

Advancing Large Multi-modal Models with Explicit Chain-of-Reasoning and Visual Question Generation

Kohei Uehara^{1,2} Nabarun Goswami^{1,2} Hanqin Wang¹ Toshiaki Baba^{1,2}
 Kohtaro Tanaka^{1,2} Tomohiro Hashimoto^{1,2} Kai Wang^{1,2} Rei Ito¹ Takagi Naoya^{1,2}
 Ryo Umagami¹ Yingyi Wen¹ Tanachai Anakewat^{1,2} Tatsuya Harada^{1,2}

¹The University of Tokyo, ²RIKEN

{uehara, nabarungoswami, wang, baba, k-tanaka, hashimoto, wang-kai, ito, takagi, umagami, wenyy, anakewat, harada}@mi.t.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Abstract

The increasing demand for intelligent systems capable of interpreting and reasoning about visual content requires the development of large Vision-and-Language Models (VLMs) that are not only accurate but also have explicit reasoning capabilities. This paper presents a novel approach to develop a VLM with the ability to conduct explicit reasoning based on visual content and textual instructions. We introduce a system that can ask a question to acquire necessary knowledge, thereby enhancing the robustness and explicability of the reasoning process. To this end, we developed a novel dataset generated by a Large Language Model (LLM), designed to promote chain-of-thought reasoning combined with a question-asking mechanism. The dataset covers a range of tasks, from common ones like caption generation to specialized VQA tasks that require expert knowledge. Furthermore, using the dataset we created, we fine-tuned an existing VLM. This training enabled the models to generate questions and perform iterative reasoning during inference. The results demonstrated a stride toward a more robust, accurate, and interpretable VLM, capable of reasoning explicitly and seeking information proactively when confronted with ambiguous visual input.

1. Introduction

In recent years, LLMs have gained significant popularity in the field of artificial intelligence [1,24,31]. Building upon this, research has stepped into large Vision-and-Language Models (VLMs) [5, 11, 17, 18]. Our study specifically focuses on tasks involving both vision and language modalities. Generally, VLMs learn the alignment between images and texts using large datasets sourced by web crawling.



Question: What brand of candy is shown here?
 Answer: mike and ike

Initial Reasoning

1. I observe a scene where a person is decorating a cake with frosting and candy. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
2. The cake is placed on a dining table surrounded by several bowls. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
3. Among the objects present, one of the bowls appears to contain candy. [Uncertainty Score: 2]
4. There is no explicit mention of the type or brand of candy in the given description of the image. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
5. Without additional information on the appearance or label of the candy, it's challenging to identify its brand. [Uncertainty Score: 8]
6. Therefore, the brand of the candy on the table is **uncertain**. [Uncertainty Score: 10]

Reasoning with Questioning

1. I observe a scene where a person is decorating a cake with frosting and candy. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
2. The cake is placed on a dining table surrounded by several bowls. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
3. Among the objects present, one of the bowls appears to contain candy. [Uncertainty Score: 2]
- [+] Question to knowledgeable person:** Can you describe the visual appearance or packaging characteristics of popular candy brands?
- [+] Answer:** Mike and Ike candies are oblong, chewy, fruit-flavored candies often found in a colorful box; Skittles are small, round, and brightly colored; M&M's have an "m" printed on them and are round chocolate candies; Starburst are square, fruit-flavored chews wrapped individually.
- [+] 4.** Comparing the candies in the bowl to the described characteristics, the candies most closely resemble Mike and Ike based on their oblong shape and appearance. [Uncertainty Score: 3]
- [+] 5.** Thus, the brand of candy shown in the image is identified as **Mike and Ike**. [Uncertainty Score: 2]

Figure 1. An example of the explicit reasoning steps we aim to achieve, also representing a sample from our constructed dataset. It demonstrates the thought process in response to a given question. Notably, we incorporate a question generation step into the reasoning process (as seen on the right side of the figure), allowing the model to interactively acquire knowledge and refine its reasoning steps.

They are then fine-tuned with smaller, high-quality datasets

for instruction tuning to enhance their text generation capabilities for various tasks. However, these models often struggle with hallucination, where they produce outputs not aligned with the given input. For instance, in VLMs, the models may mention objects that do not exist in the given images [14, 15].

A critical limitation of these models is their inability to explain the reasoning behind their outputs, especially when hallucination occurs. This is a significant drawback, as it is difficult to identify and correct the model’s mistakes. We argue that these issues stem from the models being trained to directly output answers to instructions without including a reasoning process. By explicitly learning and outputting the reasoning process, models can provide more concrete and explanatory responses. Another limitation is that the models cannot correct their mistakes by themselves, as they lack the ability to reason about their own outputs. On the other hand, humans, when uncertain, often ask questions to acquire new knowledge and refine their answers. By explicitly outputting the reasoning process, models can be trained to generate questions during the reasoning steps, pause to acquire necessary knowledge from knowledgeable someone, and then continue the reasoning process, thereby arriving at more accurate and reliable conclusions.

Therefore, our research aims to address these challenges by incorporating an explicit reasoning process and the ability to generate questions during reasoning. This approach is akin to the Chain-of-Thought reasoning seen in LLMs [4, 36], where models are prompted to explicitly reason out problems. However, due to VLMs’ relatively weaker text generation capabilities compared to LLMs, achieving Chain-of-Thought solely through prompting is challenging. To overcome this, we have created a novel dataset that includes the explicit reasoning process. Following mainstream methods in LLM-based dataset creation [18], we generate this data using LLMs, combining image annotations and a few manually created examples. This data includes scenarios where the model needs to generate questions when uncertain, training it to ask questions during ambiguous reasoning situations. We refer to this reasoning process as “Chain-of-Reasoning (CoR).”

In order to present the effectiveness of our approach, we fine-tune an existing VLM model on the dataset we created. Being trained on our dataset, the model acquires the ability to generate explicit reasoning steps and ask questions when uncertain, thereby improving the reliability of its inferences. Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We present an approach by incorporating an explicit reasoning process and question-generation capability into VLMs, promoting more reliable inferences.
- We crafted a new dataset and utilized it for model training, setting a precedent for future VLM advancements.

- With our novel dataset and model, we achieved giving the model the ability to generate explicit reasoning steps and question-asking capability.

2. Related Work

2.1. Large-scale Vision-and-Language Models

The development of LLMs like ChatGPT [23], GPT-4 [24], and LLaMA [31] has paved the way for research into large-scale multi-modal models that extend beyond text-based modalities. This section highlights studies particularly relevant to our research, focusing on models integrating vision and language modalities.

BLIP-2 [11] and InstructBLIP [5] utilize pre-trained image encoders and text decoders, employing a Transformer model known as Q-Former as an adapter. The training of these models is typically divided into two stages. In the first stage, Q-Former learns the alignment between image and text using large-scale image-text paired datasets. The second stage involves training the Q-Former alongside the text decoder to enable the decoder to produce outputs according to given instructions. Generally, while the first training stage prioritizes the scale of the dataset, the second stage emphasizes the quality of smaller, high-quality instruction and answer datasets. This two-stage learning approach is widely adopted in the training of VLMs, as seen in models like BLIVA [9], MiniGPT (v1&2) [2, 39], and LLaVA (v1&1.5) [17, 18].

Additionally, there’s growing interest in VLMs that not only produce outputs aligned with overall image instructions but also focus on specific regions within images. This research direction is evident in models such as KOSMOS-2 [26], Shikra [3], MiniGPT v2 [2], and LLaVA v1.5 [17]. These models transform bounding box coordinates, representing input regions, into special tokens for textual representation. Another noteworthy model is GPT4RoI [38], which applies an RoIAlign based on the target region to the features outputted by the image encoder, thus obtaining features focused on the specified region.

2.2. Explicit Reasoning in V&L Tasks

In the field of natural language processing tasks, LLMs have shown the capability to perform explicit reasoning in a format known as Chain-of-Thought [4], thanks to their advanced language generation abilities. However, in vision-and-language (V&L) tasks, the adoption of explicit reasoning using large-scale models is still in its developmental phase compared to language-only tasks. The closest research in this area involves using LLMs to predict necessary reasoning steps in a programmatic format and subsequently calling APIs specialized for V&L tasks, such as in Visual Programming [7] and ViperGPT [30]. A significant limitation of these approaches is that the LLM predicting the




Figure 2. An overview of the dataset construction process. The LLM takes bounding boxes information, image captions, and instructions as input and generates reasoning steps and questions as output.

reasoning steps does not have direct access to the images, leading to a lack of assurance that the reasoning is genuinely based on the image content. Our model addresses this gap by allowing the V&L model to directly predict reasoning steps, ensuring that the reasoning is firmly grounded in the image content.

2.3. Visual Question Generation

A related field to the concept of acquiring information through question generation is Visual Question Generation (VQG). In the early stages of VQG, the primary focus was on generating questions related to images, without any specific goal of acquiring knowledge [12, 16, 22, 35]. K-VQG [33, 34] does involve generating questions for knowledge acquisition; however, there has been no emphasis on utilizing the acquired knowledge in further reasoning steps.

Learning by Asking (LBA) is another relevant area. LBA is an approach where question generation is used to acquire data for learning purposes. For instance, LBA has been employed in tasks like VQA [21, 32, 34], caption generation [29], and scene graph completion [37]. However, our research significantly diverges from LBA, as we focus on generating questions as part of explicit reasoning during the inference process. The acquired answers are then immediately used to update and refine the reasoning quality, differentiating our approach from traditional LBA work.

3. Method

First, we introduce how we constructed our CoR dataset. Then, we explain the model details and training process.

3.1. Dataset Construction

In pursuit of realizing the CoR, we developed a novel dataset. This dataset was created using a combination of the specially designed prompt, manually curated examples and the text generation capabilities of LLM. We show an

overview of the dataset construction process in Figure 2 and an example of the dataset in Figure 3.

The data structure of our dataset consists of the image, an instruction text of the task, a question (optional, if the task is in QA format), the answer, and the reasoning process required to derive the answer. We used different approaches to build the dataset depending on the types of annotations provided with the base dataset.

(1) If the dataset had rich annotations, including captions and object detection annotations, such as labels and bounding boxes, we followed the LLaVA approach [18]. In this case, we used an LLM (GPT-4 [25]) that does not process images to build the dataset. Coupling these inputs with thoughtfully designed prompts (Listing 1) enables the LLM to generate the appropriate reasoning steps. It’s crucial that the prompts ensure that the LLM simulates the act of observing the image directly, without mentioning any references to captions, descriptions, or bounding boxes. This approach ensures the consistency of the reasoning process when training VLMs, which do view the image directly. To achieve this, in the prompt given to the LLM, we clearly state like *you must not use the word “caption”, “description”, or “bounding box” in the reasoning steps. Especially, do not mention the coordinates of each object in the image. If you want to mention the position of the object, please refer to it by relative position, such as “at the left of the image” or “in front of xx”*. Furthermore, in the prompt, we instruct the LLM to suppose that the image is of size 1000×1000 pixels. This ensures accurate position estimations based on given textual coordinates of the bounding boxes. The prompts also emphasize succinct reasoning steps without redundancy, and the need to add *uncertainty scores* at the end of each reasoning step.

(2) If the dataset did not have such rich annotations, we used a model that can input images (GPT-4V) to build the dataset. We used the similar prompts as previous case, ex-



Question: What type of cat is this?

Answer: domestic shorthair

Reasoning Steps (w/o QA):

1. I observe a gray cat lying on a wooden platform in the image. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
2. The cat's fur appears to be short based on the visible structure. [Uncertainty Score: 3]
3. There are many types of cats with short and gray fur, which includes Russian blue, Chartreux, and domestic shorthair. [Uncertainty Score: 5]
4. The distinction between these breeds could be made through eye color, facial structure, size, and unique characteristics, which are not clearly distinguished in the image. [Uncertainty Score: 7]
5. Thus, due to the lack of distinctive information, the type of the cat in the image remains uncertain. [Uncertainty Score: 10]

Reasoning Steps (with Question):

1. I observe a gray cat lying on a wooden platform in the image. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
2. The cat's fur appears to be short based on the visible structure. [Uncertainty Score: 3]
3. Imagined Knowledge Needed: Distinctive characteristics of various types of short-haired gray cats.
Question to knowledgeable person: "What are the distinctive characteristics of different breeds of short-haired gray cats?"
Answer: Russian blue cats typically have green eyes and high-set ear; Chartreux cats tend to have copper or gold eyes and robust bodies; domestic shorthairs often come in diverse colors, but gray ones generally have yellow or green eyes and standard build.
4. Although the image does not provide a clear view of the cat's eye color or body shape, the cat appears to lack distinctive characteristics unique to specific breeds. [Uncertainty Score: 5]
5. Therefore, the cat in the image can presumptively be identified as a domestic shorthair. [Uncertainty Score: 6]

Reasoning Steps (with GT):

1. I observe a gray cat lying on a wooden platform in the image. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
2. The cat's fur appears to be short based on the visible structure. [Uncertainty Score: 3]
3. Many breeds of cats have short, gray fur; these include breeds like the Russian Blue, Domestic Shorthair, or Chartreux. [Uncertainty Score: 6]
4. The cat lacks distinct features exclusive to specific breeds. [Uncertainty Score: 4]
5. Therefore, the cat in the image can be identified as a domestic shorthair due to its common features. [Uncertainty Score: 2]

Figure 3. An example from our dataset, created from the OK-VQA dataset. To the given question, the dataset contains a series of reasoning steps in three settings: without QA, with QA, and with GT.

cluding the parts that required GPT to imagine image input from text information.

We devised three variants of reasoning step data: without QA, with QA, and with GT. In "without QA" setting, the reasoning process to the answer is conducted without generating any questions midway. This setting aims to mimic the process a VLM undergoes when attempting to answer a question directly, without generating any questions. In this scenario, the LLM is instructed to generate reasoning steps without seeing the correct answer to the given task. We in-

You are an AI visual assistant, and you are seeing a single image (1000x1000 pixels). What you see are provided with captions, describing the same image you are looking at, and the coordinates of the bounding box of objects in the image. Provide the detailed reasoning steps for the given question as you are seeing the image. Please consider you cannot access the answer, but you can use a knowledgeable person to ask a question.

You need to generate reasoning steps in three settings:

1. You are not allowed to ask questions to a knowledgeable person. In this case, you may not reach the correct answer in the end.
2. You can ask questions to a knowledgeable person to gain additional knowledge. You must keep the same reasoning steps as the case 1, until you ask questions.
3. You are not allowed to ask questions, but you can see the answer to the question. So, you must construct your reasoning step to definitely reach the answer.

Note that the captions and bounding boxes are provided as a reference, so you need to behave like you are seeing the image.

IMPORTANT: The presence of these captions or descriptions, bboxes, and the answer must not be included in reasoning steps. Behave like you are actually seeing the image. Thus, you must not use the word "caption", "description", or "bounding box" in the reasoning steps.

Especially, do not mention the coordinates of each object in the image. If you want to mention the position of the object, please refer to it by relative position, such as "at the left of the image" or "in front of xx".

Please provide reasoning steps only, do not include other sentences or contents.

The reasoning step should include only the information necessary to infer the answer to the question, and should not refer to anything that is not directly related to the question or answer.

Each reasoning step must contain only one sentence, and the total size of the reasoning steps must not be over seven. Please add an uncertainty score [1-10, higher is more uncertain] to each reasoning step.

Avoid leaps of logic between each step, but if there are any, please increase the uncertainty score in that step.

IMPORTANT: In case 2, if there is any chance to decrease the uncertain score by asking questions to other knowledgeable people, you must ask questions to obtain additional information. Before asking the question, you need to imagine what kind of knowledge is needed to decrease the uncertainty, and the question must be one that you can get the knowledge.

The question must not be a paraphrase of the given question. Include a specific statement of your imagined knowledge, question, and the answer to your question. Please continue the reasoning as if you could get the answer to the questions. Note that the question and the answer should not be counted as the reasoning steps.

Listing 1. Full example of our prompt given to GPT-4.

struct the model to generate "Uncertainty score" along with each reasoning step, indicating the model's confidence in its reasoning. This plays a crucial role in "with QA" setting described below.

In contrast, the "with QA" setting incorporates the generation of questions as part of the reasoning steps. This setup is crucial for training VLMs to perform explicit reasoning while simultaneously generating questions. As the model generates the reasoning steps, it also generates an uncertainty score for each step. If the score significantly rises at any point in the "without QA" setting, it triggers the generation of a question just before the step. This mechanism helps the model to identify moments of uncertainty and seek



Figure 4. Examples of dataset in each category: visual understanding tasks, vision + common-sense understanding tasks, and vision + encyclopedic knowledge tasks.

external information, thereby simulating a more interactive and dynamic reasoning process.

Lastly, the “with GT” setting involves the LLM generating reasoning steps while having access to the correct answers to the tasks (i.e., the ground-truth answers for the given questions or captions for the given images). This approach differs from the previous two as the reasoning steps invariably lead to the correct answer, serving as a ground truth for correct reasoning without question generation. This data is primarily used to train VLMs that do not involve question generation in their reasoning process.

Each question step is designed to consist of three key elements: **Imagined Knowledge Needed**, the **Question**, and the **Answer**. Firstly, “Imagined Knowledge Needed” component represents the knowledge the model predicts it needs to acquire during the reasoning process. Let us consider the example shown in Figure 2. Here, the model need to answer the question “What holiday do we use this for?”, according to the given image of Christmas decorations. The model might need more specific information about different holidays and their associated symbols or decorations.

Secondly, we include the “Question” that would facilitate the acquisition of this knowledge. For instance, the model might generate a question to acquire imagined knowledge needed, such as “Which holiday is generally associated with a decorated tree placed in a living room?” This step is crucial as it reflects the model’s ability to formulate relevant questions based on the required knowledge.

The third component is the “Answer”, which is essentially the answer to the generated question. For example, the answer to the question above would be “Christmas”, and then the model is able to successfully acquire the knowledge it needs to answer the original question.

3.2. Dataset Statistics

We provide a comprehensive overview of our dataset statistics in Table 1. In our research, we based our dataset generation on seven datasets: COCO Caption [13], Visual Genome Caption [10], VQA v2 [6], OK-VQA [19], A-OKVQA [28], OVEN [8], and Encyclopedic-VQA [20]. We can categorize these datasets into three groups:

(1) Visual understanding tasks.

This group includes COCO Caption, Visual Genome Caption, and VQA v2, which are captioning tasks and VQA tasks that require the model to understand or describe the content of the image. Usually, these tasks do not require the model to have expert knowledge that cannot be directly observed from the image.

(2) Vision + common-sense understanding tasks.

This group includes OK-VQA and A-OKVQA, which require the model to have common-sense knowledge to answer the questions. Here, common-sense knowledge refers to general knowledge about topics such as geography, brands, and vehicles. [19]

(3) Vision + encyclopedic knowledge tasks.

This group includes Encyclopedic-VQA and OVEN, which require the model to have encyclopedic knowledge to answer the questions. Encyclopedic knowledge refers to more in-depth and specific knowledge compared to common-sense knowledge. This includes knowledge such as the names of animal and plant species, or details about when and by whom a building in an image was constructed [20].

We assume that the difficulty of the reasoning process increases as we move from visual understanding tasks to vision + encyclopedic knowledge tasks, as the latter requires detailed and expert knowledge to answer the questions. For each of these datasets, we generated approximately 6,000 data samples, randomly selecting from their training sets.

	Num. of samples	Num. of images	Average number of steps		
			without QA	with QA	with GT
COCO Caption	5,857	5,782	6.27	8.75	6.20
VQA v2	5,755	5,633	4.68	7.36	4.54
OK-VQA	5,793	5,792	4.77	7.35	4.55
A-OKVQA	5,736	5,718	4.87	7.43	4.63
Visual Genome	5,883	5,609	4.34	7.31	4.12
Encyclopedic VQA	6,521	6,186	7.00	9.45	7.00
OVEN	5,685	5,685	6.99	9.51	6.99
Total	41,230	39,272	5.58	8.19	5.46

Table 1. Dataset statistics of our dataset. In each row, we show the statistics of the base dataset to craft our dataset. “Num. of images” indicates the number of unique images in the dataset. “without QA”, “with QA”, and “with GT” indicate the average number of steps when the dataset is generated without questions and answers, with questions and answers, and without seeing ground-truth answers, respectively.




Figure 5. An overview of the model. Image encoders extract embeddings from input images, which are fed into the Adapter MLPs. The extracted image feature and instruction texts are fed into the LLM, culminating in the generation of a text response. This architecture enables the model to consider both visual information and textual instructions in its reasoning process.

We show examples of each category in Figure 4.

From Table 1, we can see that when generating reasoning data without questions and answers (without QA) and when not seeing ground-truth answers (with GT), the average number of reasoning steps is shorter compared to the scenario where both questions and answers are included (with QA). This is attributed to the fact that the QA generation process inherently requires more reasoning steps.

The “with GT” setting shows slightly fewer reasoning steps than the without QA setting. This can be attributed to providing the correct answers to GPT-4, which likely allows for concise reasoning steps leading to the correct answer.

The COCO Caption, Encyclopedic-VQA, and OVEN dataset tend to have longer reasoning steps compared to the others. For COCO Caption, this is likely due to the nature of the task, which involves generating captions based on the entire content of the image, requiring a more comprehensive reasoning process. The Encyclopedic-VQA and OVEN datasets often contains questions that require very detailed observations or expert knowledge to answer, leading to longer reasoning steps. In contrast, the other tasks focus on specific questions or target regions within the im-

ages, thereby requiring less information to be incorporated into the reasoning steps.

3.3. Model Architecture

Our model fundamentally builds upon the LLaVA architecture [18], consisting of an image encoder, a text decoder, and an adapter component based on two-layer MLP blocks. We show an overview of our model in Figure 5. The input image is first resized to 336×336 pixels and passed through a pre-trained image encoder (e.g., CLIP-ViT [27]). The image encoder extracts the image features, which are then fed into the Adapter MLPs to transform the image features into a format that can be processed by the LLM. The instruction text is also fed into the LLM, and the model generates a text response based on the image features and instruction text.

3.4. Training

We utilize our dataset to make the model learn to generate reasoning steps and questions. In the training process, we utilized a pre-trained VLM, which is already instruction-tuned, and fine-tuned it on our dataset. In the fine-tuning process, we froze the parameters of the image encoder, and

	COCO Caption	Visual Genome	OK-VQA	A-OKVQA	VQA v2	Encyclopedic VQA	OVEN	average
LLaVA (original)	2.258	1.424	2.414	2.332	2.604	1.606	1.521	2.023
CoR w/o question	1.621	1.653	2.224	2.054	2.524	1.520	1.582	1.883
CoR w/ uncertainty	1.748	1.748	2.536	2.408	2.715	1.902	1.761	2.117
CoR w/ uncertainty, w/o knowledge	1.775	1.739	2.526	2.376	2.717	1.909	1.839	2.126
Ours CoR	1.769	1.782	2.631	2.459	2.737	1.925	1.836	2.163

Table 2. Evaluation results of our model on various datasets. The evaluation is conducted using GPT-4 to score the reasoning steps generated by the model. The scores range from 1 to 4, with 4 indicating a correct answer. The average score across all datasets is shown in the last column.

updated the parameters of the text decoder and the adapter MLP. Along with the image and original question, we provided a specially designed prompts, such as “*Analyze the image and outline your reasoning process step by step before providing your final answer,*” to let the model generate reasoning steps and questions.

When the model is applied to test data, it performs a two-stage reasoning process to reach the final answer. The first stage encompasses the reasoning that leads up to the generation of a question. The second stage occurs after an external response to the question is obtained; the model is given the original inputs, the intermediate reasoning steps, and the external response. Then, the model generates the remaining reasoning steps based on this new information.

In this study, we leverage GPT-4o as the external answerer. It is noteworthy that the questions generated by the model typically demand an understanding of the image content as well as common-sense and encyclopedic knowledge. Given its extensive training data and large model parameters, GPT-4 is expected to adeptly handle the knowledge required to answer the questions.

4. Experiments

4.1. Implementation Details

Our experimental setup incorporates the following models: for image processing, we use CLIP-ViT-Large¹, and for text generation, we employ vicuna-7b-1.5². The entire model is trained from a publicly available pre-trained checkpoint³.

In fine-tuning stage, we utilized $8 \times$ NVIDIA H100 (80GB) GPU for about 1 hour. We trained the model for one epoch with a total batch size of 128. The learning rate was set to a maximum of $2e-5$, linearly increasing until 3% of the training steps, followed by a cosine decay schedule. Training was conducted using bfloat16 precision.

¹<https://huggingface.co/openai/clip-vit-large-patch14-336>

²<https://huggingface.co/lmsys/vicuna-7b-v1.5>

³<https://huggingface.co/llava-hf/llava-1.5-7b-hf>

4.2. Evaluation Settings

In our experiments, we investigated how the presence or absence of CoR affects the behavior of the model when solving tasks. We also evaluated several ablations related to the CoR method. These included listing the necessary knowledge before question generation and generating an uncertainty score along with the reasoning steps. We used validation set of seven datasets for this evaluation: MS COCO, Visual Genome, VQA v2, OK-VQA, A-OKVQA, OVEN, and Encyclopedic VQA. Using entire validation set is computationally expensive, so we randomly sampled 1000 instances from each dataset for evaluation. Our experiments compared the model trained with CoR to a baseline model trained without question generation, specifically using the “with GT” setting from the dataset (referred to as “w/o Question”).

Currently, there are no established metrics for evaluating results that include long reasoning steps. Therefore, in this study, we used GPT-4 for scoring the answers. We instructed GPT-4 to extract the final answer from the reasoning steps and then evaluate the answer with a score from 1 to 4 (1: incorrect, 2: partially correct, 3: mostly correct, 4: correct).

4.3. Results and Discussions

The results of our experiments are shown in Table 2. Also, we show an example of the predicted reasoning steps in Figure 6.

The evaluation results show that “Ours CoR” performs the best on average across various datasets. In contrast, the CoR model without questions (CoR w/o question) has the lowest performance. This might be because the current model cannot consistently provide coherent outputs over long reasoning processes. The challenge of developing VLMs that can produce coherent and consistent long reasoning steps in line with the given tasks remains an important area for future research.

Comparing “Ours CoR” with the original LLaVA, the latter performs relatively well on VQA v2 and COCO Cap-



Figure 6. An example of the predicted reasoning steps for Encyclopedic-VQA, A-OKVQA, COCO Captioning, which are a representative sample from our constructed dataset’s category.

tion, which are part of LLaVA’s training data. However, for datasets not included in LLaVA’s training data, like OVEN and Encyclopedic VQA, which require specialized knowledge, models that ask questions (such as “Ours CoR”) show significantly better performance. This indicates that asking questions helps the model acquire necessary specialized knowledge that it does not inherently possess.

Furthermore, outputting uncertainty did not significantly improve performance (CoR w/ uncertainty vs. Ours CoR). This is likely because generating uncertainty outputs makes the model’s responses longer and less consistent, leading to performance degradation. However, if the model can handle uncertainty effectively, it could ask questions during the most uncertain reasoning steps, potentially improving performance.

Comparing models with and without prior knowledge output (CoR w/o knowledge vs. Ours CoR), it’s evident

that pre-outputting necessary knowledge improves performance. This prevents the model from asking irrelevant questions and ensures that it focuses on helpful inquiries, leading to better results.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented a novel approach of improving the capabilities of VLMs. This was achieved by incorporating a structured CoR and the ability to generate questions during the reasoning process. The model was trained on a dataset specifically designed to include an explicit reasoning and question-asking process.

We proposed an architecture for a VLM that leverages pre-trained components such as an image encoder and text decoder, all of which are fine-tuned using our novel dataset. Our experimental results suggest that the model’s ability to generate questions contributes to its performance, compared

to a baseline model that does not generate questions. This underscores the potential utility of integrating explicit reasoning processes into VLMs.

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by JST Moonshot R&D Grant Number JPMJPS2011, CREST Grant Number JPMJCR2015 and Basic Research Grant (Super AI) of Institute for AI and Beyond of the University of Tokyo.

References

- [1] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In *NeurIPS*, volume 33, 2020. 1
- [2] Jun Chen, Deyao Zhu, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, Zechu Liu, Pengchuan Zhang, Raghuraman Krishnamoorthi, Vikas Chandra, Yunyang Xiong, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigt-v2: large language model as a unified interface for vision-language multi-task learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.09478*, 2023. 2
- [3] Keqin Chen, Zhao Zhang, Weili Zeng, Richong Zhang, Feng Zhu, and Rui Zhao. Shikra: Unleashing multimodal llm’s referential dialogue magic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15195*, 2023. 2
- [4] Zheng Chu, Jingchang Chen, Qianglong Chen, Weijiang Yu, Tao He, Haotian Wang, Weihua Peng, Ming Liu, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. A survey of chain of thought reasoning: Advances, frontiers and future. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15402*, 2023. 2
- [5] 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 *NeurIPS*, 2023. 1, 2
- [6] Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Making the v in vqa matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in visual question answering. *IJCV*, 127:398–414, 2016. 5
- [7] Tanmay Gupta and Aniruddha Kembhavi. Visual programming: Compositional visual reasoning without training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 14953–14962, June 2023. 2
- [8] Hexiang Hu, Yi Luan, Yang Chen, Urvashi Khandelwal, Mandar Joshi, Kenton Lee, Kristina Toutanova, and Ming-Wei Chang. Open-domain visual entity recognition: Towards recognizing millions of wikipedia entities. In *ICCV*, 2023. 5
- [9] Wenbo Hu, Yifan Xu, Yi Li, Weiye Li, Zeyuan Chen, and Zhuowen Tu. BLIVA: A simple multimodal llm for better handling of text-rich visual questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09936*, 2023. 2
- [10] Ranjay Krishna, Yuke Zhu, Oliver Groth, Justin Johnson, Kenji Hata, Joshua Kravitz, Stephanie Chen, Yanis Kalantidis, Li-Jia Li, David A Shamma, et al. Visual genome: Connecting language and vision using crowdsourced dense image annotations. *IJCV*, 123(1):32–73, 2017. 5
- [11] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven C. H. Hoi. BLIP-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *ICML*, 2023. 1, 2
- [12] Yikang Li, Nan Duan, Bolei Zhou, Xiao Chu, Wanli Ouyang, and Xiaogang Wang. Visual question generation as dual task of visual question answering. In *CVPR*, 2018. 3
- [13] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge J. Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C. Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft COCO: Common objects in context. In *ECCV*, 2014. 5
- [14] Fuxiao Liu, Tianrui Guan, Zongxia Li, Lichang Chen, Yaser Yacoob, Dinesh Manocha, and Tianyi Zhou. Hallusionbench: You see what you think? or you think what you see? an image-context reasoning benchmark challenging for GPT-4V (ision), LLaVA-1.5, and other multi-modality models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14566*, 2023. 2
- [15] Fuxiao Liu, Kevin Lin, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Yaser Yacoob, and Lijuan Wang. Aligning large multimodal model with robust instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14565*, 2023. 2
- [16] Feng Liu, Tao Xiang, Timothy M. Hospedales, Wankou Yang, and Changyin Sun. IVQA: Inverse visual question answering. In *CVPR*, 2018. 3
- [17] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03744*, 2023. 1, 2
- [18] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. In *NeurIPS*, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 6

- [19] Kenneth Marino, Mohammad Rastegari, Ali Farhadi, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. OK-VQA: A visual question answering benchmark requiring external knowledge. In *CVPR*, 2019. 5
- [20] Thomas Mensink, Jasper Uijlings, Lluís Castrejon, Arushi Goel, Felipe Cadar, Howard Zhou, Fei Sha, André Araujo, and Vittorio Ferrari. Encyclopedic vqa: Visual questions about detailed properties of fine-grained categories. In *ICCV*, 2023. 5
- [21] Ishan Misra, Ross Girshick, Rob Fergus, Martial Hebert, Abhinav Gupta, and Laurens van der Maaten. Learning by asking questions. In *CVPR*, June 2018. 3
- [22] Nasrin Mostafazadeh, Ishan Misra, Jacob Devlin, Margaret Mitchell, Xiaodong He, and Lucy Vanderwende. Generating natural questions about an image. In *ACL*, 2016. 3
- [23] OpenAI. OpenAI: Introducing ChatGPT. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>, 2022. 2
- [24] OpenAI. GPT-4 Technical Report. *ArXiv*, abs/2303.08774, 2023. 1, 2
- [25] OpenAI. GPT-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023. 3
- [26] Zhiliang Peng, Wenhui Wang, Li Dong, Yaru Hao, Shaohan Huang, Shuming Ma, and Furu Wei. Kosmos-2: Grounding multimodal large language models to the world. *ArXiv*, abs/2306, 2023. 2
- [27] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *ICML*, 2021. 6
- [28] Dustin Schwenk, Apoorv Khandelwal, Christopher Clark, Kenneth Marino, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. A-OKVQA: A benchmark for visual question answering using world knowledge. In *ECCV*, 2022. 5
- [29] Kevin Shen, Amlan Kar, and Sanja Fidler. Learning to caption images through a lifetime by asking questions. In *ICCV*, 2019. 3
- [30] Dídac Surís, Sachit Menon, and Carl Vondrick. ViperGPT: Visual inference via python execution for reasoning. *ICCV*, 2023. 2
- [31] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin R. Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, Daniel M. Bikel, Lukas Blecher, Cristian Cantón Ferrer, Moya Chen, Guillem Cucurull, David Esiobu, Jude Fernandes, Jeremy Fu, Wenyin Fu, Brian Fuller, Cynthia Gao, Vedanuj Goswami, Naman Goyal, Anthony S. Hartshorn, Saghar Hosseini, Rui Hou, Hakan Inan, Marcin Kardas, Viktor Kerkez, Madian Khabsa, Isabel M. Kloumann, A. V. Korenev, Punit Singh Koura, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Thibaut Lavril, Jenya Lee, Diana Liskovich, Yinghai Lu, Yuning Mao, Xavier Martinet, Todor Mihaylov, Pushkar Mishra, Igor Molybog, Yixin Nie, Andrew Poulton, Jeremy Reizenstein, Rashi Rungta, Kalyan Saladi, Alan Schelten, Ruan Silva, Eric Michael Smith, R. Subramanian, Xia Tan, Binh Tang, Ross Taylor, Adina Williams, Jian Xiang Kuan, Puxin Xu, Zhengxu Yan, Iliyan Zarov, Yuchen Zhang, Angela Fan, Melanie Kambadur, Sharan Narang, Aurelien Rodriguez, Robert Stojnic, Sergey Edunov, and Thomas Scialom. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *ArXiv*, abs/2307.09288, 2023. 1, 2
- [32] Kohei Uehara, Nan Duan, and Tatsuya Harada. Learning to ask informative sub-questions for visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) Workshops*, pages 4681–4690, June 2022. 3
- [33] Kohei Uehara and Tatsuya Harada. K-vqg: Knowledge-aware visual question generation for common-sense acquisition. In *WACV*, 2023. 3
- [34] Kohei Uehara and Tatsuya Harada. Learning by asking questions for knowledge-based novel object recognition. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 132(6):2290–2309, 2024. 3
- [35] Kohei Uehara, Antonio Tejero-De-Pablos, Yoshitaka Ushiku, and Tatsuya Harada. Visual question generation for class acquisition of unknown objects. In *ECCV*, 2018. 3
- [36] 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. In *NeurIPS*, 2022. 2
- [37] Jianwei Yang, Jiasen Lu, Stefan Lee, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Visual curiosity: Learning to ask questions to learn visual recognition. In *CoRL*, 2018. 3
- [38] Shilong Zhang, Peize Sun, Shoufa Chen, Min Xiao, Wenqi Shao, Wenwei Zhang, Kai Chen, and Ping Luo. GPT4RoI: Instruction tuning large language model on region-of-interest. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03601*, 2023. 2
- [39] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592*, 2023. 2

Appendix

A. Prompt Details

```
You are a helpful assistant to a user who is trying to answer the question about an image.
The user has provided a question and a reasoning process that led to their answer.
The user asks you a question to collect knowledge that will help them answer the question.
You should provide a response that helps the user answer the question.
Keep the answer as concise as possible; single-sentence answers are best.
Your answer must be in JSON formatted dictionary with the key "answer".
Generate json-formatted dictionary only, do not include any other information like formatting, etc.
example:
{"answer": "Gothic architecture"}
```

Listing 2. Full example of our prompt given to GPT-4 to answer the question generated by our model.

```
You are a helpful assistant to a person who is trying to answer the question about an image from an examiner.
The person has provided a reasoning process to reach the final answer, and then provide a final answer.
Your task is to evaluate the answer in score 1-4.
1: The answer is wrong.
2: The answer is somewhat correct; meaning of the answer is similar to the correct answer but details are wrong.
3: The answer is mostly correct; meaning of the answer is correct but some details are wrong.
4: The answer is completely correct.
Before you evaluate the answer, you need to extract the final answer from the user's full response.
When extracting the answer, you should not modify the user's wording; just extract the answer as it is.

Your answer must be in JSON formatted dictionary with the key "answer" (str) and "score" (int).
Generate json-formatted dictionary only, do not include any other information like formatting, etc.
example:
{"answer": "Gothic architecture", "score": 4}
{"answer": "Cathedral", "score": 2}
{"answer": "School", "score": 1}
{"answer": "Baroque architecture", "score": 3}
```

Listing 3. Full example of our prompt given to GPT-4 for answer evaluation.

Here, we provide the full example of the prompt given to GPT-4 for answer generation and evaluation. The prompt for answer generation is shown in Listing 2, and the prompt for answer evaluation is shown in Listing 3. In both prompts, we provide an instruction and several examples to guide GPT-4 to generate and evaluate the answer, respectively. We instructed GPT-4 to return the answer in JSON format, which enables us to parse the answer and evaluate it automatically.

B. More Examples of the Dataset

In Figure 7 and 8, we show more examples of the dataset we crafted based on different datasets: OK-VQA, A-OKVQA, MS COCO caption, Visual Genome caption, OVEN, and Encyclopedic-VQA. Each example consists of an image, a question, and a reasoning chain that explains how to answer the question or generate a caption for the image. We provide the reasoning chain of three types: (1) reasoning steps without answer and question, in which the data is generated without access to the ground-truth answer and there is no question generation step; (2) reasoning steps with question, in which the data is generated with access to the ground-truth answer and there is a question generation step; and (3) reasoning steps with answer and without question, same as the second type but without the question generation step.

C. More Qualitative Results

We show more qualitative results of generated reasoning steps by our model for VQA, A-OKVQA, COCO Caption, Encyclopedic VQA, OVEN, OK-VQA, and Visual Genome in Figure 10, 11, 12, and 13.

OK-VQA

Question: What's the name of the tallest building in this photo?

Answer: big Ben

Reasoning Steps (w/o answer, w/o question):

1. I can see a man standing near a body of water. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
2. In the background, there is a large building with a clock tower. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
3. The man appears to be posing with the skyline in the background. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
4. I can identify the building with a clock tower as one of the famous structures, but I can't exactly say the name. [Uncertainty Score: 5]
5. Thus, the name of the tallest building in this photo is unsure. [Uncertainty Score: 8]

Reasoning Steps (with question):

1. I can see a man standing near a body of water. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
2. In the background, there is a large building with a clock tower. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
3. The man appears to be posing with the skyline in the background. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
4. Imagined Knowledge Needed: Information about famous buildings with a clock tower.

Question to knowledgeable person: "Can you name some famous buildings with a clock tower?"

Answer: "Some famous buildings with a clock tower are the 'Big Ben' in London, 'Philadelphia City Hall' in Philadelphia, 'Custom House Tower' in Boston, and 'Kremlin Clock' in Moscow."

5. Considering the skyline and the characteristics of the building with the clock tower, it resembles the 'Big Ben'. [Uncertainty Score: 3]
6. Thus, the name of the tallest building in this photo is identified as the 'Big Ben'. [Uncertainty Score: 2]

Reasoning steps (with answer, w/o question):

- Reasoning Steps: 1. I can see a man standing near a body of water. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
2. In the background, there is a large building with a clock tower. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
 3. The man appears to be posing with the skyline in the background. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
 4. Considering the skyline and the characteristics of the building with the clock tower, it can be identified as the 'Big Ben'. [Uncertainty Score: 2]
 5. Thus, the name of the tallest building in this photo is identified as the 'Big Ben'. [Uncertainty Score: 1]

A-OKVQA

Question: What type of dinosaur does this represent?

Answer: brontosaurus

Reasoning Steps (w/o answer, w/o question):

1. I notice a dinosaur statue prominently displayed in what appears to be a park. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
2. There are various types of kites flying around the dinosaur statue. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
3. There's no distinct and specific information given about the type of dinosaur this statue is supposed to represent. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
4. Due to the lack of explicit defining traits or marks on the statue, it is difficult to identify with certainty the type of dinosaur it represents. [Uncertainty Score: 7]

Reasoning Steps (with question):

1. I notice a dinosaur statue prominently displayed in what appears to be a park. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
2. There are various types of kites flying around the dinosaur statue. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
3. Imagined Knowledge Needed: Distinct features of the dinosaur statue that could help determine the type of dinosaur it represents.

Question to knowledgeable person: "What are some defining features of a Brontosaurus that I can look for in the statue?"

Answer: A brontosaurus typically has a long and slender neck and tail, and a small head compared to its body.

4. Comparing the statue with the knowledge I've obtained, I can see that it does have a long neck and tail, and a small head, characteristics of a Brontosaurus. [Uncertainty Score: 4]
5. Hence, the dinosaur statue represents a Brontosaurus. [Uncertainty Score: 3]

Reasoning steps (with answer, w/o question):

1. I notice a dinosaur statue prominently displayed in what appears to be a park. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
2. There are various types of kites flying around the dinosaur statue. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
3. While observing the statue, I can see that it has a long neck and tail, and a small head, which are characteristics of a Brontosaurus. [Uncertainty Score: 4]
4. Therefore, I can conclude that this statue represents a Brontosaurus. [Uncertainty Score: 2]

Figure 7. Examples from our dataset, based on OK-VQA and A-OKVQA.

MS COCO



Reasoning Steps (w/o answer, w/o question):

1. I see a number of objects in a display case with various people around it. [Uncertainty: 1]
2. Multiple objects in the display case are elongated and appear to be the same kind. [Uncertainty: 2]
3. These elongated objects are uniformly colored and look unripe. [Uncertainty: 3]
4. The color of the elongated objects is greenish-yellow which is typical for certain unripe fruits. [Uncertainty: 3]
5. According to their shape and color, these objects may be unripe fruits. [Uncertainty: 4]
6. Based on their elongated form, these unripe fruits might be bananas. [Uncertainty: 5]
7. So the display seems to be full of greenish-yellow, unripe bananas. [Uncertainty: 5]

Reasoning Steps (with question):

1. I see a number of objects in a display case with various people around it. [Uncertainty: 1]
2. Multiple objects in the display case are elongated and appear to be the same kind. [Uncertainty: 2]
3. These elongated objects are uniformly colored and look unripe. [Uncertainty: 3]
4. Imagined Knowledge Needed: I need to identify the unripe fruit that is elongated and greenish-yellow in color.
Question to knowledgeable person: What kind of unripe fruit is typically elongated and greenish-yellow in color?
Answer: An unripe banana is typically elongated and greenish-yellow in color.
5. Given the answer, these elongated items appear to be unripe bananas. [Uncertainty: 2]
6. Therefore, the display case appears to be full of unripe bananas. [Uncertainty: 2]

Reasoning Steps (with answer, w/o question):

1. I see a number of objects in a display case with various people around it. [Uncertainty: 1]
2. Multiple objects in the display case are elongated and appear to be the same kind. [Uncertainty: 2]
3. These elongated objects are uniformly colored and look unripe. [Uncertainty: 1]
4. The color and shape of these items closely match those of unripe bananas. [Uncertainty: 1]
5. I verify that they are unripe since they display a greenish-yellow color which is characteristic for an unripe banana. [Uncertainty: 1]
6. Given the observed features, these items are definitely unripe bananas. [Uncertainty: 1]
7. Therefore, the display case is filled with unripe bananas. [Uncertainty: 1]

Visual Genome



Question: Provide a short description for the area at 230 156 245 145 .

Answer: Two chains on a fire hydrant

Reasoning Steps (w/o answer, w/o question):

1. The prominent object in the image is a fire hydrant, which is colored in red and white. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
2. It appears to be placed near a street or a road, as depicted in the scene. [Uncertainty Score: 2]
3. The fire hydrant appears to have some form of chains or attachments. [Uncertainty Score: 7]
4. From these observations, I can infer that the image might depict a fire hydrant with chains, standing near a street. [Uncertainty Score: 7]

Reasoning Steps (with question):

1. The prominent object in the image is a fire hydrant, which is colored in red and white. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
2. It appears to be placed near a street or a road, as depicted in the scene. [Uncertainty Score: 2]
3. Imagined Knowledge Needed: Clear knowledge of any attachments or chains that are typically seen on fire hydrants.
Question to knowledgeable person: "Do fire hydrants typically have chains or any forms of attachments to them?"
Answer: Yes, it's common for fire hydrants to have chains connected to their caps to prevent them from getting lost when the hydrant is being used.

4. Given the additional information, the chains I observed on the fire hydrant are common attachments and not unusual. [Uncertainty score: 1]
5. Thus, a short description for the area could be 'Two chains on a fire hydrant'. [Uncertainty Score: 1]

Reasoning Steps (with answer, w/o question):

1. The prominent object in the image is a fire hydrant, which is colored in red and white. [Uncertainty Score: 1]
2. It appears to be placed near a street or a road, as depicted in the scene. [Uncertainty Score: 2]
3. Keeping the answer in consideration, the short description rightly suggests the presence of 'Two chains on a fire hydrant'. [Uncertainty Score: 1]

Figure 8. Examples from our dataset, based on MS COCO caption and Visual Genome caption.

OVEN



Question: what kind of animal is this?

Answer: Fur seal

Reasoning Steps (w/o answer, w/o question)

1. The image shows an animal on a sandy beach with the ocean in the background. [Uncertainty: 1]
2. The animal has a thick fur coat. [Uncertainty: 2]
3. It appears to have a robust body and short flippers. [Uncertainty: 2]
4. The habitat and body structure suggest it is a marine mammal. [Uncertainty: 3]
5. Marine mammals with such features are commonly seals or sea lions. [Uncertainty: 3]
6. The animal does not appear to have visible external ear flaps, which are characteristic of sea lions. [Uncertainty: 4]
7. Thus, the answer is "seal". [Uncertainty: 4]

Reasoning Steps (with question)

1. The image shows an animal on a sandy beach with the ocean in the background. [Uncertainty: 1]
2. The animal has a thick fur coat. [Uncertainty: 2]
3. It appears to have a robust body and short flippers. [Uncertainty: 2]
4. The habitat and body structure suggest it is a marine mammal. [Uncertainty: 3]
5. Marine mammals with such features are commonly seals or sea lions. [Uncertainty: 3]

Imagined Knowledge Needed: Characteristics that distinguish between different types of marine mammals such as seals and sea lions. [Uncertainty: 0]

Question: What are the physical characteristics that differentiate seals from sea lions? [Uncertainty: 0]

Seals do not have visible ear flaps and have shorter, less muscular flippers compared to sea lions, which have visible external ears and longer flippers for walking on land. [Uncertainty: 0]

6. The visible external ears and muscular flippers of this animal are characteristics of a sea lion, not a seal. [Uncertainty: 2]
7. Noting the presence of these features, the animal is more likely a fur seal, part of the sea lion family, rather than a true seal. [Uncertainty: 2]
8. Thus, the answer is "Fur seal". [Uncertainty: 2]

Reasoning Steps (with answer, w/o question)

1. The image shows an animal on a sandy beach with the ocean in the background. [Uncertainty: 1]
2. The animal has a thick fur coat. [Uncertainty: 2]
3. It appears to have a robust body and short flippers. [Uncertainty: 2]
4. The habitat and body structure suggest it is a marine mammal. [Uncertainty: 3]
5. Marine mammals with such features are commonly seals or sea lions. [Uncertainty: 3]
6. The animal does not appear to have visible external ear flaps, which are characteristic of sea lions. [Uncertainty: 4]
7. Thus, the answer is "seal". [Uncertainty: 4]

Encyclopedic VQA



Question: In what year did the monastic reform of this abbey take place?

Answer: 1481

Reasoning Steps (w/o answer, w/o question)

1. The image depicts a building with traditional architecture, possibly an abbey. [Uncertainty: 3]
2. There is no visible information from the image that directly indicates the date of monastic reform. [Uncertainty: 1]
3. Historical events such as monastic reforms are not usually discernible from a photograph alone. [Uncertainty: 1]
4. Details about when a monastic reform occurred would require historical records or texts. [Uncertainty: 1]
5. The image does not contain any overt signage or text that provides historical context. [Uncertainty: 1]
6. To obtain an accurate year for the monastic reform, external historical data related to this particular abbey would need to be consulted. [Uncertainty: 1]
7. Thus, the answer is "The date of the monastic reform for this abbey cannot be determined from the image alone". [Uncertainty: 1]

Reasoning Steps (with question)

1. The image shows a building with traditional architecture that may be an abbey. [Uncertainty: 3]
 2. Specific historical details like the date of a monastic reform cannot be determined just from looking at the building in the image. [Uncertainty: 1]
 3. Historical events are documented in written records, which are not present or visible in this photograph. [Uncertainty: 1]
- Imagined Knowledge Needed: Historical records or credible documentation regarding the abbey's history. [Uncertainty: 0]
- Question: Where can one find historical records or documentation regarding the monastic reforms of abbeys? [Uncertainty: 0]
- Historical records about monastic reforms of abbeys are typically housed in church archives, national libraries, or historical societies. [Uncertainty: 0]
4. Access to such documentation can reveal specific details about historical events, including reforms. [Uncertainty: 2]
 5. The context information for this abbey provides the specific year of its monastic reform. [Uncertainty: 1]
 6. Thus, the answer is "1481". [Uncertainty: 1]

Reasoning Steps (with answer, w/o question)

1. The image depicts a building with traditional architecture, possibly an abbey. [Uncertainty: 3]
2. There is no visible information from the image that directly indicates the date of monastic reform. [Uncertainty: 1]
3. Historical events such as monastic reforms are not usually discernible from a photograph alone. [Uncertainty: 1]
4. Details about when a monastic reform occurred would require historical records or texts. [Uncertainty: 1]
5. The image does not contain any overt signage or text that provides historical context. [Uncertainty: 1]
6. To obtain an accurate year for the monastic reform, external historical data related to this particular abbey would need to be consulted. [Uncertainty: 1]
7. Thus, the answer is "The date of the monastic reform for this abbey cannot be determined from the image alone". [Uncertainty: 1]

Figure 9. Examples from our dataset, based on OVEN and Encyclopedic-VQA.



VQA

User

Is that a train or a bus?

Model

1. I can recognize a variety of objects in the image, including several people, luggage, and a blue and white transportation vehicle.
2. This transportation vehicle has four wheels and appears to be attached to a series of luggage.

Model

Imagined Knowledge Needed: Features that differentiate a train from a bus.
Question to knowledgeable person: "What are some key differences between trains and buses?"

GPT

Trains run on tracks and are often longer in length with multiple attached cars, whereas buses operate on roads and generally have a single body. Additionally, trains often have different types of locomotives or trains attached in front/behind.

Model

3. The vehicle has a long structure attached to it, which matches the characteristics of a train.
4. Given the presence of luggage attached to it and the knowledge of the features of trains, the vehicle is identified as a train.
5. Therefore, the image includes a train.



A-OKVQA

User

What is the name of the sport the man is participating in?

Model

1. There's a man wakeboarding in a body of water.
2. The man is standing on top of a device that's connected to a speedboat.
3. Wakeboarding is a type of boat sport that involves a person being towed by a boat and performing tricks.

Model

Imagined Knowledge Needed: Exact names of boat sports involving similar activities.
Question to knowledgeable person: "What are some popular boat sports that involve wakeboarding or a similar activity?"

GPT

Wakeboarding, waterskiing, kneeboarding, wakeskating, and wakesurfing are all popular boat sports.

Model

4. From the observed action, the man is performing the same kind of activity typically associated with wakeboarding.
5. Thus, the sport the man is participating in is identified as 'wakeboarding'.

Figure 10. Additional qualitative results on generating reasoning steps for VQA and A-OKVQA caption.



COCO Captioning

User

Provide a detailed description of the given image.

Model

1. I observe multiple small dark objects near the center of the image.
2. These small objects appear to have four legs and small ears, indicating they are small dogs or puppies.
3. The environment appears natural with trees and grass visible.

Model

Imagined Knowledge Needed: I need to confirm the exact position of the people in relation to the puppies.
Question to knowledgeable person: "What are the typical signs when people are holding onto a leash and the dog is in front?"

GPT

Typical signs include a taut leash line extending from the person's hand to the dog's collar and the person usually looking towards or guiding the dog. Also, the dog would be ahead of the person.

Model

4. Considering the answer, the position of the puppies and humans suggests that the people are holding on to leashes.
5. There appears to be a connection between the puppies and the people.
6. Therefore, considering all the observations, it's likely that the people are holding onto the leashes of the puppies.



Encyclopedic VQA

User

Is the chemical that this plant contains present in extractable or detectable amounts?

Model

1. The image shows a plant with heart-shaped leaves.
2. The leaves appear to contain a natural chemical or substance.
3. Detecting such chemicals in a plant often requires specialized equipment or analytical methods.
4. Chemicals may vary depending on the specific species, season, and location, making analysis challenging.

Model

Imagined Knowledge Needed: Detailed knowledge of the specific plant species and potential chemicals present in extractable or detectable amounts.
Question to knowledgeable person: "Can you provide information on how to identify chemicals that can be bioassayed from this plant species?"

GPT

The identification of chemicals in plants typically involves methods such as chromatography (e.g., HPLC, GC-MS), spectroscopy (e.g., NMR, IR), and bioassays to analyze and quantify the chemical compounds present. The specific chemicals present in this plant species are dependent on factors such as season, location, and the time of year.

Model

5. Since the identification and assessment of the chemicals in the plant require specialized analytical methods, it's highly likely that the chemicals are present in extractable or detectable amounts.

Figure 11. Additional qualitative results on generating reasoning steps for MS COCO caption and Encyclopedic VQA.



OVEN

User
what is the category of this object?

Model
1. The object in the image is a bottle.
2. The bottle has a rounded shape with a cap.
3. The cap has a crystal ring.
4. The color is blue.

Model
Imagined Knowledge Needed: Categories of glass bottles based on shape and decoration.
Question to knowledgeable person: "What categories of glass bottles are used specifically for perfumes or toiletries?"

GPT
Perfume bottles or atomizers can have various designs and shapes but are typically smaller and contain a spray mechanism.

Model
5. The item in the image is used for personal hygiene as indicated by its contents and design, which is typically associated with perfumes and toiletries.
6. Thus, the category of this object is identified as a perfume bottle.



OKVQA

User
What is the red building called?

Model
1. The image features a man riding a bike on a pier over the water.
2. The man wearing shorts is walking towards the water on the pier.
3. In the background, there is a building that is red in color.
4. The building has several floors.

Model
Imagined Knowledge Needed: Typical names or signage around buildings on piers over the water.
Question to knowledgeable person: "What are typical names given to buildings built on piers over water?"

GPT
Lighthouse is one common name.

Model
5. Given the information obtained, the building could potentially be a lighthouse.

Figure 12. Additional qualitative results on generating reasoning steps for OVEN and OK-VQA.



Visual Genome

User

Provide a short description for the area at 17 26 163 307.

Model

1. The image features a black-and-white object, possibly an animal, sitting or laying down.
2. This object appears partially inside a building, likely a house based on its typical windows and walls.

Model

Imagined Knowledge Needed: Information about common behaviors of cats, specifically their attitudes while positioned near windows.
Question to knowledgeable person: "How would you describe a cats general behavior when it is near a window, watching the outside?"

GPT

Cats are generally curious and alert when near a window, often watching the outside world with interest and intrigue.
They might be looking out for birds, cars, other animals or people.

Model

3. Given the context and added information, the object seemingly demonstrates a general cat behavior of being intrigued at a window, looking out perhaps for some interesting activity outside.
4. Therefore, a short description of the area could be 'an intrigued black cat gazing out of the window'.

Figure 13. Additional qualitative results on generating reasoning steps for Visual Genome.