

---

# MLVU: A Comprehensive Benchmark for Multi-Task Long Video Understanding

---

Junjie Zhou<sup>1,3\*</sup> Yan Shu<sup>1\*</sup> Bo Zhao<sup>1\*</sup> Boya Wu<sup>1</sup> Shitao Xiao<sup>1</sup> Xi Yang<sup>1</sup>  
 Yongping Xiong<sup>3</sup> Bo Zhang<sup>4</sup> Tiejun Huang<sup>1,2</sup> Zheng Liu<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Beijing Academy of Artificial Intelligence

<sup>2</sup>School of Computer Science, Peking University

<sup>3</sup>Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications

<sup>4</sup>College of Computer Science and Technology, Zhejiang University  
 {bozhaonanjing, zhengliu1026}@gmail.com

## Abstract

The evaluation of Long Video Understanding (LVU) performance poses an important but challenging research problem. Despite previous efforts, the existing video understanding benchmarks are severely constrained by several issues, especially the insufficient lengths of videos, a lack of diversity in video types and evaluation tasks, and the inappropriateness for evaluating LVU performances. To address the above problems, we propose a new benchmark, called MLVU<sup>1</sup> (Multi-task Long Video Understanding Benchmark), for the comprehensive and in-depth evaluation of LVU. MLVU presents the following critical values: 1) The substantial and flexible extension of video lengths, which enables the benchmark to evaluate LVU performance across a wide range of durations. 2) The inclusion of various video genres, e.g., movies, surveillance footage, egocentric videos, cartoons, game videos, etc., which reflects the models' LVU performances in different scenarios. 3) The development of diversified evaluation tasks, which enables a comprehensive examination of MLLMs' key abilities in long-video understanding. The empirical study with 20 latest MLLMs reveals significant room for improvement in today's technique, as all existing methods struggle with most of the evaluation tasks and exhibit severe performance degradation when handling longer videos. Additionally, it suggests that factors such as context length, image-understanding quality, and the choice of LLM backbone can play critical roles in future advancements. We anticipate that MLVU will advance the research of long video understanding by providing a comprehensive and in-depth analysis of MLLMs.

## 1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) are growing into a general solution for numerous AI tasks [6; 40]. In recent years, it becomes increasingly emphasized to extend LLMs with multi-modal capabilities and thus bring the Multi-modal LLM, namely, MLLM. Remarkably, it has been made possible for today's MLLMs to perceive information in texts, images, videos, etc., and solve complicated problems in physical environments [1; 39]. Along with the development of MLLMs, new benchmarks are continuously created to facilitate comprehensive and in-depth analysis of MLLMs [51; 27; 9; 21].

However, it remains a great challenge to evaluate the MLLMs' long-video understanding (LVU) performances given the following limitations. Firstly, the majority of existing video understanding

\*Junjie Zhou, Yan Shu, and Bo Zhao are the co-first authors. Zheng Liu is the corresponding author.

<sup>1</sup>MLVU Repository: <https://github.com/JUNJIE99/MLVU>.

benchmarks are made up of short videos [48; 21; 19; 32; 15], whose lengths can be merely a few seconds. As a result, they are insufficient to reflect the MLLMs’ long-video understanding capabilities. Secondly, there is a severe lack of diversity for the existing LVU benchmarks in terms of video genres and evaluation tasks. On one hand, the existing benchmarks are usually created based on one type of videos, e.g., movies [36; 22]. On the other hand, it may only contain one specific type of task in each individual benchmark, for example, the captioning task in [48], the temporal perception task in [50], and the action understanding task in [42; 11]. Due to the above limitations, existing benchmarks have difficulty in performing a comprehensive evaluation of LVU performances. Last but not least, many previous evaluation tasks are not properly designed for LVU, as they can be solved without using the complex information from long videos. For example, many questions are simply about one single frame in the long videos [36]. Besides, numerous others are about popular movies and celebrities [22], which can be answered directly by MLLMs based on the textual prompts.

Conceptually, the MLLMs are expected to handle any type of long video and accomplish any type of related tasks. Therefore, the evaluation of LVU should emphasize two important properties: *length* and *diversity*. Based on such a principle, we propose a novel benchmark called **MLVU** (Mult-Long Video Understanding Benchmark), which presents the following critical advantages.

- **It makes a substantial extension for the video length.** MLVU is created based on long videos of diversified lengths, *ranging from 3 minutes to 2 hours*. The average video length is about 12 minutes, which makes it much longer than most of the existing benchmarks. Additionally, each video is further segmented so that evaluation tasks can be created w.r.t. different video clips (e.g., summarization for the first 3 minutes, the first 6 minutes, and the entire duration of the video). Therefore, it is able to flexibly evaluate the MLLMs’ performance across different video lengths.
- **It covers a wide variety of video genres.** On one hand, it contains different types of real-world videos, such as *movies, documentaries, surveillance videos, and ego-centric videos*. On the other hand, it also includes typical simulated videos, like *games and cartoons*. As a result, it is able to comprehensively reflect the MLLMs’ performance across different application scenarios.
- **It introduces diversified evaluation tasks tailored for LVU.** There are 9 different tasks in MLVU, which jointly examine a wide range of MLLMs’ key abilities, such as *reasoning, captioning, recognition, summarization*, etc. Both *multi-choice* and *free-form generation* tasks are included in MLVU, which reflect the MLLMs’ performances in handling different forms of tasks. Finally, some of the tasks are designed to leverage *global information from entire videos*, while others need to utilize *proper local information from specific clips*. Therefore, it can provide a unified perspective for the degree of completeness and nuance in understanding long videos.

We extensively investigate 20 popular MLLMs with MLVU, which brings in several critical insights. Firstly, *long-video understanding remains a technically challenging problem for the existing MLLMs*. While GPT-4o<sup>2</sup> achieves the leading performance in the experiment, it only attains an average score of 64.6% in multi-choice tasks. All methods struggle with tasks requiring fine-grained information from entire videos, such as action counting, ordering, and summarization. Additionally, all methods experience significant performance drops as video lengths increase. Secondly, *a significant gap persists between open-source and proprietary models*. Although some of the latest open-source MLLMs can handle very long videos and excel at single-image tasks, they notably lag behind GPT-4o in understanding long videos. Finally, *the empirical results underscore the influential factors in LVU*, such as the extension of context length, the improvement of image understanding ability, and the utilization of strong LLM-backbones. In addition to the benchmark’s overall conclusion, the individual tasks enable the fine-grained analysis of MLLMs’ performances in each of the specialized aspects. Therefore, we anticipate the benchmark to assist in improving MLLMs’ long-video understanding capabilities by providing insights into their current strengths and weaknesses.

## 2 Related Work

**Multimodal Large Language Models.** Multimodal large language models (MLLMs) have gained wide interests from both academic and industrial sectors. Recent studies have made significant progresses in this field by integrating LLM backbones with visual encoders and adapters, and fine-tuning the entire architecture through visual instruction [25; 56; 7]. Based on the same philosophy,

<sup>2</sup><https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>

MLLMs have been further developed for video processing using video instruction datasets and specialized video adapters [53; 29; 20; 49; 23; 21]. However, most existing models are optimized for short videos, typically under one minute, due to the difficulty in establishing sufficient context for longer videos. To address this challenge, researchers have explored compact representations of videos. For example, LLaMa-Vid [22] compresses each video frame into two tokens, allowing the model to handle videos several hours long. Methods like MovieChat [36] and MA-LMM [12] introduce specialized memory components for recursive video processing. Additionally, it is also explored to make selective usage of frames or clips from long videos based on retrievers or agents [47; 34; 41]. Despite these progresses, it remains an open problem for MLLMs to effectively handle long videos.

**Video Understanding Benchmarks.** With the unprecedented interest in MLLMs, the creation of benchmarks for these models has become increasingly emphasized (as advanced by MMMU [51], MME [9], and many other pioneering works). In video understanding, the research community has made significant efforts as well, particularly for short videos. There are specialized benchmarks for temporal perception [50; 43; 28], action understanding [43; 42], video classification [14], video reasoning [46; 45], and video captioning [48; 31]. Recently, MVBench [21] provides a comprehensive short-video benchmark to evaluate general capabilities via question-answering. For long video understanding, people seek to leverage long-form videos, like movies, to create benchmarks. For example, the LVU dataset [44] presents movie understanding tasks, such as predicting release years and identifying character relationships. Similarly, LLaMA-Vid [22] created a movie question-answering dataset based on MovieNet [13]. Despite using long videos, many questions are about common-sense knowledge of the movies. As a result, they could be directly answered without using the video’s information. In contrast, MovieChat [36] makes use of diversified videos and avoids specific character names or plot details in its questions. Considering that many of the questions target on exact time segments, it potentially degrades the tasks to short-video or image understanding problems. Beyond movies, there are other task-specific benchmarks like EgoSchema [30], which presents video reasoning tasks using first-person footage from Ego4D [11]. However, these specialized benchmarks only focus on one single aspect of MLLMs, rather than offering a comprehensive analysis of long video understanding. Therefore, it remains essential to develop a comprehensive benchmark with carefully designed tasks to effectively evaluate MLLMs’ capabilities in understanding long videos.

### 3 MLVU: Multi-task Long Video Understanding Benchmark

In this section, we start with an overview of MLVU, which highlights its constitution and explains its values over the previous works. Then, we discuss how each evaluation task is constructed in MLVU.

#### 3.1 Overview

MLVU is a comprehensive benchmark made up of 2593 evaluation tasks<sup>3</sup> (shown as the right side of Figure 1), which belong to 9 task categories tailored for long-video understanding. These categories include 1) Topic Reasoning, 2) Anomaly Recognition, 3) Video Summarization, 4) Needle Question Answering, 5) Ego Reasoning, 6) Plot Question Answering, 7) Sub-Scene Captioning, 8) Action Count, and 9) Action Order. The benchmark is distinguished by the following features.




Figure 1: Statistical overview of our LVBench dataset. **Left:** Distribution of Video Duration; **Middle:** Distribution of Source Types for Long Videos; **Right:** Quantification of Each Task Type.

<sup>3</sup>Only consider the tasks for the entire videos. Others for fine-grained video segments are not accounted.

**Substantial extension of video length.** MLVU is made up of videos of diversified lengths, spanning from 3 min to more than 2 hours (Figure 1 Left). The average length is about 12 min, which is much longer than the existing LVU benchmarks. Besides, each video is further partitioned as incremental segments, e.g., the first 3 min, the first 6 min, and the entire video, where tasks are created for each individual segment. Thus, the MLLMs can be flexibly evaluated across different video lengths.

**Diversified video categories.** MLVU offers a comprehensive collection of videos of different categories (Figure 1 Middle). There are typical real-world videos, which includes movies [52; 36], documentaries [36], TV series, egocentric videos [11], and surveillance footage [38]. Meanwhile, there are also important simulated videos from animated series and game videos [8].

**Diversified evaluation tasks.** MLVU also provides a diversified collection of evaluation tasks, which are closely related to the common visual capabilities of MLLMs, such as reasoning, captioning, recognition, perception, and summarization (Figure 1 Right). All the tasks are tailored for LVU. That is to say, the tasks need to be solved based on the in-depth understanding of video. Some of tasks are to examine whether the global information from the entire video can be effectively utilized (holistic LVU); while others focus on whether the MLLMs can make precise usage of proper local information within the long video (detail LVU). Additionally, both multi-choice and free-form generation tasks are included in MLVU, which help to examine MLLMs’ capabilities in handling different task formats.

### 3.2 Construction of MLVU

The evaluation tasks of MLVU which can be categorized into three types: 1) *holistic LVU*, which needs to be solved by making use of the global information from the entire video; 2) *single-detail LVU*, which needs to leverage one critical plot within the long video; 3) *multi-detail LVU*, which calls for the joint utilization of multiple plots within the long video. The construction process of MLVU is discussed w.r.t. the above three categories. To facilitate the discussion, we define *ULVC* (Universal Long Video Collection) as the universal collection of miscellaneous long videos, which includes movies, documentaries, TV-series, ego-centric videos, surveillance footages, animated series, game videos, et al. (more details about ULVC is presented in the Appendix B).

#### 3.2.1 Holistic LVU

**Topic Reasoning (TR).** The topic reasoning task requires MLLMs to respond to questions about the principal subject of a long video, as shown with Figure 2 (a). This includes elements such as the video’s genre, pivotal events, or primary settings. Videos for TR tasks are sourced from movies, documentaries, animated series, egocentric videos, and game videos from ULVC. All questions and answers undergo manual annotation<sup>4</sup>, resulting in a total of 264 questions. TR tasks are formatted as multiple-choice questions, with the model’s performance assessed based on accuracy.

**Anomaly Recognition (AR).** The anomaly recognition task involves identifying the anomalous behavior within a surveillance footage (Figure 2 b). We leverage the surveillance video clips from UCF Crime dataset [38] for this task. The selected video clips are longer than three minutes. We create 200 questions based on the original annotations provided by the dataset. The AR task is also conducted in the multiple-choice format, whose performance is measured by accuracy.

**Video Summarization (VS).** This task requires MLLMs to summarize the key events in a long video (Figure 2 c). We select the narrative-rich videos from ULVC for this task, including movies, TV series, documentaries, and animated series. There are 217 selected videos in total, whose summaries are manually annotated. During evaluation, the MLLMs are prompted with "Please summarize the main content of this video". We employ GPT-4 to assess the generated summaries by comparing with the annotation results. Details about annotation and evaluation are presented in Appendix E.3 and F.3.

#### 3.2.2 Single-Detail LVU

**Needle Question-Answering (NQA).** Needle-In-the-Haystack-Search (NIHS) is a popular evaluation task for long-context LLM [26]. Taking the inspiration from NIHS, we create Needle Question-Answering (NQA), shown as Figure 2 (d). In this task, the MLLM is required to answer a question

<sup>4</sup>Detailed information and annotation guidelines for annotators are presented in Appendix E




Figure 2: Examples of MLVU. There are nine tasks designed to evaluate the *holistic*, *single-detail*, and *multi-detail LVU* capabilities of MLLMs. The MLLMs are asked to solve the problem (with the ground-truth answers marked in blue) based on the long video input and textual prompt.

related to a specific segment (referred as *needle*) within a long video (referred as *background video*). The needles are short video clips sampled from WebVid [5], while the background videos are sampled from our ULVC. The needle is randomly inserted into the background video, where a question-answer pair is annotated. By incorporating necessary details, the question can always correspond to the needle without ambiguity. During evaluation, the MLLM needs to infer the location of the needle based on the details provided in the question, and solve the problem on top of the needle’s information. The NQA task is structured as multiple-choice, whose performance is measured by accuracy.

**Ego Reasoning (ER).** Ego-centric videos capture a series of consecutive actions from a first-person perspective. The MLLM needs to reason for a question about a specific behavior in the video, e.g., predicting for the event which is correlated or satisfies a certain causal relationship with the behavior (Figure 2 e). Both videos and QA annotations are collected from the NLQ task of Ego4D [11]. The ER task is structured as multiple-choice, with a total of 352 questions created for this task.

**Plot Question-Answering (PQA).** In this task, the MLLM needs to reason for questions about a plot in a narrative video, shown as Figure 2 (f). The video is sampled from the movies, TV series, and animated series in our ULVC. There are 539 question-answer pairs created by manual annotation. During annotation, the human annotators are asked to only provide necessary details about the plot but not to suggest any objective hints, e.g., the two characters in the example video are referred as cat and mouse, rather than Tom and Jerry. Therefore, it can prevent the question from being short-cut by the MLLM’s common-sense knowledge (more details about PQA can be found in the Appendix E.6).

**Sub-Scene Captioning (SSC).** In this task, the MLLM needs to generate the caption for a sub-scene in a long video. The long videos in SSC are sampled from the Movie101 dataset [52], while the questions and answers are manually annotated. During annotation, the human annotator is asked to provide a detailed description for the sub-scene as the ground-truth answer. Besides, they need to offer necessary clues in their questions such that the referred sub-scenes can be identified without ambiguity. During evaluation, we employ GPT-4 [1] to measure the quality of caption in comparison with the ground-truth. Details about annotation and evaluation are presented in Appendix E.7 and F.3.

### 3.2.3 Multi-Detail LVU

**Action Order (AO).** In this task, the MLLM needs to predict the right order for a sequence of actions (Figure 2 h). The actions are presented by short video clips, called *probes*. The probes are formulated in two different ways. One is made up of clips from the Kinetics dataset [14], where each clip represents a distinct action. The other one is from the consecutive clips of an action in the ActivityNet-Caption dataset [16]. The probes are inserted into a long *background video*, which is sampled from ULVC. There are 259 AO questions in total. The task is structured as a multiple-choice problem, where the right order is selected from the misleading options provided by the annotator.

**Action Count (AC).** This task requires the MLLM to count the occurrences of an action within a long video (Figure 2 i). Each action corresponds to multiple short *probe* clips sampled from the Kinetics dataset [14]. The probes of an action are inserted into a long *background video* sampled from ULVC. We also perform manual examination to ensure that the inserted action does not exist in the original background video. A total of 206 evaluation instances have been created. The AC task is structured as a multiple-choice problem, with performance measured by accuracy.

## 4 Experiments and Analysis

### 4.1 Settings

We perform a comprehensive investigation of 20 MLLMs based on MLVU, both open-source and proprietary. The experimental MLLMs can be partitioned into three categories. **1. Image MLLMs**, which are primarily fine-tuned by image-related instructions. We consider the following models for this category: Otter-I [18], LLaVA-1.6 [24], InternVL-1.5 [7], Claude3-Opus [2], Qwen-VL-Max [4], and GPT-4 Turbo [1]. **2. Short Video MLLMs**, which are fine-tuned by short-video related instructions. This category includes: Otter-V [18], mPlug-Owl-V [49], Video LLaMA-2 [53], Video ChatGPT [29], VideoChat [20], VideoChat2 [21], and Video-LLaVA [23]. **3. Long Video MLLMs**, which are optimized for their long-video understanding capability. This category includes: MiniGPT4-Video [3], LLaMA-VID [22], Movie-LLM [37], MA-LMM [12], MovieChat [36], TimeChat [35], and GPT-4o [33]. For Image MLLMs, we leverage their multi-image inference capabilities to process

segmented frames from original videos. In the case of Video MLLMs, we employ either a uniform sampling strategy or a frame rate sampling strategy for video processing. All models are evaluated based on their official implementations or available APIs, where the evaluation is conducted in a zero-shot manner. More details about the evaluation are provided in the Appendix F.

## 4.2 Overall Performance

The overall evaluation results for all investigated MLLMs are shown in Table 1. The individual performance is reported for each individual task; meanwhile, the average performances are reported for the multiple-choice (M-Avg) and generation tasks (G-Avg), respectively. We can obtain two primary observations from the demonstrated results.

On one hand, the recently released GPT-4o [33] achieves an overwhelming advantage in our benchmark. It outperforms the rest of methods by a big margin in terms of the average performances, with an M-Avg of 64.6% (within 0-100%) and a G-Avg of 5.80 (within 0.0-10.0). Besides, it also maintains the leading position in every individual task. As for the open-source models, InternVL-1.5 [7] achieves the highest average performance in multiple-choice tasks, whose M-Avg scores reaches 50.4%. Such a performance is impressive knowing that it even slightly goes beyond GPT-4 Turbo [1]. Meanwhile, LLaMA-VID [22] presents the top performance for the generation tasks, whose G-Avg score reaches 4.22. However, such a score is significantly lagging behind GPT-4 Turbo and GPT-4o.

On the other hand, although GPT-4o achieves a huge advantage in comparison with other methods, it actually struggles to handle most of the tasks in the benchmark. For example, it only ends up with 64.8% in dealing with the needle question-answering (NQA) task. Whereas its analogue tasks in the text domain, e.g., NIHS (Needle-In-the-HayStack-Search) and Passkey Retrieval, can be effectively conquered by many of the existing long LLMs [10; 54]. At the same time, it exhibits even less reliability given tasks like ego-reasoning (ER), action ordering (AO), and action count (AC), while other baseline methods produce even worse performances in these scenarios. The above observations indicate that long-video understanding remains a tough challenge for today’s MLLMs.

In addition to the primary conclusions from the overall performances, we can also make the following interesting observations about the individual tasks. First of all, the multiple-choice holistic tasks, i.e., topic retrieval (TR) and anomaly recognition (AR), present much higher differentiation than other tasks. Proprietary MLLMs, like GPT-4o, GPT-4-turbo, and superior open-source models, like InternVL-1.5, can accurately solve such problems; meanwhile, many other popular MLLMs still fail to generate meaningful performances. Knowing that the two tasks only require an overall understanding of the long videos, they can serve as a preliminary indicator of MLLMs’ LVU ability.

Besides, it’s hard to deal with tasks which need nuanced understanding of multiple details. Although several MLLMs can handle single-detail LVU tasks to some extent, their performances suffer from catastrophic degradation when addressing multi-detail LVU tasks. Most methods, except for GPT-4o, fail entirely in action order (AO) and action count (AC) tasks. Additionally, most approaches struggle with the summarization task, which require recalling multiple nuanced details from long videos.

Finally, the existing long-videos MLLMs (except for GPT-4o) are no better than those primarily trained from short-video or image related instructions. Although such models can intake much longer videos (i.e. much more frames than other baselines), it turns out that the extended input information is not effectively utilized. On the contrary, Video-LLaVA can achieve a relatively competitive performance, especially in multiple-choice, despite that it can only intake 8 frames.

As a brief conclusion, although today’s MLLMs can deal with some preliminary LVU tasks, it remains a tough challenge to achieve an in-depth understanding of nuanced information within long videos.

## 4.3 Detailed Analysis

We analyze the impact from video length and three factors: context length, image understanding (IU) ability, LLM-backbone. All the factors are empirically critical to MLLMs’ LVU performances.

In the first place, we evaluate MLLMs’ performances across various video lengths. For this purpose, we introduce a derivative dataset alongside MLVU, called *MLVU Time-ladder*. In this dataset, the same kinds of evaluation tasks are created for videos of variant lengths, including 180s, 360s, and 600s (more details presented in Appendix D). As shown in Figure 3, the performances of all models

| Methods                        | Input    | Holistic    |             |             | Single Detail |             |             |             | Multi Detail |             | M-Avg       | G-Avg       |
|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                                |          | TR          | AR          | VS*         | NQA           | ER          | PQA         | SSC*        | AO           | AC          |             |             |
| Full mark                      | -        | 100         | 100         | 10          | 100           | 100         | 100         | 100         | 10           | 100         | 100         | 10          |
| <i>Image MLLMs</i>             |          |             |             |             |               |             |             |             |              |             |             |             |
| Otter-I [18]                   | 16 frm   | 25.0        | 25.0        | 2.18        | 25.1          | 25.0        | 24.9        | 4.12        | 13.1         | 25.2        | 23.3        | 3.15        |
| LLaVA-1.6 [25]                 | 16 frm   | 60.6        | 41.0        | 2.11        | 43.1          | 38.4        | 41.0        | 4.35        | 25.5         | 25.7        | 39.3        | 3.23        |
| InternVL-1.5 [7]               | 16 frm   | 78.8        | 67.0        | 3.16        | 52.7          | 43.5        | 54.4        | 4.88        | 32.8         | 23.8        | 50.4        | 4.02        |
| Claude-3-Opus <sup>†</sup> [2] | 16 frm   | 67.2        | 43.5        | 3.11        | 21.6          | 40.2        | 47.8        | 3.66        | 18.2         | 16.7        | 36.5        | 3.39        |
| Qwen-VL-Max <sup>†</sup> [4]   | 16 frm   | 67.4        | 63.5        | 2.71        | 40.3          | 40.9        | 43.3        | 5.21        | 25.0         | 14.8        | 42.2        | 3.96        |
| GPT-4 Turbo <sup>†</sup> [1]   | 16 frm   | 79.5        | 68.0        | 4.49        | 45.9          | 47.4        | 60.6        | 6.21        | 26.5         | 16.1        | 49.2        | 5.35        |
| <i>Short Video MLLMs</i>       |          |             |             |             |               |             |             |             |              |             |             |             |
| Otter-V [18]                   | 16 frm   | 24.6        | 26.0        | 2.38        | 28.2          | 27.6        | 22.3        | 4.23        | 15.1         | 26.7        | 24.4        | 3.31        |
| mPLUG-Owl-V [49]               | 16 frm   | 28.0        | 25.0        | 2.36        | 24.5          | 31.8        | 27.3        | 5.31        | 21.2         | 23.3        | 25.9        | 3.84        |
| VideoChat [20]                 | 16 frm   | 33.0        | 32.0        | 2.31        | 27.0          | 32.1        | 27.6        | 5.01        | 24.3         | 28.6        | 29.2        | 3.66        |
| Video-ChatGPT [29]             | 100 frm  | 26.9        | 24.0        | 2.31        | 40.3          | 42.0        | 29.9        | 5.48        | 25.1         | 31.1        | 31.3        | 3.90        |
| Video-LLaMA-2 [53]             | 16 frm   | 54.5        | 41.5        | 2.34        | 39.4          | 33.5        | 35.4        | 5.22        | 18.5         | 25.7        | 35.5        | 3.78        |
| VideoChat2 [21]                | 16 frm   | 74.6        | 51.5        | 2.57        | 42.0          | 47.4        | 43.8        | 5.04        | 22.8         | 29.6        | 44.5        | 3.81        |
| Video-LLaVA [23]               | 8 frm    | 71.6        | 57.0        | 2.43        | 53.2          | 45.2        | 48.4        | 5.25        | 20.1         | 35.9        | 47.3        | 3.84        |
| <i>Long Video MLLMs</i>        |          |             |             |             |               |             |             |             |              |             |             |             |
| MovieChat [36]                 | 2048 frm | 29.5        | 25.0        | 2.33        | 24.2          | 24.7        | 25.8        | 3.23        | 28.6         | 22.8        | 25.8        | 2.78        |
| Movie-LLM [37]                 | 1 fps    | 30.0        | 29.0        | 2.88        | 29.6          | 24.7        | 24.1        | 5.00        | 20.5         | 24.8        | 26.1        | 3.94        |
| TimeChat [35]                  | 96 frm   | 23.1        | 27.0        | 2.54        | 24.5          | 28.4        | 25.8        | 4.29        | 24.7         | 32.0        | 30.9        | 3.42        |
| LLaMA-VID [22]                 | 1 fps    | 50.8        | 34.5        | 3.22        | 30.1          | 32.7        | 32.5        | 5.22        | 23.9         | 27.8        | 33.2        | 4.22        |
| MA-LMM [12]                    | 1000 frm | 51.9        | 35.5        | 2.12        | 43.1          | 38.9        | 35.8        | 4.80        | 25.1         | 24.3        | 36.4        | 3.46        |
| MiniGPT4-Video [3]             | 90 frm   | 70.9        | 52.5        | 2.64        | 49.0          | 48.6        | 44.5        | 4.07        | 23.2         | 23.0        | 44.5        | 3.36        |
| GPT-4o <sup>†</sup> [33]       | 0.5 fps  | <b>87.4</b> | <b>74.5</b> | <b>4.90</b> | <b>64.8</b>   | <b>57.1</b> | <b>65.1</b> | <b>6.69</b> | <b>56.7</b>  | <b>46.3</b> | <b>64.6</b> | <b>5.80</b> |

Table 1: The overall performances on MLVU, including the holistic LVU tasks (TR: Topic Reasoning, AR: Anomaly Recognition, VS: Video Summary), the single-detail LVU tasks (NQA: Needle QA, ER: Ego Reasoning, PQA: Plot QA, SSC: Sub-Scene Captioning), and multi-detail LVU tasks (AO: Action Order, AC: Action Count). M-Avg: the average performance of multiple-choice tasks; G-Avg: the average performance of generation tasks (marked by \*). Two input strategies are used by the MLLMs in evaluation: Uniform Sampling (**N frm**), which evenly samples N frames from the video; Frame Rate Sampling (**N fps**), which samples N frames per second. † denotes proprietary models.

| Impact of Context Length |              |                        | Impact of IU |            |                        | Impact of LLM |            |                        |
|--------------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------------|------------|------------------------|---------------|------------|------------------------|
| Model                    | Context Len. | M-Avg                  | Model        | MMMU (Val) | M-Avg                  | Model         | LLM        | M-Avg                  |
| MGV                      | 16           | 41.1                   | Otter        | 32.2       | 24.4                   | VLM2          | Vicuna-7B  | 24.3                   |
|                          | 90           | 44.5 <sup>†</sup> 3.4  | LLaVA        | 35.8       | 39.3 <sup>†</sup> 14.9 |               | Vicuna-13B | 35.5 <sup>†</sup> 11.2 |
| GPT-4o                   | 16           | 54.2                   | GPT4V        | 58.1       | 49.2                   | MGV           | LLAMA-7B   | 33.7                   |
|                          | 256          | 64.6 <sup>†</sup> 10.4 | GPT-4o       | 63.8       | 54.2 <sup>†</sup> 5.0  |               | Mistral-7B | 44.5 <sup>†</sup> 10.8 |

Table 2: Detailed analysis about the impact from context length, image understanding (IU) ability, and LLM Backbone. MGV: MiniGPT4-Video, GPT4V: GPT-4-turbo, VLM2: Video-LLaMA-2.

tend to decline as the video length grows, which indicates that the existing MLLMs’ LVU abilities are severely constrained by the video length. By comparison, image models, like GPT-4-turbo [1], and short-video models, like VideoChat2 [21], VideoLLaMA [53], are more vulnerable to the growth of video length, while long video models, like MiniGPT4-Video, can be relatively more resilient.

We further examine MLLMs’ performances (measured by M-Avg) under varying context lengths. Specifically, we increase MiniGPT4-Video’s input from 16 to 90 frames and GPT-4o’s input from 16 to 256 frames (the left side of Table 2). As the input length extends, both models consistently show improved performance. To investigate the impact of MLLMs’ image understanding (IU) ability, we reference the experiment results from MMMU [51] (the middle of Table 2). It’s evident that






Figure 3: Experimental performances on MLVU under various video lengths: GPT4-turbo (orange), MiniGPT4-Video (red), VideoChat2 (green), Video-LLaMA-2 (blue), and MA-LMM (cyan).

the MLLMs’ LVU performances basically align with their image understanding performances in MMMU. Finally, we compare MLLMs with different backbones (the right side of Table 2). The results show that LVU performances improve with larger (Vicuna-13B vs. Vicuna-7B) and more capable (Mistral-7B vs. Llama-2-7B) backbone encoders. These observations indicate that LVU is the result of multiple complex factors, with the ability to perceive longer videos and effectively utilize the perceived information being crucial for the improvement of LVU.

## 5 Conclusion & Discussion

This paper presents MLVU, a novel benchmark for the assessment of long video understanding. With several critical innovations: the substantial extension of video lengths, the inclusion of various video genres, and the development of diversified LVU-oriented evaluation tasks, the new benchmark is able provide a comprehensive and in-depth analysis for MLLMs’ long-video understanding performance. The empirical study on MLVU reveals LVU remains a technically challenging problem for today’s state-of-the-art MLLMs. Future advancements may call for the joint optimization of complex factors, such as context length, image understanding ability, and even LLM backbones. We anticipate this benchmark will facilitate future research in long-video understanding of MLLMs.

**Limitations.** While MLVU basically covers the major dimensions of long-video understanding, it can still be improved for even better comprehensiveness. For instance, there can be tasks related to high-resolution videos, or more specific tasks such as tracking and low-level processing. Our work will be a persistent effort, where new tasks and video types will be continually introduced.

## References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774), 2023.
- [2] Anthropic. Claude 3. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-family>, March 2024.
- [3] Kirolos Ataallah, Xiaoqian Shen, Eslam Abdelrahman, Essam Sleiman, Deyao Zhu, Jian Ding, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigt4-video: Advancing multimodal llms for video understanding with interleaved visual-textual tokens. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.03413](https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.03413), 2024.
- [4] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. Qwen technical report. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.16609), 2023.

- [5] Max Bain, Arsha Nagrani, Gül Varol, and Andrew Zisserman. Frozen in time: A joint video and image encoder for end-to-end retrieval. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, pages 1728–1738, 2021.
- [6] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. Advances in neural information processing systems, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [7] Zhe Chen, Weiyun Wang, Hao Tian, Shenglong Ye, Zhangwei Gao, Erfei Cui, Wenwen Tong, Kongzhi Hu, Jiapeng Luo, Zheng Ma, et al. How far are we to gpt-4v? closing the gap to commercial multimodal models with open-source suites. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.16821, 2024.
- [8] Linxi Fan, Guanzhi Wang, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Yuncong Yang, Haoyi Zhu, Andrew Tang, De-An Huang, Yuke Zhu, and Anima Anandkumar. Minedojo: Building open-ended embodied agents with internet-scale knowledge. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 35:18343–18362, 2022.
- [9] 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. arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13394, 2023.
- [10] Yao Fu, Rameswar Panda, Xinyao Niu, Xiang Yue, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Yoon Kim, and Hao Peng. Data engineering for scaling language models to 128k context. arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10171, 2024.
- [11] Kristen Grauman, Andrew Westbury, Eugene Byrne, Zachary Chavis, Antonino Furnari, Rohit Girdhar, Jackson Hamburger, Hao Jiang, Miao Liu, Xingyu Liu, et al. Ego4d: Around the world in 3,000 hours of egocentric video. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 18995–19012, 2022.
- [12] Bo He, Hengduo Li, Young Kyun Jang, Menglin Jia, Xuefei Cao, Ashish Shah, Abhinav Shrivastava, and Ser-Nam Lim. Ma-lmm: Memory-augmented large multimodal model for long-term video understanding. arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05726, 2024.
- [13] Qingqiu Huang, Yu Xiong, Anyi Rao, Jiase Wang, and Dahua Lin. Movienet: A holistic dataset for movie understanding. In Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part IV 16, pages 709–727. Springer, 2020.
- [14] Will Kay, Joao Carreira, Karen Simonyan, Brian Zhang, Chloe Hillier, Sudheendra Vijayanarasimhan, Fabio Viola, Tim Green, Trevor Back, Paul Natsev, et al. The kinetics human action video dataset. arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.06950, 2017.
- [15] Muhammad Uzair Khattak, Muhammad Ferjad Naeem, Jameel Hassan, Muzammal Naseer, Federico Tombari, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Salman Khan. Complex video reasoning and robustness evaluation suite for video-lmms. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.03690, 2024.
- [16] Ranjay Krishna, Kenji Hata, Frederic Ren, Li Fei-Fei, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Dense-captioning events in videos. In Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision, pages 706–715, 2017.
- [17] Jie Lei, Licheng Yu, Mohit Bansal, and Tamara L Berg. Tvqa: Localized, compositional video question answering. arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.01696, 2018.
- [18] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Liangyu Chen, Jinghao Wang, Jingkang Yang, and Ziwei Liu. Otter: A multi-modal model with in-context instruction tuning. CoRR, abs/2305.03726, 2023.
- [19] Bohao Li, Rui Wang, Guanzhi Wang, Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, and Ying Shan. Seed-bench: Benchmarking multimodal llms with generative comprehension. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16125, 2023.

- [20] KunChang Li, Yinan He, Yi Wang, Yizhuo Li, Wenhai Wang, Ping Luo, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Videochat: Chat-centric video understanding. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06355](#), 2023.
- [21] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yinan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Ping Luo, et al. Mvbench: A comprehensive multi-modal video understanding benchmark. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17005](#), 2023.
- [22] Yanwei Li, Chengyao Wang, and Jiaya Jia. Llama-vid: An image is worth 2 tokens in large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17043](#), 2023.
- [23] Bin Lin, Bin Zhu, Yang Ye, Munan Ning, Peng Jin, and Li Yuan. Video-llava: Learning united visual representation by alignment before projection. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10122](#), 2023.
- [24] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Sheng Shen, and Yong Jae Lee. Llava-next: Improved reasoning, ocr, and world knowledge. <https://llava-vl.github.io/blog/2024-01-30-llava-next/>, January 2024.
- [25] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2023.
- [26] Nelson F Liu, Kevin Lin, John Hewitt, Ashwin Paranjape, Michele Bevilacqua, Fabio Petroni, and Percy Liang. Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:157–173, 2024.
- [27] Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhang, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, et al. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player? [arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06281](#), 2023.
- [28] Yuanxin Liu, Shicheng Li, Yi Liu, Yuxiang Wang, Shuhuai Ren, Lei Li, Sishuo Chen, Xu Sun, and Lu Hou. Tempcompass: Do video llms really understand videos? [arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.00476](#), 2024.
- [29] Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Rasheed, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Video-chatgpt: Towards detailed video understanding via large vision and language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05424](#), 2023.
- [30] Karttikeya Mangalam, Raiymbek Akshulakov, and Jitendra Malik. Egoschema: A diagnostic benchmark for very long-form video language understanding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2023.
- [31] Antoine Miech, Dimitri Zhukov, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Makarand Tapaswi, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Howto100m: Learning a text-video embedding by watching hundred million narrated video clips. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 2630–2640, 2019.
- [32] Munan Ning, Bin Zhu, Yujia Xie, Bin Lin, Jiayi Cui, Lu Yuan, Dongdong Chen, and Li Yuan. Video-bench: A comprehensive benchmark and toolkit for evaluating video-based large language models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16103](#), 2023.
- [33] OpenAI. Gpt-4o. <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>, May 2024.
- [34] Junting Pan, Ziyi Lin, Yuying Ge, Xiatian Zhu, Renrui Zhang, Yi Wang, Yu Qiao, and Hongsheng Li. Retrieving-to-answer: Zero-shot video question answering with frozen large language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 272–283, 2023.
- [35] Shuhuai Ren, Linli Yao, Shicheng Li, Xu Sun, and Lu Hou. Timechat: A time-sensitive multi-modal large language model for long video understanding. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02051](#), 2023.
- [36] Enxin Song, Wenhao Chai, Guan hong Wang, Yucheng Zhang, Haoyang Zhou, Feiyang Wu, Xun Guo, Tian Ye, Yan Lu, Jenq-Neng Hwang, et al. Moviechat: From dense token to sparse memory for long video understanding. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16449](#), 2023.

- [37] Zhende Song, Chenchen Wang, Jiamu Sheng, Chi Zhang, Gang Yu, Jiayuan Fan, and Tao Chen. Moviellm: Enhancing long video understanding with ai-generated movies. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.01422](#), 2024.
- [38] Waqas Sultani, Chen Chen, and Mubarak Shah. Real-world anomaly detection in surveillance videos. In Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 6479–6488, 2018.
- [39] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805](#), 2023.
- [40] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288](#), 2023.
- [41] Xiaohan Wang, Yuhui Zhang, Orr Zohar, and Serena Yeung-Levy. Videoagent: Long-form video understanding with large language model as agent. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10517](#), 2024.
- [42] Zhenhailong Wang, Ansel Blume, Sha Li, Genglin Liu, Jaemin Cho, Zineng Tang, Mohit Bansal, and Heng Ji. Paxion: Patching action knowledge in video-language foundation models. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 36, 2023.
- [43] Bo Wu, Shoubin Yu, Zhenfang Chen, Joshua B Tenenbaum, and Chuang Gan. Star: A benchmark for situated reasoning in real-world videos. In Thirty-fifth conference on neural information processing systems datasets and benchmarks track (Round 2), 2021.
- [44] Chao-Yuan Wu and Philipp Krahenbuhl. Towards long-form video understanding. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 1884–1894, 2021.
- [45] Junbin Xiao, Xindi Shang, Angela Yao, and Tat-Seng Chua. Next-qa: Next phase of question-answering to explaining temporal actions. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 9777–9786, 2021.
- [46] Binzhu Xie, Sicheng Zhang, Zitang Zhou, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Jack Hessel, Jingkang Yang, and Ziwei Liu. Funqa: Towards surprising video comprehension. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14899](#), 2023.
- [47] Jiaqi Xu, Cuiling Lan, Wenxuan Xie, Xuejin Chen, and Yan Lu. Retrieval-based video language model for efficient long video question answering. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04931](#), 2023.
- [48] Jun Xu, Tao Mei, Ting Yao, and Yong Rui. Msr-vtt: A large video description dataset for bridging video and language. In Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, pages 5288–5296, 2016.
- [49] Qinghao Ye, Haiyang Xu, Guohai Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Yiyang Zhou, Junyang Wang, Anwen Hu, Pengcheng Shi, Yaya Shi, et al. mplug-owl: Modularization empowers large language models with multimodality. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.14178](#), 2023.
- [50] Zhou Yu, Dejing Xu, Jun Yu, Ting Yu, Zhou Zhao, Yueting Zhuang, and Dacheng Tao. Activitynet-qa: A dataset for understanding complex web videos via question answering. In Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, volume 33, pages 9127–9134, 2019.
- [51] Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoqi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, et al. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16502](#), 2023.
- [52] Zihao Yue, Qi Zhang, Anwen Hu, Liang Zhang, Ziheng Wang, and Qin Jin. Movie101: A new movie understanding benchmark. In Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 4669–4684, 2023.

- [53] Hang Zhang, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. Video-llama: An instruction-tuned audio-visual language model for video understanding. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.02858](#), 2023.
- [54] Xinrong Zhang, Yingfa Chen, Shengding Hu, Zihang Xu, Junhao Chen, Moo Khai Hao, Xu Han, Zhen Leng Thai, Shuo Wang, Zhiyuan Liu, et al.  $\infty$  bench: Extending long context evaluation beyond 100k tokens. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13718](#), 2024.
- [55] Bin Zhu, Bin Lin, Munan Ning, Yang Yan, Jiayi Cui, HongFa Wang, Yatian Pang, Wenhao Jiang, Junwu Zhang, Zongwei Li, et al. Languagebind: Extending video-language pretraining to n-modality by language-based semantic alignment. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01852](#), 2023.
- [56] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigpt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. In [The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations](#), 2023.

## A Overview of Appendix

- B: **Collecting Details of our Universal Long Video Collection (ULVC).**
- C: **Distribution of Video Durations for Each Task.**
- D: **Details of the MLVU Time-Ladder**
- E: **Annotation Details of MLVU.**
- F: **Details of Baselines and the Evaluation Process.**
- G: **Explorations of Video Retrieval Augmented Generation.**
- H: **More Experimental Results.**
- I: **More Visualized Examples of MLVU.**
- J: **Licensing, Hosting and Maintenance Plan.**
- K: **Datasheet.**

## B Collecting Details of our Universal Long Video Collection (ULVC)

In the initial stage of our Multi-task Long Video Understanding (MLVU) benchmark creation, we first collected long-form videos from a variety of sources to form our Universal Long Video Collection (ULVC). The entirety of the long videos incorporated into our MLVU benchmark were selected, edited, or synthesized from ULVC.

Specifically, our ULVC consists of a diverse set of 757 long videos. This collection includes 168 movies sourced from the Movie101 dataset [52] and the MovieChat dataset [36], as well as 60 documentaries from the MovieChat dataset [36]. Additionally, it comprises 65 game videos from the MineDojo dataset [8], 200 surveillance videos from the UCF-Crime dataset [38], and 100 ego-centric videos from the Ego4D dataset [11]. Furthermore, our team independently collected 72 cartoons and 92 TV series to enrich the dataset.

It’s important to clarify that the quantity of videos in the ULVC does not directly correspond to the number of videos and questions in our MLVU benchmark, which are 1334 and 2593 respectively. For example, a two-hour movie from the ULVC might be utilized in its entirety for the Sub-Scene Captioning task, or it could be segmented into several approximately 10-minute clips for the Video Summary task, or even used as a background video for synthetic video generation. Moreover, a single video could be annotated with multiple questions simultaneously.

## C Distribution of Video Durations for Each Task

Figure 4 illustrates the detailed video duration distribution for each task in our MLVU, featuring videos of varying lengths from three minutes to over 120 minutes.

## D Details of the MLVU Time-Ladder

As discussed in Section 3.1, most tasks in our MLVU are subject to segment-level annotation. This approach provides us with the flexibility to adjust the length of the video without requiring additional human annotators. Building on this strategy, as mentioned in Section 4.3, we have generated a derivative dataset, *MLVU Time-Ladder*, which includes videos of varying durations - specifically 3, 6, and 10 minutes. This dataset allows us to investigate how video duration impacts LVU task difficulty.

Specifically, during the annotation process of the VS task, we guided annotators to delineate the summarization in accordance with the initial 3 and 6-minute segments. For the PQA and SSC tasks, we requested annotators to identify the segments within the extended video where the pertinent answers are located. In the case of the ego reasoning task, the Ego4D dataset [11] already comprises the intervals where the answers reside. Lastly, for the synthetic tasks of NQA, AO, and AC, we possess the capability to directly generate the necessary video lengths.




Figure 4: Video duration distributions of different tasks in our MLVU.

## E Annotation Details of MLVU

### E.1 Topic Reasoning (TR).

The questions and corresponding answers for the TR task were meticulously annotated by human annotators, following the specific guidelines illustrated in Figure 5. We required the annotators to design questions related to the reasoning of the video topic, rather than focusing on the creation of questions about minor details. More visualized examples of TR task can be found in Figure 14.

### E.2 Anomaly Recognition (AR).

The anomaly recognition task did not involve manual annotation. We utilized videos exceeding three minutes in duration, extracted from the UCF-Crime dataset [38]. We also modified the original labels to fit a multiple-choice format.

### E.3 Video Summarization (VS).

The ground truth data for the VS task were derived from manual annotations. We instructed the annotators to use pronouns instead of specific character names in all annotations. This guideline stemmed from the inherent constraints of most existing MLLMs, which generally lacked the capacity to process audio or subtitles. This made it difficult for these models to identify specific characters.

### Annotation Guidelines for Topic Reasoning

- 1. Task Description:** Your task is to formulate a question that pertains to the genre and key content of a given long video, and then provide the corresponding answer.
- 2. Question Requirements:**
  - Your questions should be centered around the core content of the video, rather than focusing on minor details.
  - Suitable topics for questions include the genre of the video, the main events or themes, the primary environmental setting, the depicted weather conditions, and the time period or timeline.
- 3. Question Format:**
  - Questions should be structured in a multiple-choice format. Each question should have one correct answer and three plausible, yet incorrect, distractor options.
- 4. Question Examples** (for reference only, not limited):
  - What genre does this movie/video fall into?
  - Where does the main scene in the video take place?
  - What is the main event being narrated in the video?
  - What is the protagonist in the video accomplishing?

Figure 5: Annotation Guidelines for the Topic Reasoning Task.

The annotation instructions and examples provided to the annotators are elaborated in Figure 6. More visualized examples of VS task can be found in Figure 14.

#### E.4 Needle Question-Answering (NQA).

We leveraged the GPT-4 [1] and the detailed video caption data from the WebVid dataset [5] to facilitate a semi-automated generation of annotated questions and answers for the NQA task. Initially, we selected video clips from WebVid, which we referred to as *needle* clips. The corresponding captions of these needle clips were then fed into GPT-4, which generated question-answer pairs based on the information encapsulated in the captions. The specific prompt provided to GPT-4 is depicted in Figure 7. The generated questions were carefully crafted to focus on a particular detail within the needle clip. These questions were structured to incorporate the maximum number of hints to effectively guide MLLMs in grounding the content of the needle within the context of the longer video. Following this, we randomly selected longer background videos from our ULVC and manually ensured that the scene indicated by the needle’s question did not feature in these background videos. The final step involves integrating the needle into the longer video, thereby producing the final needle question video. More visualized examples of NQA task can be found in Figure 15.

#### E.5 Ego Reasoning (ER).

The video resources, questions, and correct responses used in the ER task were derived from the Natural Language Queries (NLQ) task within the Ego4D dataset [11]. This data was restructured to fit a multiple-choice question format.

#### E.6 Plot Question-Answering (PQA).

The PQA task’s questions and answers were annotated by human annotators, following specific guidelines illustrated in Figure 8. We instructed the annotators to craft questions that probe into the intricate plot details encapsulated within the videos. These questions were designed to encompass both perception and reasoning aspects. We stipulated that both questions and their corresponding answers should avoid the use of specific character names or any objective hints, and should instead utilize pronouns. This approach was strategized to prevent potential information leakage, given that MLLMs often demonstrate a familiarity with the storylines of well-known movies and TV series. Such common-sense knowledge could potentially allow the MLLMs to answer questions correctly without the essential requirement of analyzing the input video.



### Annotation Guidelines for Video Summarization

- 1. Task Description:** Your task is to provide a comprehensive summary of the key events occurring within a video clip that ranges from 3 to 15 minutes in length.
- 2. Annotation Requirements:**
  - The annotation should encapsulate the principal events portrayed in the video, structured in chronological order.
  - Refrain from using specific character names in the annotation. Instead, all characters should be referred to using pronouns and identified by their unique attributes or roles, such as attire, age, profession, etc. For instance, characters could be described as an "elderly individual" (age), a "medical professional" (profession), among others.
  - Disregard audio-related information, such as dialogues between characters. The summaries should be derived exclusively from the visual content presented in the video.
- 3. Annotation Template:**
  - Initiate your summary by outlining the overall content of the video: the event being narrated or the video's main theme.
  - Subsequently, chronologically depict the key events that unfold in the video. The aim is to provide a clear and concise description of the main content, events, and scenes exhibited in the video.
- 4. Annotation Examples:**
  - **Cartoon:** This is a video about a cartoon sponge's whimsical adventures. The video begins with a cartoon sponge rushing into a house to converse with a cartoon starfish on a rocking chair. The sponge then heads to a concert hall where he watches a performance, during which a cartoon animal on a throne reprimands a cartoon octopus who continues his act. Later, the cartoon sponge and a cartoon squirrel are seen flying and conversing in the air. The sponge also encounters a cartoon shark preparing to drink coffee and a cartoon lobster sailing on a sponge, after which the lobster chases the sponge away.
  - **Movie / TV Series:** This is a video depicting a dramatic narrative. The video starts with a man singing into a microphone, with a few other men playing instruments behind him. The scene changes to someone pushing open a door and walking into a room where others are resting. She then opens another door, enters a room and starts arguing with the singing man, which results in a fight. Next, the woman drives the man away, which results in a car crash. The car then falls off a bridge and gets hit by another car. The screen goes black and then lights up again, revealing a bookshelf filled with books at the end.
  - **Documentary:** This is a documentary about forest animals and ecology. The video begins by showing scenes of fish, butterflies, orangutans, and birds in the forest. Then, the video depicts two birds cooperatively building a nest on a rock. As it starts to rain in the forest, a hatchling is born. The two birds catch bugs and frogs in the forest and feed them to the newborn. The camera follows the direction of the flowing river, which converges to form a spectacular waterfall. The video ends with a calm sea and beach, with a large flock of seabirds flying over the sea, hunting for prey close to the water.

Figure 6: Annotation Guidelines for the Video Summarization Task.

Nonetheless, the complexity of character interactions and actions in longer videos poses a challenge to conveying plot details using only pronouns and feature descriptions. Previous datasets for plot question answering that avoided the use of character names often resulted in compromised question diversity and tended towards generalized queries. We illustrate this through a comparative analysis of TVQA [17], Moviechat [36], and our PQA dataset's question word clouds in Figure 9. While TVQA provides a diverse range of questions, it does so by employing specific character names. In contrast, Moviechat avoids character names, but its questions are frequently overly broad, lack specific plot details, and exhibit diminished diversity. Our PQA dataset successfully navigates these challenges, offering a diverse range of questions without resorting to the use of character names. More visualized examples of PQA task can be found in Figure 15.

#### E.7 Sub-Scene Captioning (SSC).

In the development process of the SSC task, we employed human annotators to generate both prompts and standard caption data. The specific guidelines provided to annotators are illustrated in Figure 10. Initially, the annotators identified a specific, easily referable sub-scene within a lengthy movie. Subsequently, they crafted a prompt replete with adequate clues to reference this scene, ensuring the uniqueness of these clues throughout the entire film. To prevent any leakage of information, the prompt was designed to exclude any character-specific names or objective hints, instead incorporating rich descriptive details to allude to the plot. Following this, the annotators produced a detailed caption

### Prompt for Generating Needle Questions

You are a question setter. Your task is to evaluate the participants' ability to capture detailed information from an extremely long video. The participants will receive a lengthy and content-rich video, and you are required to ask a question about a specific piece of information from the video.

I will provide you with a description of the segment that needs to be questioned at the end. Your question must include as much contextual information as possible to help the participants locate the source of the information. The description I provide generally contains multiple clues, and you should ask questions targeting different clues. Your question should be in a multiple-choice format, necessitating the provision of at least four choices, including the correct answer. Depending on the depth of information in the segment description, you can craft between 1 to 3 distinct questions.

Please provide the questions in the JSON format as follows...

Here is the description of the segment that needs to be questioned...

Figure 7: The prompt provided to GPT-4 in the process of creating the question-answer pair for the Needle Question-Answering task.

### Annotation Guidelines for Plot Question-Answering

**1. Task Description:** Your task is to generate questions and answers based on the plot events depicted in various media, including movie, TV series, and cartoon animations.

**2. Question Requirements:**

- The questions should target specific details or events within the given video. Both factual and inferential questions are encouraged.
- Avoid using specific character names in the questions. Instead, use pronouns or identify characters by unique attributes or roles (e.g., attire, age, profession).
- Ensure that the plot referred to in your question is unique within the long video. Avoid using vague descriptions that can apply to multiple instances (like "eating"). Instead, refer to unique scenes or add enough details to specify the exact event.

**3. Question Format:**

- Questions should be structured in a multiple-choice format. Each question should have one correct answer and three plausible, yet incorrect, distractor options.

**4. Examples of Questions** (for reference only, not limited):

- How does the character in the small boat end up?
- How did the warship and the small boat approach each other?
- Why didn't the old man buy the chicken?
- What mode of transportation did the old man take in the end?
- What was the young woman doing when she drove to the airport?

Figure 8: Annotation Guidelines for the Plot Question-Answering Task.

for this sub-scene, and deconstructed the caption into multiple, non-redundant "scoring points" to facilitate quantitative assessment (the details of the evaluation metric can be found in Appendix F.3). More visualized examples of PQA task can be found in Figure 16.

## E.8 Action Order (AO).

The videos, questions, and answers for the action order task were all synthetically generated. In order to maintain the high quality of our evaluation data, we adopted a dual-strategy approach. Firstly, we selected actions for the *probe* videos that were not commonly seen in most films, such as making jewelry and water skiing. Secondly, in the selection of background videos, we conducted a cursory review of the video content to further ensure that the actions referenced in the questions were not present in the video. This rigorous methodology ensured the reliability of our data.




Figure 9: **Word Cloud Comparison** of questions in TVQA test set (left), MovieChat test set (middle), and our PQA (right). Notably, TVQA’s character-specific names require LLMs to recognize characters, risking reliance on pre-existing knowledge. In contrast, MovieChat questions are less diverse. Our PQA addresses these issues, providing enhanced usability and reliability.

**Annotation Guidelines for Sub-Scene Captioning**

- 1. Task Description:** You are required to provide a detailed **caption** for a specific scene in a long movie and clearly provide a unique **prompt** that can point to this scene.
- 2. Prompt Requirements:**
  - The clue in the prompt should direct to a specific and singular scene in the movie.
  - Ensure that the prompt does not contain specific character names or movie-specific terms.
  - The scene to be described should generally not exceed 1 minute.
- 3. Caption Requirements:**
  - Avoid using specific character names in the captions. Instead, use pronouns or identify characters by unique attributes or roles (e.g., attire, age, profession).
  - Provide a caption and a list of unique plot details as scoring points, ensuring there's no repetition of details already present in the prompt.
- 4. Examples:**
  - Example (1):
    - Prompt: Please describe the situation after the man at the door takes off his hat and throws it away.
    - Caption: The hat flies into the room and is kicked into the large clock by the man in black who stands up.
    - Scoring points: "The hat flies into the room", "is kicked into the large clock", "by the man in black who stands up"
  - Example (2):
    - Prompt: Please describe the reaction of the short-haired man when the long-haired man took out the urn.
    - Caption: The short-haired man stood up, held the urn in his hands, and pressed his forehead against the mouth of the urn, unable to hold back his tears.
    - Scoring points: "The short-haired man stood up", "held the urn in his hands", "pressed his forehead against the mouth of the urn", "unable to hold back his tears"

Figure 10: Annotation Guidelines for the Sub-Scene Captioning Task.

## E.9 Action Count (AC).

The process of data acquisition and annotation for the action count task closely mirrored that of the action order task. All videos, questions, and answers were synthetically generated. We employed a strategy consistent with the action order task to ensure the validity and reliability of our evaluation data.

## F Details of Baselines and the Evaluation Process

### F.1 Baselines

In this section, we detail the primary baselines evaluated on our MLVU. For image-based MLLMs, most available models lack multi-image inference capabilities. Consequently, we select Otter-I, LLaVA-1.6, and InternVL, which offer official multi-image implementations. Additionally, we include three proprietary models—Claude-3-Opus, Qwen-VL-Max, and GPT-4 Turbo—that provide APIs for multi-image inference. For available models, we estimate the maximum input frames based on their maximum LLM context length. For Claude and Qwen, the supported maximum image numbers are approximately 20; therefore, we select 16 frames to ensure fair comparisons. Similarly, we choose 16 frames for GPT-4 Turbo to maintain consistency. In terms of video MLLMs, we adhere to the default settings for frame sampling strategies. For instance, VideoChat2 uniformly samples 16 frames, whereas LLaMA-Vid samples 1 frame per second. Specifically, the GPT-4o can support a maximum of approximately 500 images when each image’s resolution is set to  $512 \times 512$  pixels. Consequently, we opt for a sampling rate of 0.5 fps to accommodate the majority of our videos. Table 3 and Table 4 show the LLM-backbone as well as evaluated weight links used in each MLLM.

| Image MLLMs   |            | Short Video MLLMs |            | Long Video MLLMs |            |
|---------------|------------|-------------------|------------|------------------|------------|
| Model         | LLM        | Model             | LLM        | Model            | LLM        |
| Otter-I       | MPT-7B     | Otter-V           | LLaMA-7B   | Movie-LLM        | Vicuna-7B  |
| LLaVA-1.6     | Vicuna-7B  | mPLUG-Owl-V       | LLaMA-7B   | MovieChat        | Vicuna-7B  |
| InternVL-1.5  | Vicuna-13B | VideoChat         | Vicuna-7B  | TimeChat         | LLaMA-2 7B |
| Claude-3-Opus | Claude3    | Video-ChatGPT     | Vicuna-7B  | LLaMA-VID        | Vicuna-7B  |
| Qwen-VL-Max   | Qwen       | Video-LLaMA-2     | Vicuna-13B | MA-LMM           | Vicuna-7B  |
| GPT-4 Turbo   | GPT-4      | VideoChat2        | Vicuna-7B  | MiniGPT4-Video   | Mistral-7B |
|               |            | Video-LLaVA       | Vicuna-7B  | GPT-4o           | GPT4       |

Table 3: LLM-Backbone in different MLLMs

| Image MLLMs   |        | Short Video MLLMs |        | Long Video MLLMs |        |
|---------------|--------|-------------------|--------|------------------|--------|
| Model         | Weight | Model             | Weight | Model            | Weight |
| Otter-I       | Link   | Otter-V           | Link   | Movie-LLM        | Link   |
| LLaVA-1.6     | Link   | mPLUG-Owl-V       | Link   | MovieChat        | Link   |
| InternVL-1.5  | Link   | VideoChat         | Link   | TimeChat         | Link   |
| Claude-3-Opus | -      | Video-ChatGPT     | Link   | LLaMA-VID        | Link   |
| Qwen-VL-Max   | -      | Video-LLaMA-2     | Link   | MA-LMM           | Link   |
| GPT-4 Turbo   | -      | VideoChat2        | Link   | MiniGPT4-Video   | Link   |
|               |        | Video-LLaVA       | Link   | GPT-4o           | -      |

Table 4: Link of evaluation weights. The specific version for “GPT-4 Turbo” and “GPT-4o” is “gpt-4-turbo-2024-04-09” and “gpt-4o-2024-05-13”.

### F.2 Inference Detatils

We have developed two templates specifically for Multiple-Choice and Generation tasks, as illustrated in Figure 11. Distinct system prompts were designed to accommodate the differences between video-based and image-based MLLMs. Considering the variances in task requirements, we incorporated “option prediction guidance” into the Multiple-Choice template to aid in option extraction. Conversely, in Generation tasks, we do not implement any additional interventions but employ fixed-question guidance to enable models to respond to diverse task questions. In our evaluation, the templates are seamlessly integrated into the evaluation code of open-release models or available API of proprietary models.

### F.3 Evaluation Metrics

For the evaluation of Multiple Choice tasks, we directly compute absolute accuracy by matching the predicted option with the ground truth. In Generation tasks, we develop multiple criteria for assessment and employ GPT-4 to rank the alignment between generated texts and the provided answers. As illustrated in Figure 12, we use “Accuracy” and “Relevance” to benchmark Sub-scene Captioning, and “Completeness” and “Reliability” to evaluate the capabilities of Video Summary.




Figure 11: Inference template for our MLVU.

### Evaluation Prompt For Sub-Scene Captioning Task

**##TASK DESCRIPTION:** You are required to evaluate a respondent's answer based on a provided question, some scoring points, and the respondent's answer. You should provide two scores. The first is the accuracy score, which should range from 1 to 5. The second is the relevance score, which should also range from 1 to 5. Below are the criteria for each scoring category.

**##ACCURACY Scoring Criteria:**

Evaluate the respondent's answer against specific scoring points as follows:

Score 1: The response completely misses the scoring point.

Score 3: The response mentions content related to the scoring point but is not entirely correct.

Score 5: The response accurately addresses the scoring point.

Calculate the average score across all scoring points to determine the final accuracy score.

**##RELEVANCE Scoring Criteria:**

Assess how the respondent's answer relates to the original question:

Score 1: The response is completely off-topic from the question.

Score 2: The response is partially related to the question but contains a significant amount of irrelevant content.

Score 3: The response primarily addresses the question, but the respondent seems uncertain about their own answer.

Score 4: The response mostly addresses the question and the respondent appears confident in their answer.

Score 5: The response is fully focused on addressing the question with no irrelevant content and demonstrates complete certainty.

**##INSTRUCTION:**

1. Evaluate ACCURACY: First, assess and score each scoring point based on the respondent's answer. Calculate the average of these scores to establish the final accuracy score. Provide a detailed rationale before assigning your score.

2. Evaluate RELEVANCE: Assess the relevance of the respondent's answer to the question. Note that when evaluating relevance, the correctness of the answer is not considered; focus solely on how relevant the answer is to the question. Provide a comprehensive rationale before assigning your score.

3. Output Scores in JSON Format: Present the scores in JSON format as follows...

### Evaluation Prompt For Video Summarization Task

**##TASK DESCRIPTION:**

You are required to evaluate the performance of the respondent in the video summarization task based on the standard answer and the respondent's answer. You should provide two scores. The first is the COMPLETENESS score, which should range from 1 to 5. The second is the RELIABILITY score, which should also range from 1 to 5. Below are the criteria for each scoring category:

**##COMPLETENESS Scoring Criteria:**

The completeness score focuses on whether the summary covers all key points and main information from the video.

Score 1: The summary hardly covers any of the main content or key points of the video.

Score 2: The summary covers some of the main content and key points but misses many.

Score 3: The summary covers most of the main content and key points.

Score 4: The summary is very comprehensive, covering most to nearly all of the main content and key points.

Score 5: The summary completely covers all the main content and key points of the video.

**##CORRECTNESS Scoring Criteria:**

The correctness score evaluates the correctness and clarity of the video summary. It checks for factual errors, misleading statements, and contradictions with the video content. If the respondent's answer includes details that are not present in the standard answer, as long as these details do not conflict with the correct answer and are reasonable, points should not be deducted.

Score 1: Contains multiple factual errors and contradictions; presentation is confusing.

Score 2: Includes several errors and some contradictions; needs clearer presentation.

Score 3: Generally accurate with minor errors; minimal contradictions; reasonably clear presentation.

Score 4: Very accurate with negligible inaccuracies; no contradictions; clear and fluent presentation.

Score 5: Completely accurate with no errors or contradictions; presentation is clear and easy to understand.

**##INSTRUCTION:**

1. Evaluate COMPLETENESS: First, analyze the respondent's answer according to the scoring criteria, then provide an integer score between 1 and 5 based on sufficient evidence.

2. Evaluate CORRECTNESS: First, analyze the respondent's answer according to the scoring criteria, then provide an integer score between 1 and 5 based on sufficient evidence.

3. Output Scores in JSON Format: Present the scores in JSON format as follows...

Figure 12: Detailed prompt for evaluation of generation tasks in MLVU.

## G Explorations of Video Retrieval Augmented Generation

As discussed in Section 4.3, most MLLMs are adversely affected by video length. Drawing inspiration from the use of Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) in video understanding, we have developed a zero-shot RAG strategy and seamlessly integrated it into existing MLLMs. Table 5 displays the performance comparison between the baseline models and the models employing our RAG strategy. It is noteworthy that all methods benefit from the RAG strategy in Needle QA, Ego Reasoning, and Plot QA. Conversely, minimal improvement is observed in Action Count, and a decrease is noted in Action Order and Overall Reasoning. This is primarily because RAG facilitates the retrieval of detail-oriented video clips, which makes models more likely to focus on answer-related cues in specific single-detail reasoning tasks. However, RAG exhibits limited capabilities in multi-detail reasoning and holistic understanding tasks, which require global perception and knowledge aggregation.

The pipeline of our video retrieval augmented generation is illustrated in Figure 13. Initially, a long video is uniformly divided into  $N$  video clips, each containing  $C$  frames. Subsequently, we employ a robust video feature extraction tool, LanguageBind [55] to extract clip embeddings  $F_I \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times d}$ , where  $d$  represents the dimension of each clip embedding. We then compute the similarities between  $F_I$  and the text embedding  $F_T$ , concatenating the top  $K$  clips to enhance the model’s capability for question-answering. Given that many Video MLLMs are limited to processing only 16 frames, we have adjusted the settings for  $C$  and  $K$  to accommodate video retrieval in 16-second intervals. As discussed below, the RAG strategy excels in detail-oriented tasks but shows limitations in global understanding tasks. Moreover, it is relatively inefficient, requiring more than one minute to complete the process. Consequently, more effective approaches need to be developed for long video understanding tasks, and we aim to address this in future work.




Figure 13: Pipeline of our video retrieval augmented generation strategy.

## H More Experimental Results

### H.1 Leaderboard of each task in MLVU

Table 6 shows the leaderboard of each task in our MLVU.

| Model            | Settings | Needle QA | Ego Rea. | Plot QA | Action Or. | Action Co. | Anomaly Rec. | Topic Rea. |
|------------------|----------|-----------|----------|---------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| LLaVA-B          | -        | 43.1      | 38.4     | 41.0    | 25.5       | 25.7       | 41.0         | 60.6       |
| LLaVA-R          | C=2,K=8  | 50.7      | 45.7     | 49.7    | 26.3       | 26.7       | 40.8         | 59.8       |
|                  | C=4,K=4  | 53.5      | 43.5     | 50.6    | 25.9       | 29.6       | 39.9         | 58.5       |
|                  | C=8,K=2  | 55.2      | 42.6     | 50.3    | 25.1       | 30.1       | 40.6         | 59.5       |
| InternVL-B       | -        | 52.7      | 43.5     | 54.4    | 32.8       | 23.8       | 67.0         | 78.8       |
| InternVL-R       | C=2,K=8  | 77.2      | 52.6     | 61.4    | 30.1       | 36.4       | 57.9         | 69.2       |
|                  | C=4,K=4  | 76.3      | 51.4     | 59.9    | 29.3       | 36.9       | 58.3         | 69.4       |
|                  | C=8,K=2  | 77.8      | 48.9     | 61.6    | 31.7       | 33.0       | 60.2         | 62.3       |
| Video-LLaMA-B    | -        | 39.4      | 33.5     | 35.4    | 18.5       | 25.7       | 41.5         | 54.5       |
| Video-LLaMA-R    | C=2,K=8  | 61.4      | 42.6     | 38.8    | 17.4       | 17.5       | 35.7         | 48.5       |
|                  | C=4,K=4  | 58.9      | 42.6     | 39.1    | 17.8       | 23.8       | 36.0         | 49.3       |
|                  | C=8,K=2  | 62.0      | 38.4     | 36.2    | 25.5       | 18.0       | 38.5         | 51.0       |
| VideoChat2-B     | -        | 42.0      | 47.4     | 43.8    | 22.8       | 29.6       | 51.5         | 74.6       |
| VideoChat2-R     | C=2,K=8  | 72.1      | 53.7     | 55.5    | 21.6       | 30.1       | 45.8         | 68.2       |
|                  | C=4,K=4  | 72.4      | 55.4     | 53.4    | 22.4       | 31.1       | 45.3         | 68.9       |
|                  | C=8,K=2  | 73.8      | 53.1     | 55.3    | 22.0       | 31.6       | 46.6         | 69.7       |
| MiniGPT4-Video-B | -        | 49.0      | 48.6     | 44.5    | 23.2       | 23.0       | 52.5         | 70.9       |
| MiniGPT4-Video-R | C=2,K=8  | 60.6      | 44.3     | 47.4    | 23.2       | 23.7       | 42.8         | 60.9       |
|                  | C=4,K=4  | 60.3      | 44.6     | 46.9    | 26.3       | 23.8       | 42.6         | 60.7       |
|                  | C=8,K=2  | 56.3      | 44.6     | 46.6    | 27.4       | 24.8       | 45.0         | 47.5       |

Table 5: Quantitative results on video Retrieval Augmented Generation. “model-B” and “model-R” denote Baseline and RAG models respectively. We evaluate two image MLLMs and three video MLLMs in different settings.

| Rank | Model          | Score | Rank | Model          | Score | Rank | Model          | Score | Rank | Model          | Score |
|------|----------------|-------|------|----------------|-------|------|----------------|-------|------|----------------|-------|
| 1    | GPT-4o         | 87.4  | 1    | GPT-4o         | 74.5  | 1    | GPT-4o         | 4.90  | 1    | GPT-4o         | 64.8  |
| 2    | GPT-4 Turbo    | 79.5  | 2    | GPT-4 Turbo    | 68.0  | 2    | GPT-4 Turbo    | 4.49  | 2    | Video-LLaVA    | 53.2  |
| 3    | InternVL-1.5   | 78.8  | 3    | InternVL-1.5   | 67.0  | 3    | LLaMA-VID      | 3.22  | 3    | InternVL-1.5   | 52.7  |
| 4    | VideoChat2     | 74.6  | 4    | Qwen-VL-Max    | 63.5  | 4    | InternVL-1.5   | 3.16  | 4    | MiniGPT4-Video | 49.0  |
| 5    | Video-LLaVA    | 71.6  | 5    | Video-LLaVA    | 57.0  | 5    | Claude-3-Opus  | 3.11  | 5    | GPT-4 Turbo    | 45.9  |
| 6    | MiniGPT4-Video | 70.9  | 6    | MiniGPT4-Video | 52.5  | 6    | Movie-LLM      | 2.88  | 6    | LLaVA          | 43.1  |
| 7    | Qwen-VL-Max    | 67.4  | 7    | VideoChat2     | 51.5  | 7    | Qwen-VL-Max    | 2.71  | 7    | MA-LMM         | 43.1  |
| 8    | Claude-3-Opus  | 67.2  | 8    | Claude-3-Opus  | 43.5  | 8    | MiniGPT4-Video | 2.64  | 8    | VideoChat2     | 42.0  |
| 9    | LLaVA          | 60.6  | 9    | Video-LLaMA-2  | 41.5  | 9    | VideoChat2     | 2.57  | 9    | Qwen-VL-Max    | 40.3  |
| 10   | Video-LLaMA-2  | 54.5  | 10   | LLaVA          | 41.0  | 10   | TimeChat       | 2.54  | 10   | Video-ChatGPT  | 40.3  |

| Rank | Model          | Score | Rank | Model          | Score | Rank | Model         | Score | Rank | Model         | Score |
|------|----------------|-------|------|----------------|-------|------|---------------|-------|------|---------------|-------|
| 1    | GPT-4o         | 57.1  | 1    | GPT-4o         | 65.1  | 1    | GPT-4o        | 6.69  | 1    | GPT-4o        | 56.7  |
| 2    | MiniGPT4-Video | 48.6  | 2    | GPT-4 Turbo    | 60.6  | 2    | GPT-4 Turbo   | 6.21  | 2    | InternVL-1.5  | 32.8  |
| 3    | GPT-4 Turbo    | 47.4  | 3    | InternVL-1.5   | 54.4  | 3    | Video-ChatGPT | 5.48  | 3    | MovieChat     | 28.6  |
| 4    | VideoChat2     | 47.4  | 4    | Video-LLaVA    | 48.4  | 4    | mPLUG-Owl-V   | 5.31  | 4    | GPT-4V        | 26.5  |
| 5    | Video-LLaVA    | 45.2  | 5    | Claude-3-Opus  | 47.8  | 5    | Video-LLaVA   | 5.25  | 5    | LLaVA         | 25.5  |
| 6    | InternVL-1.5   | 43.5  | 6    | MiniGPT4-Video | 44.5  | 6    | Video-LLaMA-2 | 5.22  | 6    | Video-ChatGPT | 25.1  |
| 7    | Video-ChatGPT  | 42.0  | 7    | VideoChat2     | 43.8  | 7    | LLaMA-VID     | 5.22  | 7    | MA-LMM        | 25.1  |
| 8    | Qwen-VL-Max    | 40.9  | 8    | Qwen-VL-Max    | 43.3  | 8    | Qwen-VL-Max   | 5.21  | 8    | Qwen-VL-Max   | 25.0  |
| 9    | Claude-3-Opus  | 40.2  | 9    | LLaVA          | 41.0  | 9    | VideoChat2    | 5.04  | 9    | TimeChat      | 24.7  |
| 10   | MA-LMM         | 38.9  | 10   | MA-LMM         | 35.8  | 10   | VideoChat     | 5.01  | 10   | VideoChat     | 24.3  |

| Rank | Model         | Score | Rank | Model          | Score | Rank | Model         | Score | Rank | Model         | Score |
|------|---------------|-------|------|----------------|-------|------|---------------|-------|------|---------------|-------|
| 1    | GPT-4o        | 46.3  | 1    | GPT-4o         | 64.6  | 1    | GPT-4o        | 5.80  | 1    | GPT-4o        | 5.35  |
| 2    | Video-LLaVA   | 35.9  | 2    | InternVL-1.5   | 50.4  | 2    | GPT-4 Turbo   | 4.22  | 2    | LLaMA-VID     | 4.22  |
| 3    | TimeChat      | 32.0  | 3    | GPT-4 Turbo    | 49.2  | 3    | LLaMA-VID     | 4.02  | 3    | InternVL-1.5  | 4.02  |
| 4    | Video-ChatGPT | 31.1  | 4    | Video-LLaVA    | 47.3  | 4    | InternVL-1.5  | 3.96  | 4    | Qwen-VL-Max   | 3.96  |
| 5    | VideoChat2    | 29.6  | 5    | MiniGPT4-Video | 44.5  | 5    | Qwen-VL-Max   | 3.90  | 5    | Video-ChatGPT | 3.90  |
| 6    | VideoChat     | 28.6  | 6    | VideoChat2     | 44.5  | 6    | Video-ChatGPT | 3.84  | 6    | mPLUG-Owl-V   | 3.84  |
| 7    | LLaMA-VID     | 27.8  | 7    | Qwen-VL-Max    | 42.2  | 7    | mPLUG-Owl-V   | 3.84  | 7    | Video-LLaVA   | 3.84  |
| 8    | Otter-V       | 26.7  | 8    | LLaVA-1.6      | 39.3  | 8    | Video-LLaVA   | 3.81  | 8    | VideoChat2    | 3.81  |
| 9    | LLaVA         | 25.7  | 9    | Claude-3-Opus  | 36.5  | 9    | VideoChat2    | 3.78  | 9    | Video-LLaMA-2 | 3.78  |
| 10   | Video-LLaMA-2 | 25.7  | 10   | MA-LMM         | 36.4  | 10   | Video-LLaMA-2 | 3.78  | 10   | Video-LLaMA-2 | 3.78  |

Table 6: Leaderboard of different tasks in MLVU. (until 2024/06/01)



## H.2 Comprehensive evaluation results on MLVU Time-ladder

Table 7, Table 8 and Table 9 show the experimental results on MLVU Time-ladder within 3 minutes, 6 minutes and 10 minutes. As anomaly recognition and topic reasoning are global tasks, thus, we can not annotate them in MLVU Time-ladder as the way provided in Appendix D.

| Model          | Needle QA   | Ego Rea.    | Plot QA     | Action Or.  | Action Co.  | Sub-Scene Cap. | Video Sum.  | M-Avg       |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|
| Otter-I        | 25.0        | 25.0        | 25.4        | 25.0        | 25.0        | 4.04           | 2.59        | 25.1        |
| LLaVA-1.6      | 48.0        | 43.0        | 45.2        | 29.5        | 28.5        | 4.48           | 2.40        | 38.8        |
| InternVL-1.5   | <b>70.5</b> | <b>47.5</b> | <b>60.9</b> | 19.5        | 28.5        | 5.42           | 3.30        | <b>45.3</b> |
| Claude-3-Opus  | 34.5        | 42.5        | 38.1        | 15.5        | 22.0        | 4.12           | 3.35        | 30.5        |
| Qwen-VL-Max    | 49.5        | 42.2        | 50.3        | 27.7        | 16.3        | 5.58           | 2.95        | 37.2        |
| Otter-V        | 30.5        | 32.0        | 18.3        | 21.0        | 29.5        | 4.32           | 2.63        | 26.3        |
| mPLUG-Owl-V    | 31.0        | 29.5        | 22.3        | 29.0        | 24.0        | 5.35           | 2.68        | 27.2        |
| Video-LLaMA-2  | 55.0        | 35.0        | 36.5        | 22.5        | 22.0        | <b>5.76</b>    | 2.47        | 34.3        |
| Video-ChatGPT  | 43.5        | 41.0        | 40.0        | 29.0        | 28.0        | 5.51           | 2.65        | 34.5        |
| VideoChat      | 32.5        | 31.5        | 26.4        | 24.5        | 26.0        | 5.39           | 2.61        | 28.2        |
| VideoChat2     | 54.0        | 53.5        | 50.3        | <b>30.0</b> | 31.0        | 5.11           | 3.25        | 43.8        |
| Video-LLaVA    | 58.0        | <b>47.5</b> | 55.8        | 29.5        | <b>34.5</b> | 5.38           | 2.89        | 45.0        |
| MiniGPT4-Video | 57.0        | 44.5        | 47.2        | 27.5        | 26.5        | 4.38           | 2.98        | 40.5        |
| LLaMA-VID      | 38.5        | 36.5        | 36.0        | 22.5        | 25.5        | 5.31           | <b>3.55</b> | 31.8        |
| Movie-LLM      | 23.5        | 22.5        | 25.9        | 25.0        | 25.0        | 5.13           | 3.23        | 34.4        |
| MA-LMM         | 48.0        | 43.0        | 41.6        | 27.5        | 23.5        | 4.55           | 2.25        | 36.7        |
| MovieChat      | 32.5        | 29.5        | 27.4        | 21.0        | 21.0        | 3.60           | 2.60        | 26.3        |
| TimeChat       | 30.5        | 30.5        | 31.0        | 27.5        | 24.5        | 4.29           | 2.92        | 28.8        |

Table 7: Quantitative results on MLVU Time-ladder (180s). “M-Avg” is calculated by the average of five multiple-choice tasks. Bold fonts mean the best results.

| Model          | Needle QA   | Ego Rea.    | Plot QA     | Action Or.  | Action Co.  | Sub-Scene Cap. | Video Sum.  | M-Avg       |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|
| Otter-I        | 25.0        | 25.0        | 25.0        | 11.5        | 25.0        | 4.17           | 2.33        | 22.4        |
| LLaVA-1.6      | 41.0        | 38.5        | 39.6        | 22.0        | 26.0        | 4.14           | 2.18        | 33.4        |
| InternVL-1.5   | <b>66.5</b> | <b>48.5</b> | <b>58.4</b> | <b>34.0</b> | 24.0        | 5.23           | 3.12        | <b>46.2</b> |
| Claude-3-Opus  | 32.0        | 44.7        | 42.6        | 30.2        | 15.5        | 3.75           | 3.13        | 33.0        |
| Qwen-VL-Max    | 50.0        | 43.4        | 41.1        | 24.4        | 14.7        | 5.49           | 3.21        | 34.7        |
| Otter-V        | 27.0        | 30.5        | 23.9        | 13.0        | 26.5        | 4.34           | 2.51        | 24.2        |
| mPLUG-Owl-V    | 29.5        | 34.5        | 22.3        | 23.5        | 23.0        | 5.58           | 2.42        | 26.6        |
| Video-LLaMA-2  | 43.0        | 36.0        | 40.1        | 23.0        | 28.0        | <b>5.62</b>    | 2.45        | 34.0        |
| Video-ChatGPT  | 42.5        | 35.0        | 27.4        | 23.5        | 32.0        | 5.22           | 2.56        | 32.1        |
| VideoChat      | 28.5        | 27.5        | 19.8        | 25.5        | 30.0        | 5.32           | 2.38        | 26.3        |
| VideoChat2     | 47.5        | 44.5        | 39.6        | 27.0        | 31.0        | 4.97           | 2.83        | 37.9        |
| Video-LLaVA    | 55.5        | 47.5        | 47.7        | 22.0        | <b>35.0</b> | 5.25           | 2.62        | 41.5        |
| MiniGPT4-Video | 53.0        | 43.5        | 43.1        | 31.0        | 24.5        | 4.11           | 2.82        | 39.0        |
| LLaMA-VID      | 30.5        | 39.0        | 28.4        | 19.5        | 30.5        | 5.39           | <b>3.29</b> | 29.6        |
| Movie-LLM      | 26.0        | 22.5        | 32.0        | 22.5        | 26.0        | 5.16           | 3.14        | 25.8        |
| MA-LMM         | 41.5        | 37.0        | 41.6        | 27.0        | 27.5        | 4.52           | 2.19        | 34.9        |
| MovieChat      | 28.5        | 25.5        | 29.4        | 25.0        | 23.5        | 3.25           | 2.41        | 26.4        |
| TimeChat       | 36.5        | 30.0        | 31.0        | 26.5        | 26.0        | 4.37           | 2.66        | 30.0        |

Table 8: Quantitative results on MLVU Time-ladder (360s).

| Model          | Needle QA   | Ego Rea.    | Plot QA     | Action Or.  | Action Co.  | Sub-Scene Cap. | M-Avg.      |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| Otter-I        | 25.0        | 25.0        | 25.0        | 12.5        | 25.0        | 4.02           | 22.5        |
| LLaVA-1.6      | 37.5        | 38.5        | 43.9        | 25.0        | 28.5        | 4.45           | 34.6        |
| InternVL-1.5   | <b>56.0</b> | 46.0        | <b>55.6</b> | 33.0        | 25.0        | 5.17           | <b>43.1</b> |
| Claude-3-Opus  | 27.0        | 38.5        | 39.8        | <b>35.7</b> | 15.0        | 3.88           | 31.2        |
| Qwen-VL-Max    | 43.0        | 44.8        | 50.0        | 17.3        | 17.9        | 5.45           | 34.6        |
| Otter-V        | 27.5        | 28.5        | 22.4        | 14.0        | 26.0        | 4.09           | 23.7        |
| mPLUG-Owl-V    | 30.5        | 36.0        | 21.4        | 20.0        | 28.0        | 5.29           | 27.2        |
| Video-LLaMA-2  | 39.0        | 39.0        | 29.6        | 21.5        | 25.5        | <b>5.62</b>    | 30.9        |
| Video-ChatGPT  | 41.0        | 40.5        | 28.6        | 24.5        | <b>32.5</b> | 5.37           | 33.4        |
| VideoChat      | 25.5        | 34.5        | 26.0        | 28.0        | 30.0        | 4.91           | 28.8        |
| VideoChat2     | 43.0        | <b>49.0</b> | 41.8        | 24.5        | 29.5        | 5.05           | 37.6        |
| Video-LLaVA    | 54.0        | <b>49.0</b> | 52.0        | 21.0        | 29.5        | 5.21           | 41.1        |
| MiniGPT4-Video | 54.0        | 39.0        | 41.8        | 25.0        | 28.0        | 4.13           | 37.6        |
| LLaMA-VID      | 32.0        | 36.5        | 34.2        | 27.0        | 27.0        | 5.39           | 31.3        |
| Movie-LLM      | 26.5        | 32.5        | 27.0        | 21.5        | 24.5        | 5.25           | 26.4        |
| MA-LMM         | 44.5        | 41.5        | 35.7        | 24.0        | 28.0        | 4.72           | 34.7        |
| MovieChat      | 27.5        | 32.5        | 22.4        | 24.0        | 27.0        | 3.48           | 26.7        |
| TimeChat       | 28.0        | 32.0        | 23.5        | 26.0        | 24.5        | 4.19           | 26.8        |

Table 9: Quantitative results on MLVU Time-ladder (600s).

## I More Visualized Examples of MLVU.

### Topic Reasoning



Question: What type of film is this?  
 (A) Mystery (B) Action (C) Comedy (D) **Romance**



Question: What is this video about?  
 (A) A person in the game taking care of pets (B) **A person in the game building a structure by the lake**  
 (C) A person in the game planting trees by the lake (D) A documentary about humans and nature



Question: Where is the main setting of the video?  
 (A) Desert (B) Grassland (C) **Outside the house** (D) Inside the house

### Video Summarization



Prompt: Please summarize the main content of this video.  
 The video begins with two men talking in a dimly lit room. After one of the men leaves, he enters another house where an elderly woman is present. They engage in conversation, and the elderly woman appears sad. In another scene, two women are talking, and one of them takes car keys and leaves. She arrives at another location and talks with a woman and a man. Subsequently, one of the women makes a phone call.



Prompt: Please summarize the main content of this video.  
 The video starts with a man singing into a microphone, with a few other men playing instruments behind him. The scene changes to someone pushing open a door and walking into a room where others are resting. She then opens another door, enters a room and starts arguing with the singing man, which results in a fight. Next, the woman drives the man away, which results in a car crash. The car then falls off a bridge and gets hit by another car. The screen goes black and then lights up again, revealing a bookshelf filled with books at the end.

Figure 14: More Examples of Topic Reasoning and Video Summarization Tasks.

### Needle Question-Answering



Question: Where is the senior businessman having a serious conversation on the cell phone?


- (A) In a park    **(B) By the sea shore**    (C) In his office    (D) At a restaurant



Question: What are the little girl and her grandmother doing together?

- (A) Watching TV    (B) Playing a game    **(C) Reading a children's book**    (D) Eating dinner

### Plot Question Answering



Question: What happened after the person with the yellow stripe arrived at the camp?

- (A) He went to eat    (B) He went hunting  
(C) He went to war    **(D) He started a fight with the person holding the pipe**



Question: What color is the table lamp in the background of the scene where a man and a woman are chatting?

- (A) Black    **(B) White**    (C) Green    (D) Yellow

Figure 15: More Examples of Needle Question Answering and Plot Question Answering Tasks.

### Sub-Scene Captioning



Prompt: Please describe the situation after the woman in red walked to the window of the bridal shop.

Answer: The woman in red took a picture with her camera. As the photo slowly slid out, she looked down at it.



Prompt: Please describe the process of a man alone in a room looking for a camera.

Answer: The man raises his cue stick to find the angle, then turns around and walks to a statue where he finds the camera.

Figure 16: More Examples of Sub-Scene Captioning.

## J Licensing, Hosting and Maintenance Plan

**Author Statement.** We bear all responsibilities for the licensing, distribution, and maintenance of our dataset.

**License.** MLVU is under CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0 license.

**Hosting.** MLVU can be viewed and downloaded on GitHub at <https://github.com/JUNJIE99/MLVU> or on Huggingface at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/MLVU/MVLU>. We assure its long-term preservation for future reference and use. The annotations for questions and answers are provided in the JSON file format, while the raw videos are available in the MP4 format.

For the video files, we do not hold any copyright, and all video rights belong to the video authors. To facilitate user usage, under the premise of a user agreement that the data will be used solely for research purposes and not for commercial use, we provide the download methods for these videos. We have taken measures such as reducing resolution, modifying aspect ratio, and editing to minimize the impact on the original work rights. However, there is still a risk that copyright holders may request the removal of some data. If this happens, we will follow the practice of Movienet [13] to sparsely collect these video frames. This will not significantly impact our data usage, as all our annotations are focused on the visual information in the videos, unrelated to the audio. Moreover, most of the models we evaluate are essentially still frame-based video processing and do not involve audio processing. If retaining video frames is also not allowed, we will still preserve the annotation data and provide metadata for the corresponding videos.

**Metadata.** Metadata can be found at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/MLVU/MVLU/tree/main/MLVU/json>.

## K Datasheet

### K.1 Motivation

**For what purpose was the dataset created?**

**Answer:** The creation of MLVU is to facilitate the evaluation and development of MLLM’s long video understanding capabilities. Compared to previous video understanding benchmarks, MLVU possesses a substantial extension of video length, diversified video categories, and diversified evaluation tasks. MLVU is the first comprehensive benchmark for long video understanding.

**Who created the dataset (e.g., which team, research group) and on behalf of which entity (e.g., company, institution, organization)?**

**Answer:** The MLVU is created by Junjie Zhou (BUPT, BAAI), Yan Shu (BAAI), Bo Zhao (BAAI), Boya Wu (BAAI), Shitao Xiao (BAAI), Xi Yang (BAAI), Yongping Xiong (BUPT), Bo Zhang (ZJU), Tiejun Huang (PKU, BAAI), and Zheng Liu (BAAI)

**Who funded the creation of the dataset?**

**Answer:** Beijing Academy of Artificial Intelligence, Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Peking University, and Zhejiang University.

### K.2 Composition

**What do the instances that comprise the dataset represent? (e.g., documents, photos, people, countries)**

**Answer:** Each instance in our dataset represents a long video ranging from 3 minutes to 2 hours in duration, a question, a standard answer, and for the multiple-choice task, there are also 4 options. Videos are stored in MP4 file format, while the questions, standard answers, and options are all stored in JSON format files.

**How many instances are there in total (of each type, if appropriate)?**

**Answer:** In total, we collect 2593 instances, including 2175 multiple-choice questions and 418 free-form generation questions. The number of distinct videos is 1334, as one video may correspond to multiple questions. The specific distribution of question types and video duration can be found in Figure 1 in the main paper.

**Does the dataset contain all possible instances or is it a sample (not necessarily random) of instances from a larger set?**

**Answer:** Only a part of the questions was sampled from existing datasets (the ego reasoning task and the anomaly recognition task). The rest of the questions were newly annotated by us (for example, plot question answering, sub-scene captioning, video summarization, topic reasoning), or they were substantially modified based on existing annotations (needle question answering, action count, action order). During the data collection and annotation process, we ensured that the instances within each task were diverse in terms of videos and questions.

**Is there a label or target associated with each instance?**

**Answer:** Yes, for the multiple-choice question type, each instance provides the correct option. For the free-form generation task, each instance comes with a standard caption or summary answer.

**Is any information missing from individual instances?**

**Answer:** All instances are complete.

**Are relationships between individual instances made explicit (e.g., users' movie ratings, social network links)?**

**Answer:** Some instances may have the same video but different questions and answers. Each instance clearly indicates the corresponding video, and each video has a unique identifier.

**Are there recommended data splits (e.g., training, development/validation, testing)?**

**Answer:** No. Our MLVU is specifically designed for evaluation, with its core objective being to assess the capability of MLLMs to understand long-term video.

**Are there any errors, sources of noise, or redundancies in the dataset?**

**Answer:** No.

**Is the dataset self-contained, or does it link to or otherwise rely on external resources (e.g., websites, tweets, other datasets)?**

**Answer:** All data will be publicly accessible in the dataset repository. Our annotations will be stored in JSON format. As our collected videos include parts of movies, TV series, documentaries, and cartoons, we have taken measures such as reducing resolution, modifying aspect ratio, and editing to minimize the impact on the original work rights. However, there is still a risk that copyright holders may request removal of some data. If this happens, we will follow the practice of Movienet [13] to sparsely collect these video frames. This will not have much impact on our data usage, as all our annotations are focused on the visual information in the videos, unrelated to the audio. If retaining video frames is also not allowed, we will still keep the annotation data and provide metadata for the corresponding videos.

**Does the dataset contain data that might be considered confidential?**

**Answer:** No.

**Does the dataset contain data that, if viewed directly, might be offensive, insulting, threatening, or might otherwise cause anxiety?**

**Answer:** No.

### K.3 Collection Process

The data collection process is described in Section 3.2 of the main paper and Appendix B, D, and E.

### K.4 Uses

**Has the dataset been used for any tasks already?**

**Answer:** Yes, MLVU has been used to evaluate the long-video understanding capabilities of as many as 20 different MLLMs. For specific details, please refer to Section 4.

**What (other) tasks could the dataset be used for?**

**Answer:** MLVU is primarily used to comprehensively evaluate the long-video understanding capabilities of MLLMs. Since MLVU includes multiple different tasks, it can also be used to individually assess the ability of MLLMs or other video-specific models on a particular task, such as video summarization.

**Is there a repository that links to any or all papers or systems that use the dataset?**

**Answer:** No.

**Is there anything about the composition of the dataset or the way it was collected and preprocessed/cleaned/labeled that might impact future uses?**

**Answer:** As our collected videos include parts of movies, TV series, documentaries, and cartoons, we have taken measures such as reducing resolution, modifying aspect ratio, and editing to minimize the impact on the original work rights. However, there is still a risk that copyright holders may request removal of some data. If this happens, we will follow the practice of Movienet [13] to sparsely collect these video frames. This will not have much impact on our data usage, as all our annotations are focused on the visual information in the videos, unrelated to the audio. If retaining video frames is also not allowed, we will still keep the annotation data and provide metadata for the corresponding videos.

**Are there tasks for which the dataset should not be used?**

**Answer:** The MLVU cannot be used to evaluate the image or video generation capabilities of the MLLM.

## K.5 Distribution

**Will the dataset be distributed to third parties outside of the entity (e.g., company, institution, organization) on behalf of which the dataset was created?**

**Answer:** Yes. The benchmark is publicly available on the Internet.

**How will the dataset will be distributed (e.g., tarball on website, API, GitHub)?**

**Answer:** The benchmark is available on GitHub at <https://github.com/JUNJIE99/MLVU> or on Huggingface at <https://huggingface.co/datasets/MLVU/MVLU>.

**Will the dataset be distributed under a copyright or other intellectual property (IP) license, and/or under applicable terms of use (ToU)?**

**Answer:** CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0.

**Have any third parties imposed IP-based or other restrictions on the data associated with the instances?**

**Answer:** No.

**Do any export controls or other regulatory restrictions apply to the dataset or to individual instances?**

**Answer:** No.

## K.6 Maintenance

**Who will be supporting/hosting/maintaining the dataset?**

**Answer:** The authors will be supporting, hosting, and maintaining the dataset.

**How can the owner/curator/manager of the dataset be contacted (e.g., email address)?**

**Answer:** Please contact the official email of our project ([mlvubenchmark@gmail.com](mailto:mlvubenchmark@gmail.com)), or contact the one of the authors ([zhoujunjie@bupt.edu.cn](mailto:zhoujunjie@bupt.edu.cn); [shuyan9812@gmail.com](mailto:shuyan9812@gmail.com))



**Is there an erratum?**

**Answer:** No. We will make announcements if there are any.

**Will the dataset be updated (e.g., to correct labeling errors, add new instances, delete instances)?**

**Answer:** Yes. We will post new update in <https://github.com/JUNJIE99/MLVU> and <https://huggingface.co/datasets/MLVU/MVLU> if there is any.

**If the dataset relates to people, are there applicable limits on the retention of the data associated with the instances (e.g., were individuals in question told that their data would be retained for a fixed period of time and then deleted)?**

**Answer:** People may appear in the reference videos. People may contact us to exclude specific data instances if they appear in the reference videos.

**Will older versions of the dataset continue to be supported/hosted/maintained?**

**Answer:** Yes. Old versions will also be hosted in <https://github.com/JUNJIE99/MLVU> and <https://huggingface.co/datasets/MLVU/MVLU>.

**If others want to extend/augment/build on/contribute to the dataset, is there a mechanism for them to do so?**

**Answer:** If others wish to add data, they can apply to do so provided the data is compliant and reasonable. However, making other modifications based on our dataset is currently not allowed.