

Unexplored Flaws in Multiple-Choice VQA Evaluations

Fabio Rosenthal^{1,2} Sebastian Schmidt¹ Thorsten Graf²
 Thorsten Bagodonat² Stephan Günnemann^{1,3} Leo Schwinn^{1,3}

¹Technical University of Munich ²Volkswagen AG ³Munich Data Science Institute

Abstract

Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) demonstrate strong capabilities in handling image-text inputs. A common way to assess this ability is through multiple-choice Visual Question Answering (VQA). Earlier works have already revealed that these benchmarks are sensitive to answer choice order, a limitation that can be mitigated through careful design. Yet, we highlight additional, unexplored biases in prompt formatting that question the reliability of current MLLM evaluations. Specifically, we identify three key variation factors in prompt formatting and analyze their impact through a large-scale study involving **seven** MLLMs and **five** VQA datasets, spanning **48** distinct **prompt format variations**. Our findings reveal that multiple-choice VQA is highly sensitive to minor prompt format changes, even when these changes are semantically neutral. We further demonstrate that these biases persist independently of known order biases or the MLLM’s confidence in the correct answer. Finally, we demonstrate that existing bias mitigation strategies fail to address these newly identified biases.

1. Introduction

MLLMs demonstrate strong perceptual and reasoning abilities on image-text interleaved inputs [1, 4, 17], making them applicable across domains such as general knowledge [12, 52], high-resolution imaging [50, 55], and autonomous driving [29, 30], and document understanding [18, 41]. One of the most common tasks for assessing these capabilities is multiple-choice VQA [12, 31, 39], in which MLLMs are prompted to select the correct answer from a set of predefined options [28, 52]. This approach is particularly popular as it constrains the output space of the MLLM, thereby simplifying answer evaluation compared to open-ended generation, which requires complex methods (e.g., regular expression or LLMs-as-a-judge) for answer extraction [32, 37]. In multiple-choice VQA, the prompt is formulated by presenting the question, accompanying instructions, and all




Figure 1. **Prompt template in multiple-choice VQA.** A typical prompt in VQA evaluation consists of the *question* itself, the *instruction*, and different *options*, with their respective indexing *option IDs*. Option and option ID are separated by the *option delimiter* while the different option-option ID pairs are divided by the *option separator*.

answer options to the MLLM, allowing it to compare the choices [37, 39]. Typically, each answer choice is assigned an *option ID*, and the MLLM is required to output the corresponding ID rather than the textual answer [28, 37]. Here, each option ID and option are separated by the *option delimiter* (e.g., a dot), and the different option ID-option pairs are separated by the *option separator* (e.g., line break), as illustrated in Fig. 1. For evaluation, the model is instructed to produce a *single token* representing the selected option ID. Note that there is no standardized format for these elements in the literature, and prompt structures vary across datasets.

In such multiple-choice settings, it has been shown that Large Language Models (LLMs) fail to consistently select the same answers when options are shuffled [35, 54], indicating a position bias. As LLMs are an essential component of MLLMs [23, 26, 27], this behavior can also be observed in MLLMs [28, 44]. However, variations in the prompt are not limited to the order of options. Changes in any of the three key components of prompt formatting of multiple-choice VQA, the option ID set, the option delimiter, or the option separator, might significantly influence the performance of MLLMs, similarly to the option position bias. Yet, such additional bias effects have not been investigated to date.




Figure 2. **Biases in multiple-choice VQA evaluation of MLLMs.** We compare benchmarking results on A-OKVQA using two distinct prompt formats applied to the same MLLMs. *Prompt Format 1* uses lowercase option IDs, double brackets as delimiters, and line breaks as separators, whereas *Prompt Format 2* uses uppercase option IDs, dots as delimiters, and commas as separators. Changing these formatting choices significantly alters the ranking of models, highlighting sensitivity to prompt design.

We find that slight modifications to the option ID set, option delimiter, or option separator can drastically alter benchmarking results for seven MLLMs on A-OKVQA [39] (see Fig. 2). For instance, under a changed prompt format, LLaVA-OV [21] shifts from the second-lowest to the top rank, with an accuracy difference of nearly 50 percentage points (pp). Similarly, LLaVA-1.5 [27] and Qwen-2-VL [51] exhibit considerable accuracy differences across formats.¹ As existing multiple-choice VQA datasets rely on a single, fixed prompt format, the *reliability of current evaluations has to be questioned*. To investigate this issue, we conduct a comprehensive study across five diverse datasets to examine how modifications of the prompt format affect MLLM performance. We further evaluate whether these biases can be mitigated using existing bias reduction methods.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We unveil unexplored biases that originate in prompt formatting of VQA in a comprehensive study of 6,807,192 question-level evaluations.
- We analyze which prompt format variations yield significant impact on model performances and demonstrate that high confidence from MLLMs does not mitigate prompt-induced biases.
- We demonstrate that current bias mitigation techniques are insufficient in mitigating the impact of prompt formatting on VQA benchmarks.

¹These bias effects were isolated from the known position bias through a circular evaluation scheme.

2. Preliminary

In this section, we first explain the generation procedure of MLLMs, and then describe the evaluation schemes of MLLMs on VQA tasks.

2.1. Multimodal Large Language Models

Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) typically consist of three components: a vision encoder, a modality projector, and an LLM [21, 23, 26, 27]. The vision encoder, usually a transformer backbone without its prediction head, processes the input image to produce high-level visual features represented as tokens \mathbf{X}_v [23, 26]. These visual tokens are then mapped by the modality projector into the embedding space of the LLM, yielding projected tokens $\mathbf{X}_{v,proj}$ [26, 27]. This projection is typically implemented as a linear layer or a multilayer perceptron (MLP) [26, 27], and in some variants, the number of visual tokens is reduced through downsampling to enhance efficiency [4, 17, 51]. Finally, the LLM takes a concatenation of the visual and text tokens as an input [1, 2, 23, 26]:

$$\mathbf{X}_{in} = [\mathbf{X}_t; \mathbf{X}_{v,proj}] \quad (1)$$

The LLM produces an autoregressive sequence of token probabilities conditioned by the input token sequence \mathbf{X}_{in} and the previously generated tokens $\mathbf{y}_{<i}$ [26, 45]. The MLLM generates output sequence \mathbf{y} until it either produces the End-Of-Sequence (EOS) token or reaches the maximum allowed token sequence length o [23, 26]:

$$\mathbf{y} = [y_0, y_1, \dots, y_i]; i \leq o, \quad (2)$$

2.2. Visual Question Answering

Visual Question Answering (VQA) is one of the most common evaluation tasks for multimodal reasoning and perception capabilities of MLLMs [31, 39, 52]. A typical sample from a VQA task consists of an *image*, a *question* about the image, and a correct *answer*, which should be generated based on the combined visual and textual context [3, 12]. In multiple-choice VQA, answer options are provided as additional context [37], and the MLLM is expected to generate one of these options as its final answer [28, 31, 39]. The standard prompt template consists of the dataset question, the answer options, and an instruction prompt [28, 39, 52, 53] (see Fig. 1) that constrains the MLLM to produce only in-scheme responses [10, 36]. The answer options are set in a specific order, and each option is indexed by the option ID, which the model is asked to output [28, 31, 39]. Since models may not strictly follow the given instruction, certain evaluation methods rely solely on the logits over all option IDs, selecting the one with the highest logit as the predicted answer [37]. However, while

this approach is often used in LLMs evaluations, it’s not common in MLLMs [10]. Yet, many design choices in the prompt template are arbitrary in existing evaluations: (i) *the order of the options*, (ii) *the utilized option ID sets*, (iii) *the option delimiter*, and (iv) *the option separator*. Since there is no standard configuration (see Tab. 5), these choices vary across multiple-choice VQA datasets.

3. Related Work

In this section, we describe the most relevant advancements for multiple-choice VQA, highlight recent findings on biases in (M)LLM evaluation, and discuss methods for mitigating these biases to ensure fair and robust assessment.

Prompt Wording in Multiple-Choice Tasks. The most common VQA setting is multiple-choice tasks [3, 12, 39]. In LLM evaluations, prompt modifications strongly affect performance [14, 48], *e.g.*, on the popular multiple-choice benchmark MMLU [15]. This sensitivity also applies to MLLMs, and while first methods exist to remove biases in option order [44], they do not address the arbitrariness of prompt formats we evaluate in this paper. Consequently, evaluations remain biased by linguistic patterns (*e.g.*, option ID sets), reducing the reliability of evaluations.

Biases in (M)LLMs. LLMs and MLLMs exhibit various biases [9, 13, 40], leading to severe failures such as hallucinations [33, 38]. Beyond these extreme failure cases, performance can fluctuate due to high prompt sensitivity [14, 20, 44]. Specific to multiple-choice tasks, LLMs and MLLMs are not robust to option reordering and exhibit positional selection biases [35, 44, 54]. Even minor changes, such as altering delimiters in few-shot examples [43] or replacing a single symbol, can drastically affect outputs, including bypassing safety constraints [25]. Overall, such brittleness undermines the reliability of current evaluations, making benchmark rankings poor indicators of robust and generalized performance [42].

Biases Mitigation for (M)LLMs. Bias mitigation strategies exist broadly, including methods for reducing hallucinations in LLMs [24] and MLLMs [19, 34]. However, approaches specific to multiple-choice tasks are limited. For LLMs, proposed solutions address option-order sensitivity either through post-hoc logit calibration [35, 54] or by retraining parts of the model [8, 11]. For MLLMs, the sole post-hoc method recalculates accuracy based on option selection frequency, thereby mitigating positional bias [44].

Concluding, current evaluation practices in multiple-choice VQA rely on complex and inconsistent prompt designs, creating significant challenges for fair evalu-

ation. In this work, we show that minor changes in prompt format can strongly influence the evaluation of MLLM on multiple-choice VQA, leading to unreliable benchmark results.

4. Experiment Setup

Previous studies on biases in multiple-choice tasks have exclusively examined the effect of option order [35, 44, 54], while other sources of variation in prompt design remain unexplored. To address this gap, we conduct an extensive empirical study examining the bias effects of prompt modifications. This section outlines our extensive experimental setup, which includes diverse datasets, models, and evaluation metrics. Furthermore, we provide details on the 48 prompt format permutations used in our bias analysis and explain the characteristics of three bias mitigation techniques, exploring their effectiveness in mitigating prompt format variations.

4.1. Experimental Framework

MLLM Overview. We use a set of popular MLLMs covering different architectural types: Gemma-3 [17], LLaVA-1.5 [27], LLaVA-OV [21], Phi-3.5 [2], Phi-4 [1], Qwen-2-VL [51] and Qwen-2.5-VL [4]. We provide specifications of the models in App. B.1.

Dataset Overview. We use a highly diverse selection of datasets covering different domains and task difficulties, containing high-resolution datasets HRBench-4K [46] and V*Bench [50], general knowledge dataset A-OKVQA [39], and multi-domain benchmark datasets MME-RealWorld-Lite [53] and MMBench [28]. We provide dataset statistics in App. B.2.

Instruction Prompt. In order to reduce potential poor instruction-following of models (*e.g.*, out-of-scheme answers), we use an optimized instruction prompt for each dataset. More details regarding this, see App. A.1.

Evaluation Setting. As is common with multiple-choice VQA datasets, we evaluate all models in a *zero-shot setting, excluding in-context examples* [22, 23, 27]. Additionally, we enforce fully deterministic outputs across all models by disabling sampling, ensuring consistent comparisons on the same datasets for different prompt formats. Further, we set the number of generated output tokens to match the maximum required to output all option IDs from the utilized option ID set. For more details on our evaluation setting, see App. A.4.

Evaluation Metrics. To evaluate the performance of the MLLMs on multiple-choice VQA tasks, we used the standard metric of *accuracy* based on the model’s generated answer [3, 12]. Another important metric in this work is *coverage*, which measures the instruction-following capability of MLLMs independent from their

performances. We define the coverage as the ratio between the number of answers belonging to the option ID set (e.g., "A" from "A/B/C/D") and the total number of questions in the evaluation set. A high coverage indicates high instruction-following capability of an MLLM. For more details on the used metrics, see App. A.3.

4.2. Bias Analysis Scope

We aim to provide a comprehensive analysis of bias introduced by the prompt format used in multiple-choice VQA. To this end, we create 48 permuted prompt format variations (see Tab. 1) based on the *option ID set*, *option delimiter*, and the *option separator*, which we use to analyze *all* model and dataset combinations. To isolate these biases from the *option order* bias, we apply the circular evaluation scheme [28] in all evaluations.

Table 1. **Analysis scope for prompt format variations.** We base our study on prompt format variations observed in multiple-choice VQA datasets and extend them with additional prompt designs to capture a wider spectrum of stylistic diversity. The three permutation factors considered are: (1) *option ID set*, (2) *option delimiter*, and (3) *option separator*.

Prompt format factor	Format style	Example repr.
Option ID set	Uppercase	A/B/C/D
	Lowercase	a/b/c/d
	Numbers	1/2/3/4
	Roman numbers	I/II/III/IV
Option delimiter	Colon	{opt}:
	Dot	{opt}.
	Bracket	{opt})
	Double brackets	({opt})
Option separator	Line break	{opt}\n {opt}
	Comma	{opt}, {opt}
	Semicolon	{opt}; {opt}

4.3. Methods for Bias Mitigation

Some methods have been proposed to mitigate option order bias in multiple-choice VQA. However, their robustness to prompt format variations remains unknown. We evaluate whether these existing bias mitigation methods for (M)LLMs remain effective under our newly introduced prompt format permutations (see Tab. 2). Our work is the first to comprehensively assess all prompt format variants by combining circular evaluation [28] with a combinatorial exploration of all 48 prompt format variations (see Tab. 1). We average results across all configurations to establish a robust “gold standard” measure of performance, serving as a reference ground truth.² In the following, we summarize existing bias mit-

²Designed as a tool for comprehensive bias analysis rather than mitigation, it offers high reliability at increased computational cost.

Table 2. **Comparison of bias mitigation strategies for (M)LLMs and our analysis.** Most bias mitigation strategies *counteract a single influencing bias* or *impose stringent requirements*. We estimate the complexity as the number of required model forward passes, based on the number of question-image pairs (N), options (O), and prompt permutations (P), where $P \gg O$. An asterisk (*) denotes a novel evaluation within the respective category in our work.

Approach	Compl.	Requirements		Robust to change of option ...			
		Variable no. of options	No calibration	pos.	IDs	del.	sep.
Vanilla	$\mathcal{O}(N)$	—	—	✗	✗	✗	✗
PriDe [54]	$\mathcal{O}(N)$	✗	✗	✓	*	*	*
PIA [44]	$\mathcal{O}(N \cdot O)$	✗	✓	✓	*	*	*
CP-LN [37]	$\mathcal{O}(N \cdot O)$	✓	✓	*	*	*	*
Our analysis	$\mathcal{O}(N \cdot O \cdot P)$	—	—	✓	✓	✓	✓

igation strategies; for details, see App. B.3.

Debiasing with Prior estimation (PriDe). PriDe estimates the prior for each option ID using calibration logits derived from circularly shifted multiple-choice samples [54]. During inference, these priors adjust the logits for each option ID, and the answer is selected based on the highest adjusted logit. This method is only applicable to questions with the same number of options as in the calibration data, limiting its use on datasets with varying option counts.

Position-invariant accuracy (PIA). PIA modifies accuracy computation by comparing how often each option was correctly selected to how often it was selected overall. Unlike PriDe, it does not require calibration data. However, it is incompatible with datasets containing a varying number of options, because its adjustment formula assumes a fixed option set. When the number of options changes across samples, the normalization for mitigating varying answer selection becomes inconsistent, leading to unreliable accuracy estimates.

Cloze prompt (length normalized) (CP-LN). CP-LN adopts a different evaluation strategy: instead of including all answer options in the prompt (as shown in Fig. 1), only the question is provided [6, 37]. The perplexity is computed for each option w.r.t. the question, allowing the method to handle a variable number of options. The option with the lowest perplexity is selected as the answer, therefore, eliminating the need for calibration data. Since prompt formatting is not involved, CP-LN is robust to prompt variations. However, it has not yet been evaluated in the context of bias mitigation [6, 37].

5. Results

Our overarching goal is to investigate how prompt variations influence multiple-choice VQA and thereby advance the reliability of VQA evaluation. To this end,

we examine the impact of these biases on MLLMs (Sec. 5.1), identify which biases *significantly* affect benchmarking outcomes (Sec. 5.2), determine which questions are most susceptible to bias (Sec. 5.3), and assess the potential for mitigating these effects (Sec. 5.4).

5.1. Effect of Prompt Format Variations

We begin by analyzing how variations in prompt format influence benchmarking results, focusing on the following metrics: (i) *benchmark rankings* are the primary evaluation metric; (ii) *accuracy* is the standard criterion for ranking; and (iii) *coverage* affects accuracy and reflects instruction-following ability.

Benchmark Ranking. Across the 48 previously unexplored prompt format permutations introduced in this work, we rank model performance for each permutation individually and show the resulting rank distributions per MLLM in Fig. 3. For comparison, we provide an example of an ideal benchmarking result, where the MLLM ranking remains distinct and unaffected by variations in prompt format. On A-OKVQA and MME-RealWorld-Lite, ranking variations are so pronounced that no single MLLM can be identified as the clear leader. In particular, the ranking of LLaVA-OV on the A-OKVQA benchmark predominantly falls within the range of 1 to 3, although in certain instances it may decline to as low as 6. For MM-Bench and V*Bench, Qwen-2.5-VL consistently ranks first, though the positions of other models fluctuate considerably. On HRBench-4K, prompt format variations have minimal impact on ranking, as indicated by the lowest rank variation across all datasets.

Accuracy. To examine why prompt format variations strongly affect benchmark rankings, we analyze accuracy deviations from each dataset-model average (see

Fig. 4). Note that the results in all heatmaps represent averages of 12 evaluations for *option IDs* and *option delimiter*, and 16 for *option separator*. Model-wise, we observe the highest accuracy deviations for the models LLaVA-1.5 (−48 to +28 pp), LLaVA-OV (−18 to +11 pp), and Phi-3.5 (−59 to +20 pp) across all multiple-choice VQA datasets. For the other MLLMs, the accuracy deviation is rather minor. Gemma-3 and Qwen-2.5-VL exhibit highly stable performance, with accuracy deviations of only −1 to +1 pp for Gemma-3 and −3 to +3 pp for Qwen-2.5-VL across all averaged prompt format variations. Regarding the prompt format factors, we observe the highest deviations when varying the option ID set and the option delimiter. Varying the option separator seems to have no severe influence on MLLM’s performance.

Coverage. A key factor influencing MLLM accuracy in multiple-choice VQA tasks is coverage (see Sec. 4.1). Low coverage often indicates poor instruction-following, which in turn limits accuracy because only a subset of the provided answers appears in the option ID set. Overall, coverage shows fewer deviations across models and datasets compared to accuracy (see Fig. 5). Most MLLMs maintain high coverage with minor variation, while Gemma-3 and Qwen-2.5-VL achieve 100% coverage across all datasets and prompt formats. In contrast, LLaVA-1.5 and Phi-3.5 exhibit the highest degradation, dropping to 0% coverage when option IDs are numerical. Among prompt format factors, lowercase and numerical option IDs, as well as double brackets as option delimiter, negatively impact coverage for most models. We provide the full coverage results in App. C.1.

Option Selection Patterns. As previously described, we mitigate the influence of option position bias by em-




Figure 3. **Benchmarking results across five multiple-choice VQA datasets.** The figure shows the distribution of ranks for seven MLLMs across 48 prompt format permutations. The ranks vary substantially across datasets and models, indicating high sensitivity to prompt format. Compared to an ideal evaluation (left), where ranks remain constant across formats, real-world evaluations exhibit significant variability—highlighting that *prompt robustness remains a major challenge for current MLLMs*.




Figure 4. **Accuracy deviations of MLLMs on multiple-choice VQA datasets.** We report the average deviation from the mean accuracy across all prompt formats per model-dataset pair. The results are averaged over 12 evaluations for *option IDs* and *option delimiter*, and 16 for *option separator*. Option position bias is mitigated via a circular evaluation scheme.

playing circular evaluation (see Sec. 4.2). In general, this approach effectively reduces position-related bias, as reflected in a more uniform distribution of selected answers across option positions. However, due to complex interactions between prompt format variations and option position bias, we still observe a preference for specific option positions in some cases. This preference can either persist uniformly across different prompt formats or, interestingly, vary depending on the prompt format. For instance, in certain model-dataset evaluations (e.g., LLaVA-1.5 on HRBench-4K), MLLMs tend to fa-

vor particular option ID positions more frequently depending on how the prompt is formatted. We provide a more detailed analysis of this behavior in App. C.2.

Coverage-Neutral Analysis. For a deeper analysis, we examine the prompt format-induced biases in scenarios where the coverage of the MLLMs exceeds 75%, to avoid deviations in accuracy due to a poor instruction-following capability of the model. Notably, we still observe accuracy variations in the multiple-choice VQA evaluations that stem from variations in the prompt format. These biases vary from the results of all observations; however, no such differences are observed for Gemma-3, Phi-4, Qwen-2-VL, and Qwen-2.5-VL, all of which maintain coverage above 75% in all evaluations. For further details, refer to App. C.3.

Summary Takeaway of 5.1

Trivial variations in prompt format significantly impact the evaluation of MLLM in multiple-choice VQA, substantially skewing benchmark results.




Figure 5. **Coverage of MLLMs on multiple-choice VQA datasets.** The results are averaged over 12 evaluations for *option IDs* and *option delimiter*, and 16 for *option separator*. While models such as Gemma-3, Phi-4, Qwen-2-VL, and Qwen-2.5-VL consistently achieve coverage above 75%, indicating stable instruction-following capabilities, others, like LLaVA-1.5, LLaVA-OV, and Phi-3.5, exhibit significant drops under certain prompt formats, revealing strong sensitivity to formatting variations. Grey cells indicate 0% coverage, meaning the models fail to produce any valid answers in these cases.

5.2. Significance Analysis

We employ a linear mixed model (LMM) to investigate which biases have a statistical influence on the performance of MLLMs. This modeling approach is suitable for our data, which exhibits non-independence due to observations across different model-dataset combinations [16]. LMMs model fixed effects (e.g., prompt format factors) and random effects (e.g., combined group of model and dataset), thereby yielding less biased and more generalizable results than traditional linear models (e.g., linear regression) [16]. For more details on this modeling approach, see App. A.2. We control for performance differences across MLLMs and datasets by incorporating random effects, acknowledging differences

in model capabilities and dataset difficulty. The results of the LMM, shown in Fig. 6, reveal the estimated change in accuracy when varying each prompt format factor from a baseline configuration, which in our case consists of *lowercase* (option IDs), *bracket* (option delimiter), and *comma* (option separator). We observe a significant influence when modifying either the option IDs—negative when selecting *Numbers* (−10 pp) and positive when selecting *Uppercase* (+6 pp)—or the option delimiter, which shows a negative effect when changed to *Double brackets* (−5 pp).

Summary Takeaway of 5.2

Option ID and delimiter significantly impact model performance, while separators have minimal effect.

5.3. Model Confidence vs. Bias

Further, we investigate whether prompt format-induced biases undermine the reliability of MLLMs, even on questions where the models were previously highly confident in the correct answer. Specifically, we rank the questions from A-OKVQA and V*Bench by the model’s logit for the correct option ID using each dataset’s standard prompt format, and group them into three confidence bins: (i) top-20% (most confident), (ii) middle-60%, and (iii) bottom-20% (least confident). This approach allows us to examine how prompt format variations influence MLLMs’s behavior across different confidence levels, revealing potential instability even in high-confidence predictions. We observe two main accuracy shifting patterns besides some constant and not shifted distributions: (i) a uniform decrease of accuracy across the groups, and (ii) a shift of confidence caused by only the top-20% questions getting a high accuracy






Figure 6. **Prompt formatting choices can have significant effects on MLLM accuracy, even after controlling for model and dataset differences.** Bars show the effect of each prompt format factor, with error bars indicating 95% confidence intervals. Significant effects are colored by their direction, and non-significant effects are gray. All effects are interpreted relative to the base configuration (*option IDs: lowercase, option delimiter: bracket, option separator: comma*).



(a) Accuracy distribution across questions under varied prompt format factors for LLaVA-OV on V*Bench.



(b) Accuracy distribution across questions under varied prompt format factors for Qwen-2-VL on V*Bench.

Figure 7. **Even high-confidence predictions are susceptible to prompt format-induced biases.** Questions are ranked by confidence under the reference prompt and grouped into three confidence levels. Accuracy shifts show either (a) similar deviations across all levels, indicating uniform sensitivity, or (b) larger deviations for high-confidence questions, revealing greater vulnerability to prompt variations.

decrease. For (i), we illustrate LLaVA-OV on V*Bench, where accuracy decreases similarly across all three confidence groups (Fig. 7a). This shows that even the most confident questions are affected by prompt-induced biases to the same extent as the least confident ones. Hence, an MLLM cannot be expected to consistently answer previously high-confidence questions correctly once the prompt format changes. For (ii), we show an example of Qwen-2-VL on V*Bench, in which there is a significant decrease in accuracy of the most-confident questions, while the other groups only suffer minor or no accuracy decrease (Fig. 7b). This can result in the accuracy distribution of the most confident questions being lower or comparable to that of previously middle-confidence questions. The presence of varying accuracy patterns among confidence-based question groups makes this phenomenon difficult to identify and address.

Summary Takeaway of 5.3

Even high-confidence answers remain vulnerable to prompt format variations.

5.4. Existing Bias Mitigation Methods

Finally, we examine the extent to which existing bias mitigation methods PIA, PriDe, and CP-LN (see Sec. 4.3) can mitigate the influence of the prompt format-induced biases across the datasets A-OKVQA,

HRBench-4K, and V*Bench. We assess their effectiveness by comparing method rankings to those obtained by averaging accuracy across all 48 prompt format permutations. For reference, we also compare rankings based on each dataset’s standard prompt format with those from the full evaluation. Our findings indicate that none of the methods effectively mitigates the influence of prompt format-induced biases (see Fig. 8). Interestingly, on A-OKVQA, the vanilla prompt format performs best, correctly ranking the most models (3), while all bias mitigation methods—PIA and PriDe (2 each) and CP-LN (0)—perform worse. On HRBench-4K, the trend continues: PriDe and CP-LN rank 3 models correctly, slightly ahead of PIA (2), yet the vanilla format still ranks one model correctly, highlighting that mitigation strategies do not consistently improve over the standard setting. PIA and PriDe are not compatible with evaluations on V*Bench due to their requirement for a fixed number of options (*NA* in Fig. 8), which varies between 2 and 4 in this dataset. CP-LN correctly rank 3, while the vanilla format ranks 1 of the 7 MLLMs. In summary, *none of the evaluated bias mitigation methods reliably reflect benchmarking outcomes under the prompt format variations*, as no method ranks more than half of the MLLMs correctly across all datasets. We provide the full bias mitigation results in App. C.4.

Summary Takeaway of 5.4

Existing bias mitigation methods fail to address biases arising from simple variations in prompt format.




Figure 8. **Current bias mitigation methods cannot mitigate the prompt format-induced biases analyzed in this work.** We compare the effectiveness of bias mitigation methods (see Sec. 4.3) to reduce the unexplored biases on three multiple-choice VQA datasets. No method ranks at least half of the MLLMs according to the average performance across all 48 prompt format permutations (see Sec. 4.2).

5.5. Discussion

Recommendations. Our analysis reveals the severe impact of prompt format variations on various metrics like accuracy, benchmark ranking, and model confidence. Here, we offer recommendations for researchers developing new MLLMs and those creating new multiple-choice VQA datasets. On the model side, we urge providers to disclose how prompt format-induced biases affect their MLLM, *e.g.*, performance on varying prompt formats. To enhance robustness, researchers should consider training MLLMs using diverse prompt formats for multiple-choice tasks. For datasets, we recommend evaluating multiple-choice VQA datasets in an open-ended format to avoid biases introduced by the prompt structure. In particular, approaches that rely solely on the logits of option IDs [37] are suboptimal, as they can introduce additional biases due to differences in answer behaviors between single- and multi-token outputs [7, 32, 47]. Moreover, dataset creators could provide a validation set to facilitate adaptation to specific prompt formats. Finally, given that MLLMs are frequently integrated into other models or complex applications, we encourage transparency and careful consideration of these biases throughout the development pipeline.

Limitations. Our analysis does not cover all possible prompt format variations, and additional biases may exist in multiple-choice VQA evaluation. Future work should focus on developing targeted methods to effectively mitigate prompt format-induced biases.

6. Conclusion

In this work, we investigate the prompt sensitivity of MLLMs in multiple-choice VQA. We analyze the influence of prompt format variations on MLLMs’ performance in a comprehensive study including seven MLLMs, five datasets, and 48 prompt format variations. Our findings reveal that multiple-choice VQA evaluations are highly sensitive to minor prompt format variations, even to semantically neutral changes. The examined modifications can substantially alter benchmarking outcomes so that the *rank can change from second-to-last to first with performance deltas of up to 59 pp*. Importantly, we demonstrate that these *biases persist independently of known order biases and model confidence*, revealing a previously underexplored vulnerability in current evaluation pipelines. Finally, we demonstrate that existing bias mitigation strategies fail to address these newly identified biases. With this work, we aim to highlight this *critical issue* and encourage researchers to design future models and datasets with these biases in mind.

Disclaimer

The results, opinions and conclusions expressed in this publication are not necessarily those of Volkswagen Aktiengesellschaft.

References

- [1] Marah I Abdin, Jyoti Aneja, Harkirat S. Behl, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Suriya Gunasekar, Michael Harrison, Russell J. Hewett, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, James R. Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Weishung Liu, Caio C. T. Mendes, Anh Nguyen, Eric Price, Gustavo de Rosa, Olli Saarikivi, Adil Salim, Shital Shah, Xin Wang, Rachel Ward, Yue Wu, Dingli Yu, Cyril Zhang, and Yi Zhang. Phi-4 technical report. *CoRR*, abs/2412.08905, 2024. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#)
- [2] Marah I Abdin, Sam Ade Jacobs, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jyoti Aneja, Ahmed Awadallah, Hany Awadalla, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Harkirat S. Behl, Alon Benhaim, Misha Bilenko, Johan Bjorck, Sébastien Bubeck, Martin Cai, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Weizhu Chen, Vishrav Chaudhary, Parul Chopra, Allie Del Giorno, Gustavo de Rosa, Matthew Dixon, Ronen Eldan, Dan Iter, Amit Garg, Abhishek Goswami, Suriya Gunasekar, Emman Haider, Junheng Hao, Russell J. Hewett, Jamie Huynh, Mojan Javaheripi, Xin Jin, Piero Kauffmann, Nikos Karampatziakis, Dongwoo Kim, Mahoud Khademi, Lev Kurilenko, James R. Lee, Yin Tat Lee, Yuanzhi Li, Chen Liang, Weishung Liu, Eric Lin, Zeqi Lin, Piyush Madan, Arindam Mitra, Hardik Modi, Anh Nguyen, Brandon Norick, Barun Patra, Daniel Perez-Becker, Thomas Portet, Reid Pryzant, Heyang Qin, Marko Radmilac, Corby Rosset, Sambudha Roy, Olatunji Ruwase, Olli Saarikivi, Amin Saied, Adil Salim, Michael Santacrose, Shital Shah, Ning Shang, Hiteshi Sharma, Xia Song, Masahiro Tanaka, Xin Wang, Rachel Ward, Guanhua Wang, Philipp A. Witte, Michael Wyatt, Can Xu, Jiahang Xu, Sonali Yadav, Fan Yang, Ziyi Yang, Donghan Yu, Chengruidong Zhang, Cyril Zhang, Jianwen Zhang, Li Lyna Zhang, Yi Zhang, Yue Zhang, Yunan Zhang, and Xiren Zhou. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone. *CoRR*, abs/2404.14219, 2024. [2](#), [3](#)
- [3] Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jiasen Lu, Margaret Mitchell, Dhruv Batra, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. VQA: visual question answering. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2015, Santiago, Chile, December 7-13, 2015*, pages 2425–2433. IEEE Computer Society, 2015. [2](#), [3](#), [14](#)
- [4] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, Humen Zhong, Yuanzhi Zhu, Ming-Hsuan Yang, Zhaohai Li, Jianqiang Wan, Pengfei Wang, Wei Ding, Zheren Fu, Yiheng Xu, Jiabo Ye, Xi Zhang, Tianbao Xie, Zesen Cheng, Hang Zhang, Zhibo Yang, Haiyang Xu, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2.5-vl technical report. *CoRR*, abs/2502.13923, 2025. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#)
- [5] Yoshua Bengio, Réjean Ducharme, Pascal Vincent, and Christian Janvin. A neural probabilistic language model. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 3:1137–1155, 2003. [16](#)
- [6] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020. [4](#), [16](#)
- [7] Nikhil Chandak, Shashwat Goel, Ameya Prabhu, Moritz Hardt, and Jonas Geiping. Answer matching outperforms multiple choice for language model evaluation. *CoRR*, abs/2507.02856, 2025. [8](#)
- [8] Liang Chen, Li Shen, Yang Deng, Xiaoyan Zhao, Bin Liang, and Kam-Fai Wong. PEARL: towards permutation-resilient llms. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2025, Singapore, April 24-28, 2025*. OpenReview.net, 2025. [3](#)
- [9] Meiqi Chen, Yixin Cao, Yan Zhang, and Chaochao Lu. Quantifying and mitigating unimodal biases in multi-modal large language models: A causal perspective. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024, Miami, Florida, USA, November 12-16, 2024*, pages 16449–16469. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024. [3](#)
- [10] Haodong Duan, Junming Yang, Yuxuan Qiao, Xinyu Fang, Lin Chen, Yuan Liu, Xiaoyi Dong, Yuhang Zang, Pan Zhang, Jiaqi Wang, et al. Vlmevalkit: An open-source toolkit for evaluating large multi-modality models. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, pages 11198–11201, 2024. [2](#), [3](#), [13](#), [14](#)
- [11] Beni Egressy and Jan Stühmer. Set-llm: A permutation-invariant llm, 2025. [3](#)
- [12] Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Making the V in VQA matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in visual question answering. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2017, Honolulu, HI, USA, July 21-26, 2017*, pages 6325–6334. IEEE Computer Society, 2017. [1](#), [2](#), [3](#), [14](#)
- [13] Vipul Gupta, Zhuowan Li, Adam Kortylewski, Chenyu Zhang, Yingwei Li, and Alan L. Yuille. Swapmix: Diagnosing and regularizing the over-reliance on visual context in visual question answering. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, June 18-24, 2022*, pages 5068–5078. IEEE, 2022. [3](#)
- [14] Jia He, Mukund Rungra, David Koleczek, Arshdeep Sekhon, Franklin X. Wang, and Sadid Hasan. Does

- prompt formatting have any impact on LLM performance? *CoRR*, abs/2411.10541, 2024. 3
- [15] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net, 2021. 3
- [16] Jiming Jiang and Thuan Nguyen. *Linear and Generalized Linear Mixed Models and Their Applications*. Springer, 2nd edition, 2021. 6, 13, 14
- [17] Aishwarya Kamath, Johan Ferret, Shreya Pathak, Nino Vieillard, Ramona Merhej, Sarah Perrin, Tatiana Matejovicova, Alexandre Ramé, Morgane Riviére, Louis Rouillard, Thomas Mesnard, Geoffrey Cideron, Jean-Bastien Grill, Sabela Ramos, Edouard Yvinec, Michelle Casbon, Etienne Pot, Ivo Penchev, Gaël Liu, Francesco Visin, Kathleen Kenealy, Lucas Beyer, Xiaohai Zhai, Anton Tsitsulin, Róbert Busa-Fekete, Alex Feng, Naveen Sachdeva, Benjamin Coleman, Yi Gao, Basil Mustafa, Iain Barr, Emilio Parisotto, David Tian, Matan Eyal, Colin Cherry, Jan-Thorsten Peter, Danila Sinopalnikov, Surya Bhupatiraju, Rishabh Agarwal, Mehran Kazemi, Dan Malkin, Ravin Kumar, David Vilar, Idan Brusilovsky, Jiaming Luo, Andreas Steiner, Abe Friesen, Abhanshu Sharma, Abheesh Sharma, Adi Mayrav Gilady, Adrian Goedeckemeyer, Alaa Saade, Alexander Kolesnikov, Alexei Bendebury, Alvin Abdagic, Amit Vadi, András György, André Susano Pinto, Anil Das, Ankur Bapna, Antoine Miech, Antoine Yang, Antonia Paterson, Ashish Shenoy, Ayan Chakrabarti, Bilal Piot, Bo Wu, Bobak Shahriari, Bryce Petrin, Charlie Chen, Charline Le Lan, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, CJ Carey, Cormac Brick, Daniel Deutsch, Danielle Eisenbud, Dee Cattle, Derek Cheng, Dimitris Paparas, Divyashree Shivakumar Sreepathihalli, Doug Reid, Dustin Tran, Dustin Zelle, Eric Noland, Erwin Huizenga, Eugene Kharitonov, Frederick Liu, Gagik Amirkhanyan, Glenn Cameron, Hadi Hashemi, Hanna Klimczak-Plucinska, Harman Singh, Harsh Mehta, Harshal Tushar Lehri, Hussein Hazimeh, Ian Ballantyne, Idan Szpektor, Ivan Nardini, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Jetha Chan, Joe Stanton, John Wieting, Jonathan Lai, Jordi Orbay, Joseph Fernandez, Josh Newlan, Ju-yeong Ji, Jyotinder Singh, Kat Black, Kathy Yu, Kevin Hui, Kiran Vodrahalli, Klaus Greff, Linhai Qiu, Marcella Valentine, Marina Coelho, Marvin Ritter, Matt Hoffman, Matthew Watson, Mayank Chaturvedi, Michael Moynihan, Min Ma, Nabila Babar, Natasha Noy, Nathan Byrd, Nick Roy, Nikola Momchev, Nilay Chauhan, Oskar Bunyan, Pankil Botarda, Paul Caron, Paul Kishan Rubenstein, Phil Culliton, Philipp Schmid, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Pingmei Xu, Piotr Stanczyk, Pouya Tafti, Rakesh Shivanna, Renjie Wu, Renke Pan, Reza Rokni, Rob Willoughby, Rohith Vallu, Ryan Mullins, Sammy Jerome, Sara Smoot, Sertan Girgin, Shariq Iqbal, Shashir Reddy, Shruti Sheth, Siim Pöder, Sijal Bhatnagar, Sindhu Raghuram Panyam, Sivan Eiger, Susan Zhang, Tianqi Liu, Trevor Yacovone, Tyler Liechty, Uday Kalra, Utku Evci, Vedant Misra, Vincent Roseberry, Vlad Feinberg, Vlad Kolesnikov, Woohyun Han, Woosuk Kwon, Xi Chen, Yinlam Chow, Yuvein Zhu, Zichuan Wei, Zoltan Egyed, Victor Cotruta, Minh Giang, Phoebe Kirk, Anand Rao, Jessica Lo, Erica Moreira, Luiz Gustavo Martins, Omar Sanseviero, Lucas Gonzalez, Zach Gleicher, Tris Warkentin, Vahab Mirrokni, Evan Senter, Eli Collins, Joelle K. Barral, Zoubin Ghahramani, Raia Hadsell, Yossi Matias, D. Sculley, Slav Petrov, Noah Fiedel, Noam Shazeer, Oriol Vinyals, Jeff Dean, Demis Hassabis, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Clément Farabet, Elena Buchatskaya, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Rohan Anil, Dmitry (Dima) Lepikhin, Sebastian Borgeaud, Olivier Bachem, Armand Joulin, Alek Andreev, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, and Léonard Hussenot. Gemma 3 technical report. *CoRR*, abs/2503.19786, 2025. 1, 2, 3
- [18] Jordy Van Landeghem, Rafal Powalski, Rubèn Tito, Dawid Jurkiewicz, Matthew B. Blaschko, Lukasz Borchmann, Mickaël Coustaty, Sien Moens, Michal Pietruszka, Bertrand Anckaert, Tomasz Stanislawek, Pawel Józiak, and Ernest Valveny. Document understanding dataset and evaluation (DUDE). In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2023, Paris, France, October 1-6, 2023*, pages 19471–19483. IEEE, 2023. 1
- [19] Sicong Leng, Hang Zhang, Guanzheng Chen, Xin Li, Shijian Lu, Chunyan Miao, and Lidong Bing. Mitigating object hallucinations in large vision-language models through visual contrastive decoding. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2024, Seattle, WA, USA, June 16-22, 2024*, pages 13872–13882. IEEE, 2024. 3
- [20] Ao Li, Zongfang Liu, Xinhua Li, Jinghui Zhang, Pengwei Wang, and Hu Wang. Modeling variants of prompts for vision-language models. *CoRR*, abs/2503.08229, 2025. 3
- [21] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Dong Guo, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Peiyuan Zhang, Yanwei Li, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-onevision: Easy visual task transfer. *Trans. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 2025. 2, 3
- [22] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven C. H. Hoi. BLIP: bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2022, 17-23 July 2022, Baltimore, Maryland, USA*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022. 3
- [23] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven C. H. Hoi. BLIP-2: bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR, 2023. 1, 2, 3
- [24] Xiang Lisa Li, Ari Holtzman, Daniel Fried, Percy Liang, Jason Eisner, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis. Contrastive decoding: Open-ended text generation as optimization. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2023*,

- Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023, pages 12286–12312. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. 3
- [25] Leon Lin, Hannah Brown, Kenji Kawaguchi, and Michael Shieh. Single character perturbations break LLM alignment. In *AAAI-25, Sponsored by the Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence, February 25 - March 4, 2025, Philadelphia, PA, USA*, pages 27473–27481. AAAI Press, 2025. 3
- [26] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*. 1, 2
- [27] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2024, Seattle, WA, USA, June 16-22, 2024*, pages 26286–26296. IEEE, 2024. 1, 2, 3
- [28] Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhang, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, Kai Chen, and Dahua Lin. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player? In *Computer Vision - ECCV 2024 - 18th European Conference, Milan, Italy, September 29-October 4, 2024, Proceedings, Part VI*, pages 216–233. Springer, 2024. 1, 2, 3, 4, 15
- [29] Yingzi Ma, Yulong Cao, Jiachen Sun, Marco Pavone, and Chaowei Xiao. Dolphins: Multimodal language model for driving. In *Computer Vision - ECCV 2024 - 18th European Conference, Milan, Italy, September 29-October 4, 2024, Proceedings, Part XLV*, pages 403–420. Springer, 2024. 1
- [30] Ana-Maria Marcu, Long Chen, Jan Hünemann, Alice Karnsund, Benoît Hanotte, Prajwal Chidananda, Saurabh Nair, Vijay Badrinarayanan, Alex Kendall, Jamie Shotton, Elahe Arani, and Oleg Sinavski. Lingoqa: Visual question answering for autonomous driving. In *Computer Vision - ECCV 2024 - 18th European Conference, Milan, Italy, September 29-October 4, 2024, Proceedings, Part LXXVII*, pages 252–269. Springer, 2024. 1
- [31] Kenneth Marino, Mohammad Rastegari, Ali Farhadi, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. OK-VQA: A visual question answering benchmark requiring external knowledge. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2019, Long Beach, CA, USA, June 16-20, 2019*, pages 3195–3204. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2019. 1, 2
- [32] Francesco Maria Moltese, Luca Moroni, Luca Gioffrè, Alessandro Scirè, Simone Conia, and Roberto Navigli. Right answer, wrong score: Uncovering the inconsistencies of LLM evaluation in multiple-choice question answering. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2025, Vienna, Austria, July 27 - August 1, 2025*, pages 18477–18494. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2025. 1, 8
- [33] Letitia Parcalabescu and Anette Frank. MM-SHAP: A performance-agnostic metric for measuring multimodal contributions in vision and language models & tasks. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, pages 4032–4059. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. 3
- [34] Woohyeon Park, Woojin Kim, Jaeik Kim, and Jaeyoung Do. SECOND: Mitigating perceptual hallucination in vision-language models via selective and contrastive decoding. In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025. 3
- [35] Pouya Pezeshkpour and Estevam Hruschka. Large language models sensitivity to the order of options in multiple-choice questions. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024, Mexico City, Mexico, June 16-21, 2024*, pages 2006–2017. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024. 1, 3
- [36] Felipe Maia Polo, Ronald Xu, Lucas Weber, Mírian Silva, Onkar Bhardwaj, Leshem Choshen, Allysson Flavio Melo de Oliveira, Yuekai Sun, and Mikhail Yurochkin. Efficient multi-prompt evaluation of llms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 38: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2024, NeurIPS 2024, Vancouver, BC, Canada, December 10 - 15, 2024*. 2
- [37] Joshua Robinson and David Wingate. Leveraging large language models for multiple choice question answering. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. 1, 2, 4, 8, 16
- [38] Anna Rohrbach, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Kaylee Burns, Trevor Darrell, and Kate Saenko. Object hallucination in image captioning. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Brussels, Belgium, October 31 - November 4, 2018*, pages 4035–4045. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2018. 3
- [39] Dustin Schwenk, Apoorv Khandelwal, Christopher Clark, Kenneth Marino, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. A-OKVQA: A benchmark for visual question answering using world knowledge. In *Computer Vision - ECCV 2022 - 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23-27, 2022, Proceedings, Part VIII*, pages 146–162. Springer, 2022. 1, 2, 3, 13, 15
- [40] Qingyi Si, Fandong Meng, Mingyu Zheng, Zheng Lin, Yuanxin Liu, Peng Fu, Yanan Cao, Weiping Wang, and Jie Zhou. Language prior is not the only shortcut: A benchmark for shortcut learning in VQA. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, December 7-11, 2022*, pages 3698–3712. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022. 3
- [41] Amanpreet Singh, Vivek Natarajan, Meet Shah, Yu Jiang, Xinlei Chen, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, and Marcus Rohrbach. Towards VQA models that can read. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2019, Long Beach, CA, USA, June 16-20, 2019*, pages 8317–8326. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2019. 1

- [42] Shivalika Singh, Yiyang Nan, Alex Wang, Daniel D’souza, Sayash Kapoor, Ahmet Üstün, Sanmi Koyejo, Yuntian Deng, Shayne Longpre, Noah Smith, Beyza Ermis, Marzieh Fadaee, and Sara Hooker. The leaderboard illusion. *CoRR*, abs/2504.20879, 2025. 3
- [43] Jingtong Su, Jianyu Zhang, Karen Ullrich, Léon Bottou, and Mark Ibrahim. A single character can make or break your llm evals, 2025. 3
- [44] Zhijie Tan, Xu Chu, Weiping Li, and Tong Mo. Order matters: Exploring order sensitivity in multimodal large language models, 2024. 1, 3, 4, 15, 16
- [45] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 5998–6008, 2017. 2
- [46] Wenbin Wang, Liang Ding, Minyan Zeng, Xiabin Zhou, Li Shen, Yong Luo, Wei Yu, and Dacheng Tao. Divide, conquer and combine: A training-free framework for high-resolution image perception in multimodal large language models. In *AAAI-25, Sponsored by the Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence, February 25 - March 4, 2025, Philadelphia, PA, USA*, pages 7907–7915. AAAI Press, 2025. 3, 13, 15
- [47] Xinpeng Wang, Chengzhi Hu, Bolei Ma, Paul Rottger, and Barbara Plank. Look at the text: Instruction-tuned language models are more robust multiple choice selectors than you think. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*, 2024. 8
- [48] Yubo Wang, Xueguang Ma, Ge Zhang, Yuansheng Ni, Abhramil Chandra, Shiguang Guo, Weiming Ren, Aaran Arulraj, Xuan He, Ziyang Jiang, Tianle Li, Max Ku, Kai Wang, Alex Zhuang, Rongqi Fan, Xiang Yue, and Wenhua Chen. Mmlu-pro: A more robust and challenging multi-task language understanding benchmark. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 38: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2024, NeurIPS 2024, Vancouver, BC, Canada, December 10 - 15, 2024*, 2024. 3
- [49] Jason Wei, Clara Meister, and Ryan Cotterell. A cognitive regularizer for language modeling. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing, ACL/IJCNLP 2021, (Volume 1: Long Papers), Virtual Event, August 1-6, 2021*, pages 5191–5202. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021. 16
- [50] Penghao Wu and Saining Xie. V*: Guided visual search as a core mechanism in multimodal llms. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2024, Seattle, WA, USA, June 16-22, 2024*, pages 13084–13094. IEEE, 2024. 1, 3, 13, 15
- [51] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Guanting Dong, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jialin Wang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Ma, Jianxin Yang, Jin Xu, Jingren Zhou, Jinze Bai, Jinzheng He, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Chen, Kexin Yang, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Na Ni, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Ru Peng, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Runji Lin, Shijie Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Tianhang Zhu, Tianhao Li, Tianyu Liu, Wenbin Ge, Xiaodong Deng, Xiaohuan Zhou, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Zhang, Xipin Wei, Xuancheng Ren, Xuejing Liu, Yang Fan, Yang Yao, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yunfei Chu, Yuqiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, Zhifang Guo, and Zhihao Fan. Qwen2 technical report. *CoRR*, abs/2407.10671, 2024. 2, 3
- [52] Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Tianyu Zheng, Kai Zhang, Ruochi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, Cong Wei, Botao Yu, Ruibin Yuan, Renliang Sun, Ming Yin, Boyuan Zheng, Zhenzhu Yang, Yibo Liu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhua Chen. MMMU: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert AGI. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2024, Seattle, WA, USA, June 16-22, 2024*, pages 9556–9567. IEEE, 2024. 1, 2
- [53] Yifan Zhang, Huanyu Zhang, Haochen Tian, Chaoyou Fu, Shuangqing Zhang, Junfei Wu, Feng Li, Kun Wang, Qingsong Wen, Zhang Zhang, Liang Wang, and Rong Jin. Mme-realworld: Could your multimodal LLM challenge high-resolution real-world scenarios that are difficult for humans? In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2025, Singapore, April 24-28, 2025*. OpenReview.net, 2025. 2, 3, 13, 15
- [54] Chujie Zheng, Hao Zhou, Fandong Meng, Jie Zhou, and Minlie Huang. Large language models are not robust multiple choice selectors. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 1, 3, 4, 16
- [55] Liangyu Zhong, Fabio Rosenthal, Joachim Sicking, Fabian Hügler, Thorsten Bagdonat, Hanno Gottschalk, and Leo Schwinn. FOCUS: Internal MLLM representations for efficient fine-grained visual question answering. In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2025. 1

Unexplored Flaws in Multiple-Choice VQA Evaluations

Supplementary Material

A. Implementation Details

In this section, we present additional technical details covering: (i) the instruction prompts used (App. A.1), (ii) the background on LMMs (App. A.2) applied in Sec. 5.2, (iii) the metrics employed in our analysis (App. A.3), and (iv) the evaluation settings (App. A.4).

A.1. Instruction Prompts

As shown in Fig. 1, instruction prompts are essential for prompting in multiple-choice VQA tasks. They guide MLLMs to output only the corresponding option ID for the selected option [10]. In practice, many datasets use simple instruction prompts [10, 39, 46, 50, 53]; see the *Reference* instruction prompt from V*Bench in Tab. 3. Vague instruction prompts, such as failing to specify that the MLLM should return the option ID rather than the option text, can lead to poor instruction-following of MLLMs. This can lead to low coverage and, consequently, lower accuracy, not due to reasoning errors but simply because of inadequate prompt design. Therefore, we use an optimized instruction prompt that clearly specifies what the MLLMs should generate and what it should avoid in all experiments of our comprehensive analysis. Additionally, the prompt includes the exact option IDs that the models are expected to generate (see examples in Tab. 3).

Table 3. **Instruction prompt used across all multiple-choice VQA datasets.** We employ this optimized instruction prompt to mitigate poor instruction-following behavior. Additionally, we include the reference prompt from V*Bench for comparison. Finally, we demonstrate the adaptability of our prompt to different question formats, accommodating variations in the number and sets of option IDs.

Option IDs	Instruction prompt
<i>Reference</i> (V*Bench [10])	<i>Please select the correct answer from the options above.</i>
Template	Select the best answer to the above multiple-choice question based on the image. Respond with only the letter (e.g., {opt}, {opt}, {opt} or {opt}) of the correct option and no bracket, colon, or dot.
A/B/C/D	Select the best answer to the above multiple-choice question based on the image. Respond with only the letter (e.g., A, B, C or D) of the correct option and no bracket, colon, or dot.
A/B	Select the best answer to the above multiple-choice question based on the image. Respond with only the letter (e.g., A, or B) of the correct option and no bracket, colon, or dot.
a/b/c/d	Select the best answer to the above multiple-choice question based on the image. Respond with only the letter (e.g., a, b, c or d) of the correct option and no bracket, colon, or dot.
1/2/3/4	Select the best answer to the above multiple-choice question based on the image. Respond with only the number (e.g., 1, 2, 3 or 4) of the correct option and no bracket, colon, or dot.
I/II/III/IV	Select the best answer to the above multiple-choice question based on the image. Respond with only the roman number (e.g., I, II, III or IV) of the correct option and no bracket, colon, or dot.

A.2. Linear Mixed Models

For the significance analysis of prompt format variations (see Sec. 5.2), we employ a linear mixed model (LMM) to assess the impact of prompt format factors such as *option ID set*, *option delimiter*, and *option separator* on accuracy. Our comprehensive study spans multiple performance levels, including diverse datasets and MLLMs. Standard linear models (e.g., linear regression) are unsuitable for this non-independent data due to their independence assumption [16]. In contrast, LMMs handle such dependencies by modeling the target variable y as:

$$\mathbf{y} = X\boldsymbol{\beta} + Z\mathbf{u} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{y} is the vector of observations, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ the fixed effects, and \mathbf{u} the random effects [16]. The design matrices X and Z capture the relationships between \mathbf{y} and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, and between \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{u} , respectively [16].

In our application, we want to model the accuracy, therefore, our modeling design of the LMM is:

$$\text{Accuracy}_{ijk} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Option_IDs}_i + \beta_2 \text{Options_delimiter}_j + \beta_3 \text{Options_separator}_k + u_g + \epsilon_{ijk} \quad (4)$$

where β_0 is the intercept, $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$ are fixed-effect coefficients for the prompt format factors, u_g is the random effect for group g (model–dataset), and ϵ_{ijk} is the residual error. This specification estimates the effects of prompt format variations on accuracy while accounting for non-independence across different models and datasets through random effects.

Specifically, we fit a LMM using `statsmodels` in Python to estimate the influence of prompt format variations on accuracy. The model includes fixed effects for *option IDs*, *option delimiter*, and *option separator*, and a random intercept for each *model–dataset* combination via this modeling equation:

$$\text{''Accuracy} \sim \text{Option_IDs} + \text{Options_delimiter} + \text{Options_separator} + (1 \mid \text{Model:Dataset)}\text{''} \quad (5)$$

A.3. Metrics

Accuracy. The most commonly used metric for evaluating the reasoning ability of MLLMs in VQA is *accuracy* [3, 12]. The accuracy is defined as the ratio of correctly answered questions to the total number of questions in the evaluation set [3, 12]. The correctness assessment is performed directly on the model’s generated output sequence without applying any answer extraction mechanism (*e.g.*, regular expressions). An answer is considered correct only if it exactly matches the ground-truth label. For instance, if the label is "A", then "A" is correct, whereas "A ." or "A)" are not.

Coverage. To assess instruction-following capability, we introduce the metric *coverage*. Coverage is defined as the ratio of answers that belong to the valid option ID set to the total number of questions in the evaluation set:

$$\text{coverage} = \frac{s_i}{n} \quad (6)$$

where s_i denotes the number of answers within the option ID set and n is the total number of questions. A higher coverage value indicates higher instruction-following capability.

A.4. Evaluation Settings

We evaluate all models in a fully deterministic setting by disabling sampling. Specifically, we set `do_sample=False` and $k = 0$ during generation for each MLLM. This ensures that each model produces identical outputs for identical inputs. Before evaluating an MLLM on a given prompt format, we iterate over all option IDs required by the dataset. We tokenize each option ID and set the number of generated tokens to the maximum required to generate any option ID. Furthermore, we evaluate the seven MLLMs across all multiple-choice VQA datasets in a zero-shot setting, *i.e.* without providing any in-context learning examples, as is standard for this task [10].

B. Experiment Details

In this section, we provide more information on the used MLLMs in App. B.1 and datasets in App. B.2. Further, we provide more details on the bias mitigation methods in App. B.3.

B.1. Models

We evaluate a set of seven widely used MLLMs (see Tab. 4), each selected to have a comparable LLM parameter size. We consider three categories of models: (i) those that process a single downsized global view of the input image (LLaVA-1.5), (ii) those that combine a global view with additional high-resolution local crops (Gemma-3, LLaVA-OV, Phi-3.5, and Phi-4), and (iii) those that operate on a high-resolution global view of the input image (Qwen-2-VL and Qwen-2.5-VL).

Table 4. **Model overview.** We report the specific versions used of each MLLM for reproducibility reasons of this work.

Model	Year release	Huggingface model name	LLM size [B]
Gemma-3	2025	<i>google/gemma-3-4b-it</i>	4
LLaVA-1.5	2023	<i>llava-hf/llava-1.5-7b-hf</i>	7
LLaVA-OV	2024	<i>lmms-lab/llava-onevision-qwen2-7b-ov</i>	7
Phi-3.5	2024	<i>microsoft/Phi-3.5-vision-instruct</i>	3.8
Phi-4	2025	<i>microsoft/Phi-4-multimodal-instruct</i>	3.8
Qwen-2-VL	2024	<i>Qwen/Qwen2-VL-7B-Instruct</i>	7
Qwen-2.5-VL	2025	<i>Qwen/Qwen2.5-VL-7B-Instruct</i>	7

B.2. Datasets

For our comprehensive analysis, we employ five multiple-choice VQA datasets that span a range of task difficulties and domains. Additional details about these datasets are provided in Tab. 5.

Table 5. **Statistics of the multiple-choice VQA datasets.** The datasets vary significantly in the number of samples and image resolution. We report the number of question-answer (QA) pairs for both the single-prompt and circular evaluation schemes. Additionally, we indicate the prompt format variations that are standard for each dataset.

Dataset	No. options	QA pairs [#]		Image size [px]		Prompt format		
		Single	Circ. eval.	\bar{H}	\bar{W}	Option IDs	Option del.	Option sep.
A-OKVQA [39]	4	1,145	4,580	582	480	Low.	Double b.	Line break
HR-Bench-4k [46]	4	200	800	4,024	3,503	Upp.	Dot	Line break
MMBench-DEV [28]	2 – 4	1,292	4,876	464	349	Upp.	Dot	Semicolon
MME-RW-Lite [53]	5	1,919	9,595	2,836	1,566	Upp.	Double b.	Line break
V*Bench [50]	2 – 4	192	596	2,246	1,582	Upp.	Dot	Line break

B.3. Bias Mitigation Methods

We assess the effectiveness of several bias mitigation techniques in reducing prompt format-induced biases. All methods are reimplemented according to the specifications provided in their respective papers.

Circular evaluation. The circular evaluation scheme shifts the options in the prompt by one position [28] and thereby increases the number of questions - *e.g.*, for four options it enlarges the dataset by a factor of four. This mitigates the option position bias. While the approach requires no retraining or calibration, it is computationally more expensive.

Position-invariant accuracy (PIA). PIA is a post-hoc metric that mitigates the influence of the option position bias by weighting the per-option accuracy by the number of times an MLLM selects a specific option [44]:

$$\text{PIA} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{C_i}{Pr_i} \frac{C_i}{N} \quad (7)$$

where M is the number of options, C_i is the number of times option i was correctly selected, Pr_i is the number of times option i was selected in total and N is the number of questions [44]. This method does not require a calibration; however, it is prone to variations in the prompt format, as these changes may influence the selection frequency of MLLMs. Furthermore, it changes the accuracy calculation, which has two disadvantages: (i) this measure is less intuitive and not comparable to standard accuracy, and (ii) it can skew the result, *e.g.*, when a model performs overall well but it does not match the dataset’s positional distribution or when a model answers one option only rarely.

Debiasing with Prior estimation (PriDe). PriDe estimates the prior for each option ID based on calibration data containing circularly shifted multiple-choice questions [54]. This prior is then used to debias the predictions of an MLLM, adjusting the probability of each option ID according to its corresponding prior:

$$P_{\text{debiased}}(o_i | q, x) \propto \frac{P_{\text{observed}}(d_i | q, x)}{P_{\text{prior}}(d_i)} \quad (8)$$

where o_i denotes the i -th option, q is the question, x represents the default ordering of option IDs, and d_i is the i -th option ID [54]. The answer is then selected as the option ID with the highest debiased probability [54]. For our evaluations with PriDe, we estimate this prior using the 4-option questions from V*Bench. These priors are only valid for questions with the same number of options as in the calibration data; therefore, they cannot be applied to datasets with varying numbers of options.

Cloze prompt (length normalized) (CP-LN). An alternative approach to mitigating biases in MLLMs involves modifying the answer generation process. Rather than presenting all options to the model together with a predefined prompt format and instruction, this method calculates the perplexity of the question for each individual option. Perplexity serves as a metric for MLLMs, indicating how unexpected it is for the model to generate an output sequence y given the input token sequence \mathbf{X}_{in} and the previously generated tokens $y_{<i}$ [5, 6, 49]:

$$\text{PPL}(\mathbf{X}_{\text{in}})^y = \left(\prod_i^n P(y_i | \mathbf{X}_{\text{in}}, y_{<i}) \right)^{-\frac{1}{n}} \quad (9)$$

where n is the number of tokens in the sequence. A lower perplexity value indicates a more likely prediction of the output token sequence than a higher one. Unlike the sum of log-probabilities, perplexity is normalized and thus less sensitive to the sequence length n . Given the set of perplexities $\text{PPL}^o(X)$ computed by the MLLM for input \mathbf{X}_{in} conditioned on each option o , we select the predicted answer \hat{Y} as the option with the lowest perplexity among all options O :

$$\hat{Y} = \arg \min_{o \in O} (\text{PPL}^o(\mathbf{X}_{\text{in}})) \quad (10)$$

This approach is closely related to the methods used in [6, 37]. It has been shown to be less effective than the standard multiple-choice evaluation scheme in terms of accuracy [37], while its impact on bias mitigation remains unclear.

B.4. Computation Report

We provide an overview of the computational complexity involved in our comprehensive analysis of prompt format-induced biases in multiple-choice VQA, including the number of questions and inference time, in Tab. 6.

Table 6. **Computation Report.** Computational complexity for the comprehensive analysis.

Dataset	Question-level evaluations		Inference time estimates	
	Per prompt format variant	Total evaluations	Per question [s]	Total time [h]
A-OKVQA	4,580	1,538,880	0.50	205
HRBench-4K	800	268,800	2.00	149
MM-Bench	4,876	1,638,336	1.00	455
MME-RW-Lite	9,595	3,223,920	1.50	1,343
V*Bench	596	200,256	2.00	111
Sum	—	6,807,192	—	2,264

C. Further Results

We provide detailed results on coverage in App. C.1, answer behavior in App. C.2, coverage-neutral accuracy analysis in App. C.3, and bias mitigation in App. C.4. Finally, App. C.5 reports all dataset-model evaluations.

C.1. Coverage

As previously noted, a key factor affecting MLLM accuracy in multiple-choice VQA tasks is *coverage*. Low coverage reflects poor instruction-following, limiting accuracy because only part of the provided answers appear in the option ID set. We report the coverage results across all datasets in Fig. 9, complementing Fig. 5, which shows only A-OKVQA and HRBench-4K. The coverage trends are consistent across datasets, with minimal deviation. Most MLLMs maintain high coverage, while Gemma-3 and Qwen-2.5-VL achieve nearly 100% across all datasets and prompt formats. In contrast, LLaVA-1.5 and Phi-3.5 degrade sharply, dropping to 0% when option IDs are numerical. Among prompt format factors, lowercase and numerical as option IDs, or double brackets as delimiters, negatively impact coverage.




Figure 9. Full coverage results of MLLMs on multiple-choice VQA datasets. The results are averaged over 12 evaluations for *option IDs* and *option delimiter*, and 16 for *option separator*. While models such as Gemma-3, Phi-4, Qwen-2-VL, and Qwen-2.5-VL consistently achieve coverage above 75%, indicating stable instruction-following capabilities, others, like LLaVA-1.5, LLaVA-OV, and Phi-3.5, exhibit significant drops under certain prompt formats, revealing strong sensitivity to formatting variations. Grey cells indicate 0% coverage, meaning the models fail to produce any valid answers in these cases.

C.2. Option Selection Patterns

We report the answering frequency for each option position across five multiple-choice VQA datasets, using a circular evaluation scheme to mitigate option-order bias, as previously noted. We present the answer frequency results for A-




Figure 10. Answer behavior of MLLMs on the A-OKVQA dataset. We report the average answering frequency per option position for all seven MLLMs across the prompt format variations. The results are averaged over 12 evaluations for *option IDs* and *option delimiter*, and 16 for *option separator*. Option position bias is mitigated via a circular evaluation scheme.

OKVQA in Fig. 10, HRBench-4K in Fig. 11, MM-Bench in Fig. 12, MME-RealWorld-Lite in Fig. 13 and V*Bench in Fig. 14.

For our analysis, we first count the number of times each option position is selected for each evaluation. To obtain a meaningful measure of answer frequency, we normalize these counts. This is necessary because some datasets contain a varying number of options per question. Therefore, for each option position i , we compute its normalized answering frequency by dividing the number of times it was selected (s_i) by the number of times it appeared in questions (n_i):

$$f_i = \frac{s_i}{n_i}. \quad (11)$$

Next, we normalize these answering frequencies across all option positions so that they sum to 1:

$$\hat{f}_i = \frac{f_i}{\sum_{j=1}^o f_j}, \quad (12)$$

where o is the maximal number of options in the datasets. This ensures comparability of the answering frequency across datasets and positions.

In general, we observe a uniform answering behavior across all MLLMs for the datasets A-OKVQA, HRBench-4K, MM-Bench, and V*Bench. However, under certain evaluation configurations—such as LLaVA-1.5 with lowercase option IDs or LLaVA-OV with Roman numeral option IDs—we detect significant preferences for specific option positions. These biases appear to result from complex interactions between prompt format variations and inherent option-position preferences. Interestingly, this preference can either remain consistent across different prompt formats or vary depending on the format. This phenomenon is particularly pronounced for LLaVA-1.5, where the most favored option position changes with prompt format, yet exhibits similar patterns across datasets. Notably, on MME-RealWorld-Lite, most models display less uniform option-selection behavior compared to other benchmarks. Grey cells in the answer frequency plots indicate an answer frequency of 0%, meaning the MLLM did not generate the option ID corresponding to the option position even once during evaluation.




Figure 11. Answer behavior of MLLMs on the HRBench-4K dataset. We report the average answering frequency per option position for all seven MLLMs across the prompt format variations. The results are averaged over 12 evaluations for *option IDs* and *option delimiter*, and 16 for *option separator*. Option position bias is mitigated via a circular evaluation scheme.




Figure 12. **Answer behavior of MLLMs on the MM-Bench dataset.** We report the average answering frequency per option position for all seven MLLMs across the prompt format variations. The results are averaged over 12 evaluations for *option IDs* and *option delimiter*, and 16 for *option separator*. Option position bias is mitigated via a circular evaluation scheme.




Figure 13. **Answer behavior of MLLMs on the MME-RealWorld-Lite dataset.** We report the average answering frequency per option position for all seven MLLMs across the prompt format variations. The results are averaged over 12 evaluations for *option IDs* and *option delimiter*, and 16 for *option separator*. Option position bias is mitigated via a circular evaluation scheme.




Figure 14. **Answer behavior of MLLMs on the V*Bench dataset.** We report the average answering frequency per option position for all seven MLLMs across the prompt format variations. The results are averaged over 12 evaluations for *option IDs* and *option delimiter*, and 16 for *option separator*. Option position bias is mitigated via a circular evaluation scheme.

C.3. Coverage-Neutral Analysis

Here, we present accuracy deviations after filtering out evaluations where the MLLM shows poor instruction-following capabilities (coverage below 75%). This filtering isolates accuracy effects from coverage-related failures. As shown in Fig. 15, deviations are generally smaller than in the unfiltered case (Fig. 4), indicating that extreme biases often coincide with low coverage. For LLaVA-1.5, previously strongly biased, deviations are now reduced, while Phi-3.5 shows only minor deviations. In contrast, LLaVA-OV exhibits the largest deviations under coverage-neutral conditions (-21 to $+8$ pp), and Phi-4 displays notable deviations across all datasets, ranking as the third-most sensitive model. Compared to the original heatmap, the filtered version shows a narrower deviation range, with extreme negative values such as -59 pp disappearing, suggesting these were caused by coverage failures rather than inherent format sensitivity. Patterns across option delimiters and separators also appear more uniform, confirming that instruction-following issues amplify prompt format-related biases. Models with persistent coverage failures, such as LLaVA-1.5 in some datasets and Phi-3.5 in earlier evaluations, are partially or fully excluded from extreme accuracy deviations. Overall, this coverage-neutral analysis reduces observed accuracy deviations and isolates genuine format-related effects.




Figure 15. **Accuracy deviations (coverage filtered) of MLLMs on multiple-choice VQA datasets.** We report the average deviation from the mean accuracy across all prompt formats per model-dataset pair. The results are averaged over 12 evaluations for *option IDs* and *option delimiter*, and 16 for *option separator*. Option position bias is mitigated via a circular evaluation scheme. Grey cells indicate the absence of valid evaluations, as these were filtered out due to low coverage ($< 75\%$).

C.4. Bias Mitigation Results

We present the full bias mitigation results on A-OKVQA in Tab. 7a, HRBench-4K in Tab. 7b, and V*Bench in Tab. 7c. We assess the effectiveness of three bias mitigation results by comparing method rankings to those obtained by averaging accuracy across all 48 prompt format permutations (see Sec. 4.2).

Table 7. **Full bias mitigation results.** This table compares the bias-mitigation effectiveness of the methods CP-LN, PIA, and PriDe on the datasets A-OKVQA, HRBench-4K, and V*Bench. V*Bench contains questions with 2 and 4 options. The methods PIA and PriDe do not support mixed-number of options datasets. We assess effectiveness by counting the number of correctly ranked models relative to the pseudo GT. The pseudo GT is obtained by averaging accuracy across all 48 prompt-format variations for each dataset (see Sec. 4.2). For correctly ranked models, the rank is highlighted in bold.

(a) Bias mitigation results on A-OKVQA.										
Model	Pseudo GT		Vanilla		PIA		PriDe		CP-LN	
	Acc. [%]	Rank	Acc. [%]	Rank	Acc. [%]	Rank	Acc. [%]	Rank	Acc. [%]	Rank
Gemma-3	77.99	5	78.08	3	61.00	4	78.86	6	67.78	6
LLaVA-1.5	48.47	7	12.29	7	10.93	7	77.12	7	68.21	5
LLaVA-OV	81.28	3	42.40	6	37.91	5	91.35	1	96.59	1
Phi-3.5	59.27	6	78.67	2	64.37	2	80.70	5	67.69	7
Phi-4	80.50	4	75.04	4	61.14	3	83.40	4	85.94	2
Qwen-2-VL	81.96	2	44.26	5	36.31	6	87.16	3	78.52	3
Qwen-2.5-VL	86.77	1	87.93	1	77.31	1	87.69	2	74.93	4
Complexity [#] ↓	219,840		1,145		4,580		1,145		4,580	
Comparison to Pseudo GT										
Ranking correlation ↑			0.32		0.32		0.86		0.57	
Correctly ranked ↑			(3/7)		(2/7)		(2/7)		(0/7)	

(b) Bias mitigation results on HRBench-4K.

Model	Pseudo GT		Vanilla		PIA		PriDe		CP-LN	
	Acc. [%]	Rank	Acc. [%]	Rank	Acc. [%]	Rank	Acc. [%]	Rank	Acc. [%]	Rank
Gemma-3	45.91	5	44.25	6	4.99	6	44.25	6	52.00	6
LLaVA-1.5	22.05	7	36.75	7	3.41	7	37.13	7	34.50	7
LLaVA-OV	55.21	4	65.00	1	10.61	3	65.50	2	64.00	3
Phi-3.5	35.84	6	50.50	5	6.40	5	50.13	5	53.00	5
Phi-4	61.13	3	65.00	1	10.66	2	65.25	4	58.00	4
Qwen-2-VL	64.36	2	62.00	4	9.63	4	65.50	2	68.06	2
Qwen-2.5-VL	69.61	1	62.75	3	39.47	1	72.50	1	68.50	1
Complexity [#] ↓	38,400		200		800		200		800	
Comparison to Pseudo GT										
Ranking correlation ↑			0.63		0.86		0.88		0.93	
Correctly ranked ↑			(1/7)		(2/7)		(2/7)		(3/7)	

(c) Bias mitigation results on V*Bench.

Model	Pseudo GT		Vanilla		PIA		PriDe		CP-LN	
	Acc. [%]	Rank	Acc. [%]	Rank	Acc. [%]	Rank	Acc. [%]	Rank	Acc. [%]	Rank
Gemma-3	34.41	6	36.13	7	—	—	—	—	42.93	7
LLaVA-1.5	22.05	7	40.84	6	—	—	—	—	44.50	6
LLaVA-OV	62.36	4	72.73	3	—	—	—	—	68.06	2
Phi-3.5	35.46	5	52.88	5	—	—	—	—	53.40	5
Phi-4	69.83	2	73.30	1	—	—	—	—	62.83	4
Qwen-2-VL	69.58	3	54.45	4	—	—	—	—	65.97	3
Qwen-2.5-VL	77.44	1	72.77	2	—	—	—	—	69.11	1
Complexity [#] ↓	28,608		191		—		—		596	
Comparison to Pseudo GT										
Ranking correlation ↑			0.89		—		—		0.93	
Correctly ranked ↑			(1/7)		—		—		(3/7)	

C.5. Full Results

In this subsection, we report the complete results of all dataset–model evaluations across *A-OKVQA* in Tab. 8, *HRBench-4K* in Tab. 9, *MM-Bench* in Tab. 10, *MME-RealWorld-Lite* in Tab. 11, and *V*Bench* in Tab. 12. Each table summarizes the performance of multiple MLLMs under diverse prompt format variations. The reported metrics include accuracy (%) and coverage (%), where accuracy reflects the correctness of predictions and coverage indicates the instruction-following capability for each model. These tables provide a comprehensive view of how prompt format variations influence model performance across all used multiple-choice VQA datasets.

Table 8. Full results of prompt format variations on A-OKVQA dataset. This table presents the performance of seven MLLMs under different option separators (*Comma*, *Line break*, *Semicolon*) and delimiters (*Dot*, *Colon*, *Bracket*, *Double brackets*). Option ID sets are varied across four formats: *Uppercase*, *Lowercase*, *Numbers*, and *Roman numbers*. Metrics include accuracy (%) and coverage (%), with coverage consistently near 100% and accuracy varying by format. The top-performing model changes across prompt format variations, alternating between Qwen-2.5-VL, Qwen-2-VL, and LLaVA-OV. The accuracy gap to the second-best MLLM ranges from 0.00 pp (tie between two models) to 5.39 pp. The highest accuracy per prompt format variation is highlighted in bold.

Option sep.	Model		Option delimiter															
			Dot				Colon				Bracket				Double brackets			
			Option IDs				Option IDs				Option IDs				Option IDs			
			Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.	Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.	Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.	Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.
Comma	Gemma-3	Acc. [%]	77.97	78.36	77.84	77.34	77.51	77.84	77.66	77.14	78.08	78.56	77.88	77.45	78.56	78.56	77.97	77.77
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.98	100.00	99.96
	LLaVA-1.5	Acc. [%]	73.82	45.18	0.00	71.81	72.18	52.49	0.00	71.05	73.80	55.57	0.00	72.01	75.42	8.28	0.00	46.03
		Cov. [%]	100.00	67.10	0.00	99.87	100.00	80.09	0.00	99.98	100.00	80.55	0.00	99.93	99.96	10.26	0.00	55.44
	LLaVA-OV	Acc. [%]	89.85	89.54	89.76	80.72	90.42	90.07	89.80	74.28	90.61	90.33	90.15	77.58	90.59	3.82	89.72	73.14
		Cov. [%]	100.00	99.98	99.78	99.93	100.00	100.00	99.89	99.78	100.00	100.00	99.93	99.96	100.00	4.39	99.78	99.45
	Phi-3.5	Acc. [%]	76.92	78.25	0.00	79.00	79.54	79.69	0.00	79.13	78.30	79.19	0.00	79.32	79.65	69.85	0.00	78.56
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	84.52	0.00	97.99
	Phi-4	Acc. [%]	82.77	82.49	82.36	72.12	82.77	82.86	82.29	73.04	82.82	82.73	82.62	69.54	83.04	82.84	82.58	76.57
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	89.85	100.00	100.00	100.00	90.35	100.00	100.00	100.00	87.16	100.00	99.93	100.00	94.76
	Qwen-2-VL	Acc. [%]	83.58	84.26	85.59	85.33	84.15	85.35	85.20	85.70	84.26	85.09	85.59	85.59	65.94	35.76	84.21	85.94
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.83	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.83	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.83	100.00	78.08	44.06	98.43	99.91
	Qwen-2.5-VL	Acc. [%]	87.31	87.21	85.70	85.94	86.97	87.03	85.68	85.13	87.23	86.99	86.05	85.59	87.56	87.36	85.79	85.13
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.87	100.00	100.00	99.98	99.87	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.87	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.85	100.00
Line break	Gemma-3	Acc. [%]	78.56	78.19	78.17	77.75	78.47	78.41	78.30	77.82	78.62	78.65	78.30	77.82	78.14	78.08	78.12	78.06
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.98	100.00	100.00	100.00
	LLaVA-1.5	Acc. [%]	79.11	69.98	0.00	77.58	78.56	76.05	0.00	77.03	78.89	74.26	0.00	77.36	78.89	12.29	0.00	38.60
		Cov. [%]	100.00	89.50	0.00	99.93	100.00	97.47	0.00	100.00	100.00	94.48	0.00	99.98	100.00	13.87	0.00	42.03
	LLaVA-OV	Acc. [%]	91.07	90.76	90.02	59.85	90.96	90.61	90.50	62.80	90.87	90.90	90.37	63.58	90.74	42.40	90.26	67.27
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.72	99.41	100.00	100.00	99.91	99.61	100.00	100.00	99.85	99.69	100.00	47.47	99.74	99.59
	Phi-3.5	Acc. [%]	81.00	81.05	0.00	80.09	80.87	80.98	0.00	79.85	81.07	80.87	0.00	80.13	81.05	78.67	0.00	79.85
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	96.18	0.00	99.72
	Phi-4	Acc. [%]	82.62	82.34	82.18	78.17	82.88	82.71	82.53	79.11	82.66	82.53	81.97	76.20	82.90	82.60	82.60	75.66
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	96.16	100.00	100.00	100.00	96.79	100.00	100.00	100.00	93.78	100.00	100.00	100.00	93.71
	Qwen-2-VL	Acc. [%]	86.57	86.83	85.63	84.98	86.62	86.62	85.59	85.35	86.66	86.42	85.81	85.13	78.97	44.26	85.22	85.61
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.91	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.89	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.91	100.00	91.77	53.95	99.26	99.85
	Qwen-2.5-VL	Acc. [%]	87.99	87.77	86.49	86.16	88.12	87.80	86.53	86.09	87.90	87.86	86.53	86.03	88.17	87.99	86.83	85.68
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.87	99.98	100.00	100.00	99.85	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.87	99.98	100.00	100.00	99.85	99.96
Semicolon	Gemma-3	Acc. [%]	77.97	78.30	77.40	77.56	77.49	77.86	77.56	77.51	78.10	78.43	77.53	77.51	78.30	78.34	77.90	77.86
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.98
	LLaVA-1.5	Acc. [%]	77.47	60.74	0.00	73.91	75.63	68.14	0.00	73.01	76.11	68.71	0.00	73.71	76.40	12.16	0.00	54.32
		Cov. [%]	100.00	80.79	0.00	99.93	100.00	90.90	0.00	100.00	100.00	90.92	0.00	99.96	99.98	14.32	0.00	65.81
	LLaVA-OV	Acc. [%]	90.00	90.24	89.76	79.39	90.85	90.33	90.18	73.58	90.94	90.66	90.02	77.42	90.72	11.66	89.83	72.66
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.89	99.83	100.00	100.00	99.96	99.83	100.00	100.00	99.91	99.96	100.00	13.30	99.78	99.72
	Phi-3.5	Acc. [%]	78.89	79.39	0.00	79.32	79.69	79.91	0.00	79.30	79.56	79.76	0.00	79.78	79.76	72.53	0.00	79.15
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	87.49	0.00	98.87
	Phi-4	Acc. [%]	82.60	82.36	82.21	71.83	82.84	82.62	82.42	72.75	82.73	82.51	82.62	68.30	82.73	82.62	82.58	77.60
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	89.39	100.00	100.00	100.00	89.74	100.00	100.00	100.00	84.98	100.00	99.93	100.00	95.50
	Qwen-2-VL	Acc. [%]	84.87	86.27	85.90	85.44	86.11	86.55	85.59	85.66	86.29	86.46	85.98	85.72	73.65	41.09	84.96	85.92
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.87	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.85	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.87	100.00	86.00	50.02	98.91	99.96
	Qwen-2.5-VL	Acc. [%]	87.84	87.58	86.11	85.87	87.60	87.42	85.90	85.72	87.40	87.58	86.33	85.92	87.62	87.56	86.40	85.50
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.87	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.85	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.87	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.85	99.98

Table 9. **Full results of prompt format variations on HR-Bench-4K dataset.** This table presents the performance of seven MLLMs under different option separators (*Comma*, *Line break*, *Semicolon*) and delimiters (*Dot*, *Colon*, *Bracket*, *Double brackets*). Option ID sets are varied across four formats: *Uppercase*, *Lowercase*, *Numbers*, and *Roman numbers*. Metrics include accuracy (%) and coverage (%), with coverage consistently near 100% and accuracy varying by format. Qwen-2.5-VL is consistently the top-performing MLLM, demonstrating strong robustness. The accuracy gap to the second-best MLLM ranges from 0.25 pp to 6.88 pp. The highest accuracy per prompt format variation is highlighted in bold.

Option sep.	Model		Option delimiter															
			Dot Option IDs				Colon Option IDs				Bracket Option IDs				Double brackets Option IDs			
			Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.	Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.	Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.	Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.
Comma	Gemma-3	Acc. [%]	45.75	46.00	43.50	46.38	46.25	46.38	44.25	46.25	46.38	46.25	46.38	46.88	45.63	46.38	45.00	46.88
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	LLaVA-1.5	Acc. [%]	33.00	24.38	0.00	33.38	33.13	25.38	0.00	31.75	35.13	27.00	0.00	33.38	35.88	1.88	0.00	11.88
		Cov. [%]	100.00	84.88	0.00	99.88	100.00	89.25	0.00	100.00	100.00	87.25	0.00	100.00	100.00	4.75	0.00	32.13
	LLaVA-OV	Acc. [%]	64.25	62.38	60.25	47.75	64.25	63.88	60.38	44.63	64.50	63.88	61.38	46.63	64.13	4.38	62.00	40.13
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.63	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.63	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.88	100.00	6.63	99.63	99.63
	Phi-3.5	Acc. [%]	46.88	48.00	0.00	45.50	47.75	47.25	0.00	45.38	47.25	48.25	0.00	45.88	50.25	39.63	0.00	45.13
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	78.13	0.00	99.75
	Phi-4	Acc. [%]	62.00	63.25	60.38	53.25	63.50	63.63	63.13	54.38	63.50	62.75	62.50	49.63	63.13	63.25	61.88	50.88
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	94.88	100.00	100.00	100.00	94.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	92.38	100.00	100.00	100.00	93.50
Line break	Qwen-2-VL	Acc. [%]	66.00	66.13	67.63	66.38	65.50	66.75	67.50	66.63	66.25	66.25	66.88	66.38	59.88	25.63	66.00	67.63
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.88	100.00	92.25	43.88	100.00	100.00
	Qwen-2.5-VL	Acc. [%]	70.63	69.88	68.88	67.88	69.63	69.63	67.75	67.38	70.50	70.38	68.88	67.88	70.50	70.00	69.38	66.50
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.75	100.00	100.00	99.88	99.88	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.88	100.00	100.00	99.88	100.00	100.00
	Gemma-3	Acc. [%]	44.25	44.88	45.13	46.88	46.00	45.88	46.00	46.13	44.88	44.63	45.63	46.63	45.50	44.75	45.13	46.75
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	LLaVA-1.5	Acc. [%]	36.75	33.00	0.00	34.00	36.75	33.25	0.00	34.13	36.38	34.13	0.00	33.63	35.38	0.88	0.00	5.63
		Cov. [%]	100.00	93.38	0.00	100.00	100.00	96.63	0.00	100.00	100.00	95.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	1.88	0.00	9.25
	LLaVA-OV	Acc. [%]	65.00	65.75	63.50	34.25	65.25	65.88	63.50	34.75	65.13	65.25	63.25	36.00	65.88	42.38	63.63	35.63
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.13	99.00	100.00	100.00	99.88	99.63	100.00	100.00	99.38	99.75	100.00	65.88	99.13	99.75
	Phi-3.5	Acc. [%]	50.50	49.75	0.00	49.63	50.63	50.25	0.00	49.13	50.38	49.63	0.00	48.75	50.75	47.63	0.00	49.50
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	0.00	99.75	100.00	100.00	0.00	99.88	100.00	100.00	0.00	99.75	100.00	93.13	0.00	99.88
Semicolon	Phi-4	Acc. [%]	65.00	65.50	63.25	60.00	65.00	65.13	63.25	61.38	64.25	65.50	63.88	56.38	64.50	64.50	63.50	54.00
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.13	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.38	100.00	100.00	100.00	96.38	100.00	100.00	100.00	93.13
	Qwen-2-VL	Acc. [%]	67.13	67.38	68.63	65.88	67.00	67.50	68.38	67.00	66.63	66.88	68.38	67.50	64.75	25.88	68.75	68.38
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	97.75	47.00	99.88	100.00
	Qwen-2.5-VL	Acc. [%]	71.25	69.88	69.88	69.00	71.00	70.38	69.63	68.88	71.00	70.38	69.63	68.63	71.50	70.50	69.75	68.88
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.63	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.88	100.00
	Gemma-3	Acc. [%]	46.38	46.88	44.88	46.63	46.88	46.75	45.00	47.50	46.38	46.38	45.25	46.63	45.38	47.00	45.63	46.63
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	LLaVA-1.5	Acc. [%]	37.25	29.88	0.00	35.50	36.63	32.88	0.00	32.75	36.88	33.13	0.00	33.88	35.63	2.00	0.00	13.00
		Cov. [%]	100.00	91.88	0.00	99.88	100.00	95.13	0.00	100.00	100.00	94.63	0.00	100.00	100.00	5.38	0.00	33.88
	LLaVA-OV	Acc. [%]	64.13	63.38	61.50	46.50	65.50	65.13	61.63	41.75	64.75	65.13	61.50	43.88	64.38	9.38	62.88	39.13
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.25	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.63	100.00	100.00	99.88	99.75	100.00	15.50	99.88	99.50
Comma	Phi-3.5	Acc. [%]	48.13	48.38	0.00	45.88	48.50	48.50	0.00	46.63	48.88	48.38	0.00	47.38	49.88	39.13	0.00	47.13
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	0.00	99.75	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	99.75	100.00	79.13	0.00	100.00
	Phi-4	Acc. [%]	62.13	62.00	61.38	53.88	63.00	62.63	62.38	55.88	62.75	63.50	62.75	51.50	63.63	63.13	62.75	54.88
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	93.88	100.00	100.00	100.00	94.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	91.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	95.75
	Qwen-2-VL	Acc. [%]	67.00	68.00	67.88	66.38	67.75	68.13	67.25	67.38	68.13	68.38	68.13	62.25	27.38	67.13	67.63	
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	94.25	49.13	99.88	100.00
	Qwen-2.5-VL	Acc. [%]	71.75	69.88	69.25	69.00	70.25	69.88	69.38	68.88	69.63	70.50	69.63	69.13	71.25	69.25	69.75	68.38
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.88	99.88	100.00	100.00	99.88	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.88	100.00	100.00

Table 10. **Full results of prompt format variations on MM-Bench dataset.** This table presents the performance of seven MLLMs under different option separators (*Comma*, *Line break*, *Semicolon*) and delimiters (*Dot*, *Colon*, *Bracket*, *Double brackets*). Option ID sets are varied across four formats: *Uppercase*, *Lowercase*, *Numbers*, and *Roman numbers*. Metrics include accuracy (%) and coverage (%), with coverage consistently near 100% and accuracy varying by format. Qwen-2.5-VL is consistently the top-performing MLLM, demonstrating strong robustness. The accuracy gap to the second-best MLLM ranges from 0.10 pp to 3.84 pp. The highest accuracy per prompt format variation is highlighted in bold.

Option sep.	Model	Option delimiter															
		Dot Option IDs				Colon Option IDs				Bracket Option IDs				Double brackets Option IDs			
		Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.	Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.	Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.	Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.
Comma	Gemma-3	Acc. [%]	76.74	77.52	77.24	76.91	77.03	77.24	77.67	76.60	76.85	77.48	77.46	77.09	78.12	78.04	77.67
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	LLaVA-1.5	Acc. [%]	66.63	52.69	0.00	65.42	66.12	55.99	0.00	64.89	66.78	56.87	0.00	65.05	69.07	14.52	0.00
		Cov. [%]	99.96	83.76	0.00	99.16	99.96	90.03	0.00	99.43	99.94	89.15	0.00	99.24	99.90	17.56	0.00
	LLaVA-OV	Acc. [%]	84.58	84.09	83.70	78.92	84.76	84.33	84.39	76.27	84.76	84.45	84.15	77.69	85.25	9.25	84.62
		Cov. [%]	99.98	99.96	99.57	99.08	100.00	100.00	99.80	99.61	100.00	100.00	99.69	99.61	100.00	11.10	99.57
	Phi-3.5	Acc. [%]	75.55	76.60	0.00	77.30	77.85	78.10	0.00	77.01	77.40	77.67	0.00	77.87	79.80	68.48	0.00
		Cov. [%]	99.96	99.96	0.00	99.98	100.00	99.98	0.00	100.00	100.00	99.98	0.00	99.92	99.96	82.08	0.00
	Phi-4	Acc. [%]	84.52	84.25	83.92	81.01	84.48	84.17	83.68	80.95	84.68	84.64	84.33	79.86	84.72	84.13	84.60
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	97.99	100.00	100.00	100.00	97.70	100.00	100.00	100.00	96.53	100.00	99.16	99.90
Line break	Qwen-2-VL	Acc. [%]	82.81	83.08	83.45	83.74	82.88	83.35	83.80	83.94	83.04	83.27	84.09	83.94	66.18	40.73	83.61
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.86	99.96	100.00	100.00	99.92	99.98	100.00	100.00	99.92	99.96	79.53	50.08	99.34
	Qwen-2.5-VL	Acc. [%]	88.08	87.86	86.49	85.73	87.76	87.84	86.75	85.17	87.98	87.80	86.53	85.34	87.96	87.96	87.06
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.94	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.98	100.00	100.00	99.92	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Gemma-3	Acc. [%]	77.73	77.79	78.36	77.93	77.97	78.20	78.45	78.45	77.56	78.06	78.38	77.81	78.24	78.49	78.28
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	LLaVA-1.5	Acc. [%]	71.86	67.97	0.00	70.32	72.13	69.46	0.00	69.91	71.97	68.79	0.00	70.22	71.47	14.17	0.00
		Cov. [%]	100.00	95.02	0.00	99.69	100.00	97.95	0.00	99.84	100.00	96.37	0.00	99.77	99.98	16.00	0.00
	LLaVA-OV	Acc. [%]	85.54	85.21	84.37	65.09	85.54	85.17	84.70	67.00	85.52	85.13	84.76	68.89	85.42	27.54	84.99
		Cov. [%]	100.00	99.92	99.67	99.04	100.00	100.00	99.80	99.82	100.00	99.98	99.77	99.84	100.00	34.37	99.51
	Phi-3.5	Acc. [%]	80.27	80.35	0.00	79.23	79.66	79.74	0.00	79.64	80.27	80.27	0.00	79.35	80.13	75.51	0.00
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	0.00	99.34	100.00	100.00	0.00	99.96	100.00	100.00	0.00	99.26	100.00	91.88	0.00
Semicolon	Phi-4	Acc. [%]	85.25	84.82	85.03	83.14	85.05	84.80	85.05	83.88	85.28	85.03	85.32	82.57	85.19	84.72	85.15
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.12	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.63	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.61	100.00	99.88	99.82
	Qwen-2-VL	Acc. [%]	85.46	85.40	84.60	84.58	85.56	85.48	84.48	85.13	85.30	85.40	84.64	84.97	79.08	44.69	84.25
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.92	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.92	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.92	100.00	93.01	54.61	99.80
	Qwen-2.5-VL	Acc. [%]	87.88	87.88	87.24	85.99	88.02	88.08	87.33	86.16	87.84	88.04	87.43	85.99	87.96	87.90	87.35
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.96	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.94	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.98	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	Gemma-3	Acc. [%]	77.19	77.48	77.58	77.03	77.26	77.58	77.69	77.34	77.17	77.44	77.69	77.05	77.83	77.91	77.61
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	LLaVA-1.5	Acc. [%]	69.38	62.59	0.00	67.62	69.16	64.89	0.00	66.41	69.01	65.09	0.00	66.94	69.65	17.25	0.00
		Cov. [%]	99.92	90.98	0.00	99.47	99.96	95.16	0.00	99.73	99.92	94.61	0.00	99.57	99.90	20.43	0.00
	LLaVA-OV	Acc. [%]	84.84	84.52	84.21	78.16	85.42	85.03	84.72	75.74	85.17	84.95	84.80	77.75	85.50	12.39	84.89
		Cov. [%]	99.98	99.94	99.69	99.04	100.00	100.00	99.82	99.73	100.00	100.00	99.80	99.75	100.00	14.97	99.49
	Phi-3.5	Acc. [%]	77.40	77.69	0.00	78.59	78.92	78.86	0.00	77.97	78.38	78.67	0.00	78.88	79.43	69.30	0.00
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	0.00	99.94	100.00	100.00	0.00	99.98	100.00	100.00	0.00	99.90	99.96	83.39	0.00
	Phi-4	Acc. [%]	84.23	84.17	83.51	81.30	84.52	83.78	83.66	81.32	84.52	84.31	84.31	80.21	84.27	84.02	84.39
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.05	100.00	100.00	100.00	97.58	100.00	100.00	100.00	96.37	100.00	98.95	99.90
	Qwen-2-VL	Acc. [%]	83.51	84.62	83.96	84.48	84.41	84.70	84.07	84.27	84.91	84.80	84.09	84.66	73.40	42.35	83.57
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.92	99.94	100.00	100.00	99.92	99.96	100.00	100.00	99.90	99.94	87.43	52.09	99.36
	Qwen-2.5-VL	Acc. [%]	88.08	87.94	86.81	85.99	88.06	88.02	86.87	85.85	88.04	87.96	86.92	85.69	87.98	87.78	87.16
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.94	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table 11. **Full results of prompt format variations on MME-RealWorld-Lite dataset.** This table presents the performance of seven MLLMs under different option separators (*Comma*, *Line break*, *Semicolon*) and delimiters (*Dot*, *Colon*, *Bracket*, *Double brackets*). Option ID sets are varied across four formats: *Uppercase*, *Lowercase*, *Numbers*, and *Roman numbers*. Metrics include accuracy (%) and coverage (%), with coverage consistently near 100% and accuracy varying by format. The top-performing model changes across prompt format variations, alternating between Qwen-2.5-VL, Qwen-2-VL, and Phi-4. The accuracy gap to the second-best MLLM ranges from 0.08 pp to 3.00 pp. The highest accuracy per prompt format variation is highlighted in bold.

Option sep.	Model	Option delimiter															
		Dot Option IDs				Colon Option IDs				Bracket Option IDs				Double brackets Option IDs			
		Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.	Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.	Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.	Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.
Comma	Gemma-3	Acc. [%]	35.97	34.24	35.28	35.78	36.23	34.10	35.33	35.33	35.85	32.84	35.04	35.87	36.11	30.70	35.70
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.97	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.99	100.00	100.00	99.94	100.00	100.00	99.99	99.98	100.00
	LLaVA-1.5	Acc. [%]	30.44	26.62	0.00	29.03	29.71	26.11	0.00	28.23	30.79	27.14	0.00	29.88	30.94	8.50	0.00
		Cov. [%]	100.00	97.98	0.00	99.74	100.00	99.33	0.00	99.92	100.00	98.75	0.00	99.81	100.00	30.39	0.00
	LLaVA-OV	Acc. [%]	44.77	44.72	45.14	34.77	46.18	45.51	45.55	33.08	46.20	45.03	45.09	33.99	45.31	3.93	44.66
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.75	99.19	100.00	100.00	99.95	99.49	100.00	100.00	99.89	99.60	100.00	9.53	98.60
	Phi-3.5	Acc. [%]	37.34	35.14	0.00	39.40	39.25	36.21	0.00	39.50	38.00	36.33	0.00	39.02	37.67	26.76	0.00
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	99.96	88.53	0.00
	Phi-4	Acc. [%]	47.51	47.82	45.49	44.19	47.66	47.48	45.66	45.29	47.51	47.67	45.61	42.82	46.90	45.81	46.13
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.32	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.34	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.78	100.00	99.20	99.85
Line break	Qwen-2-VL	Acc. [%]	44.27	41.96	45.92	45.43	44.62	42.30	46.17	46.35	44.98	42.96	46.14	45.69	42.64	33.24	45.70
		Cov. [%]	100.00	99.99	99.73	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.78	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.88	100.00	99.36	91.68	99.43
	Qwen-2.5-VL	Acc. [%]	47.21	44.82	47.48	46.02	47.74	45.17	47.51	45.76	46.84	44.52	47.32	45.51	46.51	44.42	47.29
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.90	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.90	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.95	100.00	100.00	99.95	99.99
	Gemma-3	Acc. [%]	35.92	33.23	35.28	36.12	35.78	32.35	35.58	35.38	35.82	31.86	35.69	36.17	36.09	29.65	35.50
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.94	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.95	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.95	100.00	100.00	99.95	100.00
	LLaVA-1.5	Acc. [%]	32.53	29.38	0.00	33.76	31.70	28.77	0.00	32.80	32.94	29.20	0.00	34.47	33.13	6.48	0.00
		Cov. [%]	100.00	99.52	0.00	99.98	100.00	99.65	0.00	99.99	100.00	99.64	0.00	99.99	99.99	23.44	0.00
	LLaVA-OV	Acc. [%]	44.53	44.16	43.86	29.59	45.48	44.96	44.92	30.12	45.43	44.58	44.73	30.42	45.23	22.93	44.77
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	98.44	99.04	100.00	100.00	99.85	99.53	100.00	100.00	99.80	99.52	100.00	54.81	99.43
	Phi-3.5	Acc. [%]	38.95	34.64	0.00	39.24	39.01	34.85	0.00	39.16	38.34	35.30	0.00	38.44	38.06	27.83	0.00
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	91.01	0.00
Semicolon	Phi-4	Acc. [%]	47.43	46.95	46.67	44.70	47.70	47.06	46.38	46.08	47.09	47.08	46.73	43.91	47.36	46.31	46.99
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.75	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.84	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.50	100.00	99.92	99.97
	Qwen-2-VL	Acc. [%]	45.18	44.30	46.56	45.12	45.80	44.83	46.45	45.97	45.91	45.34	46.59	45.71	45.07	32.72	46.48
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.80	99.99	100.00	100.00	99.90	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.87	100.00	98.92	86.80	99.56
	Qwen-2.5-VL	Acc. [%]	46.17	44.41	47.91	45.46	46.77	44.86	47.85	45.41	46.02	44.42	47.55	45.08	46.55	44.30	47.22
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.97	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.98	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.97	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.99
	Gemma-3	Acc. [%]	36.04	34.15	35.18	35.78	36.09	34.07	35.25	35.29	36.08	32.90	35.54	35.66	36.09	30.74	35.65
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.99	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.99	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.99	100.00	100.00	99.98	100.00
	LLaVA-1.5	Acc. [%]	32.01	28.63	0.00	31.28	30.89	27.61	0.00	30.57	32.26	28.77	0.00	31.70	31.78	10.28	0.00
		Cov. [%]	100.00	98.82	0.00	99.85	100.00	99.50	0.00	99.94	100.00	99.31	0.00	99.93	100.00	36.09	0.00
	LLaVA-OV	Acc. [%]	43.90	44.18	44.43	34.25	45.84	45.21	45.04	32.97	45.72	44.84	44.78	33.57	44.98	8.25	44.67
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.90	98.73	100.00	100.00	99.97	99.47	100.00	100.00	99.95	99.58	100.00	20.60	98.92
	Phi-3.5	Acc. [%]	37.55	35.00	0.00	40.45	39.55	36.09	0.00	39.84	37.97	36.12	0.00	39.75	37.88	26.71	0.00
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	99.97	89.06	0.00
	Phi-4	Acc. [%]	47.29	47.49	46.10	44.83	47.53	47.18	45.82	45.34	47.51	48.07	46.36	43.42	47.25	45.90	46.81
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.16	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.03	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.36	100.00	99.10	99.92
	Qwen-2-VL	Acc. [%]	44.65	42.96	46.14	46.05	45.23	43.14	46.02	46.34	45.75	43.91	46.38	46.07	43.79	34.47	45.82
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.92	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.92	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.96	100.00	99.57	92.73	99.57
	Qwen-2.5-VL	Acc. [%]	47.51	45.59	47.62	46.24	48.04	45.82	47.67	46.09	47.32	45.46	47.58	45.62	47.40	45.67	47.08
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	99.93	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.91	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.96	100.00	100.00	99.95	99.99

Table 12. **Full results of prompt format variations on V*Bench dataset.** This table summarizes the performance of seven MLLMs under different option separators (*Comma*, *Line break*, *Semicolon*) and delimiters (*Dot*, *Colon*, *Bracket*, *Double brackets*). Option ID sets are varied across four formats: *Uppercase*, *Lowercase*, *Numbers*, and *Roman numbers*. Metrics include accuracy (%) and coverage (%), with coverage consistently near 100% and accuracy varying by format. Qwen-2.5-VL is consistently the top-performing MLLM, demonstrating strong robustness. The accuracy gap to the second-best MLLM ranges from 1.01 pp to 9.56 pp. The highest accuracy per prompt format variation is highlighted in bold.

Option sep.	Model		Option delimiter															
			Dot Option IDs				Colon Option IDs				Bracket Option IDs				Double brackets Option IDs			
			Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.	Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.	Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.	Upp.	Low.	Num.	Rom.
Comma	Gemma-3	Acc. [%]	35.40	34.56	35.74	32.22	34.23	34.90	34.40	35.24	33.89	33.39	35.07	33.39	34.23	34.90	34.06	33.56
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	LLaVA-1.5	Acc. [%]	37.58	15.27	0.00	35.07	39.43	20.13	0.00	35.40	37.25	23.66	0.00	35.24	38.59	0.34	0.00	16.44
		Cov. [%]	100.00	50.67	0.00	100.00	100.00	63.09	0.00	100.00	100.00	68.96	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.50	0.00	32.38
	LLaVA-OV	Acc. [%]	72.65	69.80	70.30	52.01	71.81	70.81	73.49	45.81	72.99	71.14	73.83	48.49	73.66	0.67	72.99	44.97
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	97.32	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.99	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.50	100.00	1.17	100.00	97.65
	Phi-3.5	Acc. [%]	46.31	47.48	0.00	45.97	49.66	48.99	0.00	46.81	48.32	48.49	0.00	45.64	49.50	30.03	0.00	46.31
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	99.83	59.90	0.00	98.99
	Phi-4	Acc. [%]	72.32	72.32	70.30	60.07	73.32	72.32	71.31	62.42	72.82	73.15	70.81	59.23	72.65	72.65	71.48	58.22
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	93.62	100.00	100.00	100.00	92.11	100.00	100.00	100.00	92.79	100.00	100.00	100.00	91.28
Line break	Qwen-2-VL	Acc. [%]	70.13	70.81	71.14	69.30	69.80	70.30	70.64	69.97	69.63	70.47	70.64	68.96	67.62	35.24	70.47	70.97
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	94.97	57.89	100.00
	Qwen-2.5-VL	Acc. [%]	78.36	78.36	74.50	74.33	78.52	78.19	75.17	73.49	77.18	78.02	75.67	74.16	77.85	79.53	73.99	72.65
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	98.15	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.49	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.32	100.00	100.00	100.00	97.99	100.00
	Gemma-3	Acc. [%]	34.90	33.73	33.89	32.55	35.24	35.74	34.23	34.23	34.23	33.39	34.56	32.22	33.22	33.05	34.06	33.89
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	LLaVA-1.5	Acc. [%]	38.42	22.82	0.00	37.42	37.25	33.22	0.00	37.25	38.76	30.20	0.00	37.25	37.75	0.17	0.00	11.07
		Cov. [%]	100.00	69.80	0.00	100.00	100.00	91.61	0.00	100.00	100.00	85.40	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.17	0.00	21.98
	LLaVA-OV	Acc. [%]	73.99	73.99	73.66	37.58	74.83	73.99	74.16	38.09	74.16	74.33	74.33	39.43	73.99	42.95	73.32	39.43
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	95.47	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.49	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.32	100.00	61.91	99.83	98.83
	Phi-3.5	Acc. [%]	51.01	49.50	0.00	48.32	50.84	48.83	0.00	47.15	50.34	48.66	0.00	46.98	50.00	44.97	0.00	48.49
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	91.28	0.00	99.83
Semicolon	Phi-4	Acc. [%]	74.33	74.16	73.15	68.62	73.83	72.99	72.82	70.97	73.99	73.83	72.65	66.28	73.66	72.99	71.98	59.90
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.83	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.33	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.15	100.00	100.00	99.66	91.11
	Qwen-2-VL	Acc. [%]	73.83	73.83	72.65	72.48	73.32	73.83	72.32	73.99	73.99	73.49	72.48	72.48	73.32	42.95	71.14	72.82
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	99.50	67.62	100.00	100.00
	Qwen-2.5-VL	Acc. [%]	81.71	80.87	75.84	73.83	81.04	81.38	77.18	75.67	81.04	80.87	75.50	73.83	80.71	80.71	75.67	74.83
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	98.66	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.15	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.66	100.00	100.00	100.00	97.82	100.00
	Gemma-3	Acc. [%]	35.24	35.07	36.24	34.56	35.40	35.40	35.57	34.73	35.40	34.56	35.07	35.07	34.23	34.56	34.90	33.56
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
	LLaVA-1.5	Acc. [%]	37.42	21.14	0.00	37.75	37.92	30.87	0.00	36.07	38.26	31.88	0.00	36.75	37.58	0.34	0.00	16.61
		Cov. [%]	100.00	64.60	0.00	100.00	100.00	87.25	0.00	100.00	100.00	85.57	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.34	0.00	36.24
	LLaVA-OV	Acc. [%]	72.48	72.15	71.81	50.17	73.83	73.32	74.16	42.62	73.83	72.99	73.32	47.99	73.83	5.87	73.66	43.79
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	94.97	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.66	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.66	100.00	8.89	100.00	98.15
Comma	Phi-3.5	Acc. [%]	45.30	48.83	0.00	47.32	48.99	48.49	0.00	47.32	49.33	48.99	0.00	46.81	49.66	34.73	0.00	47.48
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	68.62	0.00	99.83
	Phi-4	Acc. [%]	72.65	71.48	69.97	59.06	73.15	71.64	70.64	61.91	72.65	71.98	71.98	57.05	73.15	71.48	71.48	60.24
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	90.94	100.00	100.00	100.00	91.11	100.00	100.00	100.00	89.09	100.00	100.00	100.00	92.28
	Qwen-2-VL	Acc. [%]	71.31	73.66	71.14	71.81	72.65	73.15	71.48	71.14	72.65	72.82	71.81	70.97	70.81	36.41	71.48	71.64
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	97.99	60.07	100.00	100.00
	Qwen-2.5-VL	Acc. [%]	80.20	80.87	75.00	74.83	80.20	80.37	75.50	75.00	80.37	81.04	75.34	75.34	81.04	81.04	76.01	74.16
		Cov. [%]	100.00	100.00	98.83	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.32	100.00	100.00	100.00	98.83	100.00	100.00	99.83	98.15	100.00