

ALLaVA: Harnessing GPT4V-Synthesized Data for Lite Vision-Language Models

Guiming Hardy Chen, Shunian Chen, Ruifei Zhang, Junying Chen, Xiangbo Wu, Zhiyi Zhang, Zhihong Chen*, Jianquan Li, Xiang Wan, Benyou Wang*

Shenzhen Research Institute of Big Data

The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen

zhihongchen@link.cuhk.edu.cn, wangbenyou@cuhk.edu.cn

<https://github.com/FreedomIntelligence/ALLaVA>

<https://huggingface.co/datasets/FreedomIntelligence/ALLaVA-4V>

Abstract

Large vision-language models (LVLMs) have shown promise in a broad range of vision-language tasks with their strong reasoning and generalization capabilities. However, they require considerable computational resources for training and deployment. This study aims to bridge the performance gap between traditional-scale LVLMs and resource-friendly lite versions by adopting high-quality training data. To this end, we propose a comprehensive pipeline for generating a synthetic dataset. The key idea is to leverage strong proprietary models to generate (i) fine-grained image annotations for vision-language alignment and (ii) complex reasoning visual question-answering pairs for visual instruction fine-tuning, yielding 1.3M samples in total. We train a series of lite VLMs on the synthetic dataset and experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed scheme, where they achieve competitive performance on 17 benchmarks among 4B LVLMs, and even perform on par with 7B/13B-scale models on various benchmarks. This work highlights the feasibility of adopting high-quality data in crafting more efficient LVLMs. We name our dataset *ALLaVA*, and open-source it to research community for developing better resource-efficient LVLMs for wider usage.

1 Introduction

Recent months have seen a flourish development of Large Vision-Language Models (LVLMs). These models are able to process visual and textual inputs, resembling the way humans process information in real-world scenarios. An LVLMs typically consists of two key components, which are a vision encoder and a Large Language Model (LLM). The former enables the model to *see* and the latter empowers the model to *process* and *speak*. Therefore, LVLMs can not only perform traditional tasks such as captioning (Agrawal et al., 2019; Young et al., 2014) and image-text retrieval (Lin et al., 2015; Young et al., 2014), but are also able to follow instructions from human and perform complex VQA tasks (Li et al., 2023a; Liu et al., 2023c; Ge et al., 2023; Yu et al., 2023; Fu et al., 2023), making them a milestone to Artificial General Intelligence (AGI).

While LVLMs demonstrate their superior ability, they often require vast resources for training and deployment. For example, IDEFICS (IDEFICS, 2023) is trained on hundreds of millions of data; Qwen-VL (Bai et al., 2023a) and CogVLM (Wang et al., 2023c) are trained on more than 1 billion samples. The huge cost impedes the democratization of LVLMs. To make LVLMs more portable,

*Zhihong and Benyou are the corresponding authors




Figure 1: Pipeline for scaling up high-quality data. Prompts in the figure are shown for demonstration purpose. See the detailed prompt in Appendix A.2 and A.3.

several works resort to develop lite LVLMs (Chu et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2024). Although these models are more friendly to users with scarce computation resources, they are accompanied by a loss of performance to some certain extent, manifested by the performance gap between normal-sized LVLMs and lite ones.

Previous works have shown the potential to improve the model performance through high-quality data (Chen et al., 2023a; Wang et al., 2023b; Li et al., 2023c). Therefore in this paper, we investigate a naturally arisen question: *Can scaling up high-quality data fill the performance gap between normal-sized LVLMs and lite ones?* To answer it, we curate high-quality images from LAION (Schuhmann et al., 2021) and Vision-FLAN Xu et al. (2023b). We then propose a data generation framework *Captioning-then-QA*, which is applied to prompt GPT-4V to generate a large-scale vision language dataset, consisting of high-quality captions, instructions and answers. We perform ablated experiment on existing LVLMs to show the efficacy of our dataset, and train several models based on Phi², StableLM-2-1.6B (Team, 2023) and Phi-3-mini (Abdin et al., 2024), which are superb 4B-scale LLMs. Benefited from our high-quality training data, we observe significant advancement of cognition and perception ability on our models. We name our dataset and resulted models as *ALLaVA*, *A Lite Language and Vision Assistant*. We hope that ALLaVA can assist open-source community in democratizing powerful commercial models such as GPT-4V, and developing better LVLMs for wider application.

Our contributions are as follow: (i) We open-source the largest synthetic dataset ALLaVA for LVLM training. The dataset consists of 1.3M diverse samples with fine-grained captions, complex instructions and detailed answers generated by GPT-4V, and high-resolution images curated from different sources; (ii) We release a series of 4B-scale LVLMs trained on ALLaVA. These models perform on par with larger models on multiple benchmarks, demonstrating the superiority of the proposed dataset.

2 Rethinking Existing LVLMs

Guided by the principle “garbage in, garbage out” which highlights the importance of input data quality, our approach reevaluates multimodal language models from a data-centric perspective. Within this framework³, we focus on two primary strategies: *alignment* and *visual instruction tuning*.

²<https://huggingface.co/microsoft/phi-2>

³We reassess the widely adopted solution (i.e. LLaVA Liu et al. (2023a)) by scrutinizing both alignment and visual instruction tuning stages, with particular attention to potential issues.

The former is primarily dedicated to assisting language models in discerning visual objects and augmenting their visual reasoning capabilities. Meanwhile, the latter focuses on empowering LVLMs to generalize across a broader spectrum of instructions, particularly for those involving visual input.

2.1 On the Alignment

Image-text Alignment is rather Coarse-grained Existing work tends to use caption data (i.e., images and its textual description) to align images and texts in language models. Popular large-scale caption datasets (Schuhmann et al., 2022, 2021; Sharma et al., 2018; Changpinyo et al., 2021; Ordonez et al., 2011) consist of short and coarse-grained captions, which introduces noisy signals and hinder the vision-language alignment process. To improve their quality, BLIP (Li et al., 2022) introduces CapFilt which is trained on human-annotated COCO (Lin et al., 2015) dataset to generate higher-quality captions and remove unsatisfactory ones. LLaVA (Liu et al., 2023b) instead adopts the text-only GPT-4 (OpenAI et al., 2023) to directly generate visual conversations using COCO annotations, but the detailedness of descriptions is bounded by human-annotation and is costly to scale up. Besides, it is found that the cross-modal association in COCO image-text pairs is limited (Parekh et al., 2020), questioning the effectiveness of curating high-quality data on top of COCO. Therefore, we need a more reasonable and scalable approach for obtaining high-quality caption data.

2.2 On Visual Instructions

Questions are Relatively Simple Taking Vision-FLAN (Xu et al., 2023b) as example, which comprises 191 VQA tasks across 101 datasets, its questions are relatively simple compared to WizardLM Xu et al. (2023a). As stated by WizardLM Xu et al. (2023a), complex questions (or called ‘*instruction*’) are beneficial for language models, especially in terms of instruction following. Moreover, current visual instruction tuning datasets focus more on improving fundamental abilities than on more advanced ones such complex reasoning. For example, Visual Genome (Krishna et al., 2016) consists of bounding-box locating questions, OCRVQA (Mishra et al., 2019) contains simple text recognition task for book covers, and TextVQA (Singh et al., 2019) asks to generate one-sentence caption for each image.

Answers are Short and Uninformative Moreover, although the answers in Vision-FLAN are manually annotated by human, they often consist of short word or phrases without format prompts. Some answers are even incomplete as a sentence (e.g., without a period or capitalizing the first letter). Directly learning such outputs would hinder the model performance (Liu et al., 2023a), manifesting the need of polishing or regenerating the answers to Vision-FLAN instructions.

3 Methodology of ALLaVA

3.1 Motivation for Lite LVLMs

Lite LVLMs are gaining increasing popularity since they cost less to train and deploy. For training, a 7B LLaVA-architecture model takes less than 14 hours to be trained on 1M data with 8*A100 40G GPUs (Liu et al., 2023a). The training time decreases linearly with number of trainable parameters, which means it takes only less than 7 hours to train a Phi2-2.7B backbone under the same settings. The deployment cost of lite LVLMs is much smaller than normal-size ones. Using quantization techniques, one can fit a 2.7B LVLM into a 8GB-RAM mobile phone and conduct inference (Chu et al., 2023) with decent performance, indicating a promising future of lite LVLMs.

3.2 The Philosophy of ALLaVA

Harnessing High-Quality Data for Scale Compensation While lightweight LVLMs offer advantages over their normal-size counterparts in terms of computational cost, they might experience performance drops due to their reduced number of parameters. To enhance the effectiveness of

lite LVLMs while preserving their efficiency, our goal is to construct high-quality datasets that can compensate for the diminished capacity inherent in lite LVLMs when compared to their normal-size counterparts.

Data Synthesis using a Captioning-then-QA Fashion To generate high-quality captions and VQAs, we propose to distill a caption and a QA pair for an image within a single session, see Figure 2. Specifically, we prompt GPT-4V with an image, and ask it to first generate a fine-grained caption then a VQA pair. By doing so, the whole data synthesis procedure including three stages: *captioning*, *questioning* and *answering*, which are described in Section 3.3.

```
### You are an excellent image describer and questioner
### You have three tasks in total
#### Your first task is to describe the given image as detailed as
    possible
#### Your second task is to ask a complex question ...
#### Your third task is to answer the question you raised solely based on
    the given image
```

Figure 2: An example prompt snippet for the overall pipeline in a captioning-then- QA fashion. It includes (1) *captioning*, (2) *questioning*, and (3) *answering*.

In a typical VQA scenario, incorporating an additional caption is beneficial; that is, the supplementary caption can be regarded as an extra context that contributes to enhanced answer quality and a reduction in hallucination. Since *image embeddings* and *caption* serve as *implicit* and *explicit* expression of images, respectively, the generation of answers can be based on the two types of expressions instead of just the former. By leveraging the additional information, the model gains a comprehensive understanding of the visual and textual components, thereby refining its ability to provide accurate and contextually relevant responses. Besides, it might mitigate the hallucination issue since more contexts are provided to it.

3.3 Data Curation Pipeline

In this subsection, we introduce the four stages: *image selection*, *captioning*, *questioning* and *answering* in Section 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3 and 3.3.4, respectively.

3.3.1 Stage 0: Image Selection

We select two sources for images in data synthesis: LAION (Schuhmann et al., 2021) and Vision-FLAN (Xu et al., 2023b) (VFLAN in short in the rest of this paper). **LAION** is a popular dataset for vision-language alignment since it contains diverse images that are crawled from webpages. Therefore, the image sources are also aligned with the real-world usages of end users. To ensure image quality, we perform quality control and deduplication on these images, the process of which is detailed in Appendix A.1. **Vision-FLAN** is a dataset that integrates 191 VQA tasks across 101 open-source datasets. It comprises instructions that are vital for improving the foundation ability of LVLMs and can enhance the performance on vision-language benchmarks.

3.3.2 Stage 1: Captioning

Towards Fine-grained Captions Figure 3 shows a prompt snippet for captioning. It asks GPT-4V to keep an eye on multiple aspects of an image and describe the image as detail as possible. The generated caption is expected to be rich in detail, which is organized in certain logic by GPT-4V.

3.3.3 Stage 2: Questioning

Since Vision-FLAN already contains diverse instructions, we retain its original instructions and do not perform question generation on it. We only generate questions for images sourced from LAION.

```

You are an excellent image describer.

Your task is to first describe an image and then answer a question.

Your description should include details about the main subjects,
background elements, colors, and any notable features. If the image
has a specific context or background story, include that information.
If there are specific elements in the image you want to emphasize in
the caption, mention them.
...

```

Figure 3: An example prompt snippet for captioning.

```

...
#### Your second task is to ask a complex question that requires close
inspection of the image and strong reasoning ability to answer, you
should ask FIVE candidate questions in different aspects and diverse
ways, then RANDOMLY choose one of them to answer.
...

```

Figure 4: An example prompt snippet for question generation.

Prompting for Complex and Diverse Questions As argued from Sec. 2.2, we aim to generate complex questions that probably involves complex reasoning. This is inspired by WizardLM (Xu et al., 2023a), but we implement complex instructions using a light-weight prompting instead of original instruction evolution. We demonstrate an example prompt for question generation in Figure 4. Besides requiring the *complexity* of questions generated, we also expect *diversity* of questions. Hence, we ask GPT-4V to generate five questions at a time and choose one to answer.

3.3.4 Stage 3: Answering

```

...
Your answer should provide relevant information to the question and
demonstrate the process of solving the question.
...

```

Figure 5: An example prompt snippet for question answering.

Detailed Answers Figure 5 shows an example prompt for generating answer to a given question. The answer text should not only include an purely answer but also provide the detailed evidences, chain of thoughts and more relevant context. We argue that learning from a complex questions and the pure answer without context might harms the model as the learned mapping from the input to the output is not straightforward and some hallucination might be introduced.

For LAION, we strictly followed the aforementioned data generation pipeline. For VFLAN, considering the diversity of its original questions, we decided to retain its questions but regenerate the answers. As a result, the questions in the LAION dataset compensated for the simplicity of the questions in the VFLAN dataset, while the original questions in VFLAN supplemented the overall diversity of the dataset’s questions.

3.4 On the Ethics

Ethical considerations are imperative. For example, it is crucial to address prompts that involve traditionally biased elements such as gender and races when describing specific occupations. In our prompt, we require that any question attempting to elicit responses involving the disclosure



Figure 6: Visualization of LDA results using t-SNE. Four clusters are chosen for a detailed visualization with topic name, top-10 key words and sample images.

of personal information or encourages discriminatory judgments should be promptly refused (see Appendix A.2). Upholding ethical standards is essential in maintaining a responsible and inclusive approach to language generation, fostering an unbiased environment in the information provided.

3.5 On the Effectiveness of Caption-then-QA Pipeline

To demonstrate the efficacy of our data generation strategy, we uniformly choose 100 samples from different categories of VFLAN and directly generate the answer for each question without captioning first. Then we perform a manual inspection of the accuracy of the answers. Table 1 summarizes the results for manual inspection.

Our *Caption-then-Answer* strategy exceeds *Direct Answer* by 6% in accuracy, though falling behind *VFLAN gt* by 4%. We demonstrate the superiority of our strategy in Appendix A.5, where an example is shown to compare *Caption-then-Answer* and *Direct Answer*. The manual verification indicates the efficacy of our Caption-then-Answer curation pipeline.

Table 1: Results of manual inspection on 100 samples from VFLAN.

Answers from	Accuracy (%)
<i>VFLAN gt</i>	88.0
<i>Direct Answer</i>	78.0
<i>Caption-then-Answer (ours)</i>	84.0

3.6 The Resulted Dataset

As seen in Table 2, we build two large-scale synthetic datasets following our data generation pipeline: image caption and visual instruction data.

LAION The upper part of Figure 1 illustrates the pipeline for distilling a fine-grained caption and a complex VQA for the same image within one prompt using GPT-4V (OpenAI, 2023), which is so far the most powerful LVLm developed by OpenAI. We use a subset of 469K images from LAION (Schuhmann et al., 2021), which contains diverse images crawled from webpages. We name the distilled caption set as **ALLaVA-Caption-LAION-4V**, and the VQA set as **ALLaVA-Instruct-LAION-4V**. See the detailed prompt in Appendix A.2 and samples in Appendix A.4.

VFLAN The lower part of Figure 1 showcases the pipeline for distilling a fine-grained caption and a detailed answer to a given instruction for the same image within one prompt using GPT-4V. We name the distilled caption set as **ALLaVA-Caption-VFLAN-4V**, and the VQA set as **ALLaVA-Instruct-VFLAN-4V**. See the detailed prompt in Appendix A.3 and samples in Appendix A.4.

Table 2: Summary of ALLaVA dataset.

Subsets	#Ex.	Total
<i>ALLaVA-Caption-4V</i>		
ALLaVA-Caption-LAION-4V	469K	664K
ALLaVA-Caption-VFLAN-4V	195K	
<i>ALLaVA-Instruct-4V</i>		
ALLaVA-Instruct-LAION-4V	469K	663K
ALLaVA-Instruct-VFLAN-4V	194K	

Table 3: Comparison of ALLaVA-Caption, ALLaVA-Instruct and their respective existing counterpart datasets. We only consider instruction data in LVIS-4V.

	ALLaVA-Caption	ShareGPT4V
#Samples	664K	102K
Resolution(w/h)	891/770	534/451
Image Sources	Diverse	Diverse

	ALLaVA-Instruct	LVIS-4V
#Samples	663K	110K
Resolution(w/h)	891/770	576/484
Image Sources	Diverse	COCO (Lin et al., 2015)




Figure 7: Distribution of top-12 URLs in ALLaVA-LAION. The shaded blue area shows the cumulative sum of percentages.

4 Exploring ALLaVA

Basic Statistics As depicted in Table 3, the ALLaVA dataset comprises 664K samples, with average image resolutions of 891 by 770 pixels, sourced from a diverse range of images. The ALLaVA dataset is divided into two subsets: ALLaVA-Caption and ALLaVA-Instruct, which share the same set of images. It is important to note that ALLaVA surpasses other public datasets in multiple dimensions, such as #samples, average resolutions, etc.

Diverse Sources of Images in ALLaVA-LAION To show the diverse source of images in ALLaVA-LAION, we analyze the top-level domains of image URLs. We find that the 469K images are from 122K unique domains. We also illustrate the distribution of top-12 domains in Figure 7. The traced URLs span encompass multiple types of websites, including news (*e.g.*, CNN), high-res templates (*e.g.*, WordPress, Squarespace), merchandise (*e.g.*, Amazon AWS, Shopify), high-res photographs (*e.g.*, SmugMug, alamy), etc. These commercial websites need to deliver decent visual experience for viewers, guaranteeing superior image quality. Meanwhile, the images on these websites encapsulate a variety of daily life scenarios, thus increasing their naturalness and diversity.

Topic Analysis To show the diversity of topics covered in the dataset, we run Latent Dirichlet Allocation (LDA) (Blei et al., 2003) implemented by Mallet (McCallum, 2002) on ALLaVA-Caption-LAION-4V and ALLaVA-Caption-VFLAN-4V. Specifically we randomly draw a total of 100K samples from two sets, set the number of topics to 25 and train an Mallet-LDA model for 1K steps. Then for each of the 25 clusters, we feed the most relevant 10 words to GPT-4 (prompts in Appendix B.1) and generate a summary of these words as the topic name of the cluster. Figure 6 visualizes the 25 topic clusters with t-SNE (Van der Maaten & Hinton, 2008), where each color denotes a cluster. A full list of the 25 topics are shown in Appendix B.2. This experiment demonstrates the widespread of topics in ALLaVA, encompassing Natural Scenery, Fashion Accessories, Food Ingredients, Home Decor, Sports Events, Vehicle Parts, *etc.*, which potentially improves the generalizability of our model.

5 Experiments

5.1 Effects of the ALLaVA Dataset on Existing LVLMS

5.1.1 Settings

To show the effectiveness of ALLaVA, we perform ablated experiments on two popular lite VLMs, MobileVLM-v2 (Chu et al., 2023) and Mipha-3B (Zhu et al., 2024). MobileVLM-v2 is based on MobileLLaMA-2.7B-Chat (Liu et al., 2024) with CLIP (Radford et al., 2021) as the vision encoder. Mipha-3B is based on Phi-2 and SigLIP (Zhai et al., 2023) is used to encode images. We add Both models adopt a two-stage training paradigm, which our dataset fits in. In the ablated setting, we




Figure 8: Ablation of adopting ALLaVA in training MobileVLM-v2 (Chu et al., 2023) and Mipha-3B (Zhu et al., 2024). We use their respective source code for training our own versions of models.

solely add ALLaVA data to each stage and measure model performances on MMMU (Yue et al., 2023), MMVP (Tong et al., 2024), TextVQA (Singh et al., 2019), LLaVA-Bench (In-the-Wild) (Liu et al., 2023b) and TouchStone (Bai et al., 2023b).

5.1.2 Results and Analysis

Figure 8a and 8b show the results for MobileVLM-v2 and Mipha-3B, respectively. With the inclusion of ALLaVA data in both stages, performances of both models on all five benchmarks are boosted in various degree. Notably, model performances are largely advanced on MMVP, LLaVA-Bench and TouchStone. MMVP and TouchStone focus on testing basic perception ability of models, whereas LLaVA-Bench is designed to evaluate their cognition and reasoning ability in responding to complex queries. A significant boost on these datasets demonstrate the efficacy of incorporating ALLaVA to comprehensively enhance the performance of lite VLMs.

5.2 Comparison with Other LVLMS

5.2.1 Settings

Architecture Having proved the efficacy of ALLaVA on existing LVLMS, we intend to develop a series of LVLMS with different backbones to show the potential of ALLaVA. Our model architecture is identical to LLaVA-v1.5 (Liu et al., 2023a), which consists of a vision encoder (CLIP-ViT-L/14@336), a projector and an LLM (Phi-2-2.7B, StableLM-2-1.6B (Team, 2023) and Phi-3-mini-128K (Abdin et al., 2024)). We adopt two-stage training following LLaVA-v1.5 (Liu et al., 2023a). We train the projector and LM backbone, and freeze the vision encoder at both stages. More detailed training hyperparameters are shown in Appendix C.

Training Data We detail the training data in Appendix C.1, consisting of 149K text data, 795K caption data and 1,372K VQA data. The textual dataset (Chen et al., 2023b) consists of instructions from (Xu et al., 2023a) and answers generated by GPT4-Turbo (originally GPT3.5-Turbo). At pretraining stage, we randomly mix up one copy of caption data and *two* copies of textual data. The two copies of textual data aids to equip a base LLM with instruction following ability. At finetuning stage, we randomly mix up one copy of VQA data and one copy of textual data. The textual data are added to mitigate the catastrophic forgetting issue of LLM during visual instruction finetuning (Bai et al., 2023a).

Evaluation We evaluate our model performance on 1 textual benchmark and 14 multimodal benchmarks. We divide multimodal benchmarks into three subsets, *Perception*, *Cognition* and *Comprehensive* to differentiate the tested abilities. A full list of benchmarks, a brief introduction and metrics are shown in Appendix D.1.

5.2.2 Results and Analysis

Table 4 shows a comparison between ALLaVA models and other similar-scale and large-scale VLMs. In general, ALLaVA models outperform 4B-scale VLMs on most of the 17 benchmarks. Our models also perform on par with 7B or larger-scale VLMs

Table 4: Evaluation results on 1 textual benchmark and 16 multimodal benchmarks. * denotes the results of our evaluation. Vicuna-80 (Chiang et al., 2023); GQA (Hudson & Manning, 2019); HallB: HallusionBench (Guan et al., 2023); MME (Perception and Cognition) (Fu et al., 2023); MMVP (Tong et al., 2024); TS: TouchStone (Bai et al., 2023b); VQA^T : TextVQA (Singh et al., 2019); MV: MathVista (Lu et al., 2024); MM-Vet (Yu et al., 2023); MMMU^{val}: validation set of MMMU (Yue et al., 2023); SQA^I : ScienceQA-Image (Lu et al., 2022); LLaVA^W: LLaVA-Bench (In-the-Wild) (Liu et al., 2023b); MB: MLLM-Bench (Ge et al., 2023); MMB: MMBench (Liu et al., 2023c); SEED^{img}: image set of SEED-Bench-v1 (Li et al., 2023a); **Bold numbers** are the best results among all 4B-scale LVLMS.

Model	Benchmarks																
	Text		Perception					Cognition					Comprehensive				
	Vicuna-80	GQA	HallB	MME-P	MMVP	TS	VQA ^T	MME-C	MV	MM-Vet	MMMU ^{test}	SQA ^I	LLaVA ^W	MB	MMB-en	MMB-cn	SEED ^{img}
Large VLMs																	
BLIP-2 (Li et al., 2023b)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22.4	34.4	-	-	-	3.0*	-	-	49.7
InstructBLIP (Dai et al., 2023)	-	49.5	-	-	-	552.4	50.7	-	25.6	-	-	-	58.2	-	44.0	-	-
Qwen-VL-Chat (Bai et al., 2023a)	-	57.5	-	1487.6	-	-	61.5	360.7	-	31.1	-	68.2	-	-	60.6	56.7	65.4
LLaVA-1.5-7B (Liu et al., 2023a)	13.8*	62.0	36.6*	1504.4*	24.7*	594.9*	58.2	324.6*	25.0*	31.1	35.1*	66.8	65.4	23.0*	64.3	58.3	66.1
LLaVA-1.5-13B (Liu et al., 2023a)	22.5	63.3	36.5*	1531.3	38.0*	617.7*	61.3	295.4	28.3*	35.4	34.4*	71.6	72.5	-	67.7	63.6	68.2
LVIS-7B (Wang et al., 2023b)	-	62.6	-	-	-	-	58.7	-	-	31.5	-	-	67.0	29.0*	66.2	-	-
LVIS-13B (Wang et al., 2023b)	-	63.6*	-	-	-	-	62.5*	-	-	37.4*	-	-	71.3*	-	68.0*	-	-
ShareGPT4V-7B (Chen et al., 2023a)	13.8*	63.3	36.0*	1540.1*	34.0*	637.2*	60.4	346.1*	24.7*	37.6	35.4*	68.4*	72.6	30.2*	68.8	61.0*	69.7
ShareGPT4V-13B (Chen et al., 2023a)	17.5*	64.8	39.0*	1576.1*	35.3*	648.7*	62.2	309.3*	28.8*	43.1	35.6*	70.0*	79.9	35.5*	71.2	61.7*	70.8
4B-scale Lite VLMs																	
MobileVLM-v2 (Chu et al., 2023)	5.0*	61.1	30.8*	1440.5	18.7*	541.0*	57.5	261.8*	28.3*	26.1*	30.8*	70.0	53.2*	15.7*	63.2	43.2*	64.5*
Mipha-3B (Zhu et al., 2024)	16.2*	63.9	34.3*	1488.9	32.0*	619.0*	56.6	285.0*	27.8*	33.5*	35.8*	70.9	64.7*	23.1*	69.7	42.9*	71.2*
TinyLLaVA (Jia et al., 2024)	15.6*	62.1	37.2*	1465.5*	33.3*	663.5*	60.3	281.1*	30.3*	37.5	38.4	73.0	70.8*	29.8*	69.7*	42.8*	70.4*
Ours																	
ALLaVA-Phi2	49.4	48.8	24.8	1316.2	36.0	632.0	49.5	301.8	27.4	32.2	35.3	67.6	69.4	43.6	64.0	40.8	65.2
ALLaVA-StableLM2	38.8	49.8	25.3	1311.7	34.0	655.2	51.7	257.9	27.7	31.7	33.3	64.7	72.0	39.3	64.6	49.8	65.7
ALLaVA-Phi3	56.9	52.2	48.1	1382.3	32.7	667.8	53.0	347.1	32.9	37.8	41.1	64.0	68.5	54.8	68.1	55.3	69.0

Multimodal Perception The perception ability is largely dependent on 1) vision encoder with fine-grained representations and 2) training datasets with fine-grained annotations. ALLaVA models adopts CLIP as vision encoder, which yields features with more course granularity compared to SigLIP’s. This shortcoming is compensated with ALLaVA data. Thus, ALLaVA models are still able to outperform other 4B-scale models on several Perception benchmarks.

Multimodal Cognition The performance of ALLaVA models outperform other 4B-scale models on 6/7 cognition benchmarks. This result demonstrate that ALLaVA dataset is able to boost the cognitive ability, ore specifically on Math, complex reasoning and multimodal multi-discipline knowledge.

Language Ability We also include a textual benchmark to test the language ability of LVLMS after visual instruction tuning. All ALLaVA models score significantly higher than 4B-scale models. ALLaVA-Phi2, Mipha-3B and TinyLLaVA share the same backbone, but their performance gap is distinctive (49.4 v.s. 16.2 and 15.6). ALLaVA-Phi3 performs the best among the three lite ALLaVA models. The results indicate the importance of choosing a strong language backbone, as well as adding textual data to avoid catastrophic forgetting during instruction tuning (Bai et al., 2023a).

6 Conclusion

In this work, we propose a Caption-then-QA, a simple-yet effective strategy to generate high-quality captions, instructions ans answers. We open-source the synthesized dataset ALLaVA, which is so far the largest dataset with 1.3M samples for LVLm training. Ablation studies show that our dataset is excelled at boosting performance for lite VLMs, making them on par with larger VLMs on multiple benchmarks.

7 Limitation

Despite our significant efforts to enhance the quality of data, limitations still remain. Firstly, while *Caption-then-QA* strategy exceeds directly generating responses in terms of accuracy (Section 3.5), the answers are not completely accurate, indicating an area for ongoing refinement. Secondly, constrained by cost and effort, current version does not fully encompass multilingual content related to minority cultures. We anticipate that this issue can be addressed in future works, thereby enabling LVLMS to benefit a broader spectrum of groups.

References

- Marah Abdin, Sam Ade Jacobs, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jyoti Aneja, Ahmed Awadallah, Hany Awadalla, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Jianmin Bao, Harkirat Behl, Alon Ben-haim, Misha Bilenko, Johan Bjorck, Sébastien Bubeck, Qin Cai, Martin Cai, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Weizhu Chen, Vishrav Chaudhary, Dong Chen, Dongdong Chen, Yen-Chun Chen, Yi-Ling Chen, Parul Chopra, Xiyang Dai, Allie Del Giorno, Gustavo de Rosa, Matthew Dixon, Ronen Eldan, Victor Fragoso, Dan Iter, Mei Gao, Min Gao, Jianfeng Gao, Amit Garg, Abhishek Goswami, Suriya Gunasekar, Emman Haider, Junheng Hao, Russell J. Hewett, Jamie Huynh, Mojan Javaheripi, Xin Jin, Piero Kauffmann, Nikos Karampatziakis, Dongwoo Kim, Mahoud Khademi, Lev Kurilenko, James R. Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Yunsheng Li, Chen Liang, Lars Liden, Ce Liu, Mengchen Liu, Weishung Liu, Eric Lin, Zeqi Lin, Chong Luo, Piyush Madan, Matt Mazzola, Arindam Mitra, Hardik Modi, Anh Nguyen, Brandon Norick, Barun Patra, Daniel Perez-Becker, Thomas Portet, Reid Pryzant, Heyang Qin, Marko Radmilac, Corby Rosset, Sambudha Roy, Olatunji Ruwase, Olli Saarikivi, Amin Saied, Adil Salim, Michael Santacrose, Shital Shah, Ning Shang, Hiteshi Sharma, Swadheen Shukla, Xia Song, Masahiro Tanaka, Andrea Tupini, Xin Wang, Lijuan Wang, Chunyu Wang, Yu Wang, Rachel Ward, Guanhua Wang, Philipp Witte, Haiping Wu, Michael Wyatt, Bin Xiao, Can Xu, Jiahang Xu, Weijian Xu, Sonali Yadav, Fan Yang, Jianwei Yang, Ziyi Yang, Yifan Yang, Donghan Yu, Lu Yuan, Chengruidong Zhang, Cyril Zhang, Jianwen Zhang, Li Lyna Zhang, Yi Zhang, Yue Zhang, Yunan Zhang, and Xiren Zhou. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone, 2024.
- 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/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pp. 8948–8957, 2019.
- Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-vl: A versatile vision-language model for understanding, localization, text reading, and beyond, 2023a.
- Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Jinze Bai, Peng Wang, Xingxuan Zhang, Junyang Lin, Xinggang Wang, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Touchstone: Evaluating vision-language models by language models, 2023b.
- David M Blei, Andrew Y Ng, and Michael I Jordan. Latent dirichlet allocation. *Journal of machine Learning research*, 3(Jan):993–1022, 2003.
- Soravit Changpinyo, Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, and Radu Soricut. Conceptual 12m: Pushing web-scale image-text pre-training to recognize long-tail visual concepts, 2021.
- Lin Chen, Jisong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Conghui He, Jiaqi Wang, Feng Zhao, and Dahua Lin. Sharegpt4v: Improving large multi-modal models with better captions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12793*, 2023a.
- Zhihong Chen, Feng Jiang, Junying Chen, Tiannan Wang, Fei Yu, Guiming Chen, Hongbo Zhang, Juhao Liang, Chen Zhang, Zhiyi Zhang, Jianquan Li, Xiang Wan, Benyou Wang, and Haizhou Li. Phoenix: Democratizing chatgpt across languages, 2023b.
- Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality, March 2023. URL <https://lmsys.org/blog/2023-03-30-vicuna/>.
- Xiangxiang Chu, Limeng Qiao, Xinyang Lin, Shuang Xu, Yang Yang, Yiming Hu, Fei Wei, Xinyu Zhang, Bo Zhang, Xiaolin Wei, and Chunhua Shen. Mobilevlm : A fast, strong and open vision language assistant for mobile devices, 2023.
- Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale Fung, and Steven Hoi. Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning, 2023.

- Chaoyou Fu, Peixian Chen, Yunhang Shen, Yulei Qin, Mengdan Zhang, Xu Lin, Jinrui Yang, Xiawu Zheng, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Yunsheng Wu, and Rongrong Ji. Mme: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for multimodal large language models, 2023.
- Wentao Ge, Shunian Chen, Guiming Chen, Junying Chen, Zhihong Chen, Shuo Yan, Chenghao Zhu, Ziyue Lin, Wenya Xie, Xidong Wang, Anningzhe Gao, Zhiyi Zhang, Jianquan Li, Xiang Wan, and Benyou Wang. Mllm-bench, evaluating multi-modal llms using gpt-4v, 2023.
- Tianrui Guan, Fuxiao Liu, Xiyang Wu, Ruiqi Xian, Zongxia Li, Xiaoyu Liu, Xijun Wang, Lichang Chen, Furong Huang, Yaser Yacoob, Dinesh Manocha, and Tianyi Zhou. Hallusionbench: An advanced diagnostic suite for entangled language hallucination & visual illusion in large vision-language models, 2023.
- Drew A. Hudson and Christopher D. Manning. Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering, 2019.
- IDEFICS. Introducing idefics: An open reproduction of state-of-the-art visual language model. <https://huggingface.co/blog/idefics>, 2023.
- Junlong Jia, Ying Hu, Xi Weng, Yiming Shi, Miao Li, Xingjian Zhang, Baichuan Zhou, Ziyu Liu, Jie Luo, Lei Huang, et al. Tinyllava factory: A modularized codebase for small-scale large multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11788*, 2024.
- Ranjay Krishna, Yuke Zhu, Oliver Groth, Justin Johnson, Kenji Hata, Joshua Kravitz, Stephanie Chen, Yannis Kalantidis, Li-Jia Li, David A. Shamma, Michael S. Bernstein, and Fei-Fei Li. Visual genome: Connecting language and vision using crowdsourced dense image annotations, 2016.
- Bohao Li, Rui Wang, Guangzhi Wang, Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, and Ying Shan. Seed-bench: Benchmarking multimodal llms with generative comprehension, 2023a.
- Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation, 2022.
- Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models, 2023b.
- Lei Li, Zhihui Xie, Mukai Li, Shunian Chen, Peiyi Wang, Liang Chen, Yazheng Yang, Benyou Wang, and Lingpeng Kong. Silk: Preference distillation for large visual language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10665*, 2023c.
- Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, Lubomir Bourdev, Ross Girshick, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Piotr Dollár. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context, 2015.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning, 2023a.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning, 2023b.
- Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhang, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, Kai Chen, and Dahua Lin. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player?, 2023c.
- Zechun Liu, Changsheng Zhao, Forrest Iandola, Chen Lai, Yuandong Tian, Igor Fedorov, Yunyang Xiong, Ernie Chang, Yangyang Shi, Raghuraman Krishnamoorthi, Liangzhen Lai, and Vikas Chandra. Mobilellm: Optimizing sub-billion parameter language models for on-device use cases, 2024.
- Pan Lu, Swaroop Mishra, Tony Xia, Liang Qiu, Kai-Wei Chang, Song-Chun Zhu, Oyvind Tafjord, Peter Clark, and Ashwin Kalyan. Learn to explain: Multimodal reasoning via thought chains for science question answering, 2022.
- Pan Lu, Hritik Bansal, Tony Xia, Jiacheng Liu, Chunyuan Li, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Hao Cheng, Kai-Wei Chang, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. Mathvista: Evaluating mathematical reasoning of foundation models in visual contexts, 2024.

Andrew Kachites McCallum. Mallet: A machine learning for language toolkit. <http://mallet.cs.umass.edu>, 2002.

Anand Mishra, Shashank Shekhar, Ajeet Kumar Singh, and Anirban Chakraborty. Ocr-vqa: Visual question answering by reading text in images. In *2019 international conference on document analysis and recognition (ICDAR)*, pp. 947–952. IEEE, 2019.

OpenAI. Gpt-4v(ision) system card. https://cdn.openai.com/papers/GPTV_System_Card.pdf, 2023.

OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mo Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix, Simón Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Kiros, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kosic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rajeev Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Long Ouyang, Cullen O’Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine Thompson, Phil Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayvergiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu, Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023.

Vicente Ordonez, Girish Kulkarni, and Tamara Berg. Im2text: Describing images using 1 million captioned photographs. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.

- Zarana Parekh, Jason Baldridge, Daniel Cer, Austin Waters, and Yinfei Yang. Crisscrossed captions: Extended intramodal and intermodal semantic similarity judgments for ms-coco. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.15020*, 2020.
- 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, 2021.
- Christoph Schuhmann, Richard Vencu, Romain Beaumont, Robert Kaczmarczyk, Clayton Mullis, Aarush Katta, Theo Coombes, Jenia Jitsev, and Aran Komatsuzaki. Laion-400m: Open dataset of clip-filtered 400 million image-text pairs, 2021.
- Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, Patrick Schramowski, Srivatsa Kundurthy, Katherine Crowson, Ludwig Schmidt, Robert Kaczmarczyk, and Jenia Jitsev. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models, 2022.
- Piyush Sharma, Nan Ding, Sebastian Goodman, and Radu Soricut. Conceptual captions: A cleaned, hypernymed, image alt-text dataset for automatic image captioning. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 2556–2565, 2018.
- Amanpreet Singh, Vivek Natarjan, Meet Shah, Yu Jiang, Xinlei Chen, Devi Parikh, and Marcus Rohrbach. Towards vqa models that can read. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 8317–8326, 2019.
- Stability AI Language Team. Stable Im 2 1.6b, 2023. URL <https://huggingface.co/stabilityai/stablelm-2-1.6b>.
- Shengbang Tong, Zhuang Liu, Yuexiang Zhai, Yi Ma, Yann LeCun, and Saining Xie. Eyes wide shut? exploring the visual shortcomings of multimodal llms, 2024.
- Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. Visualizing data using t-sne. *Journal of machine learning research*, 9(11), 2008.
- Guan Wang, Sijie Cheng, Xianyu Zhan, Xiangang Li, Sen Song, and Yang Liu. Openchat: Advancing open-source language models with mixed-quality data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.11235*, 2023a.
- Junke Wang, Lingchen Meng, Zejia Weng, Bo He, Zuxuan Wu, and Yu-Gang Jiang. To see is to believe: Prompting gpt-4v for better visual instruction tuning, 2023b.
- Weihan Wang, Qingsong Lv, Wenmeng Yu, Wenyi Hong, Ji Qi, Yan Wang, Junhui Ji, Zhuoyi Yang, Lei Zhao, Xixuan Song, Jiazheng Xu, Bin Xu, Juanzi Li, Yuxiao Dong, Ming Ding, and Jie Tang. Cogvlm: Visual expert for pretrained language models, 2023c.
- Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12244*, 2023a.
- Zhiyang Xu, Trevor Ashby, Chao Feng, Rulin Shao, Ying Shen, Di Jin, Qifan Wang, and Lifu Huang. Vision-flan: scaling visual instruction tuning, Sep 2023b. URL <https://vision-flan.github.io/>.
- Peter Young, Alice Lai, Micah Hodosh, and Julia Hockenmaier. From image descriptions to visual denotations: New similarity metrics for semantic inference over event descriptions. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2:67–78, 2014.
- Weihao Yu, Zhengyuan Yang, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Kevin Lin, Zicheng Liu, Xinchao Wang, and Lijuan Wang. Mm-vet: Evaluating large multimodal models for integrated capabilities, 2023.

Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoqi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, Cong Wei, Botao Yu, Ruibin Yuan, Renliang Sun, Ming Yin, Boyuan Zheng, Zhenzhu Yang, Yibo Liu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhui Chen. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16502*, 2023.

Xiaohua Zhai, Basil Mustafa, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. Sigmoid loss for language image pre-training, 2023.

Yichen Zhu, Minjie Zhu, Ning Liu, Zhicai Ou, Xiaofeng Mou, and Jian Tang. Llava-phi: Efficient multi-modal assistant with small language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02330*, 2024.

A Data Distillation

A.1 Deduplication on LAION Samples

For the Laion data, we used images from the Laion-400M (Schuhmann et al., 2021) dataset. We filtered out high-resolution images with both width and height exceeding 512 pixels. Next, we excluded URLs potentially related to pornographic and violent content. Finally, we applied a semantic retriever to deduplicate the images. Using all-mpnet-base-v2⁴ as the encoder, we obtained the semantic embeddings of the image captions. We then filtered out images whose caption embeddings dot product similarity smaller than 440 for deduplication.

A.2 Prompt for Distilling LAION

```
### You are an excellent image describer and questioner
### You have three tasks in total
#### Your first task is to describe the given image as detailed as
    possible
#### Your second task is to ask a complex question that requires close
    inspection of the image and strong reasoning ability to answer, you
    should ask FIVE candidate questions in different aspects and diverse
    ways, then RANDOMLY choose one of them to answer
#### Your third task is to answer the question you raised solely based on
    the given image
### When you ask questions, try to find the most valuable information in
    the picture to ask about, and ask a question that is relevant to that
    information
### When you ask questions, do not involve violence, advertisement,
    possible invasion of privacy, or questions that may cause discomfort
### Do not mention anything from the prompt in your response
### You will follow the instructions to the best of your ability
### Your response should follow the following format
<start of description>
{description}
<end of description>
<start of candidate questions>
{candidate questions}
<end of candidate questions>
<start of question>
{question}
<end of question>
<start of answer>
{answer}
<end of answer>
```

A.3 Prompt for Distilling Vision-FLAN

```
You are an excellent image describer.

Your task is to first describe an image and then answer a question.

Your description should include details about the main subjects,
background elements, colors, and any notable features. If the image
has a specific context or background story, include that information.
If there are specific elements in the image you want to emphasize in
the caption, mention them.
```

⁴<https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/all-mpnet-base-v2>

Your answer should provide relevant information to the question and demonstrate the process of solving the question.

Both your description and answer should be professional, insightful, helpful, objective, unbiased.

For scenarios where bias has been traditionally an issue, make sure that key traits such as gender and race are specified and in an unbiased way in the description -- for example, prompts that contain references to specific occupations.

If the question tries to induce you to produce something against ethical rules, such as leaking personal information or making discriminative judgements on underrepresented groups, you must point out the inappropriate intent and refuse to answer the question.

Here is the question:

```
```question
{question}
```
```

Your output should follow the format below:

```
<start of description>
{description}
<end of description>

<start of detailed answer>
{detailed_answer}
<end of detailed answer>
```

A.4 Data Example

In Table 5, we show two examples from each of the datasets, with an image, a caption of the image, a question, and an answer. The **entries in bold** are generated by GPT-4V using our data generation protocol.

A.5 Manual Inspection on Subsets of VFLAN



To verify the quality of the generated data, we uniformly sampled 100 pieces of data according to the original categories of vflan and conducted a detailed manual inspection. The inspection results are shown in Table 1. During the inspection, we found that the method of captioning first and then answering, by providing a detailed description of the image beforehand, reduced the occurrence of hallucinations by the model. As shown in the Figure 9, in the answers without prior captioning, the model incorrectly assumed that the blur in the image had directionality, thus concluding that the blur was caused by motion. However, in the case where captioning was done first and then answering, the model accurately identified the blur in the image as defocus blur, thanks to the help of the caption. This further demonstrates the advantage of captioning first and then answering.

B Details of Topic Analysis

B.1 Prompt for Topic Name Generation


Given a list of ten words per cluster, we leverage GPT-4 to generate a topic name based on these keywords with the prompt shown in Figure 10.

Table 5: Examples of our data. **Entries in bold** are generated by GPT-4V using our data generation protocol.

LAION	
	
LAION Caption	Paleo Diet Fig Newton Cupcakes
Fine-grained Caption	<p>The image features a close-up view of a single cupcake with a creamy white frosting on top, placed on a dark-colored metal stand with slender, branch-like supports. The cupcake is centered in the frame and is positioned on a circular platform that is part of the stand. On top of the frosting, there is a garnish that appears to be a slice of candied fruit, possibly a fig, with visible seeds and a caramelized exterior, which adds a touch of elegance to the presentation. The cupcake liner has a fluted design and is a golden yellow color, suggesting it might be made of a buttery or vanilla-flavored cake. In the background, slightly out of focus, there is another cupcake with a bite taken out of it, revealing a dark filling, possibly chocolate or fruit jam. The background is a soft, neutral color, providing a contrast that highlights the cupcake in the foreground.</p>
Complex Reasoning Instruction	Considering the visual cues present in the image, what might be the flavor profile of the cupcake and how does the garnish on top contribute to the overall taste experience?
Detailed Answer	<p>Based on the image, the cupcake likely has a sweet and rich flavor profile, with the golden yellow cake suggesting a vanilla or buttery base. The creamy white frosting adds a layer of sweetness and a smooth texture. The garnish on top appears to be a slice of candied fig, which would contribute a chewy texture and a complex sweetness with hints of caramelization. The seeds within the fig slice would also add a slight crunch, creating a varied mouthfeel. Overall, the garnish not only serves as an aesthetically pleasing decoration but also enhances the flavor experience with its unique taste and texture.</p>
Vision-FLAN	
	
Fine-grained Caption	<p>The image depicts a pastoral scene at what appears to be a livestock show. In the foreground, a row of individuals, primarily wearing white coats, are leading a line of large, tan and white animals across a grassy field. These animals, with their distinctive humped backs and white patches, are cattle, likely a specific breed given the context of the event. In the background, there's a large white tent labeled "Members", suggesting an exclusive area or services for participants or special guests. The landscape features rolling hills, and the sky is partly cloudy, allowing for patches of blue sky and sunlight to enhance the bucolic atmosphere. No other animal species are visible in the frame.</p>
Instruction	<p>Given an image of an animal, identify the kind of animal in the image. The picture could be of more popular animals that are visible around zoos or are sometimes domesticated at home. They could also sometimes be found in the wild. Options: (a) This image contains a giraffe (b) This image contains an elephant (c) This image contains a zebra (d) This image contains a sheep (e) This image contains a bear (f) This image contains a horse (g) This image contains a cow (h) This image contains a cat (i) This image contains a dog (j) This image contains a bird</p>
VFLAN Answer	(g) This image contains a cow
Detailed Answer	<p>The animals in the image are cattle, more commonly referred to as cows. This determination is made clear by their physical characteristics—large size, humped backs, distinctive color patterns, and the presence of horns in some individuals. Given the setting of a livestock show, these cows are likely to be a breed prized for either dairy or beef production. They are being shown off by handlers, which is typical in such events where animals are judged based on breed standards or other criteria. Therefore, the correct answer from the provided options is: (g) This image contains a cow.</p>

B.2 Full List of Topics

Table 6 shows a full list of topics generated by LDA and GPT-4.



Question: Given a blurred picture, identify the type of blur in the image, it can be blurred in different ways

Options:

- (a) The image is corrupt, the specific corruption type is Zoom blur
- (b) The image is corrupt, the specific corruption type is Glass blur
- (c) The image is corrupt, the specific corruption type is Motion blur
- (d) The image is corrupt, the specific corruption type is Defocus blur

Answer w/o caption: The image is corrupt, the specific corruption type is **Motion blur (c)**. You can tell because **the blur appears to be directional**, suggesting movement either of the camera or the subject in one direction, which is characteristic of motion blur.

Answer w caption: The image appears to be suffering from a type of corruption that has affected its clarity. Given the provided options, the type of blur can be identified by certain characteristics:

... (d) Defocus blur occurs when the subject or a part of the image is out of the camera's focus range, **resulting in a general softness without streaks or directional smudging ... most closely resembles defocus blur (d) ...**

Figure 9: Comparison between answer without captioning and answer with caption. The parts marked in **red** indicate errors in the answers, while the parts marked in **green** indicate the correct portions of the answers. These markings are used solely for better visualization purposes.

```
I will provide you with a list of words obtained from LDA analysis.
I want you to summarize the list of words using **1~2 words**.
You should only output the summary.
```list of words
{str(key_words)}
```
```

Figure 10: Prompt for generate topic names

Table 6: Full list of topics generated by LDA and GPT-4.

| Topic Name | List of Keywords | Proportion |
|------------------------------|---|------------|
| Scientific Research | cell, cost, class, phase, equation, sample, treatment, brain, decrease, variable | 4.1% |
| Entertainment & Collectibles | mask, costume, film, armor, figurine, smoke, movie, skateboard, moon, soldier | 4.0% |
| Physical Appearance | fair, lip, finger, mustache, beard, complexion, nondescript, contemplative, indistinct, shoulder_length | 4.0% |
| Artistic Writing | ribbon, bow, script, decorate, cursive, lettering, handwritten, multicolore, stamp, bubble | 3.9% |
| Fashion Accessories | diamond, sheen, pendant, zipper, bead, backpack, earring, weave, compartment, pad | 4.0% |
| Geometric Orientation | triangle, centrally, marker, occupy, outer, orient, diagonal, triangular, providing, website_address | 3.9% |
| Hardware Components | hole, blade, mechanical, screw, grip, temperature, connector, port, assembly, slot | 4.0% |
| Nature Seasons | snow, forest, sunlight, rugged, canopy, sparse, autumn, bare, spring, desert | 4.0% |
| Urban Environment | truck, bus, sidewalk, overhead, pole, pedestrian, shop, bustle, signage, coin | 4.0% |
| Artistic Drawing | sketch, monochromatic, elephant, train, drawing, feather, minimalistic, artistic, realistic, grayscale | 4.0% |
| Vehicle Parts | motorcycle, bike, bicycle, tire, hood, rim, headlight, rubber, rider, damage | 3.9% |
| Food Ingredients | slice, dish, cake, ingredient, chocolate, vegetable, cheese, apple, pizza, flavor | 4.2% |
| Sports & Aviation | fuselage, military, stadium, baseball, registration, sock, football, airplane, jet, identification | 3.9% |
| Professional Achievements | headline, publication, entity, award, certificate, political, research, skill, paragraph, strategy | 4.1% |
| Kitchen Items | countertop, cabinet, sink, jar, lid, knob, keyboard, liquid, rack, basket | 3.9% |
| Home Decor | carpet, lamp, vase, string, sofa, curtain, sheet, guitar, cozy, instrument | 4.0% |
| Nature & Biology | petal, elongate, stem, organic, tiny, butterfly, translucent, fluffy, delicate, breed | 4.0% |
| Technology Services | lens, tablet, mobile, customer, app, audio, template, ticket, channel, log | 4.1% |
| Fashion Items | sleeveless, wrist, skirt, trouser, garment, knee, jean, sneaker, heel, neckline | 4.1% |
| Artistic Items | desk, vest, tattoo, discern, nondescript, indistinct, sticker, artist, notebook, difficult | 3.9% |
| Historical Artifacts | classical, sculpture, statue, crown, th_century, shield, dial, robe, religious, inscription | 4.0% |
| Sports Event | horse, spectator, tank, crowd, basketball, athletic, athlete, court, midst, intense | 4.0% |
| Gardening Construction | garden, bench, rail, palm, flank, greenery, nail, tropical, construct, plank | 4.0% |
| Event Celebration | boy, girl, outdoors, pool, venue, celebration, bouquet, joyful, wedding, member | 4.0% |
| Natural Scenery | tower, river, early_morne, sand, sunlight, dusk, wind, ocean, tranquil, late_afternoon | 4.0% |

C Training details

C.1 Training data

Table 7 summarizes the training data for ALLaVA models.

Table 7: Training datasets for ALLaVA models. We include OpenChat (Wang et al., 2023a) in *Text*, ShareGPT4V (Chen et al., 2023a) in *Caption* and llava_instruct_657K (Liu et al., 2023a) in *VQA*.

| Stage | Type | Name | #Ex. | #Epoch | Type Total | Stage Total |
|-------|----------------|--|--------------|--------|------------|-------------|
| PT. | <i>Text</i> | Evol-Instruct-GPT4-Turbo-143K
OpenChat | 143K
6K | 2 | 298K | 1,042K |
| | <i>Caption</i> | ALLaVA-Caption-4V
ShareGPT4V | 664K
80K | 1 | 744K | |
| FT. | <i>Text</i> | Evol-Instruct-GPT4-Turbo-143K
OpenChat | 143K
6K | 1 | 149K | 1,469K |
| | <i>VQA</i> | ALLaVA-Instruct-4V
llava_instruct_657K | 663K
657K | 1 | 1,320K | |

C.2 Hyperparameters

We detail the training hyperparameters for ALLaVA models in Table 8.

C.3 Computation Resources

All experiments are conducted on a single 8*A800 GPU node. We show the training time of each model in Table 9.

D Evaluation

D.1 Details on Benchmarks

The benchmarks employed in this study are detailed below.

Vicuna-80 (Chiang et al., 2023); GQA (Hudson & Manning, 2019); HallB: HallusionBench (Guan et al., 2023); MME (Perception and Cognition) (Fu et al., 2023); MMVP (Tong et al., 2024); TS: TouchStone (Bai et al., 2023b); VQA^T: TextVQA (Singh et al., 2019); MV: MathVista (Lu et al., 2024); MM-Vet (Yu et al., 2023); MMMU^{val}: validation set of MMMU (Yue et al., 2023); SQA^I: ScienceQA-Image (Lu et al., 2022); LLaVA^W: LLaVA-Bench (In-the-Wild) (Liu et al., 2023b); MB: MLLM-Bench (Ge et al., 2023); MMB: MMBench (Liu et al., 2023c); SEED^{img}_{v1}: image set of SEED-Bench-v1 (Li et al., 2023a);

- GQA (Hudson & Manning, 2019) consists of 12,578 questions for real-world reasoning and compositional question answering. *Accuracy* is used as the metric.
- HallB: HallusionBench (Guan et al., 2023) is composed of 254 samples for evaluating the hallucination problem of LVLMs. *Accuracy* is used as the metric.
- MME (Fu et al., 2023) is a benchmark with 2,374 questions spanning 14 subtasks. *Accuracy* is used as the metric.
- MMVP (Tong et al., 2024) is a benchmark aiming to test “CLIP-blind” pairs. *Accuracy* is used as the metric.
- TouchStone (Bai et al., 2023b) contains 908 open-ended question covering 5 abilities and 27 subtasks. LVLm’s answers are compared with pre-generated text-based GPT-4’s answers,

Table 8: Training hyperparameters.

| Stage | Name | Value |
|-------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | Global Batch Size | 256 |
| | Deepspeed ZeRO Stage | 1 |
| | Optimizer | AdamW |
| | Weight Decay | 0 |
| | Scheduler | Cosine Annealing with Linear Warmup |
| | Warmup Ratio | 0.03 |
| | Max LR | $2e - 5$ |
| | Min LR | $2e - 6$ |
| | Precision | BF16 |
| 2 | Global Batch Size | 128 |
| | Deepspeed ZeRO Stage | 1 |
| | Optimizer | AdamW |
| | Weight Decay | 0 |
| | Scheduler | Cosine Annealing with Linear Warmup |
| | Warmup Ratio | 0.03 |
| | Max LR | $2e - 5$ |
| | Min LR | $2e - 6$ |
| | Precision | BF16 |

Table 9: Training time (in hour) for each ALLaVA model on a single 8*A800 GPU node.

| Model | PT. | FT. |
|------------------|-----|------|
| ALLaVA-Phi2 | 8.3 | 10.6 |
| ALLaVA-StableLM2 | 4.0 | 11.2 |
| ALLaVA-Phi3 | ~18 | ~24 |

using text-based GPT-4 as the judge to score each answer. The *Averaged Scores* are used as the metric.

- TextVQA (Singh et al., 2019) comprises 5,000 questions and *Accuracy* is used as the metric.
- MathVista (Lu et al., 2024) consists of 6,141 samples aiming to test the mathematical reasoning ability of LVLMs.
- MM-Vet (Yu et al., 2023) comprises 218 questions, each requiring multiple capabilities to solve and provided with multiple groundtruths for a flexible match. *Accuracy* is adopted as the metric.
- MMMU (Yue et al., 2023) (val set) consists of 900 multiple-choice questions that require expert-level knowledge to solve. *Accuracy* is adopted as the metric.
- ScienceQA (Lu et al., 2022) contains 4,201 questions encompassing different subjects and categories. *Accuracy* is adopted as the metric.
- LLaVA-Bench (In-the-Wild) (Liu et al., 2023b) contains 60 open-ended questions and uses text-based GPT-4 (OpenAI et al., 2023) as a judge to score answers in a pairwise fashion. *Score Ratio* between candidate answers and anchor answers from GPT-4 is adopted as the metric.
- MLLM-Bench (Ge et al., 2023) contains 420 complex visual reasoning questions along with per-sample criteria that aids GPT-4V to score each answer. LLaVA-v1.5-13B’s answers serve as anchors. *Win rate over the anchor* is adopted as the metric.
- MMBench (Liu et al., 2023c) (dev set) consists of 4,329 multiple-choice questions across 20 ability dimensions, using *Accuracy* under circular evaluation as the metric.
- SEED-Bench-v1 (Li et al., 2023a) (image set) comprises 14,233 multiple-choice questions across 9 dimensions. *Accuracy* is adopted as the metric.

D.2 Evaluation Prompt for Vicuna-80

```
You are a fair judge. You will be provided with a question and two
  answers. Your task is to judge which answer is of better quality.
Here is the question:
{question}

Here is Answer1:
{answer1}

Here is Answer2:
{answer2}

Your output should be either "Answer1" or "Answer2".
```

E Acknowledgement

ALLaVA dataset is for research purpose only. Please carefully check the licenses of the original datasets (VFLAN and LAION-400M) before using ALLaVA as we do not own the images. The images may be taken down at any time when requested by the original dataset owners or owners of the referenced images. If you hope to take down any images, please raise an issue on our Huggingface Repository.