 9. Automatically Generated QA examples from Captioning Data.

Dataset	AudioCapsQA		Cap3DQA	
	train	val	train	val
Size	24,156	1,274	250,070	1,157
Distinct Questions	10,010	810	67,001	953
Distinct Answers	1,636	374	4,555	451
Avg. Question Length (words)	6.0	6.1	6.8	7.0
Vocabulary Size	2,951	723	12,771	1,022

Table 10. QA Generated Dataset Statistics

Dataset	Audio-Video	Video-3D
Total Size	8,802	28,173
Number of Distinct Questions	1,212	3,100
Average Question Length	5.8 words	6.6 words
Question Vocabulary Size	701 words	1,272 words

Table 11. `DisCRn`: Discriminative Cross-modal Reasoning Dataset Statistics

table 11 provides an overview of the datasets’s distribution statistics.

8. Video Q-Former Fine-Tuning Versus Image Initialization

To explore the impact of further training the Image Q-Formers on video data, Table 12 presents the results of evaluating video tasks using the weights from the Image Q-Formers. It is evident that training on video data enhances performance. However, it’s worth noting that the Video Q-Formers reach convergence at an earlier stage (15k and 5k iterations for Vicuna7b and Vicuna13b, respectively). This is likely because the Q-Formers have already achieved semantic understanding during the image alignment phase, requiring minimal additional training to capture the nuances




Figure 8. Cross-modal Discriminative Reasoning Dataset Generation Framework

of sequential video projections. The higher drop in performance in MSVD [10] captioning compared to VATEX [88] is likely due to the closer similarity between MSVD and the held-in MSRVT [95] dataset distribution. There is a notably lower drop in performance for Video QA tasks, owing to the more constraint nature of the task - training on videos would not significantly increase the performance since the answer is typically constrained in one frame [8], and as such processing that frame would be almost equivalent to processing it in the image. The improvement probably stems from identifying the answer across a longer sequence of query tokens.

	MSVD	VATEX	MSVD QA
	<i>test</i>	<i>val</i>	<i>test</i>
X-InstructBLIP (7b)	116.1	59.2	51.7
X-InstructBLIP (7b) <i>[image]</i>	42.4(↓73.7)	28.1(↓30.1)	39.7(↓12.0)
X-InstructBLIP (7b) † <i>[image]</i>	62.0(↓56.7)	52.6(↓6.9)	38.8(↓11.7)
X-InstructBLIP (13b)	124.3	52.0	49.2
X-InstructBLIP (13b) <i>[image]</i>	78.7(↓45.6)	53.5(↑1.5)	36.0(↓13.2)

Table 12. Impact of Training Image Q-Formers on Video. Models labeled *[image]* utilize the Image Q-Former for video alignment.

9. In-Domain Evaluations

Table 13 presents in-domain performance for a sample of datasets seen in training across all four modalities. It’s important to clarify that when we refer to ‘in-domain,’ we are specifically referring to datasets that were sampled during the training process. However, it’s crucial to note that this does not constitute explicit fine-tuning, as there is no guarantee that the Q-Former has encountered the entirety of the dataset during its training.

10. Training Details

Table 14 compiles the training hyperparameters employed for each modality and model. The X-InstructBLIP†variant is trained similarly to X-InstructBLIP, with the notable distinction that the modality type is not prepended to the modality’s query outputs, both during training and inference. Following Dai et al. [19] that noted that sampling ratios play an important role in training we perform some minor modifications in the sampling ratios that we show in tables 16 and 15 are effective in improving performance. The decisions are discussed further below. It is worth noting that due to the large amount of experiments consisting of all modalities, we did not exhaust all possibilities, and there may be better training configurations. We leave this to future work to be explored.

As each modality exhibits unique characteristics, we have customized the training approach for each one. For instance, the 3D and Audio Q-Formers are trained for the maximum number of iterations specified in Table 14.

The Vicuna7b Image Q-Former undergoes training for 735k iterations, utilizing normalized data sampling. Additionally, an extra 40k iterations are performed with the sampling ratio of COCO Captions [9] set to 3.0 while keeping the other ratios consistent with the original sampling. This adjustment leverages the clean annotations of COCO Captions, mitigating noise introduced by larger image datasets. However, this upsampling technique is not applied to the Vicuna13b Image Q-Former, since it appears to lower out of distribution performance in non-captioning tasks as shown in table 16. It could be that due to the smaller batch size, Vicuna13b is less sensitive to noisy data, since it effectively sees less of them. In both cases, the last checkpoint from the iterations specified in Table 14 is chosen, with guidance from the COCO Captions validation dataset. Note that we




Figure 9. CIDEr score on MSVD (out-domain) over training iterations on Video Q-Former initialized from Image Q-Former. Most performance gains are achieved within only 1000 iterations.

optimize the Image Q-Former for 10 times more iterations than InstructBLIP. The reason is that we maintain conformity with the other Q-Formers and do not initialize the cross-attention layers from BLIP-2 pretraining nor we allow for stage-2 training. Nevertheless, we show that with enough iterations, the cross attention layers can be learned equivalently without the need of the contrastive auxiliary losses of BLIP-2 nor stage-2 training.

The Vicuna7b video Q-Former is initialized from the best Vicuna7b image Q-Former and undergoes validation every 5k iterations on the MSRVTTCaptioning [95] dataset. The selection process involves choosing the checkpoint that precedes any drop in performance during the subsequent validation rounds even if there is a better performing checkpoint later on in training, to avoid overfitting to the MSRVTTCaptioning skeletal captions. Table 15 quantitatively shows our observations. Due to the initialization of the video Q-Former with the well trained image Q-Former, the noisy captions of WebVid2M reduce the performance instead of improving it. However, this is corrected when the training consists of cleaner data.

Similarly, the Vicuna13b video Q-Former is initialized from the best checkpoint of the Vicuna13b Image Q-Former and validated every 1k iterations. While we let the Vicuna7b and 13b video Q-Formers train for 15k and 25k respectively, we observe early convergence at 15k and 5k iterations likely due to the pre-initialization with the Image Q-Former. During training, 5 frames are sampled for the Vicuna7b Video Q-Former, while 4 frames are sampled for the Vicuna13b to reduce computational demands. Figure 9 shows that the video performance converges in as little as 1k iterations on an out of domain video captioning dataset.

The best training approach for each model was empirically identified, and it is beyond the scope of the paper to rigorously analyze the reasons of the differences in training across modalities. We leave this to future work.

	Image			3D		Video				Audio		
	OKVQA	COCO		Cap3D	MSRVTT	MSRVTT QA		AudioCaps				
	<i>test</i>	<i>val</i>	<i>test</i>	<i>val</i>		<i>qa-val</i>	<i>val</i>	<i>test</i>	<i>val</i>	<i>test</i>	<i>qa-val</i>	
Finetuned SOTA	66.1 ^[23]	-	155.1 ^[44]	-	-	-	80.3 ^[94]	-	48.0 ^[94]	-	78.1 ^[12]	-
InstructBLIP (T5xl)	48.6	137.7	140.2	-	-	44.1	44.0	25.0	22.3	-	-	-
InstructBLIP (T5xxl)	47.8	139.1	140.8	-	-	41.5	47.8	25.6	21.4	-	-	-
InstructBLIP (7b)	57.3	141.0	142.3	-	-	28.1	31.1	22.1	18.7	-	-	-
InstructBLIP (13b)	56.3	139.1	141.0	-	-	36.7	37.1	24.8	20.2	-	-	-
X-InstructBLIP (7b)	52.5	137.7	138.2	142.1	53.6	61.0	57.6	44.6	42.1	44.6	67.9	41.2
X-InstructBLIP (7b) †	51.3	133.9	135.0	134.1	48.0	58.8	55.1	41.3	43.7	62.7	58.3	37.4
X-InstructBLIP (13b)	51.9	128.2	128.7	148.8	54.9	57.7	52.2	36.4	36.1	54.2	53.7	37.4

Table 13. In-Domain performance across modalities.

Modality	Model	Iterations	Batch Size
Image	7b	775k	64
	13b	880k	16
Audio	7b	65k	64
	13b	300k	16
3D	7b	65k	128
	13b	300k	32
Video*	7b	15k	32
	13b	5k	8

Table 14. Training hyperparameters. * Video Q-Former is initialized from Image Q-Former.

	MSVD	VATEX	MSVD QA
	<i>test</i>	<i>val</i>	<i>test</i>
X-InstructBLIP(7b)	118.2	58.5	52.5
X-InstructBLIP(7b) -upsample	73.3(↓44.9)	41.6(↓16.9)	49.1(↓3.4)

Table 15. Effect of MSRVTT Upsampling (at 10k iterations)

11. Evaluation Hyperparameters

During the evaluation of X-InstructBLIP, we adhere to a consistent set of hyperparameters, with minor variations to accommodate the distinct needs of each task. A comprehensive list of these configurations is presented in table 17. In every experiment, we utilize Beam Search for generation, setting the beam size to 5, repetition penalty and temperature equal to 1.5 and 1 respectively. For tasks involving contrastive reasoning across video-audio modalities, a balanced representation and computational efficiency are achieved by querying two frames from both video and audio. The length penalty is typically configured to 1 for long caption tasks, -1 for Visual Question Answering (VQA) tasks requiring short answers, and 0 for short caption tasks. The minimum and maximum length constraints are adapted based on the task: for captions, we maintain a range of 10 to 80; for short-answer VQA tasks, the range is set from 1 to 10; for variable-length captions, the range is between 1 and 80. In the case of the InstructBLIP baseline for video datasets, we borrow the recommended inference setup of sampling 4

frames for the captioning baselines of MSVD and VATEX with the prompt `A video that shows` and the same generation hyperparameters as X-InstructBLIP.

All our evaluations are reported with batch size 1 due to inconsistencies observed in [Huggingface implementations](#) of models with rotary position embeddings when evaluated in batch.

12. Instruction Tuning Suite

Table 18 presents a comprehensive list of datasets employed in the instruction tuning process for X-InstructBLIP, accompanied by their corresponding dataset sizes. Datasets labeled with ** have been generated automatically through the round-trip-consistency procedure detailed in section 4.1 of the main paper, with further information provided in Appendix 7. Datasets marked with * indicate instances of data loss resulting from file corruption or expired links.

13. Prompt Templates

X-InstructBLIP has undergone fine-tuning using a diverse array of instruction templates, tailored to cover a wide spectrum of tasks and modalities. For reference, the specific templates corresponding to each modality can be found in the following tables: Table 19 for images, Table 20 for audio, Table 21 for 3D, and Table 22 for videos. Compared to InstructBLIP [19] caption templates have increased from 13 to 32, while question-answering templates have grown from 10 to 21. These enhancements have been strategically incorporated to foster greater adaptability of the model to a wide range of user instructions.

14. Ethics Statement

In this research, we present a framework for aligning multiple modalities with a frozen large language model (LLM). Our methodology strictly involves the use of publicly available and free datasets, ensuring we do not engage in the collection of private data. However, it is crucial to acknowledge that publicly sourced datasets carry implicit biases [25, 67, 101]. These biases reflect historical and so-

⁸ Video with id `f9_bP219ehQ_63_70` is corrupt and could not be retrieved.

	Zero-Shot					In-Domain	
	Flickr30k	NoCaps	VizWiz	GQA	OKVQA	COCO	
	<i>test</i>	<i>val-all</i>	<i>test-dev</i>	<i>balanced test-dev</i>	<i>test</i>	<i>val</i>	<i>test</i>
X-InstructBLIP (7b)	82.1	117.7	34.9	48.1	52.5	137.7	138.2
X-InstructBLIP (7b)-coco	79.4(↓2.7)	116.5(↓1.2)	34.2(↓0.7)	48.2(↑0.1)	52.3(↓0.2)	133.5(↓4.2)	134.3(↓3.9)
X-InstructBLIP (13b)	74.7	114.5	36.0	49.2	51.9	128.2	128.7
X-InstructBLIP (13b)+coco	83.8(↑9.1)	118.7(↑4.2)	32.0(↓4.0)	47.0(↓2.2)	44.6(↓7.3)	138.2(↑10.0)	139.0(↑10.3)

Table 16. Effect of COCO upsampling.

Modality	Dataset	Split	Prompt	Len. Penalty	Min Len.	Max Len.
Image	Flickr30k [83]	<i>test</i> : 1,000 images	A short description	1.	10	80
	NoCaps [1]	<i>val</i> : 4,500 images <i>out-domain</i> : 1,413 images	A short description	1.	10	80
	<u>COCO</u> * [9]	<i>train</i> : 566,747 image-caption pairs <i>val</i> : 5,000 images <i>test</i> : 5,000 images	A short description.	1.	10	80
	VizWiz [6]	<i>test-dev</i> : 8,000 image-question pairs	based on the given image respond to {question}	-1.	1	10
	<u>OKVQA</u> [65]	<i>test</i> : 5,046 examples	based on the given image respond to {question} answer	-1.	1	10
	GQA [38]	<i>balanced test-dev</i> : 12,578 image-question pairs	based on the given image respond to {question}	-1.	1	10
3D	<u>Modelnet40</u> [91]	<i>test</i> : 2,468 point clouds	Describe the 3d model. A 3d model of	-1.	1	3
	Modelnet40†		Describe the 3d model.	0.	10	80
Audio	Clotho [24]	<i>eval</i> (v1): 1,045 audios <i>val</i> (v2): 1,045 audios	A short description.	0.	10	80
	<u>ClothoAQA</u> [56]	<i>test</i> : 2,838 audio-question pairs	Question: {question} Answer:	-1.	1	10
	<u>ESC50</u> [72]	<i>test</i> : 2,000 audios	Describe the audio. An audio of	1.	10	80
	<u>AudioCaps</u> * [40]	<i>train</i> : 38,695 audio-caption pairs <i>val</i> : 380 audios	A short description	0.	1	80
Video	<u>MSVD</u> [10]	<i>test</i> : 670 images ⁶	A short description	1.	10	80
	<u>MSRVTT</u> * [95]	<i>train</i> : 130,260 video-caption pairs <i>val</i> : 497 videos <i>test</i> : 2,990 videos	A short description	1.	10	80
	<u>MSVD QA</u> [93]	<i>test</i> : 13,157 video-question pairs	based on the given video respond to {question}	-1.	1	10
Audio+Video	<u>MusicAVQA</u> [46]	<i>val</i> : 3,698 examples <i>test</i> : 7,402 video-question pairs	Question: {question} Answer:	-1.	1	10
	<u>VATEX</u> [88]	<i>val</i> : 3,000 videos	A short description	1.	10	80

Table 17. Hyperparameters used on each of the evaluation datasets. Underlined datasets are in-domain evaluations. * datasets are used for best checkpoint selection. [Blue](#) text is provided as input to the LLM but not the Q-Former.

cial inequalities, potentially influencing the model’s outputs. Our framework builds upon a pre-existing frozen LLM. While this approach benefits from the extensive knowledge encoded within the LLM, it is important to recognize that such models can inherently propagate biases present in their training data. Additionally, there is a non-negligible risk of generating false or misleading information. While there exist tools to measure language model toxicity such as Helm [53], their evaluation datasets are constrained in the language modality, and hence are not applicable to measure toxicity across modalities which is the focus of this work. We leave the generation of cross-modal datasets for toxicity and bias measurement as a future research direction.

Users of our framework should be aware of these limitations and exercise caution, particularly in applications where the accuracy and impartiality of outputs are critical. We advocate for responsible use of our framework, especially in sensitive contexts. Users should critically assess and verify the model’s outputs and consider the potential for reinforcing biases or spreading misinformation. Furthermore, we commit to transparency regarding our model’s capabilities and limitations. All code, data, and model weights will be released to ensure reproducibility and encourage external evaluation and subsequent research.

Modality	Task	Dataset	Training Size
Image	Caption	CapFilt14M [49]	13,873,136 image-caption pairs
		Conceptual Captions 12M [9]	6,029,862 image-caption pairs*
		MS COCO Dataset [9]	566,747 image-caption pairs
		SBU Captions [70]	859,739 image-caption pairs
		Visual Genome Captions [43]	821,774 image-caption pairs
	QA	AOK VQA [76]	17,056 question-answer pairs
		OK VQA [65]	9,009 question-answer pairs
		OCR VQA [66]	1,002,146 question-answer pairs
		Visual Genome QA [43]	1,440,069 question-answer pairs
		VQAV2 [31]	658,104 question-answer pairs
Dialogue	LLaVA150k [57]	394,276 image-instruction pairs	
Audio	Caption	AudioCaps [40]	38,701 audio-caption pairs*
		WAVCaps [92]	297,341 audio-caption pairs*
	QA	AudioCaps QA**	24,158 question-answer pairs
	Classification	AudioSet <small>balanced train</small> [29]	14,141 labeled audios*
3D	Caption	Cap3D [63]	651,576 point cloud-caption pairs
	QA	Cap3D QA**	250,070 question-answer pairs
Video	Caption	MSRVTT [95]	130,260 video-caption pairs
		WebVid2M [4]	2M video-caption pairs
	QA	MSRVTT QA [93]	149,075 question-answer

Table 18. Datasets for Instruction Tuning: This table presents datasets used for instruction tuning, along with their associated task types and sizes. *Missing data results from expired links and corrupted files. ** Datasets marked with double asterisks are generated automatically within this study.

Image Instruction Templates	
QA	<p> “{question}” “Q: {question} A:” “Answer the following question: {question}” “Question: {question} Answer:” “How would you answer {question}?” “What is the answer to the question {question}?” “Answer the question based on the image. Question: {question} Answer: ” “Instruction: Answer the following question by reference to the input image. Question: {question} Answer:” “Given the photo, what is the answer to the question {question}?” “What’s your response to the query {question}?” “Please provide an answer to {question}” “Respond to the query {question}” “Based on the given image, respond to {question}” “Question: {question} What’s your response?” “Consider the following query: {question}” “Could you help answer the question {question}?” “Referencing the provided image, can you answer the question {question}?” “With respect to the image shown, please answer {question}” “What’s your answer to {question} in the context of the provided image?” “Question (refer to the image for context): {question} Answer:” “In response to the question {question}, what would your answer be?” </p>
Caption	<p> “A short caption:” “A short description:” “A photo of” “A photo that shows” “A picture of” “A picture that shows” “An image of” “A image that shows” “Write a short description.” “Write a description for the image.” “Provide a description of what is presented in the image.” “Briefly describe the content of the image.” “Can you briefly explain what you see in the image?” “Could you use a few words to describe what you perceive in the image?” “Please provide a short description of the image.” “Using language, provide a short account of the image.” “Use a few words to illustrate what is happening in the photo.” “Write a description for the photo.” “Provide a description of what is presented in the photo.” “Briefly describe the content of the photo.” “Can you briefly explain what you see in the photo?” “Could you use a few words to describe what you perceive in the photo?” “Please provide a short description of the picture.” “Using language, provide a short account of the picture.” “Use a few words to illustrate what is happening in the picture.” “Write a description for the picture.” “Provide a description of what is presented in the picture.” “Briefly describe the content of the picture.” “Can you briefly explain what you see in the picture?” “Could you use a few words to describe what you perceive in the picture?” “Please provide a short description of the picture.” “Using language, provide a short account of the picture.” “Use a few words to illustrate what is happening in the picture.” </p>

Table 19. Instruction-tuning templates for image tasks

Audio Instruction Templates

QA	<p>“{question}” “Question: {question} Answer:” “Q: {question} A:” “Based on the audio, {question}” “Answer the following question based on the audio: {question}” “Question: {question} Provide an answer based on the audio.” “How would you answer {question} based on the audio?” “What is the answer to the question {question} using the audio as a reference?” “Answer the question using the audio. Question: {question} Answer: ” “Instruction: Answer the following question by referencing the audio. Question: {question} Answer:” “Given the audio, what is the answer to the question {question}?” “What’s your response to the query {question} considering the audio?” “Please provide an answer to {question} using the audio as context.” “Respond to the query {question} based on the audio content.” “Based on the provided audio, respond to {question}” “Question: {question} What’s your response using the audio for context?” “Consider the following query and the audio: {question}” “Could you help answer the question {question} using the audio as reference?” “Referencing the provided audio, can you answer the question {question}?” “With respect to the audio provided, please answer {question}” “What’s your answer to {question} in the context of the provided audio?” “Question (refer to the audio for context): {question} Answer:” “In response to the question {question}, what would your answer be based on the audio?” “Given the audio, how would you respond to {question}?” “Taking the audio into consideration, what is your response to {question}?” “Based on the audio, how would you answer {question}?”</p>
Classification	<p>“Classify the following audio:” “What is the category of this audio clip?” “Identify the content of the following audio:” “Provide a classification for the audio.” “Analyze and categorize the following audio.” “Describe the category of the given audio.” “Determine the type of this audio clip.” “Can you classify what you hear in the audio?” “What type of audio is this?” “How would you classify this audio clip?” “Please identify the category of the following audio:” “What category does the following audio fall into?” “Classify the sounds in this audio clip.”</p>
Caption	<p>“A short caption:” “A short description:” “An audio of” “An audio that shows” “Write a short description.” “Write a description for the audio.” “Provide a description of what is presented in the audio.” “Briefly describe the content of the audio.” “Can you briefly explain what you hear in the audio?” “Could you use a few words to describe what you perceive in the audio?” “Please provide a short description of the audio.” “Using language, provide a short account of the audio.” “Use a few words to illustrate what is happening in the audio.” “Describe briefly the contents of the audio.” “Please provide a brief summary of the audio.” “What does the audio contain?” “What can you hear in the audio?” “What sounds are present in the audio?” “Summarize the audio in a few words.” “Write a brief summary of the audio content.” “Could you provide a concise explanation of the audio’s contents?” “Describe what the audio represents.” “What is the audio depicting?” “In a few words, describe what you hear in the audio.”</p>

Table 20. Instruction-tuning templates for audio tasks

3D Instruction Templates

QA	<p> "{question}" "Question: {question} Answer:" "Q: {question} A:" "Based on the 3D model, {question}" "Answer the following question based on the 3D model: {question}" "Question: {question} Provide an answer based on the 3D model." "How would you answer {question} based on the 3D model?" "What is the answer to the question {question} using the 3D model as a reference?" "Answer the question using the 3D model. Question: {question} Answer: " "Instruction: Answer the following question by referencing the 3D model. Question: {question} Answer:" "Given the 3D model, what is the answer to the question {question}?" "What's your response to the query {question} considering the 3D model?" "Please provide an answer to {question} using the 3D model as context." "Respond to the query {question} based on the 3D model content." "Based on the provided 3D model, respond to {question}" "Question: {question} What's your response using the 3D model for context?" "Consider the following query and the 3D model: {question}" "Could you help answer the question {question} using the 3D model as reference?" "Referencing the provided 3D model, can you answer the question {question}?" "With respect to the 3D model provided, please answer {question}" "What's your answer to {question} in the context of the provided 3D model?" "Question (refer to the 3D model for context): {question} Answer:" "In response to the question {question}, what would your answer be based on the 3D model?" "Given the 3D model, how would you respond to {question}?" "Taking the 3D model into consideration, what is your response to {question}?" "Based on the 3D model, how would you answer {question}?" </p>
Caption	<p> "A short caption:" "A short description:" "A 3D model of" "A 3D model that shows" "Write a short description." "Write a description for the 3D model." "Provide a description of what is presented in the 3D model." "Briefly describe the content of the 3D model." "Can you briefly explain what you see in the 3D model?" "Could you use a few words to describe what you perceive in the 3D model?" "Please provide a short description of the 3D model." "Using language, provide a short account of the 3D model." "Use a few words to illustrate what is happening in the 3D model." "Describe briefly the contents of the 3D model." "Please provide a brief summary of the 3D model." "What does the 3D model contain?" "What can you identify in the 3D model?" "What structures are present in the 3D model?" "Summarize the 3D model in a few words." "Write a brief summary of the 3D model content." "Could you provide a concise explanation of the 3D model's contents?" "Describe what the 3D model represents." "What is the 3D model depicting?" "In a few words, describe what you see in the 3D model." </p>

Table 21. Instruction-tuning templates for 3D tasks

Video Instruction Templates	
QA	<p>“Given the video, {question}”</p> <p>“Q: {question} A:”</p> <p>“Answer the following question based on the video: {question}”</p> <p>“Question: {question} Answer:”</p> <p>“How would you answer {question} after watching the video?”</p> <p>“What is the answer to the question {question} after viewing the video?”</p> <p>“Answer the question based on the video. Question: {question} Answer: ”</p> <p>“Instruction: Answer the following question by reference to the input video. Question: {question} Answer:”</p> <p>“Given the video, what is the answer to the question {question}?”</p> <p>“What’s your response to the query {question} after watching the video?”</p> <p>“Please provide an answer to {question} after watching the video”</p> <p>“Respond to the query {question} based on the video”</p> <p>“Based on the given video, respond to {question}”</p> <p>“Question: {question} What’s your response after watching the video?”</p> <p>“Consider the following query: {question}”</p> <p>“Could you help answer the question {question}?”</p> <p>“Referencing the provided video, can you answer the question {question}?”</p> <p>“With respect to the video shown, please answer {question}”</p> <p>“What’s your answer to {question} in the context of the provided video?”</p> <p>“Question (refer to the video for context): {question} Answer:”</p> <p>“In response to the question {question}, what would your answer be after viewing the video?”</p>
Caption	<p>“A short caption for the video:”</p> <p>“A short description of the video:”</p> <p>“A video of”</p> <p>“A video that shows”</p> <p>“Describe the video briefly.”</p> <p>“Write a description for the video.”</p> <p>“Provide a description of what is presented in the video.”</p> <p>“Briefly describe the content of the video.”</p> <p>“Can you briefly explain what you see in the video?”</p> <p>“Could you use a few words to describe what you perceive in the video?”</p> <p>“Please provide a short description of the video.”</p> <p>“Using language, provide a short account of the video.”</p> <p>“Use a few words to illustrate what is happening in the video.”</p>

Table 22. Instruction-tuning templates for audio tasks