

UTRUAL HALLUCINATION

Definition, Quantification, and Prescriptive Remediations

Anku Rani^{1*} Vipula Rawte^{1*} Harshad Sharma² Neeraj Anand³ Krishnav Rajbangshi⁴

Amit Sheth¹ Amitava Das¹

¹University of South Carolina, USA ²NIT Agartala, India

³IIT Dhanbad, India ⁴NIT Silchar, India

arani@mailbox.sc.edu amitava@mailbox.sc.edu

arXiv:2403.17306v2 [cs.AI] 31 Mar 2024



Figure 1: An illustration of hallucination across your multiple categories. Here, we have used VLMs like KOSMOS-2 (Peng et al., 2023), MiniGPT - v2 (Chen et al., 2023a), Sphinx (Lin et al., 2023) to generate captions, and the text in red color represents the particular word that is hallucinating and an added line for explanation.

Abstract

The troubling rise of *hallucination* presents perhaps the most significant impediment to the advancement of responsible AI. In recent times, considerable research has focused on detect-

ing and mitigating hallucination in Large Language Models (LLMs). However, it's worth noting that hallucination is also quite prevalent in Vision-Language models (VLMs). In this paper, we offer a fine-grained discourse on profiling VLM hallucination based on two tasks: i) *image captioning*, and ii) *Visual Ques-*

*Equal contribution

tion Answering (VQA). We delineate eight fine-grained orientations of visual hallucination: i) *Contextual Guessing*, ii) *Identity Incongruity*, iii) *Geographical Erratum*, iv) *Visual Illusion*, v) *Gender Anomaly*, vi) *VLM as Classifier*, vii) *Wrong Reading*, and viii) *Numeric Discrepancy*. We curate Visual Hallucination eLicitation (VHILT), a publicly available dataset comprising 2,000 samples generated using eight VLMs across two tasks of captioning and VQA along with human annotations for the categories as mentioned earlier.

Contributions

- Identification of Hallucination Categories: The paper identifies and categorizes various types of visual hallucinations in 8 VLMs. These include 8 categories listed in figure 1 and section 1.
- Creation of Visual Hallucination Dataset (VHILT): The dataset comprises 2000 samples using 8 contemporary VLMs. Human annotations for the identified categories are included as well (section 2).
- Mitigation Strategies: We propose three strategies to mitigate hallucinations within AI systems (section 3).

1 Visual Hallucination - an extensive categorization

Despite the rapid advances in Generative AI, policymakers (Janjeva et al.) are primarily concerned with the issue of hallucinations. These occurrences of *hallucinations* pose a significant risk of eroding trust in technology. For instance, when Google's Bard AI "hallucinated" during its initial public demonstration, Alphabet experienced a temporary loss of \$100 billion in market value (Olson, 2023).

The study of hallucinations for LLMs has recently attracted considerable attention (Rawte et al., 2023; Tonmoy et al., 2024). This paper delves into visual hallucination, a phenomenon notably prevalent in numerous recent VLMs. Given that this field is still emerging, it is imperative to initially comprehend, classify, and quantify these phenomena while establishing a benchmark. This will aid the scientific community in collectively addressing this issue. Therefore, this paper aims to provide a comprehensive categorization of VLM hallucinations. We defined eight categories of Visual Hallucination:

- **Contextual Guessing (CG)** alarming When the model generates unrelated elements that bear no resemblance to the subject at hand, highlighting the non-deterministic nature of the model.

- **Identity Incongruity (II)** alarming It's when the model can't differentiate between a person's real and fake identity traits, causing a mismatch with the predicted identity.
- **Geographic Erratum (GE)** alarming In this scenario, the model produces an inaccurate prediction or guess related to the geographical location or landmark of the place under consideration.
- **Visual Illusion (VI)** mild The model can be misled, creating a distorted perception that deviates from reality causing the model's output to be partially inaccurate due to a specific aspect of the image.
- **Gender Anomaly (GA)** mild The model provides an inaccurate representation of gender identity.
- **VLM as Classifier (VC)** mild This is a situation where the model's proficiency is assessed based on its ability to differentiate between two/more entities.
- **Wrong Reading (WR)** low When a text is engraved in an image, but the VLM read it wrong.
- **Numeric Discrepancy (ND)** low When the model encounters difficulty accurately counting the number of entities within the analyzed image leading to an inaccurate count.

VLMs are predominantly employed for two purposes: i) image captioning, and ii) Visual Question Answering. Hence, in curating the VHILT dataset, we have incorporated both of these applied aspects.

1.1 Caption Hallucination

Caption Hallucination, within the realm of VLMs, occurs when the VLM, after being provided with an image as input, produces descriptions or captions that either contain elements inconsistent with the image or omit important aspects of it as discussed in fig 1. This is otherwise known as *object hallucination*. The reasons behind this kind of hallucination, are multifaceted. Recent studies (Biten et al., 2022; Li et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2023) have demonstrated that factors such as *co-occurrence* and *uncertainty* are significant contributors. Additionally, the lack of alignment between visual and language annotations (Zhai et al., 2023), insufficient training objectives (Chen et al., 2023b), and language bias (Guan et al., 2023) have been

identified as prominent factors. It is evident that researchers have yet to make a consensus on the causality of visual hallucination, but prevalence of visual hallucination in VLMs necessitates to study of the phenomena further.

1.2 VQA Hallucination

In the domain of Visual Question Answering (VQA) for VLMs, hallucinations may appear as responses that contain references or descriptions that are incorrect (Gunjal et al., 2023). Unlike captioning, VQA requires both understanding the visual content of an image and comprehending the questions posed about it as presented in figure 2 and figure 3. Hallucinations in VQA may arise from the model’s inability to accurately interpret visual cues, grasp the context of the question, or generate suitable responses based on image features. Moreover, VQA systems may encounter challenges in complex object reasoning, where they struggle to correctly deduce intricate relationships between objects or scenes in the image, leading to inaccurate answers.



Figure 2: This describes the case of hallucination in the VQA task. The picture is processed by MiniGPT-4, and the model is asked about the content of the image. The response provided is "GRILL," falling into the hallucination category of Wrong Reading.

2 VLM dataset

The proliferation of Generative AI models has led to a significant surge in online misinformation, as outlined in the recent report (Commission, 2022) from the EU. Building on this inspiration, we aim to focus our collection of visual hallucination data on the news domain. As we annotate the hallucinations generated by VLMs, we also require gold standard, factually correct captions or answers. Hence, we opt for the *New York Times Twitter handle* (NewYorkTimes, 2024) as the trusted source of our factual data, over a period ranging from 2011 to 2021, covering a wide span multimodal data of 10 years. NYT tweets, being authored by professional journalists, are grammatically correct, devoid of wordplay, incomplete sentences, or other typical issues found in Twitter data.

We exclusively selected tweets containing images to investigate visual hallucination. Subsequently, we implemented a thorough data filtration process to refine the dataset. This process entailed eliminating duplicate tweets and irrelevant content, such as tweets related to word games (e.g., Wordles), crossword puzzles, spelling bees, etc. This ensured that only original and relevant information was retained for analysis. Furthermore, the filtration process involved removing tweets with non-English text. Furthermore, we removed hashtags and URLs, retaining only alphanumeric characters. We chose a random sample of 2000 datapoints to study visual hallucination.

2.1 Choice of VLMs: Rationale and Coverage

When selecting VLMs, we meticulously opted for state-of-the-art (SoTA) models for both tasks: i) image captioning, and ii) Visual Question Answering. The image captioning-based models comprise: (i) Kosmos-2 (Peng et al., 2023), (ii) MiniGPT-V2 (Chen et al., 2023a), and (iii) Sphinx (Lin et al., 2023). The VQA-based models include: (i) LLaVa (Liu et al., 2023b), (ii) MiniGPT-4 (Zhu et al., 2023), (iii) InstructBLIP (Dai et al., 2023), (iv) MultimodalGPT (Gong et al., 2023), and (v) MplugOwl (Ye et al., 2023). Appendix A discusses additional details about our selection criteria. Given the ever-evolving nature of the field, and **VLM** benchmark leaderboards will remain accessible to the research community, fostering an environment of continuous updates and contributions.

Caption hallucination: We began by using NYT news images and fed them into Kosmos-2, MiniGPT-V2, and Sphinx to generate text captions. At this point, we have the image, caption generated by VLMs, and the actual tweet aka news headline associated with the image obtained from NYT. We also have bounding boxes and grounding information obtained from the VLMs. We provided all this information to our in-house annotators and asked them two questions: i) *Do you observe any visual hallucinations in this VLM-generated caption? Please annotate it at the sentence level.* It’s worth noting that text captions may contain multiple sentences. ii) *If there is a visual hallucination, could you please describe its type?* Four in-house annotators were involved in the annotation process. After annotating 2000 instances, they collectively discussed and finalized the eight categories.

VQA hallucination: After finalizing all eight cate-




Figure 3: In the VQA task, we display examples across three categories, showcasing instances where the model produces hallucinatory outputs. Explanations for these are provided in each figure, with additional examples detailed in Appendix section C.

gories, we presented NYT images to the annotators and instructed them to compose specific questions that could potentially lead to visual hallucinations corresponding to those categories. For example, We recorded responses to those specific questions from all five VQA models: i) LLaVa, ii) MiniGPT-4, iii) InstructBLIP, iv) MultimodalGPT, and v) MplugOwl. Then, we asked annotators to indicate whether they detected any visual hallucination in the answers generated by those VLMs.

In summary, we observed two key points: i) There are instances where two or more hallucination categories are present, leading to confusion among annotators. We deliberately avoided multi-class classification at this point, ii) Additionally, we identified new types of hallucination beyond the eight prevalent categories. We deliberately excluded such instances with skewed categorical examples, as we believe they are rare cases and our focus is on investigating prevalent visual hallucination categories.

2.2 Annotation Process

The annotation process involved two steps. Initially, we annotated a small amount of data in-house, and then we expanded this process using the crowdsourcing service Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT). **Pilot in-house annotation** We conducted an extensive in-house study to categorize visual hallucinations, annotating 2,000 datapoints for both image captioning and VQA tasks.

Web interface for annotation: To facilitate the annotation process for the annotators, it is crucial

to provide them with a user-friendly interface that enables easy navigation. Figure 5 and 6 (c.f Appendix B.1) shows our annotation web interface used to construct the VHILT dataset for studying hallucination in captioning and VQA technique respectively.

Selecting quality annotators on AMT: It is widely acknowledged that platforms like AMT can be noisy, making the selection of high-quality annotators a critical step in ensuring accurate annotations. The in-house annotation of 2,000 data points played a significant role in achieving this goal. To identify reliable annotators, we initiated a pilot task and only selected those with an accuracy rate of over 90% based on our in-house annotated dataset. Further discussion regarding compensation etc please refer to Appendix section B.

3 Hallucination Mitigation - an emerging research paradigm

Visual hallucination has recently garnered research attention. However, to our knowledge, none of the previous studies have delved into a comprehensive categorization of visual hallucinations like ours. We identify three major families of mitigation techniques proposed so far: i) *data-driven approaches*, ii) *training adjustments*, and iii) *post-processing techniques*. A detailed taxonomy of this classification is presented in Figure 4.

Data-driven approaches: The data-driven approach to mitigate hallucination involves acquiring manually labeled visual hallucination data, followed by fine-tuning or devising techniques based on this data to mitigate hallucination in VLMs. The techniques proposed here partially fall under data-driven techniques, as we have also created the **VHILT** dataset. (Gunjal et al., 2023) presented M-HalDetect, a multi-modal hallucination detection dataset emphasizing detailed image descriptions. The authors utilized images from popular datasets like MS COCO and employed VQA models such as InstructBLIP to generate detailed descriptions of given images with the instruction "*Provide an intricate description of the image, capturing its visual elements, including colors*". The generated descriptions were then manually examined to identify any hallucinations. As mitigation techniques, the authors proposed two reinforcement learning-based reward models: a) a multimodal reward model, and b) Fine-grained Direct Preference Optimization (FDPO). They fine-tuned a VQA model based




Figure 4: Taxonomy of hallucination mitigation techniques in VLMs, showcasing various data-driven, training adjustments and post-processing techniques for mitigating hallucinations in VLMs.

on these reward models and claimed to achieve approximately 50% reduction in hallucination. This study closely relates to the topic discussed in our paper; however, our study offers a more comprehensive categorization of hallucination. We examined three captioning models and five different VQA models. Additionally, we argue that fine-tuning reward models on similar data may lead to overfitting. Therefore, whether this 50% improvement is transferrable to other domains, such as news in our case, remains an open question.

In (Liu et al., 2023a), the authors introduced the LRV-Instruction tuning dataset, consisting of 120k visual instructions generated by GPT4 across 16 vision-and-language tasks. They categorized visual hallucination into two classes: Nonexistent Element Manipulation and Existent Element Manipulation. Their proposed method, GPT4-Assisted Visual Instruction Evaluation (GAVIE), aims to evaluate visual instruction tuning without human-annotated ground truth. While promising, we advocate for a more detailed categorization of visual hallucination. Additionally, our manual crafting of categorical questions offers advantages over GPT4-based automatic question creation.

Training adjustments: Training adjustments encompass modifications made to the training process of VLMs with the goal of enhancing their ability to generate fewer hallucinations. There are three kinds of major training adjustments proposed so far - a) new decoding strategy, b) changing pre-training objective and c) visual grounding integration. In (Leng et al., 2023), Visual Contrastive Decoding (VCD) was introduced to address object hallucinations by introducing controlled uncertainty using Gaussian noise. VCD involves three stages: injecting Gaussian noise into the original image, generating two sets of textual outputs—one for the original image and one for the distorted version using dual-stream decoding, and calculating a contrastive distribution to sample words consistent with both ver-

sions of the image, thereby reducing object hallucinations. However, it’s important to note that this approach specifically targeted object hallucinations. In (Dai et al., 2022), ObjMLM was introduced as a straightforward yet effective approach to enhance object-level image-text alignment and mitigate object hallucination. ObjMLM functions similarly to Masked Language Modeling (MLM) loss, but it specifically targets objects mentioned in the text that also appear in the input image. By masking out these objects during training, ObjMLM guides the model to generate only objects that correspond to those in the image, thereby reducing the occurrence of false or nonexistent objects. It’s worth mentioning that this method focuses exclusively on object hallucination. In (Tong et al., 2024), Mixture-of-Features (MoF) was proposed to address hallucination and enhance visual grounding in Multimodal LLMs. This method integrates features from different visual encoders, such as the pre-trained Contrastive Language-Image Pre-Training (CLIP) model (Radford et al., 2021), known for its text-image alignment, and the vision-only self-supervised DINOv2 model (Oquab et al., 2023), renowned for fine-grained recognition. They introduced two methods of integration: Additive-MoF (A-MoF), which linearly combines features from CLIP and DINOv2, prioritizing DINOv2 for better grounding but sacrificing instruction-following ability. Interleaved-MoF (I-MoF) spatially mixes visual tokens from both CLIP and DINOv2 models, achieving robust grounding while preserving instruction-following capabilities. While this paper does touch upon visual hallucination to some extent, it’s important to note that the aforementioned techniques are solely evaluated on visual grounding.

Post-processing techniques: Post-processing techniques involve methods applied after the model’s inference process to refine and correct its outputs. This method family can be compared with Retrieval

Augmented Generation (RAG), which is quite popular for hallucination mitigation in LLMs.

In (Yin et al., 2023), Woodpecker was introduced as a training-free method employing a five-stage framework for diagnosing and refining model responses to correct hallucinations. The primary aim of Woodpecker is to enhance the factuality of the generated content from MLLMs by refining the responses and modifying the hallucinated parts. In (Lee et al., 2023), VOLCANO was introduced as a technique aimed at mitigating multimodal hallucination by leveraging self-feedback. VOLCANO operates by iteratively refining model responses using both natural language feedback and visual information. Initially, the method generates a response based on the provided image and question. Subsequently, it iteratively revises this response until further improvement is deemed unnecessary. This iterative refinement process is guided by self-feedback, enabling the model to correct hallucinated responses by incorporating detailed visual information. In (Zhou et al., 2023), LVLM Hallucination Revisor (LURE) was proposed as a post-processing algorithm aimed at rectifying object hallucination in LVLMs. LURE is designed to rectify object hallucination by revising the generated descriptions to align more closely with the actual content of the images. To create the revisor, the authors first generate a hallucinatory dataset using GPT-3.5 by making two modifications to the original correct captions. First, they insert additional object texts into the description that are likely to co-occur with the objects contained in the initial description. This modification allows LURE to learn to disentangle such co-occurrence patterns effectively. Second, they replace uncertain objects or those at the end of descriptions with a placeholder tag, encouraging the revisor to re-evaluate these objects. Once trained on the hallucinatory dataset, the revisor can seamlessly integrate with any LVLM to correct potential hallucinatory descriptions.

4 Conclusion

The enthusiasm and achievements surrounding Generative AI models have led to their widespread adoption, and this trend is only expected to flourish. However, one of the most significant challenges faced by these models today is hallucination. **VLM-HALL** benchmark will be publicly open for further collaborative updates.

5 Ethics Statement

Through our experiments, we have uncovered the susceptibility of VLMs to hallucination. However, we must address the potential misuse of our findings by malicious entities who may exploit AI-generated images, such as creating indistinguishable fake news from human-written content. We vehemently discourage such misuse and strongly advise against it.

References

- Ali Furkan Biten, Lluís Gómez, and Dimosthenis Karatzas. 2022. Let there be a clock on the beach: Reducing object hallucination in image captioning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 1381–1390.
- Jun Chen, Deyao Zhu, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, Zechun Liu, Pengchuan Zhang, Raghuraman Krishnamoorthi, Vikas Chandra, Yunyang Xiong, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. 2023a. [Minigt-v2: large language model as a unified interface for vision-language multi-task learning](#).
- Zhiyang Chen, Yousong Zhu, Yufei Zhan, Zhaowen Li, Chaoyang Zhao, Jinqiao Wang, and Ming Tang. 2023b. Mitigating hallucination in visual language models with visual supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16479*.
- European Commission. 2022. [Eu code of conduct against online hate speech: latest evaluation shows slowdown in progress](#).
- W Dai, J Li, D Li, AMH Tiong, J Zhao, W Wang, B Li, P Fung, and S Hoi. 2023. Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning. *arXiv 2023. arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06500*.
- Wenliang Dai, Zihan Liu, Ziwei Ji, Dan Su, and Pascale Fung. 2022. Plausible may not be faithful: Probing object hallucination in vision-language pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07688*.
- Tao Gong, Chengqi Lyu, Shilong Zhang, Yudong Wang, Miao Zheng, Qian Zhao, Kuikun Liu, Wenwei Zhang, Ping Luo, and Kai Chen. 2023. Multimodal-gpt: A vision and language model for dialogue with humans. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04790*.
- Tianrui Guan, Fuxiao Liu, Xiyang Wu, Ruiqi Xian, Zongxia Li, Xiaoyu Liu, Xijun Wang, Lichang Chen, Furong Huang, Yaser Yacoob, and Dinesh Manocha Tianyi Zhou. 2023. Hallusionbench: An advanced diagnostic suite for entangled language hallucination & visual illusion in large vision-language models. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2310.
- Anisha Gunjal, Jihan Yin, and Erhan Bas. 2023. Detecting and preventing hallucinations in large vision language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06394*.

- Ardi Janjeva, Alexander Harris, Sarah Sarah, Alexander Kasprzyk, and Anna Gausen. [The rapid rise of generative ai](#).
- Seongyun Lee, Sue Hyun Park, Yongrae Jo, and Minjoon Seo. 2023. Volcano: Mitigating multimodal hallucination through self-feedback guided revision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07362*.
- Sicong Leng, Hang Zhang, Guanzheng Chen, Xin Li, Shijian Lu, Chunyan Miao, and Lidong Bing. 2023. Mitigating object hallucinations in large vision-language models through visual contrastive decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16922*.
- Yifan Li, Yifan Du, Kun Zhou, Jinpeng Wang, Wayne Xin Zhao, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2023. Evaluating object hallucination in large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10355*.
- Ziyi Lin, Chris Liu, Renrui Zhang, Peng Gao, Longtian Qiu, Han Xiao, Han Qiu, Chen Lin, Wenqi Shao, Keqin Chen, Jiaming Han, Siyuan Huang, Yichi Zhang, Xuming He, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Qiao. 2023. [Sphinx: The joint mixing of weights, tasks, and visual embeddings for multi-modal large language models](#).
- Fuxiao Liu, Kevin Lin, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Yaser Yacoob, and Lijuan Wang. 2023a. Aligning large multi-modal model with robust instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14565*.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. 2023b. Visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08485*.
- NewYorkTimes. 2024. The new york times twitter. <https://twitter.com/nytimes>.
- Emily Olson. 2023. [Google shares drop \\$100 billion after its new ai chatbot makes a mistake](#).
- Maxime Oquab, Timothée Darcet, Théo Moutakanni, Huy Vo, Marc Szafranec, Vasil Khalidov, Pierre Fernandez, Daniel Haziza, Francisco Massa, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, et al. 2023. Dinov2: Learning robust visual features without supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07193*.
- Zhiliang Peng, Wenhui Wang, Li Dong, Yaru Hao, Shaohan Huang, Shuming Ma, and Furu Wei. 2023. Kosmos-2: Grounding multimodal large language models to the world. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14824*.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR.
- Vipula Rawte, Swagata Chakraborty, Agnibh Pathak, Anubhav Sarkar, S.M Towhidul Islam Tonmoy, Aman Chadha, Amit Sheth, and Amitava Das. 2023. [The troubling emergence of hallucination in large language models - an extensive definition, quantification, and prescriptive remediations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2541–2573, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shengbang Tong, Zhuang Liu, Yuexiang Zhai, Yi Ma, Yann LeCun, and Saining Xie. 2024. Eyes wide shut? exploring the visual shortcomings of multimodal llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06209*.
- S. M Towhidul Islam Tonmoy, S M Mehedi Zaman, Vinija Jain, Anku Rani, Vipula Rawte, Aman Chadha, and Amitava Das. 2024. [A comprehensive survey of hallucination mitigation techniques in large language models](#).
- Junyang Wang, Yiyang Zhou, Guohai Xu, Pengcheng Shi, Chenlin Zhao, Haiyang Xu, Qinghao Ye, Ming Yan, Ji Zhang, Jihua Zhu, et al. 2023. Evaluation and analysis of hallucination in large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.15126*.
- Qinghao Ye, Haiyang Xu, Guohai Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Yiyang Zhou, Junyang Wang, Anwen Hu, Pengcheng Shi, Yaya Shi, et al. 2023. mplug-owl: Modularization empowers large language models with multimodality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14178*.
- Shukang Yin, Chaoyou Fu, Sirui Zhao, Tong Xu, Hao Wang, Dianbo Sui, Yunhang Shen, Ke Li, Xing Sun, and Enhong Chen. 2023. Woodpecker: Hallucination correction for multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16045*.
- Bohan Zhai, Shijia Yang, Chenfeng Xu, Sheng Shen, Kurt Keutzer, and Manling Li. 2023. Halle-switch: Controlling object hallucination in large vision language models. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2310.
- Yiyang Zhou, Chenhao Cui, Jaehong Yoon, Linjun Zhang, Zhun Deng, Chelsea Finn, Mohit Bansal, and Huaxiu Yao. 2023. Analyzing and mitigating object hallucination in large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00754*.
- Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. 2023. Minigpt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592*.

Appendix

This section provides additional examples to assist in the understanding and interpretation of the research work presented.

A Details on Choice of VLMs: Rationale and Coverage

We shortlisted five SOTA models for VQA InstructBlip(Dai et al., 2023), MiniGPT - v2(Chen et al., 2023a), Multimodal-gpt(Gong et al., 2023), LLava(Liu et al., 2023b), mPlug-Owl(Ye et al., 2023). Recent work on visual hallucination in VLMs chooses these models LURE(Zhou et al., 2023), POPE(Li et al., 2023), and HaELM(Wang et al., 2023) for analysis. In a similar line of reasoning for the captioning task, we shortlisted three SOTA models for studying hallucination in captioning, namely Kosmos-2(Peng et al., 2023), MiniGPT-v2(Chen et al., 2023a), and SPHINX(Lin et al., 2023).

A.1 Model Hyperparameter Details

In table 1, we cover hyperparameter details of Kosmos-2, MiniGPT-v2, and Sphinx for the captioning task.

Model Name	Hyperparameters	
Kosmos-2	Image Embedding Number	64
	Learning rate	2e-4
	Adam	(0.9,0.98)
	weight decay	0.01
MiniGPT-v2	Temperature	0.6
	Learning rate	1e-4
Sphinx	Single Turn Max Response Length	1024
	Temperature	0.1
	Top-p	0.75
	Adam	(0.9,0.95)

Table 1: Hyperparameters for different models for captioning task

In table 2, we cover hyperparameter details of InstructBlip, MiniGPT - v2, Multimodal-gpt, LLava, and mPlug-Owl for the VQA task.

Models	Hyperparameters	
InstructBLIP	Number of Beams	5
	Max Length	256
	minimum length	1
	top p	0.9
	repetition penalty	1.5
	length penalty	1
	Temperature	1
	Adam	(0.9,0.999)
mPlug-Owl	weight decay	0.05
	max length	500
	Temperature	0.75
	top_p	1
	top_k	25
	penalty_alpha	0.25
	repetition penalty	1
	Number_repeat_ngram_size	0
MiniGPT-4	seed	-1
	Adam	(0.9,0.98)
	learning rate	0.0001
	weight decay	0.1
	Beam Search Number	1
LLaVa	Temperature	1
	Maximum context length	2048
Multimodal-gpt	learning rate	2e-5
	weight decay	0
	maximum new token	200
	num_beams	1
	temperature	1
Multimodal-gpt	top_k	0
	top_p	0
	learning rate	1e-5

Table 2: Hyperparameters for different models for VQA task

B Data Annotation

Here we cover additional details about the Data Annotation step expanding further on top of section 2.2 where we mentioned the use of AMT and the web interface. Another crucial consideration when annotating data on crowdsourcing platforms is the compensation offered to annotators. While offering too little may deter interest, excessively high wages may attract undesirable spammers. Achieving the ideal balance required several rounds of iteration to determine an appropriate compensation scheme. By carefully addressing factors such as selecting qualified annotators and establishing suitable compensation rates, we improved the quality of annotations obtained from crowdsourcing platforms.

B.1 Web Interface for Annotation for Captioning task

The interface is designed to offer a comprehensive view to the annotator. For instance, at the top of the interface, the actual prompt used for generating the text snippet is displayed. Directly below the prompt, the complete AI-generated text is shown. On the right-hand side, the sentence breakup is presented, with the currently selected sentence highlighted in red. Below the sentence breakup, all the relevant categories are displayed as radio buttons, allowing the annotators to annotate each category easily. This interface aims to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of the annotation process. We have gone through a few rounds of iterations before finalizing the current version of the web interface. The snapshot is present in the figure 5 for captioning and figure 6 for the VQA task.




Figure 5: Web interface used to annotate the VHILT dataset using Amazon Mechanical Turk.




Figure 6: Web interface used to annotate the VHILT dataset using Amazon Mechanical Turk.

C Additional Examples for VQA Hallucination

Here we are providing examples of VQA hallucination generated by five models.

<p>Alarming</p> <p>Contextual Guessing</p> <p>1</p>	 <p>InstructBLIP</p> <p>Question: Is there a truck in the image? Answer: Yes, there is truck in the image.</p> <p>Explanation: There's no truck in the scene, but the model predicts otherwise</p>	 <p>InstructBLIP</p> <p>Question: What is the name of the person? Answer: Indira Gandhi</p> <p>Explanation: The person is APJ Abdul Kalam, former President of India while the model predicts Indira Gandhi, former female PM of India</p>	<p>Alarming</p> <p>Identity Incongruity</p> <p>2</p>
<p>Alarming</p> <p>Geographical Erratum</p> <p>3</p>	 <p>InstructBLIP</p> <p>Question : What is the name of the place in the image? Answer: The name of the place is Tsamania</p> <p>Explanation: Image is from Newfoundland[Eastern Province of Canada], but the model predicts that it is from Tsamania</p>	 <p>MiniGPT - 4</p> <p>Question: What is person doing in the image? Answer: The person is surfing on a wave in the image.</p> <p>Explanation: The Image, overall gives model an impression of person surfing on wave, while in reality, person is skateboarding</p>	<p>Mild</p> <p>Visual Illusion</p> <p>4</p>
<p>Mild</p> <p>Gender Anomaly</p> <p>5</p>	 <p>mPlug-Owl</p> <p>Question: Display the gender of the people in the image in sequential order. Answer: The image features a diverse group of people who are standing together, with one woman in a suit and rest of the group being men.</p> <p>Explanation: There are other female counterparts as well.</p>	 <p>MiniGPT - 4</p> <p>Question: What are the names of different animals in the image? Answer: The animals in the image are a lion, a giraffe, a rhinoceros, a zebra, a camel and a flamingo.</p> <p>Explanation: Model mistakes for a rhinoceros, a zebra and a camel in the prediction.</p>	<p>Mild</p> <p>VLM as Classifier</p> <p>5</p>
<p>Low</p> <p>Wrong Reading</p> <p>7</p>	 <p>MultiModel-GPT</p> <p>Question: What is written in the image? Answer: as yourself free</p> <p>Explanation: The model reads "set yourself free" as "as yourself free".</p>	 <p>LLaVA</p> <p>Question: How many footballs are there in the image? Answer: There are two footballs in the image.</p> <p>Explanation: There is only one football in the image, while models predicts two.</p>	<p>Low</p> <p>Numeric Discrepancy</p> <p>8</p>

Figure 7: An illustration of how hallucinations occur in the case of visual question answering. We have used InstructBLIP, MiniGPT-4, LLaVA, MultimodelGPT, and MplugOWI to ask questions, and the text in red color represents the particular word that is hallucinating and an added line for explanation.

C.1 Additional Examples for VQA Hallucination using InstructBLIP



Question: What website is on the wall in back ?

Answer Generated by InstructBLIP: arsenal

Explanation: "arsenaldirect.com" is the right caption.

Category : Wrong Reading.

Degree: Low.



Question: Name each of the people in the image.

Answer Generated by InstructBLIP: lebron james

Explanation: The model failed to identify Tom Brady and Lionel Messi

Category : Identity Incongruity

Degree: Alarming



Question: Identify the gender of each person in the order they are positioned.

Answer Generated by InstructBLIP: The gender of each person in the order they are positioned is unknown.

Explanation: The model failed to identify even a single gender.

Category : Gender Anomaly

Degree: Mild



Question: How many people are there in the image ?

Answer Generated by InstructBLIP: There are ten people in the image.

Explanation: There are actually 12 people, but the model identified only 10.

Category : Numeric Discrepancy

Degree: Low



Question: What are the objects that can be seen in this image ?

Answer Generated by InstructBLIP: A man is sitting in a room filled with guitars, playing an acoustic guitar. He is surrounded by various types of guitars, including electric guitars, acoustic guitars, and bass guitars.

Explanation: No bass guitars in the image.

Category : Contextual Guessing

Degree: Alarming

Figure 8: Examples for VQA Hallucination using InstructBLIP

C.2 Additional Examples for VQA Hallucination using MiniGPT-4



Question: Name each people in the image.

Answer Generated by MiniGPT-4: The first man is **George Clooney**. The second man is **Daniel Craig**. The third man is **Leonardo DiCaprio**. The fourth man is Brad Pitt

Explanation: First one is Will Smith, Second one is Leonardo DiCaprio, Third one is Tom Cruise, Fourth one is Brad Pitt.

Category : Identity Incongruity

Degree: Alarming.



Question: What are these animals?

Answer Generated by MiniGPT-4: The first image shows a gorilla standing on a tree branch, looking down at the camera. The second image shows a **gorilla** sitting on a branch, looking at the camera with a curious expression. Both images are of gorillas.

Explanation: First one is Gorilla, Second one is Orangutan. Also first one is not standing on tree branch, but on ground.

Category : VLM as Classifier

Degree: Mild.



Question: is the dragon a Rendering or drone light show?

Answer Generated by MiniGPT-4: The dragon in the image is a **digital rendering**, not a drone light show. A digital rendering is a computer-generated image that is created using software such as Adobe Photoshop or Illustrator. It is not a live performance in which drones equipped with lights fly in formation to create a visual display. The image in the question is a digital artwork, not a live performance.

Explanation: It isn't a rendering, but a drone light show in Singapore

Category : Visual Illusion

Degree: Mild.

Figure 9: Examples for VQA Hallucination using MiniGPT-4

C.3 Additional Examples for VQA Hallucination using LLaVa



Question: Name the people in the photo.
Answer Generated by LLaVa: The soccer players in the photo are named **Zlatan Ibrahimovic, Cristiano Ronaldo** and **Lionel Messi**.

Explanation: Not a single personality was identified correctly.
Category : Identity Incongruity
Degree: Alarming



Question: Name the each one the people in the photo.
Answer Generated by LLaVa: The name of the athletes in the photo are Cristiano Ronaldo, **Lionel Messi** and Zlatan Ibrahimovic.

Explanation: Virat Kohli has been misidentified as Lionel Messi.
Category : Identity Incongruity
Degree: Alarming



Question: Describe the image.
Answer Generated by LLaVa: The image depicts a busy street scene with a red van driving down the road. There are several people walking on the sidewalk. A **fire hydrant** can also be seen on the sidewalk, providing a sense of urban infrastructure.

Explanation: No fire hydrant in the image.
Category : Contextual Guessing.
Degree: Alarming



Question: What is the name of the place?
Answer Generated by LLaVa: The name of the place is the **Grand Canyon**.

Explanation: The image is from Negev Desert, Israel.
Category : Geographical Erratum.
Degree: Alarming



Question: Identify the gender of each person in the order they are positioned.
Answer Generated by LLaVa: 1. Male 2. Male 3. Female 4. **Male** 5. Male 6. Male 7. Female

Explanation: The Fourth person is a Female.
Category : Gender Anomaly.
Degree: Mild.

Figure 10: Examples from VQA task using llava

C.4 Additional Examples for VQA Hallucination using MplugOWI



Question: Count the total number of animals in the image.

Answer Generated by mPlug-Owl: There are **four** animals in the image.

Explanation: Actually there are five of them, with the one in the middle is looking rightward.

Category : Numeric Discrepancy
Degree: Low.



Question: Name the place/city/location/country in the image.

Answer Generated by mPlug-Owl: The place/city/location/country in the image is **Riga, Latvia**.

Explanation: It's Tallinn, Estonia not Riga, Latvia

Category : Geographical Erratum
Degree: Alarming.



Question: What is the name of the woman in the image?

Answer Generated by mPlug-Owl: The woman in the image is named **Katie Price**.

Explanation: She isn't Katie Price, she is Giorgia Meloni, Prime Minister of Italy.

Category : Identity Incongruity
Degree: Alarming.



Question: Describe the image in details.

Answer Generated by mPlug-Owl: The image features a tall building located in a busy city, surrounded by multiple cars and other vehicles. A **truck** is parked near the building, while several cars are parked further away.

Explanation: There are no truck in the image.

Category : Contextual Guessing.
Degree: Alarming.

Figure 11: Examples for VQA Hallucination using mPlug-Owl

C.5 Additional Examples for VQA Hallucination using MultimodalGPT



Question: How many people are there in the image?

Answer Generated by MultiModelGPT: 12

Explanation: There are 10 people in the image

Category : Numeric Discrepancy.

Degree: Low



Question: What is the name of this place?

Answer Generated by MultiModelGPT: Taj Mahal

Explanation: This is image of Rashtrapati Bhawan, India.

Category : Geographical Erratum

Degree: Alarming

Figure 12: Examples for VQA Hallucination using MultiModel-GPT

D Additional Examples for Captioning

In the following, we provide additional examples of captioning hallucination generated by three models.


D.1 Additional Examples for captioning using Kosmos-2



Caption Generated by Kosmos-2: People hold placards and light candles during a vigil for the victims of a **New Year's Eve stampede** in Mumbai, India.

Explanation: Though the has correctly identified the key elements in the image, but it makes up unwarranted facts about the incident.


Category: Contextual Guessing
Degree: Alarming



Caption Generated by Kosmos-2: The image features a dog wearing a hoodie . In addition to the dog, there are **two other people** visible in the scene.

Explanation: There are no people in the image.


Category: Contextual Guessing
Degree: Alarming



Caption Generated by Kosmos-2: An image of the K-pop girl group **TWICE**.

Explanation: It isn't "TWICE" Girl Group, but (G)-DLE.


Category : Identity Incongruity.
Degree: Alarming



Caption Generated by Kosmos-2: A long-range rocket is seen being prepared for launch from **NORTH KOREA**.

Explanation: It isn't from North Korea.

Category : Geographical Erratum.
Degree: Alarming



Caption Generated by Kosmos-2: A Canal runs through the city of the **Nizwa, Oman**, with a small bridge crossing it and building on the left side. The canal is surrounded by Lush Green Trees and bushes, and the sky is blue.

Explanation: It isn't from Nizwa, Oman but from El-Gouna Egypt.

Category : Geographical Erratum.
Degree: Alarming

Figure 13: Examples from captioning task using KOSMOS-2

D.2 Additional Examples for captioning using MiniGPT-V2




Figure 14: Examples from captioning task using MiniGPT-v2

D.3 Additional Examples for captioning using Sphinx




Figure 15: Examples from captioning task using Sphinx