

HanDyVQA: A Video QA Benchmark for Fine-Grained Hand-Object Interaction Dynamics

Masatoshi Tateno^{1,2} Gido Kato^{3,2} Hirokatsu Kataoka^{2,4} Yoichi Sato¹ Takuma Yagi²

¹Institute of Industrial Science, The University of Tokyo

²National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST)

³Waseda University ⁴Visual Geometry Group, University of Oxford

{masatate, ysato}@iis.u-tokyo.ac.jp

{katou.1999, hirokatsu.kataoka, takuma.yagi}@aist.go.jp




Figure 1. Overview of HanDyVQA Dataset. HanDyVQA evaluates fine-grained hand-object interaction (HOI) dynamics for both manipulation and effect aspects through MCQ and ReasoningVOS tasks. MCQ only shows a subset of answer candidates.

Abstract

Hand-object interaction (HOI) inherently involves dynamics where human manipulations produce distinct spatio-temporal effects on objects. However, existing semantic HOI benchmarks focused either on manipulation or on the resulting effects at a coarse level, lacking fine-grained spatio-temporal reasoning to capture the underlying dynamics in HOI. We introduce HanDyVQA, a fine-grained video question-answering benchmark that comprehensively covers both the manipulation and effect aspects of HOI. HanDyVQA comprises six complementary question types (Action, Process, Objects, Location, State Change, and Object Parts), totalling 11.1K multiple-choice QA pairs. Collected QA pairs recognizing manipulation styles, hand/object

motions, and part-level state changes. HanDyVQA also includes 10.3K segmentation masks for Objects and Object Parts questions, enabling the evaluation of object/part-level reasoning in video object segmentation. We evaluated recent video foundation models on our benchmark and found that even the best-performing model, Gemini-2.5-Pro, reached only 73% average accuracy, which is far from human performance (97%). Further analysis shows the remaining challenges in spatial relationship, motion, and part-level geometric understanding. We also found that integrating explicit HOI-related cues into visual features improves performance, offering insights for developing future models with a deeper understanding of HOI dynamics.

	Source	Task Type	Fine-grained Dynamics		# Domain	Full Human QA Check	Answer Type		# Question	Avg. Duration
			Manipulation	Effect			Semantic	Grounding		
EgoTaskQA [18]	LEMMA	Causal / Intents / Belief	✗	✗	1~2	✗	OP	✗	40K	25 s
EgoThink [5]	Ego4D	Reasoning / Forecasting / Planning	✗	✗	26	✓	OP	✗	700	Single frame
HOI-QA [3]	EK/Ego4D	Hand and Object Location Referral	✗	✗	40	✗	OP	BBox	3.9M	Single frame
EgoHOIBench [47]	Ego4D	Action / Objects	✗	✗	74	✗	MC	✗	30K	1 s
AMB [14]	EK	Long-Term Object Interactions	✗	✗	1	✗	MC	✗	21K	20 m
OSCAR [26]	EK/Ego4D	Object State Change Understanding	✗	✓	52	✗	OP & MC	✗	400K	Unavailable
HD-EPIC [28]	HD-EPIC	Fine-grained Video / 3D Understanding	✓	△ ^{*1}	1	✗	MC	✗	26K	Variable
HanDyVQA(Ours)	Ego4D	Dynamics of Manipulation and Effect	✓	✓	112	✓	MC	Seg	11K	5 s

Table 1. Comparison against HOI-related QA datasets: We calculate number of video domains based on Ego4D [38] scenario taxonomy. MC stands for multiple-choice question-answering and OP represents open-ended question-answering. BBox indicates bounding box, and Seg refers to segmentation. Our dataset covers both manipulation and effect dynamics in HOI, with segmentation masks in diverse real-world domains. All QA pairs are verified by human. ^{*1} HD-EPIC includes only Location questions for fine-grained effect understanding, excluding categories such as State Change and Object Parts.

1. Introduction

Hand-Object Interaction (HOI) is inherently a dynamic process [13]. To accomplish tasks with precision, humans skillfully coordinate their hand movements to manipulate objects or tools, thereby inducing the desired effect on the target objects. Accurately recognizing the spatiotemporal dynamics in hand-object interactions opens up various applications, such as worker assistance [12], dexterous manipulation in robots [37], and motor function analysis [41].

While there has been a surge in semantic HOI understanding methods and benchmarks in recent years, most existing studies focus on high-level understanding of either human actions — including action recognition [8, 15, 20, 47], long-form actions [25], and procedural steps [34, 38, 51] — or object states [26, 40, 50]. However, these benchmarks isolate a single aspect of HOI, overlooking its inherently dynamic nature that arises through the progression from human manipulation to the resulting effects (e.g., how a person hammers a cylinder and how and where the object’s state changes).

We propose HanDyVQA (**Hand Dynamics Video QA**), a video question-answering benchmark designed to evaluate the dynamic process of HOI, spanning from manipulation to effect (see Figure 1). HanDyVQA requires understanding not only the actions and objects involved, but also their processes, effects, and component-level changes. The benchmark provides six types of multiple-choice question answering (MCQ) tasks, totaling 11.1K QA pairs, that cover both the manipulation (**Action, Process, Objects**) and effect (**Location, State Change, Object Parts**) aspects of HOI. **Objects** and **Object Parts** further include reasoning video object segmentation (ReasoningVOS) tasks, totaling 10.3K frames, which requires implicit pixel-level reasoning guided by the question, unlike ReferringVOS [19] based on explicit textual grounding. We built the benchmark on short video clips extracted from the Ego4D [15] dataset, enabling the creation of annotations across diverse HOI scenarios in real-world settings. Compared to other HOI-related VQA datasets, our benchmark spans a wide range of activity domains (See Table 1). Notably, all question-answer pairs are manually verified by humans for both quality and difficulty.

We evaluate existing video-language models to quantify how well they capture the dynamics of HOI. Our results show that even the latest foundation models struggle across all categories. Even the best-performing model, Gemini-2.5-Pro [7], achieves only around 68–79% accuracy in MCQ while human achieves more than 95% for all categories. Ablation studies suggest that increasing the number of input frames and resolution effectively enhances overall performance. Nevertheless, an error-specific analysis indicates that the reduction in motion-related errors remains limited. Furthermore, the ReasoningVOS results reveal that current models often overlook multiple manipulated objects or over-segment queried object parts. Consequently, the score on **Object Parts** is substantially lower than typical Referring / Reasoning VOS benchmarks, posing a new challenge for component-level grounding.

Moreover, as a baseline study for understanding HOI dynamics, we investigate whether explicitly incorporating (i) hand pose, (ii) object tracking, and (iii) object features can enhance the performance. The results reveal that each component helps reduce different error types, improving performance across categories. This highlights the importance of video encoders that explicitly model local hand-object information and their spatio-temporal dynamics.

Our contribution is as follows: (a) We introduce HanDyVQA, a new comprehensive dataset for understanding fine-grained dynamics in HOIs. (b) We conduct an in-depth analysis of how latest video-language models struggle to capture spatiotemporal dynamics and pixel-level reasoning in HOI. (c) We show fine-tuning models with additional hand and object information can enhance the performance, showing the necessity of modeling fine-grained temporal evolution of hands, objects and their components.

2. Related Work

Hand-object interaction recognition benchmarks. Various HOI recognition benchmarks have been proposed with focuses on (i) low-level localization and (ii) high-level actions or object states. For the former, benchmarks have focused on detecting hands and objects-in-contact [36], es-

timating 3D hand and object poses [4, 16], reconstructing mesh representations [39], and object tracking [2, 14]. For the latter, several benchmarks have been built on egocentric video datasets such as EPIC-KITCHENS [8] and Ego4D [15]. High-level action understanding benchmark includes action recognition [3, 8, 15, 20, 28, 47], action forecasting and planning [5], long-form actions [25], and procedural steps [34, 38, 51]. Object state recognition benchmark includes the temporal localization of state (change) [38, 40, 50, 55] and state captioning [26]. While these works address certain aspects of HOI understanding, they only cover a narrow subset of either the manipulation or the effect side, lacking a comprehensive evaluation of the underlying fine-grained spatio-temporal dynamics involved.

Referring/Reasoning video object segmentation. Referring Video Object Segmentation (RVOS) [10, 19, 35] aims to segment the target object in a video given a natural language expression, while Reasoning Video Object Segmentation (ReasoningVOS) [1, 52] introduces implicit textual queries that require complex reasoning over world knowledge and video contents. EgoMask [23] introduced an RVOS benchmark for egocentric video, which is challenging due to fast camera motion and dense object scenes. HOI-QA [3] proposed hands and objects localization task from referring expressions in egocentric images. However, these benchmarks remain limited to object-level grounding with direct expressions. Our benchmark advances this by introducing object- and part-level ReasoningVOS that require reasoning over dynamic hand-object relationships and structural changes in egocentric videos.

MLLMs and Benchmarks for video understanding. Recent video-language models integrate visual encoders pre-trained on large-scale image/video-text pairs [32, 44, 56] with LLMs, forming multimodal LLMs (MLLMs) that demonstrate strong generalization across diverse video understanding tasks [3, 6, 42, 53, 58]. Alongside the progress of MLLMs, various benchmarks have been introduced to evaluate understanding of general video [11, 22, 46], long-video [25, 43, 45, 60], egocentric video [8, 15], and event/moment localization and retrieval [21, 48]. From both model and benchmark perspectives, recent efforts have mainly focused on scaling model parameters and expanding training datasets to cover diverse downstream tasks. However, most MLLMs still rely on simple frame-based architectures and seldom incorporate local entities or spatiotemporal dynamics, such as hand poses, manipulated objects, and fine-grained state/structure changes. Existing evaluation benchmarks also fail to assess these aspects. HanDyVQA fills this gap by presenting a new challenge that encourages the development of advanced visual encoders capable of reasoning about complex hand-object interactions in dynamic scenes.

3. HanDyVQA Benchmark

Our goal is to build a systematic benchmark that evaluates models’ ability to recognize the spatiotemporal dynamics in HOI manipulation and effects. To this end, we introduce two tasks in our benchmark: (1) Multiple-Choice Question (MCQ) and (2) Reasoning Video Object Segmentation (ReasoningVOS). Given a video and a question, the goal of the MCQ task is to select the correct answer(s) from a set of options, while the ReasoningVOS task requires predicting the segmentation masks corresponding to the correct answer. We define six question categories: Action, Process, Objects, Location, State Change, and Object Parts. MCQ samples are provided for all question types, whereas ReasoningVOS samples are provided only for Objects and Parts questions.

We adopt the MCQ format over open-ended questions to reduce ambiguity in evaluation and probe fine-grained HOI understanding through challenging distractors. In this section, we describe our data collection process (Section 3.1) and its analysis (Section 3.2).

3.1. QA collection

We developed a collaborative framework that uses LLMs to propose initial QA candidates, that are carefully refined and verified by humans to ensure quality and diversity.

Data curation. We build our benchmark on Ego4D [15] as it includes unscripted and realistic hand-object interactions across variety of scenarios and recording locations. We curate HOI video clips using narration annotations with timestamps by prompting LLMs to identify whether any object is being manipulated in each action. After curation, we sample 2,000 narrations per category that contain relevant verbs (primary action conducted in the clip) or contextual information suitable for each question type. Especially for **Object Parts** question, we use LLMs to filter the narration that implies partial state change of objects. For each narration, we use a 5-second video segment centered around its timestamp, spanning 2.5 seconds before and after the narration. See supplementary for details.

Question candidate generation. We automatically generate candidate questions from narrations using the following templates. **Action:** “What is the person doing with his/her hands?” **Process:** “How does the person [verb] [object]?” **Objects:** “What object is used by the hands?” **Location:** “Where does the person [verb]” **State Change:** “How did the state of [object] change?” **Object Parts:** “What part of [object] is [effect]?”

Verbs and objects are extracted from the narration and inserted to the corresponding placeholders, [verb] and [object]. For **Object Parts** questions, we ask LLMs to infer the plausible objects and effects to be inserted. While




Figure 2. Scenario distribution of HanDyVQA dataset (left), number of questions per question type (top right), and average number of words per option (bottom right).

	#Frames	Avg. Frames per Video	Avg. Centroid Shift (px) *1	Avg. IoU b/w Adjacent Frames
Objects	5053	2.88	93.70	0.17
Parts	5216	2.89	88.35	0.08

*1 GT-mask centroid displacement between adjacent frames, computed at 480×854.

Table 2. Statistics of segmentation annotations for **Objects** and **Object Parts** questions.

most questions adhere to these templates, minor revisions are introduced to fit the grammar and context during the human refinement stage.

QA refinement by humans. Given the generated questions, annotators verify their validity and revise or reject any that do not match the actual content. Then, they provide a correct answer for each question—listing all plausible objects in the **Objects** category where multiple answers may exist—while ensuring that each answer contains enough details. Next, distractor candidates are generated by LLMs from the question-answer pair. Annotators then refine these candidates by removing overlaps, improving plausibility, and adding more challenging distractors when necessary. Overall, annotators ensure that all questions, answers, and choices are accurate, sufficiently confusing, and solvable by humans. Examples of challenging questions are shown in Figure 3.

Mask annotation by humans. For the **Objects** and **Object Parts** questions, annotators sample about three representative frames from each video, distributing them as evenly as possible across the video, where the target regions were clearly visible, and annotated the corresponding regions.

3.2. Dataset statistics

After all human verification, we obtain a total of 11,092 QA pairs. Each question has one correct answer out of five options. For the **Objects** category, multiple objects are often manipulated within a 5-second clip, leading to more than five options and multiple correct answers on average (5.7 options and 1.6 answers). For options, **Action** and **Process** exhibit

longer descriptions than other categories as they provide detailed explanations of the hand side, the objects involved, and the fine-grained hand motions. (see Figure 2)

Diversity in HOI scenarios. As shown in Figure 2, our dataset covers a wide range of video scenarios, including cooking, gardening, cars, and more. We also cover diverse verbs in the narration annotations, requiring the models to understand various actions and their underlying interactions.

Distribution of mask annotation. Table 2 shows the number of annotated frames and the relative movement/spatial overlap between them. Due to moving objects and cameras in egocentric videos, the segmentation masks shift dynamically over time and space, making them challenging to predict. See supplementary for further analysis.

Splits. We divided the videos into training, validation, and test sets in a 10 : 5 : 85 ratio, yielding 1.1 K, 0.5 K, and 9.4 K questions, respectively. Only a small portion was set aside as training/validation sets for instruction tuning, allowing models to learn the required output format while placing greater emphasis on evaluation rather than model training.

Human evaluation. We conducted a human evaluation on the MCQ task by three professional annotators. The average score is shown at the bottom of Table 3. For all question types, humans achieved over 95%, demonstrating that the created QA pairs are solvable by humans.

4. Experiments

To reveal the challenges in recognizing the dynamic aspects of HOI in HanDyVQA, we first compare the **zero-shot** performance of major existing video-language models on MCQ (Section 4.1) and ReasoningVOS (Section 4.2) tasks. We then evaluate fine-tuning of VLMs with additional hand and object cues to find future directions for model development (Section 4.3).

4.1. Multiple-Choice Questions

Baseline models. We select six open-source video LLMs and two proprietary models, categorized into (i) dual-Encoder models and (ii) LLM-integrated models. **Dual-Encoder models** include LaViLa [59], a video-language model trained on egocentric videos, and InternVideo2-Stage2 [44], whose visual encoder is pre-trained on large-scale video-text pairs. **LLM-integrated models** include VideoLLaMA2.1-7B [6], which specializes in spatio-temporal modeling; LLaVa-Video-7B [24], trained on general and egocentric video datasets; mPLUG-Owl3-8B [53], which efficiently processes long image sequences; and Qwen2.5-VL-7B/72B [42], which accepts video inputs with

Models (Zero-shot)	Visual Backbone	Resolution	LLM	Action (Acc)	Process (Acc)	Objects (AP)	Location (Acc)	State (Acc)	Parts (Acc)	Avg. ^{*3} (Acc)
Random	–	–	–	19.3	18.9	28.6	20.4	19.8	19.4	19.5
<i>Text only models</i>										
GPT-4o ^{*1} (text) [17]	–	–	GPT-4o	36.6	50.9	34.3	34.1	39.5	45.5	41.3
<i>Open-source dual-encoder video-language models</i>										
LaViLa (TSF-L) [59]	TimeSformer	224x224	–	61.6	40.1	68.5	36.9	38.9	35.6	42.6
InternVideo2-Stage2 [44]	Original	224x224	–	41.1	30.2	37.0	29.7	34.9	30.5	33.3
<i>Open source video-language models w/ integrated LLMs</i>										
VideoLLaMA2.1-7B [6]	SigLIP	384x384	Qwen2	41.4	47.3	52.9	34.6	47.0	40.5	42.1
LLaVa-Video-7B [24]	SigLIP	384x384	LLaVa-7B	56.9	53.7	60.4	50.5	58.5	54.6	54.8
mPLUG-Owl3-8B [53]	SigLIP	384x384	Qwen2	52.1	53.1	61.0	45.8	54.7	48.6	50.9
Qwen2.5-VL-7B [42]	Original	384x384	Qwen2.5	60.8	54.9	53.9	47.9	56.7	48.6	53.8
Qwen2.5-VL-72B [42]	Original	480x854	Qwen2.5	78.0	73.4	75.2	63.2	72.2	62.5	69.9
<i>Proprietary vision and language models w/ integrated LLMs</i>										
GPT-4o ^{*1} (vision) [17]	Original	480x854	GPT-4o	61.3	64.4	64.1	51.5	59.0	58.5	58.9
Gemini-2.5-Pro [7]	Original	480x854	Gemini-2.5-Pro	79.1	73.3	78.8	67.6	73.9	69.3	72.6
Human^{*2}	–	–	–	98.6	95.9	96.0	96.6	95.3	96.9	96.6

*1 GPT-4o text/vision refused to answer some questions, providing valid answers to around 87% and 79% of total questions. *2 We report average score of three human participants. *3 We average scores of all categories except Objects due to different metrics.

Table 3. Comparison of zero-shot performance of different models across various question types. We report numbers from valid responses.




Figure 3. Qualitative results. Sentence with green highlights denote correct answer. Colored circles denote options predicted by each model.

arbitrary resolutions. For proprietary models, we evaluate GPT-4o [17], which is capable of processing image sequences, in both text-only and vision-enabled settings, and Gemini-2.5-Pro [7], a proprietary model capable of processing video files.

Implementation details. We uniformly sample 16 frames from each video and use the default input resolution specified for each model. For Gemini-2.5-Pro, we feed the video input at 3.2 fps (16 frames per video), since the model expects video files. All models are evaluated in a zero-shot setting. Since Qwen2.5-VL supports arbitrary resolutions, we align its input with other 7B-scale models for fair comparison.




Figure 4. Ablation and error analyses over input frames from 1 (≈ 0.2 fps) to 64 (≈ 12.8 fps) and resolutions.

Models (Zero-shot)	#Frames	Key Features	MCQ Performance (\uparrow)						Avg. (Acc)	Error Rate (\downarrow)			
			Action (Acc)	Process (Acc)	Objects (AP)	Location (Acc)	State (Acc)	Parts (Acc)		Class/Side	Int. / Spatial Rel.	Motion	Structural Change
LaViLa-L [59]	4	—	59.8	39.6	67.5	35.9	38.7	35.2	41.8	33.5	51.3	35.9	38.9
HelpingHands-L [57]	4	Hand & Object BBox Inference	56.9 (-2.9)	36.4 (-3.2)	69.2 (+1.7)	34.5 (-1.4)	39.2 (+0.5)	34.7 (-0.5)	40.3 (-1.5)	35.9 (+2.4)	52.6 (+1.3)	36.6 (+0.7)	39.2 (+0.3)
LaViLa-L [59]	16	—	61.6	40.1	68.5	36.9	38.9	35.6	42.6	32.6	50.3	35.9	38.7
EgoHOD-L [27]	16	Rich Text & Motion Adapter	60.2 (-1.4)	37.3 (-2.8)	75.3 (+6.8)	38.0 (+1.1)	42.3 (+3.4)	35.8 (+0.2)	42.7 (+0.1)	33.8 (+0.3)	49.7 (-1.6)	36.4 (+0.5)	36.5 (-2.4)

Table 4. Comparison of zero-shot performance and error rates of models with and without explicit hand/object modeling. Key Features list the components that make the model hand-object aware. Numbers in **Green/Red** indicates improvement/degradation over LaViLa.

For the 72B model, however, we use the full resolution to showcase its full capability. For dual-encoder models (LaViLa and InternVideo2), we compute the cosine similarity between the video feature and the text feature of each option, selecting the one(s) with the highest score. For the remaining models, we provide the video frames along with a prompt listing all options and infer the most probable option(s).

Evaluation metrics. We report top-1 accuracy for all the categories except **Objects**, and Average Precision (AP) for **Objects** because it has more than one answers per question.

Quantitative results. Table 3 shows the quantitative results. Despite preparing answer options unsolvable from text alone, GPT-4o (text) scored slightly above chance (34–51 pts), indicating minor textual bias but insufficient to solve the task. The dual encoder-based LaViLa trained on Ego4D dataset outperformed InternVideo2-Stage2, particularly in the **Action** and **Objects** categories, surpassing some LLM-integrated models. However, it showed inferior performance in other categories, suggesting that LaViLa is specialized to recognize actions and objects. LLM-integrated models consistently outperformed the text-only baseline, following similar trends observed in general video understanding tasks [33]. Among the 7B-scale models, LLaVA-Video-7B, fine-tuned on Ego4D, achieved the highest average accuracy of 54.8%, highlighting the benefits of domain-specific adaptation. Among open-source models, Qwen2.5-VL-72B, when using high-resolution inputs, achieved the highest overall performance with an average accuracy of 69.9%. Gemini-2.5-Pro attained the highest accuracy across all models (72.6%), substantially surpassing another proprietary model, GPT-4o (vision) (58.9%). However, all models showed limited performance with a substantial gap compared to human

score (Avg. 96.6%), suggesting that current video foundation models still have room for improvement in capturing the fine-grained nuances of hand-object interactions.

Qualitative results. Figure 3 shows examples most of the models struggled in each category. Major failure cases include (i) confusing nearby objects or hand sides (ii) failing to capture the spatial relationship between hand-object or object-object pairs (iii) missing motion of objects or hands, (iv) failing to capture the structural or state changes of the hands or objects themselves. These results suggest that existing models tend to rely on superficial context cues, often missing subtle yet crucial local interactions, movements, and structural changes in the scene.

Effects of input frame rate and resolution. We changed the number of input frames for mPLUG-Owl3 while keeping the resolution at 384×384 , and varied both the number of input frames and resolutions for Qwen2.5-VL.

As shown in Figure 4a, increasing both the number of input frames and spatial resolution enhanced performance. However, for mPLUG-Owl3-8B, the performance saturated beyond 8 frames across all categories except **Objects**. In contrast, Qwen2.5-VL-7B consistently benefited from both higher frame counts and resolutions, particularly in **Action** and **Objects**. **Location** benefited from higher resolution only under small number of input frames, whereas improvement is relatively limited for **Process**.

Error analysis over spatiotemporal resolutions. We statistically analyze the underlying causes of recognition errors to better understand the limitations of current video models. By comparing the incorrect options with the correct ones for each question, we categorize the errors into four types: (i)

Models	Input	Prompt	Objects ($\mathcal{J} \uparrow$)				Objects ($\mathcal{F} \uparrow$)				Parts ($\mathcal{J} \uparrow$)				Parts ($\mathcal{F} \uparrow$)			
			S	M	L	All	S	M	L	All	S	M	L	All	S	M	L	All
VideoLISA-3.8B	Video	Question	4.4	10.6	7.7	7.6	5.3	10.4	8.7	8.1	0.2	1.3	4.9	2.1	0.6	1.7	3.7	2.0
VideoLISA-3.8B	Video	GT Option	0.7	3.1	4.9	2.9	2.3	4.7	4.3	3.8	0.2	1.0	3.2	1.5	0.9	1.7	3.6	2.0
Sa2VA-4B	Video	Question	11.4	20.9	19.2	17.2	14.1	18.8	15.5	16.2	1.3	5.2	15.6	7.4	3.2	7.4	11.7	7.2
Sa2VA-8B	Video	Question	22.4	38.0	35.6	32.0	28.0	36.4	29.6	31.3	1.8	7.7	23.3	10.9	4.1	9.9	16.2	10.1
Sa2VA-8B	Image	Question	21.8	42.6	44.3	36.2	22.8	35.1	30.7	29.6	1.9	8.5	27.3	12.6	3.7	9.5	16.6	9.8
Sa2VA-8B	Video	GT Option	17.9	35.8	49.7	34.5	20.8	28.8	30.1	26.7	1.5	7.1	25.8	11.5	3.2	9.0	17.8	10.0

Table 5. Results of ReasoningVOS for **Objects** and **Parts** categories. S/M/L denotes groups of videos categorized by the average size of annotated masks within each video. The best score within each mask-size group is highlighted in **bold**. GT denotes ground-truth.

Class / Side Confusion, (ii) **Interaction / Spatial Relationship Error**, (iii) **Motion Error**, and (iv) **Structural Change Error**. Each distractor may correspond to one or more error types. We annotated the above error types using GPT-4o for all categories except **Objects**. The error rate for each model was computed per error type, where the rate for type X is calculated by $\frac{\text{\#questions where the model selected an option of } X}{\text{\#questions containing an option of } X}$.

Figure 4b presents the error rate trends across different input frame counts and resolutions for the mPLUG-Owl3 and Qwen2.5-VL models. The **Interaction / Spatial Relationship** class showed the highest error rate across models, accounting for the lower performance in **Location** and **Parts**. mPLUG-Owl3 achieved its lowest error rate at 8 frames for all categories except **Motion**, explaining the observed performance saturation. This is likely because the model was trained on eight-frame video clips, whereas Qwen2.5-VL is trained with dynamically varying frame rates and resolutions. **Motion** showed the most limited gains from increasing frame counts and resolutions across models, which explains the modest improvement in **Process** and **Location**.

The above findings suggest that the models struggle at (i) capturing spatial relationships between entities over time, and (ii) effectively utilizing increased temporal information during inference.

Does hand/object-aware model help? We evaluated HelpingHands [57] and EgoHOD [27], two models explicitly designed to capture hand/object-aware features and trained on egocentric videos. The former extends the LaViLa visual encoder, while the latter builds on CLIP of a similar size. Both models are trained using auxiliary supervision based on hand and object bounding box locations—an approach likely well suited to our HOI benchmark. The results are shown in Table 4. HelpingHands improves performance in **Objects** due to bounding box supervision of manipulated objects, but introduces more errors across all error types, leading to a performance drop in other categories. EgoHOD reduces errors related to spatial relationships and structural changes through richer textual supervision, resulting in improvements in **Objects**, **Location**, and **State**. However, the Motion Adapter failed to effectively mitigate motion-related errors. These findings suggest that current hand/object-aware modeling

has limited impact on distinguishing hand sides, capturing objects in the environment, and understanding motion.

4.2. Reasoning Video Object Segmentation

Baseline models. We compare two baseline models: VideoLISA [1] and Sa2VA-4B/8B [54], both of which are multi-modal large language models (MLLM) capable of solving referring video object segmentation. Since Sa2VA is also trained for image segmentation, we performed an ablation comparing image and video inputs. The image input processes each frame independently without using temporal context. We evaluated segmentation performance using either the question or the ground-truth option as text prompt.

Evaluation Metrics. Following standard VOS evaluation protocols [30, 49], we use the Jaccard Index (\mathcal{J}) and Boundary F-measure (\mathcal{F}) computed for each frame and report their average over annotated frames. Furthermore, we categorize the videos into three size-based groups (S/M/L) based on the area of the ground truth masks averaged over each video, and report their average scores.

Implementation details. We input 16 uniformly sampled frames per video for all models, while ensuring that the annotated frames are included.

Results. As shown in Table 5, all the models performed significantly worse than those in prior ReasoningVOS tasks (*e.g.*, 40+ \mathcal{J} with VideoLISA in [1]). This degradation mainly stems from the increased scene clutter and the fact that the questions require detecting subtle hand-object contacts, unlike in prior Referring or ReasoningVOS benchmarks. In particular, the **Parts** category demands component-level reasoning and segmentation, which is more challenging than object-level segmentation.

The overall results show that larger models achieve higher scores, indicating the importance of the reasoning capacity of the models. We observed different trends in each size group. Providing video input yielded better results than frame-wise processing for larger masks (group L). However, frame-wise processing sometimes performed better for smaller masks,

Input	Fine-tune	MCQ Performance (\uparrow)							Error Rate (\downarrow)			
		Action (Acc)	Process (Acc)	Objects (AP)	Location (Acc)	State (Acc)	Parts (Acc)	Avg. (Acc)	Class/Side	Int. / Spatial Rel.	Motion	Structural Change
RGB (Zero-shot)	No	41.1	30.2	37.0	29.7	34.9	30.5	33.3	42.7	59.9	42.3	44.2
RGB	Yes	49.3	66.2	36.3	47.0	46.3	46.4	51.0	35.3	41.7	29.5	32.8
RGB + Hand	Yes	53.0 (+3.7)	68.3 (+2.1)	36.2 (-0.1)	48.4 (+1.4)	48.8 (+2.5)	47.9 (+1.5)	53.3 (+2.3)	33.6 (-1.7)	39.5 (-2.2)	27.9 (-1.6)	31.2 (-1.6)
RGB + ObjBBBox	Yes	51.0 (+1.7)	68.9 (+2.7)	37.6 (+1.3)	47.0 (+0.0)	49.3 (+3.0)	45.9 (-0.5)	52.4 (+1.4)	34.9 (-0.4)	40.4 (-1.3)	28.0 (-1.5)	31.1 (-1.7)
RGB + ObjFeats	Yes	51.9 (+2.6)	68.4 (+2.2)	38.6 (+2.3)	48.2 (+1.2)	50.3 (+4.0)	47.8 (+1.4)	53.3 (+2.3)	34.1 (-1.2)	39.6 (-2.1)	28.1 (-1.4)	30.4 (-2.4)
RGB + Hand + ObjBBBox	Yes	53.8 (+4.5)	69.6 (+3.4)	37.3 (+1.0)	47.6 (+0.6)	49.3 (+3.0)	47.0 (+0.6)	53.5 (+2.5)	33.8 (-1.5)	39.2 (-2.5)	27.3 (-2.2)	31.3 (-1.5)
RGB + Hand + ObjFeats	Yes	52.9 (+3.6)	69.2 (+3.0)	37.8 (+1.5)	48.7 (+1.7)	49.5 (+3.2)	49.1 (+2.7)	53.9 (+2.9)	33.4 (-1.9)	38.8 (-2.9)	27.4 (-2.1)	31.0 (-1.8)
RGB + Hand + ObjBBBox + ObjFeats	Yes	51.2 (+1.9)	69.1 (+2.9)	38.0 (+1.7)	47.9 (+0.9)	50.3 (+4.0)	48.8 (+2.4)	53.4 (+2.4)	33.9 (-1.4)	39.3 (-2.4)	27.6 (-1.9)	30.8 (-2.0)

Table 6. Comparison between different inputs. Numbers in **Green/Red** indicates improvement/degradation over RGB input.




Figure 5. Qualitative results on ReasoningVOS. GT means ground-truth. GT masks are shown in **green** in first row, while predictions of each model are shown in **magenta**. Models mistakenly segment entire object instead of correct part. Note that video models are provided with 16 frames during inference for temporal context.

as it can capture small objects without being distracted by temporal context from adjacent frames, as shown in the last frame on the right side of Figure 5.

Among 8B models, using the GT options as prompts yielded better scores for larger masks, whereas using questions as prompts performed better for smaller masks (groups S and M). This is possibly because the ground truth text used to prompt MLLMs may be not sufficient to describe the precise region in fine-grained HOIs, often leading to over-segmentation of the target area.

4.3. Integration of HOI cues

We also investigate additional factors to better capture the hand-object dynamics in our benchmark. We hypothesize that explicitly adding spatio-temporally local information about hand manipulations and interacting objects may improve performance.

To test this hypothesis, we trained different models with additional branches that input combination of additional cues. We chose InternVideo2-Stage2 [44] as our baseline model and fine-tune the model using the training split (1.1 K ques-

tions) which could be regarded as a small-scale instruction tuning set. Specifically, we considered (i) 3D hand pose information, (ii) bounding box tracklets of manipulated objects, and (iii) their object features as additional cues.

Implementation details. In addition to the original visual/text encoders, separate encoders for each modality consisting of frame-wise MLP and LSTM are introduced. These cues are concatenated with the video feature and passed to a projection layer to match the embedding space. The visual encoder and text encoder of InternVideo2 remain frozen during training, and only the added layers are trained using contrastive loss. We input 16 frames per video with a resolution of 224×224 . 63-dimensional 3D hand poses for both hands are extracted using WiLoR [31]. 4-dimensional bounding box tracklets of manipulated objects are obtained using AMEGO [14]. 768-dimensional object features are extracted using CLIP [32]. See supplementary for more details.

Results. Table 6 shows the comparison across different modalities. First, we observe significant improvement by applying fine-tuning (51.0 vs. 33.3 avg. accuracy). The additional cues improved performance across all question types. The error rate results show that 3D hand pose and bounding box tracklets are particularly effective for reducing **Class / Side** and **Interaction / Spatial Relationship** errors, while object features mainly mitigate **Structural Change** errors. **Motion** errors are alleviated, especially when hand pose is combined with either of the object-related cues.

Performance sometimes improves more with fewer cues, likely due to our simple concatenation design. We leave better modeling and integration strategies for future work.

5. Conclusion

We have proposed HanDyVQA, a new video QA benchmark for evaluating spatiotemporal dynamics in HOIs. Experimental results reveal that strong video-language models struggle in capturing the fine-grained dynamics of HOIs, only achieving at most 68–79% top-1 accuracy in MCQ, and showing poor performance in grounding local regions. Ablation studies and modality analysis show that increasing the number

of input frames and resolutions, as well as incorporating explicit HOI cues, improves overall performance. These findings suggest that future models should more effectively exploit richer spatio-temporal inputs and explicitly model local hand-object dynamics, rather than relying on a fixed ViT backbone pretrained on low-resolution videos (e.g., 8 fps at 224x224). We hope that HanDyVQA opens up new avenues for advancing deeper HOI understanding.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the AIST policy-based budget project “R&D on Generative AI Foundation Models for the Physical Domain”. We used ABCI 3.0 provided by AIST and AIST Solutions with support from “ABCI 3.0 Development Acceleration Use”. We thank BAOBAB Inc. for their contribution to providing human evaluations for our dataset.

References

- [1] Zechen Bai, Tong He, Haiyang Mei, Pichao Wang, Ziteng Gao, Joya Chen, Zheng Zhang, and Mike Zheng Shou. One token to seg them all: Language instructed reasoning segmentation in videos. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:6833–6859, 2024. 3, 7
- [2] Prithviraj Banerjee, Sindi Shkodrani, Pierre Moulon, Shreyas Hampali, Fan Zhang, Jade Fountain, Edward Miller, Selen Basol, Richard Newcombe, Robert Wang, et al. Introducing HOT3D: An egocentric dataset for 3D hand and object tracking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09598*, 2024. 3
- [3] Siddhant Bansal, Michael Wray, and Dima Damen. Hoi-ref: Hand-object interaction referral in egocentric vision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.09933*, 2024. 2, 3
- [4] Yu-Wei Chao, Wei Yang, Yu Xiang, Pavlo Molchanov, Ankur Handa, Jonathan Tremblay, Yashraj S Narang, Karl Van Wyk, Umar Iqbal, Stan Birchfield, et al. Dexycb: A benchmark for capturing hand grasping of objects. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9044–9053, 2021. 3
- [5] Sijie Cheng, Zhicheng Guo, Jingwen Wu, Kechen Fang, Peng Li, Huaping Liu, and Yang Liu. Egothink: Evaluating first-person perspective thinking capability of vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14291–14302, 2024. 2, 3
- [6] Zesen Cheng, Sicong Leng, Hang Zhang, Yifei Xin, Xin Li, Guanzheng Chen, Yongxin Zhu, Wenqi Zhang, Ziyang Luo, Deli Zhao, et al. VideoLLaMA 2: Advancing spatial-temporal modeling and audio understanding in video-llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.07476*, 2024. 3, 4, 5, 2
- [7] Gheorghe Comanici, Eric Bieber, Mike Schaekermann, Ice Pasupat, Naveen Sachdeva, Inderjit Dhillon, Marcel Bliestein, Ori Ram, Dan Zhang, Evan Rosen, et al. Gemini 2.5: Pushing the frontier with advanced reasoning, multimodality, long context, and next generation agentic capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.06261*, 2025. 2, 5
- [8] Dima Damen, Hazel Doughty, Giovanni Maria Farinella, Sanja Fidler, Antonino Furnari, Evangelos Kazakos, Davide Moltisanti, Jonathan Munro, Toby Perrett, Will Price, et al. The epic-kitchens dataset: Collection, challenges and baselines. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 43(11):4125–4141, 2020. 2, 3
- [9] Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Ari Holtzman, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Qlora: Efficient finetuning of quantized llms. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:10088–10115, 2023. 17
- [10] Henghui Ding, Chang Liu, Shuting He, Xudong Jiang, and Chen Change Loy. Mevis: A large-scale benchmark for video segmentation with motion expressions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 2694–2703, 2023. 3
- [11] Xinyu Fang, Kangrui Mao, Haodong Duan, Xiangyu Zhao, Yining Li, Dahua Lin, and Kai Chen. Mmbench-video: A long-form multi-shot benchmark for holistic video understanding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:89098–89124, 2024. 3
- [12] Alessandro Flaborea, Guido Maria D’Amely Di Melendugno, Leonardo Plini, Luca Scofano, Edoardo De Matteis, Antonino Furnari, Giovanni Maria Farinella, and Fabio Galasso. PREGO: online mistake detection in procedural egocentric videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18483–18492, 2024. 2
- [13] James J Gibson. *The ecological approach to visual perception: classic edition*. Psychology press, 2014. 2
- [14] Gabriele Goletto, Tushar Nagarajan, Giuseppe Averta, and Dima Damen. AMEGO: Active memory from long egocentric videos. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 92–110. Springer, 2024. 2, 3, 8, 15
- [15] Kristen Grauman, Andrew Westbury, Eugene Byrne, Zachary Chavis, Antonino Furnari, Rohit Girdhar, Jackson Hamburger, Hao Jiang, Miao Liu, Xingyu Liu, et al. Ego4d: Around the world in 3,000 hours of egocentric video. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18995–19012, 2022. 2, 3
- [16] Shreyas Hampali, Mahdi Rad, Markus Oberweger, and Vincent Lepetit. Honnotate: A method for 3D annotation of hand and object poses. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3196–3206, 2020. 3
- [17] Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, et al. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*, 2024. 5, 2
- [18] Baoxiong Jia, Ting Lei, Song-Chun Zhu, and Siyuan Huang. Egotaskqa: Understanding human tasks in egocentric videos. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:3343–3360, 2022. 2
- [19] Anna Khoreva, Anna Rohrbach, and Bernt Schiele. Video object segmentation with language referring expressions. In *Asian conference on computer vision*, pages 123–141. Springer, 2018. 2, 3
- [20] Taein Kwon, Bugra Tekin, Jan Stühmer, Federica Bogo, and Marc Pollefeys. H2o: Two hands manipulating objects for

- first person interaction recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 10138–10148, 2021. 2, 3
- [21] Jie Lei, Tamara L Berg, and Mohit Bansal. Detecting moments and highlights in videos via natural language queries. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 11846–11858, 2021. 3
- [22] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yinan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Ping Luo, et al. Mvbench: A comprehensive multi-modal video understanding benchmark. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 22195–22206, 2024. 3
- [23] Shuo Liang, Yiwu Zhong, Zi-Yuan Hu, Yeyao Tao, and Liwei Wang. Fine-grained spatiotemporal grounding on egocentric videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 9385–9395, 2025. 3, 2
- [24] Bin Lin, Bin Zhu, Yang Ye, Munan Ning, Peng Jin, and Li Yuan. Video-LLaVA: Learning united visual representation by alignment before projection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.10122*, 2023. 4, 5, 2
- [25] Karttikeya Mangalam, Raiymbek Akshulakov, and Jitendra Malik. Egoschema: A diagnostic benchmark for very long-form video language understanding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:46212–46244, 2023. 2, 3
- [26] Nguyen Nguyen, Jing Bi, Ali Vosoughi, Yapeng Tian, Pooyan Fazli, and Chenliang Xu. Oscar: Object state captioning and state change representation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17128*, 2024. 2, 3
- [27] Baoqi Pei, Yifei Huang, Jilan Xu, Guo Chen, Yuping He, Lijin Yang, Yali Wang, Weidi Xie, Yu Qiao, Fei Wu, et al. Modeling fine-grained hand-object dynamics for egocentric video representation learning. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. 6, 7
- [28] Toby Perrett, Ahmad Darkhalil, Saptarshi Sinha, Omar Emara, Sam Pollard, Kranti Parida, Kaiting Liu, Prajwal Gatti, Siddhant Bansal, Kevin Flanagan, et al. Hd-epic: A highly-detailed egocentric video dataset. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, To Appear*, 2025. 2, 3
- [29] Chiara Plizzari, Gabriele Goletto, Antonino Furnari, Siddhant Bansal, Francesco Ragusa, Giovanni Maria Farinella, Dima Damen, and Tatiana Tommasi. An outlook into the future of egocentric vision. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 132(11):4880–4936, 2024. 17
- [30] Jordi Pont-Tuset, Federico Perazzi, Sergi Caelles, Pablo Arbeláez, Alex Sorkine-Hornung, and Luc Van Gool. The 2017 davis challenge on video object segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.00675*, 2017. 7
- [31] Rolandos Alexandros Potamias, Jinglei Zhang, Jiankang Deng, and Stefanos Zafeiriou. WiLoR: End-to-end 3d hand localization and reconstruction in-the-wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, To Appear*, 2025. 8, 15
- [32] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021. 3, 8, 15
- [33] Mohammadreza Salehi, Jae Sung Park, Tanush Yadav, Aditya Kusupati, Ranjay Krishna, Yejin Choi, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, and Ali Farhadi. Actionatlas: A videoqa benchmark for domain-specialized action recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.05774*, 2024. 6
- [34] Fadime Sener, Dibyadip Chatterjee, Daniel Shelepov, Kun He, Dipika Singhania, Robert Wang, and Angela Yao. Assembly101: A large-scale multi-view video dataset for understanding procedural activities. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 21096–21106, 2022. 2, 3
- [35] Seonguk Seo, Joon-Young Lee, and Bohyung Han. Urvos: Unified referring video object segmentation network with a large-scale benchmark. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 208–223. Springer, 2020. 3
- [36] Dandan Shan, Jiaqi Geng, Michelle Shu, and David F Fouhey. Understanding human hands in contact at internet scale. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9869–9878, 2020. 2
- [37] Kenneth Shaw, Shikhar Bahl, and Deepak Pathak. Videodex: Learning dexterity from internet videos. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 654–665. PMLR, 2023. 2
- [38] Yale Song, Eugene Byrne, Tushar Nagarajan, Huiyu Wang, Miguel Martin, and Lorenzo Torresani. Ego4D Goal-Step: Toward hierarchical understanding of procedural activities. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:38863–38886, 2023. 2, 3
- [39] Anilkumar Swamy, Vincent Leroy, Philippe Weinzaepfel, Fabien Baradel, Salma Galaaoui, Romain Brégier, Matthieu Armando, Jean-Sebastien Franco, and Grégory Rogez. Showme: Benchmarking object-agnostic hand-object 3D reconstruction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1935–1944, 2023. 3
- [40] Masatoshi Tateno, Takuma Yagi, Ryosuke Furuta, and Yoichi Sato. Learning multiple object states from actions via large language models. In *2025 IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 9555–9565. IEEE, 2025. 2, 3
- [41] Meng-Fen Tsai, Rosalie H Wang, and José Zariffa. Recognizing hand use and hand role at home after stroke from egocentric video. *PLOS Digital Health*, 2(10):e0000361, 2023. 2
- [42] Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, et al. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*, 2024. 3, 4, 5, 2
- [43] Weihang Wang, Zehai He, Wenyi Hong, Yean Cheng, Xiaohan Zhang, Ji Qi, Xiaotao Gu, Shiyu Huang, Bin Xu, Yuxiao Dong, et al. Lvbench: An extreme long video understanding benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08035*, 2024. 3
- [44] Yi Wang, Kunchang Li, Xinhao Li, Jiashuo Yu, Yinan He, Guo Chen, Baoqi Pei, Rongkun Zheng, Zun Wang, Yansong

- Shi, et al. Internvideo2: Scaling foundation models for multimodal video understanding. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 396–416. Springer, 2024. [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [8](#), [2](#)
- [45] Haoning Wu, Dongxu Li, Bei Chen, and Junnan Li. Longvideobench: A benchmark for long-context interleaved video-language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.15754*, 2024. [3](#)
- [46] Junbin Xiao, Xindi Shang, Angela Yao, and Tat-Seng Chua. Next-qa: Next phase of question-answering to explaining temporal actions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 9777–9786, 2021. [3](#)
- [47] Boshen Xu, Ziheng Wang, Yang Du, Zhinan Song, Sipeng Zheng, and Qin Jin. Do egocentric video-language models really understand hand-object interactions? In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. [2](#), [3](#)
- [48] Jun Xu, Tao Mei, Ting Yao, and Yong Rui. Msr-vtt: A large video description dataset for bridging video and language. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5288–5296, 2016. [3](#)
- [49] Ning Xu, Linjie Yang, Yuchen Fan, Jianchao Yang, Dingcheng Yue, Yuchen Liang, Brian Price, Scott Cohen, and Thomas Huang. Youtube-vos: Sequence-to-sequence video object segmentation. In *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, pages 585–601, 2018. [7](#)
- [50] Zihui Xue, Kumar Ashutosh, and Kristen Grauman. Learning object state changes in videos: An open-world perspective. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18493–18503, 2024. [2](#), [3](#)
- [51] Takuma Yagi, Misaki Ohashi, Yifei Huang, Ryosuke Furuta, Shungo Adachi, Toutai Mitsuyama, and Yoichi Sato. FineBio: a fine-grained video dataset of biological experiments with hierarchical annotation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00293*, 2024. [2](#), [3](#)
- [52] Cilin Yan, Haochen Wang, Shilin Yan, Xiaolong Jiang, Yao Hu, Guoliang Kang, Weidi Xie, and Efstratios Gavves. Visa: Reasoning video object segmentation via large language models. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 98–115. Springer, 2024. [3](#)
- [53] Jiabo Ye, Haiyang Xu, Haowei Liu, Anwen Hu, Ming Yan, Qi Qian, Ji Zhang, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. mplug-owl3: Towards long image-sequence understanding in multi-modal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.04840*, 2024. [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [2](#)
- [54] Haobo Yuan, Xiangtai Li, Tao Zhang, Zilong Huang, Shilin Xu, Shunping Ji, Yunhai Tong, Lu Qi, Jiashi Feng, and Ming-Hsuan Yang. Sa2VA: Marrying SAM2 with LLaVA for dense grounded understanding of images and videos. *arXiv*, 2025. [7](#)
- [55] Parnian Zameni, Yuhao Shen, and Ehsan Elhamifar. Moscato: Predicting multiple object state change through actions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 11600–11611, 2025. [3](#)
- [56] Xiaohua Zhai, Basil Mustafa, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. Sigmoid loss for language image pre-training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 11975–11986, 2023. [3](#)
- [57] Chuhan Zhang, Ankush Gupta, and Andrew Zisserman. Helping hands: An object-aware ego-centric video recognition model. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 13901–13912, 2023. [6](#), [7](#)
- [58] Yuanhan Zhang, Jinming Wu, Wei Li, Bo Li, Zejun Ma, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Video instruction tuning with synthetic data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02713*, 2024. [3](#)
- [59] Yue Zhao, Ishan Misra, Philipp Krähenbühl, and Rohit Girdhar. Learning video representations from large language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6586–6597, 2023. [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [2](#)
- [60] Junjie Zhou, Yan Shu, Bo Zhao, Boya Wu, Shitao Xiao, Xi Yang, Yongping Xiong, Bo Zhang, Tiejun Huang, and Zheng Liu. MLVU: A comprehensive benchmark for multi-task long video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04264*, 2024. [3](#)

HanDyVQA: A Video QA Benchmark for Fine-Grained Hand-Object Interaction Dynamics

Supplementary Material

Supplementary Material Contents

A. Details on Experimental Results	1
B. Details on Data Collection	5
C. Details on Experimental Settings	13
D. Fine-tuning Qwen2.5-VL-7B	17
E. Broader Impacts	17

A. Details on Experimental Results

A.1. Multiple-Choice Questions

Performance comparison by GPT-4o answerability. In multiple-choice questions, the GPT-4o (text/vision) models often declined to answer, seemingly when the model evaluated that there is insufficient information to respond to the question, even though we asked it to answer the question. Reporting results only for the questions that GPT-4o answered risks an unfair comparison, as those questions might also be easy for the other models. To this end, we re-evaluated every model on the subset of questions answered by both the text and vision variants of GPT-4o, reducing the valid items from 9,431 to 6,629 (70.3%).

Table 7 reports these subsampled scores together with their deltas from the original evaluation. Most metrics increase, indicating that GPT-4o tends to skip more difficult questions that other models also frequently fail on. In contrast, human performance remains largely unchanged across categories (within 0.5 points), suggesting that humans can reliably recognize HOI dynamics even in challenging videos where MLLMs struggle.

We divided the questions into four categories according to whether the GPT-4o text and vision variants produced an answer, then evaluated Qwen2.5-VL-72B on each category (Table 8). Accuracy peaked for questions answered by both GPT-4o variants and declined whenever either variant abstained. This pattern suggests that GPT-4o can recognize when textual or visual information is insufficient and refrain from answering, thereby avoiding errors. This also suggests that models specifically designed for videos perform better than the general-purpose GPT-4o model, showing that our benchmark poses a challenging video QA task.

Additional Qualitative Results. Additional qualitative results per category are shown in Figure 7. We observe that current models struggle to accurately recognize objects being manipulated, their spatial relationships with hands or other objects, and their movements. The original video clips can be found in the supplementary materials.




Figure 6. Distribution of error types by question category. Bars indicate the number of questions that contain at least one distractor of each error type.

Error Type Statistics. For each distractor, we annotated the following error types by comparing it with the correct answer:

- **Class / Side Confusion:** The model confuses the hand side (left or right) or the object class.
- **Interaction / Spatial Relationship Error:** The model fails to capture interaction types and spatial relations in hand-object and object-object pairs.
- **Motion Error:** The model fails to capture motion or direction over time.
- **Structural Change Error:** The model fails to perceive state or structural change in hands/objects.

Multiple error types may apply to a single distractor. For example, if the correct answer is “*He is hammering a cylinder with the hammer in his right hand in a downward motion,*” and a distractor is “*He is hammering a cylinder with the hammer in his left hand in a sideways motion,*” the assigned error types would be **Class / Side** and **Motion**.

Figure 6 shows the number of questions that include each error type across all question categories. **Class / Side** and **Interaction / Spatial Relationship** errors are widely distributed across categories. **Motion** errors frequently appear in **Action**, **Process**, and **State**, where hand and object movements play critical roles. **Structural Change** errors appear most often in **State**, followed by **Action** and **Process**, where hand poses are particularly informative. **Location** contains fewer **Motion** errors, as distractors primarily describe positional changes using spatial relations between objects. **Parts** contains fewer **Structural Change** errors because the LLMs

Models (Zero-shot)	Visual Backbone	Resolution	LLM	Action (Acc)	Process (Acc)	Objects (AP)	Location (Acc)	State (Acc)	Parts (Acc)	Avg. (Acc)
<i>Text only models</i>										
GPT-4o (text) [17]	–	–	GPT-4o	37.3 (+0.7)	54.2 (+3.3)	34.4 (+0.1)	36.5 (+2.4)	40.0 (+0.5)	47.5 (+2.0)	43.1 (+1.8)
<i>Open-source dual-encoder video-language models</i>										
LaViLa (TSF-L) [59]	TimeSformer	224x224	–	63.7 (+2.1)	41.7 (+1.6)	68.6 (+0.1)	41.5 (+4.6)	40.6 (+1.7)	37.9 (+2.3)	45.1 (+2.5)
InternVideo2-Stage2 [44]	Original	224x224	–	42.1 (+1.0)	30.7 (+0.5)	37.1 (+0.1)	34.0 (+4.3)	36.2 (+1.3)	31.3 (+0.8)	34.8 (+1.5)
<i>Open source video-language models w/ integrated LLMs</i>										
VideoLLaMA2.1-7B [6]	SigLIP	384x384	Qwen2	44.0 (+2.6)	50.3 (+3.0)	53.2 (+0.3)	39.3 (+4.7)	47.9 (+0.9)	44.8 (+4.3)	45.2 (+3.1)
LLaVa-Video-7B [24]	SigLIP	384x384	LLaVa-7B	61.3 (+4.4)	58.2 (+4.5)	60.7 (+0.3)	55.4 (+4.9)	60.1 (+1.6)	59.6 (+5.0)	58.9 (+4.1)
mPLUG-Owl3-8B [53]	SigLIP	384x384	Qwen2	55.2 (+3.1)	56.1 (+3.0)	61.1 (+0.1)	50.2 (+4.4)	57.5 (+2.8)	52.6 (+4.0)	54.3 (+3.4)
Qwen2.5-VL-7B [42]	Original	384x384	Qwen2.5	64.3 (+3.5)	58.5 (+3.6)	54.1 (+0.2)	53.7 (+5.8)	57.9 (+1.2)	53.1 (+4.5)	57.5 (+3.7)
Qwen2.5-VL-72B [42]	Original	480x854	Qwen2.5	80.5 (+2.5)	77.6 (+4.2)	75.4 (+0.2)	69.9 (+6.7)	74.4 (+2.2)	66.5 (+4.0)	73.8 (+3.9)
<i>Proprietary vision and language models w/ integrated LLMs</i>										
GPT-4o (vision) [17]	Original	480x854	GPT-4o	60.5 (−0.8)	64.6 (+0.2)	64.1 (0.0)	53.9 (+2.4)	59.4 (+0.4)	59.3 (+0.8)	59.6 (+0.7)
Gemini-2.5-Pro [7]	Original	480x854	Gemini-2.5-Pro	81.3 (+2.2)	77.9 (+4.6)	78.9 (+0.1)	73.2 (+5.6)	75.1 (+1.2)	74.7 (+5.4)	76.4 (+3.8)
Human	–	–	–	98.6 (−0.1)	95.9 (0.0)	96.0 (+0.1)	96.6 (−0.2)	95.3 (−0.2)	96.9 (−0.5)	96.6 (−0.3)

Table 7. Comparison of different models on subset of questions answered by both the text and vision versions of GPT-4o. Only 6.6K questions (70.3%) are used for this evaluation. Differences from the full results in Table 3 are indicated in +X.X/−X.X.

Answered by GPT-4o?		Results of Qwen2.5-VL-72B (with number of questions)						
Text	Vision	Action	Process	Objects	Location	State	Parts	Avg. (Sum)
Yes	Yes	80.5 (955)	77.6 (1042)	75.4 (1493)	69.9 (764)	74.4 (1319)	66.5 (1056)	73.8 (5136)
Yes	No	67.6 (136)	65.5 (521)	54.5 (12)	54.8 (361)	62.6 (211)	55.5 (373)	61.2 (1602)
No	Yes	78.2 (444)	50.0 (8)	– (0)	63.4 (292)	54.3 (35)	50.8 (61)	59.3 (840)
No	No	67.6 (105)	71.4 (7)	– (0)	50.6 (170)	53.8 (13)	47.2 (53)	58.1 (348)

Table 8. Comparison of performance on questions grouped by whether the GPT-4o text/vision models provided an answer. The number in parentheses indicates the number of questions.

used during annotation often interpret a component as a single object, labeling part-confusion errors as **Class / Side** confusion instead.

A.2. Referring Video Object Segmentation

Additional qualitative results. Additional qualitative examples are shown in Figure 8. VideoLISA often fails to detect the target objects even when the ground-truth options are provided as prompts, likely due to domain shift from its training data to egocentric video [23]. It also tends to segment hands instead of the intended object regions in **Parts** questions.

Sa2VA generally follows the prompts more faithfully in both the **Objects** and **Parts** categories. However, when applied in a frame-wise manner, it sometimes segments visually similar but unmanipulated objects, or loses track of the manipulated object because it lacks temporal context (*e.g.*, missing the paint tube in the bottom-left case, or producing a false-positive segmentation of the paintbrush in the bottom-right example of Figure 8). When the ground-truth option is provided, Sa2VA often segments objects of the same class that are not being manipulated. This is likely because the ground-truth description does not precisely specify which instance is being interacted with. The original video clips can be found in the supplementary materials.

Action



Q. What is the person doing with his/her hands?

- ☒ (A) The person is trimming the tape with the scissors in his right hand while holding the roll of tape with his left hand.
- ☐ (B) **The person's left hand holds the strap and cuts it with the cutter in his right hand.**
- ☐ (C) The person is tearing the tape by hand while keeping it taut using both hands.
- ☐ (D) The person is measuring the tape with a measuring tape in his right hand while holding the cutter with his left hand.
- ☐ (E) The person is applying tape to a box with the adhesive side down, using his right hand to press it while holding the box in his left hand.

Why do they fail? • Fail to capture tool used

Process




Q. How does the person paint the ceiling with the paint roller?

- ☒ (A) The person carefully applies paint onto the ceiling using both hands.
- ☐ (B) **The person gently paints the ceiling horizontally using the right hand.**
- ☐ (C) The person paints the ceiling vertically while holding the roller with the left hand.
- ☐ (D) The person cautiously raises the roller above the head, allowing it to rest on the ceiling.
- ☐ (E) The person smoothly rolls the roller around in circles on the ceiling using the right hand.

Why do they fail? • Fail to capture movement of left hand during wiping motion

Objects



Q. What object is used by the hands?

- ☐ (A) Faucet.
- ☐ (B) Dishwashing liquid.
- ☒ (C) **Rolling pin.**
- ☐ (D) Bracelet.
- ☐ (E) Inner pan of rice cooker.
- ☐ (F) **Sponge.**

Why do they fail? • Mix up with objects in the background

Location



Q. Where does the person put the bucket?

- ☒ (A) **The person placed the bucket on top of the other bucket.**
- ☐ (B) The person placed the bucket beside the other bucket.
- ☐ (C) The person placed the bucket underneath the other bucket.
- ☐ (D) The person placed the bucket in front of the other bucket.
- ☐ (E) The person placed the bucket behind the other bucket.

Why do they fail? • Fail to capture spatial relationships between two bucket

State Change



Q. How did the state of a stool change?

- ☐ (A) The stool was rotated 45 degrees clockwise while remaining on the ground.
- ☐ (B) The stool was rotated 90 degrees clockwise while tilting slightly.
- ☒ (C) **The stool was rotated 90 degrees counterclockwise while remaining on the ground.**
- ☐ (D) The stool was rotated 180 degrees counterclockwise while lifted briefly.
- ☐ (E) The stool was rotated 90 degrees counterclockwise while then moving slightly forward.

Why do they fail? • Fail to capture rotation of target object

Object Parts



Q. What part of the bicycle cassette is cleaned?

- ☐ (A) The bottom part of the bicycle cassette is cleaned.
- ☒ (B) **The top part of the bicycle cassette is cleaned.**
- ☐ (C) The inner part of the bicycle cassette is cleaned.
- ☐ (D) The middle part of the bicycle cassette is cleaned.
- ☐ (E) The back part of the bicycle cassette is cleaned.



















Why do they fail? • Fail to capture structure of cassette and spatial relationship b/w cloth and cassette

VideoLLaMA2 LLaVA-Video mPLUG-Owl3 Qwen2.5-VL GPT-4o Gemini-2.5-Pro

Figure 7. Additional qualitative results for multiple-choice questions. Green highlights denote correct answers.



















Object

Question: **What object is used by hands?**
GT Options: **gallon, cap, change oil funnels.**

Model	Prompt			
GT	-			
VideoLISA-3.8B Video	Question			
VideoLISA-3.8B Video	GT Option			
Sa2VA-8B Image	Question			
Sa2VA-8B Video	Question			
Sa2VA-8B Video	GT Option			



















Object

Question: **What object is used by hands?**
GT Options: **paint tube, paint brush.**

Model	Prompt			
GT	-			
VideoLISA-3.8B Video	Question			
VideoLISA-3.8B Video	GT Option			
Sa2VA-8B Image	Question			
Sa2VA-8B Video	Question			
Sa2VA-8B Video	GT Option			

Object Parts

Question: **What part of the tap is closed?**
GT Option: **The handle of the tap is closed.**

Model	Prompt			
GT	-			
VideoLISA-3.8B Video	Question			
VideoLISA-3.8B Video	GT Option			
Sa2VA-8B Image	Question			
Sa2VA-8B Video	Question			
Sa2VA-8B Video	GT Option			

Object Parts

Question: **What part of the paintbrush is wiped?**
GT Option: **The bristle of the paint brush is wiped.**



















Model	Prompt			
GT	-			
VideoLISA-3.8B Video	Question			
VideoLISA-3.8B Video	GT Option			
Sa2VA-8B Image	Question			
Sa2VA-8B Video	Question			
Sa2VA-8B Video	GT Option			

Figure 8. Qualitative results on ReasoningVOS. GT means ground-truth. GT masks are shown in **green** in first row, while predictions of each model are shown in **magenta**.

B. Details on Data Collection

Details on video clip filtering. First, all the narration from stereo videos is filtered out. If a narration is duplicated, it is counted as a single entry. A narration is also filtered out if it does not mention either “right hand” or “left hand.” Additionally, if the narration contains the word “unsure”, indicating an unknown object name, it is filtered out. We input each narration into large language models (LLMs) to infer the contact objects and secondary objects for each hand (The prompt is shown in Table 9). If we can confirm that the camera wearer is manipulating at least one object, we retain the narration for use. However, if the extracted contact objects include any of the wearer’s body parts or the camera itself, the narration is discarded, as such cases are likely to obscure the visibility of hand-object interactions.

System Prompt:

You are a helpful assistant who understands interactions between human hands and objects.

User Prompt:

Please analyze the narration and answer the contact object and the secondary object of each right/left hand. "contact object" means the object that a hand is contacting (manipulating). "secondary object" means the object that the contact object is contacting (the object that is manipulated by the contact object). If the information is not specified in the narration, fill with None. The answer format should be json:

```
{ "Contact object of right hand": <obj/None>, "Secondary object of right hand": <obj/None>, "Contact object of left hand": <obj/None>, "Secondary object of left hand": <obj/None> }
```

Narration: {narration text}

Table 9. Prompt to extract hand-object interaction information from narration. We replace {narration text} with narration from Ego4D.

Sampling HOI narrations. To ensure diverse narration samples for each question, we first sort the remaining narrations chronologically. Then, for each question, we offset the starting index and select every sixth narration. This staggered sampling prevents identical questions from being generated for temporally adjacent HOI segments.

Next, we filter out unsuitable narrations specifically for **Location** and **Object Parts**. For **Location** questions, we select videos where the narration contains verbs indicating object movement. For **Object Parts** questions, we determine whether the object is partially affected and retain only those where partial impact is evident. This filtering process is

done automatically using LLMs based on the narration (The prompt is shown in Table 10).

Finally, to ensure diversity in HOI samples, we extract verbs from the narrations and randomly select 2,000 samples while ensuring that no single verb appears more than N times. N is determined for each question type to maintain diversity while ensuring at least 2,000 candidate samples are available.

System Prompt:

You are a helpful assistant who understands interactions between human hands and objects.

User Prompt:

Create a question for VQA about Hand-Object Interaction. Specifically, the question should follow the format "What part of [Object] is [Verb]?" (e.g., "What part of the bicycle is replaced?").

Given a narration describing a Hand-Object Interaction:

1. First, determine if it’s an appropriate scene to create a question.
2. An appropriate scene should include the following conditions:

- The person is interacting with the object(s).
- The action only affects a limited area of the object (e.g., replacing the tire of a bicycle or folding the left top corner of the paper) rather than the entire object (e.g., moving the speaker).

If the scene is appropriate for creating the question, create the question accordingly. If it’s inappropriate to create a question, reply with None.

If possible, create the corresponding answer to the question. If it’s difficult to create the answer, reply with Ambiguous.

Here is the narration:

{narration text}

Write reasoning and then output the json answer like this: <reasoning about whether it is appropriate to create a question>

“json

```
{ "question": <created question or None>, "answer": <created answer or Ambiguous> }
```

““

Table 10. Prompt to extract hand-object interaction information from narration. We replace {narration text} with narration from Ego4D.

Human QA annotation. For the automatically generated questions, annotators perform the following tasks while referencing the video: (i) verifying the validity of the question, (ii) creating the correct answer, and (iii) generating incorrect answer choices.

If an automatically generated question does not match the video, annotators either revise the question or reject the sample. Next, they create the correct answer, ensuring that it provides sufficient detail for the question to be understandable without watching the video.

Once the question and correct answer are prepared, an initial set of plausible incorrect answer choices is generated using LLMs (The prompts are shown in Table 11–16). Annotators then review these choices, filtering out inappropriate ones, such as those that overlap with the correct answer. They refine and add challenging distractors that effectively assess comprehension of the question.

Overall, human annotators verify all questions, correct answers, and incorrect answer choices, ensuring that the dataset remains sufficiently challenging while still solvable by humans. The instructions provided to the annotators are shown in Table 17–22 for each category. The screenshot of the annotation tool interface is provided in Figure 9.

User Prompt:

You will be given a pair of a question and an answer about a hand-object interaction.

Create 4 sentences that describe similar but incorrect answers, as per the examples.

Examples:

- Question: What is the person doing with his/her hands?
- Correct Answer: The person is cutting an apple on the chopping board using the knife in his right hand while holding the apple with his left hand.
- Incorrect Answer (object name or situation is wrong): The person is slicing an apple on the table using an apple slicer in his right hand while holding the apple with his left hand.
- Incorrect Answer (action is different): The person is removing the skin of an apple on the chopping board using the knife in his right hand while grasping the apple with his left hand.

The sentences should:

- Contain either different object names or situations (as in the first incorrect example)
- Or, contain the same object names but describe different actions (as in the second incorrect example)
- Maintain the same level of detail and be of a similar length to the correct answer
- Avoid overlapping with each other

The answer format should be json:

```
{"1": "<sentence1>", "2": "<sentence2>", "3": "<sentence3>", ..., "4": "<sentence4>"}
```

Make sure that you only answer json.

Question: {question}

Correct Answer: {answer}

Table 11. Prompt to generate options for **Action** question. We replace {question} and {answer} with created question and answer, respectively

User Prompt:

You will be given a pair of a question and an answer about a hand-object interaction.

Create 4 sentences that describe similar but incorrect answers, as per the examples.

Examples:

- Question: How does the person loosen the fastener?
- Correct Answer: The person loosens the fastener by holding the piece firmly in one hand while using the wrench in the other hand to turn it.
- Incorrect Answer (hand movement or object handling is slightly different but plausible): The person loosens the fastener by shaking the piece in one hand while holding the wrench in the other hand.

The sentences should:

- Contain same objects but different hand movements or ways of doing the action compared to the correct answer
- Be incompatible with the correct answer
- Maintain the same level of detail and be of a similar length to the correct answer
- Avoid overlapping with each other

The answer format should be json:

```
{"1": "<sentence1>", "2": "<sentence2>", "3": "<sentence3>", ..., "4": "<sentence4>"}
```

Make sure that you only answer json.

Question: {question}

Correct Answer: {answer}

Table 12. Prompt to generate options for **Process** question. We replace {question} and {answer} with created question and answer, respectively

User Prompt:

You will be given a pair of a question and an answer about a hand-object interaction.

Create 4 sentences that describe similar but incorrect answers, as per the examples.

Examples:

- Question: What object is used by the hands?
- Correct Answer: knife,apple.
- Incorrect Answer: chopping board.

The sentences should:

- Contain incorrect object names that are likely to be in the same scene as the correct answer (e.g., chopping board)
- Even if the correct answer contains multiple objects, the incorrect answer should contain only one object per option
- Avoid overlapping with each other

The answer format should be json:

```
{"1": "<sentence1>", "2": "<sentence2>", "3": "<sentence3>", ..., "4": "<sentence4>"}
```

Make sure that you only answer json.

Question: {question}

Correct Answer: {answer}

Table 13. Prompt to generate options for **Objects** question. We replace {question} and {answer} with created question and answer, respectively

User Prompt:

You will be given a pair of a question and an answer about a hand-object interaction.

Create 4 sentences that describe similar but incorrect answers, as per the examples.

Examples:

- Question: Where does the person place the cup?
- Correct Answer: On the left bottom corner of the table.
- Incorrect Answer: On the right top corner of the table.
- Incorrect Answer: On the chair under the table.

The sentences should:

- Include a specific location indicating where the object is moved to, but it should be a different location from the correct answer
- Be close to but different from the correct location (e.g., "On the right top corner of the table.")
- Maintain the same level of detail and be of a similar length to the correct answer
- Avoid overlapping with each other

The answer format should be json:

```
{"1": "<sentence1>", "2": "<sentence2>", "3": "<sentence3>", ..., "4": "<sentence4>"}
```

Make sure that you only answer json.

Question: {question}

Correct Answer: {answer}

Table 14. Prompt to generate options for **Location** question. We replace {question} and {answer} with created question and answer, respectively

User Prompt:

You will be given a pair of a question and an answer about a hand-object interaction.

Create 4 sentences that describe similar but incorrect answers, as per the examples.

Examples:

- Question: How did the state of the screw change?
- Correct Answer: The screw was picked up, put on the hole, and turned clockwise.
- Incorrect Answer (a little bit different state change): The screw that had already been in the hole was turned counter-clockwise.
- Question: How did the state of the camera change?
- Correct Answer: The camera was moved right by the right hand.
- Incorrect Answer (a little bit different state change): The camera was moved left and slightly shifted.

The sentences should:

- Describe very similar but different state changes of the object.
- Be incompatible with the correct answer.
- Not change the object (tools) used from the correct answer.
- Maintain the same level of detail and be of a similar length to the correct answer.
- Avoid overlapping with each other.

The answer format should be json:

```
{"1": "<sentence1>", "2": "<sentence2>", "3": "<sentence3>", ..., "4": "<sentence4>"}
```

Make sure that you only answer json.

Question: {question}

Correct Answer: {answer}

Table 15. Prompt to generate options for **State** question. We replace {question} and {answer} with created question and answer, respectively

User Prompt:

You will be given a pair of a question and an answer about a hand-object interaction.

Create 4 sentences that describe similar but incorrect answers, as per the examples.

Examples:

- Question: What part of the hammer is being held?
- Correct Answer: The bottom of the hammer handle.
- Incorrect Answer: Close to the head of the hammer.

The sentences should:

- Contain nonexistent parts or incorrect parts of the object (e.g., Close to the head of the hammer)
- Maintain the same level of detail and be of a similar length to the correct answer
- Avoid overlapping with each other

The answer format should be json:

```
{"1": "<sentence1>", "2": "<sentence2>", "3": "<sentence3>", ..., "4": "<sentence4>"}
```

Make sure that you only answer json.

Question: {question}

Correct Answer: {answer}

Table 16. Prompt to generate options for **Parts** question. We replace {question} and {answer} with created question and answer, respectively

Purpose	To ask how the person is manipulating objects and to understand the dynamically changing relationships between the hands and the objects.
Required answer information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of manipulation by both hands (left and right, if distinguishable) • All objects involved in the action
Example question	What is the person doing with his/her hands?
Example correct answer	The person is slicing an apple on the chopping board using the knife in his right hand while holding the apple with his left hand.
Examples of incorrect answers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The person is slicing an apple on the table using an apple slicer in his right hand while holding the apple with his left hand. • The person is removing the skin of an apple on the chopping board using the knife in his right hand while grasping the apple with his left hand.
Notes	Do not omit the subject ("The person").

Table 17. Instruction for annotators to annotate **Action** category

Purpose	To ask about the manner, procedure, technique, or skill involved in a hand action or its interaction with an object.
Required answer information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which hand is used • How the hand moves or interacts with the object, including the steps and state changes
Example question	How does the person drop the toy on the table?
Example correct answer	The person drops the action figure gently on the table by holding it with the index finger and thumb in the left hand.
Incorrect example	The person released his grip and let it fall with force.
Notes	Do not omit the subject ("The person") or the verb (action).

Table 18. Instruction for annotators to annotate **Process** category

Purpose	To identify the types and positions of objects being manipulated by the hands.
Required answer information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A verbal description of all manipulated objects and their positions (including segmentation mask if applicable) • Objects that are merely touched and not clearly manipulated should not be included as correct or incorrect options
Example question	What object is used by the hands?
Correct answer	knife, apple
Incorrect example	The chopping board (present but not manipulated)
Notes	Only include object names in the answer. Separate multiple correct objects with commas.

Table 19. Instruction for annotators to annotate **Objects** category

Purpose	To ask where the manipulated object was moved to, or where it ended up as a result of the action.
Required answer information	A specific description of the location where the object was placed or moved.
Example question	Where does the person place the cup?
Example correct answer	The person places the cup on the left bottom corner of the table.
Incorrect example	The person places the cup on the top right corner of the table.
Notes	Do not omit the subject ("The person"), the verb (action), or the object.

Table 20. Instruction for annotators to annotate **Location** category


Purpose	To ask how the state, structure, composition, or spatial arrangement of the object changed during the video (or remained unchanged).
Required answer information	A description of how the object's state, structure, composition, or placement changed or did not change in the video.
Example question	How did the state of the apple change?
Correct answer	The apple was cut into small slices.
Example question 2	How did the state of the camera change?
Correct answer 2	The camera is divided into two parts: the body and the lens.
Incorrect examples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The apple was crushed. • The apple was sliced. (when slicing did not occur)
Notes	Do not omit the subject (the object) or the verb.

Table 21. Instruction for annotators to annotate **State** category

Purpose	To identify the specific part of the object that is being affected, considering the object's structure, function, and spatial relation to the hands.
Required answer information	A detailed verbal description of the affected region and its position (including segmentation mask if applicable).
Example question	What part of the hammer is being held?
Correct answer	The bottom of the hammer handle is being held.
Incorrect example	Close to the head of the hammer is being held.
Notes	Do not omit the subject (the part) or the verb (effect).

Table 22. Instruction for annotators to annotate **Parts** category

how_0000 Annotated



Question: How does the person loosen the bolt?

※ 質問文の修正が必要な場合はボックスに記入。
※ 修正できない問題がある場合は当てるものを全てチェック (Check all that apply)

How does the person loosen the bolt?

☐ 質問として成立していない (The question doesn't make sense)

☐ 動画からは質問に回答出来ない (Unable to answer question from this video)

☐ 正答が一意に定まらない (Unable to create uniquely determined answer)

☐ 既にほぼ同じ動画-質問の組があった (I have already annotated almost the same video-question pairs.)

[Save Question](#)

Answer: The person loosens the bolt by holding the T-shaped screw tool with his right hand, applying pressure, and rotating it counterclockwise.

※ 解答は質問に対して内容が適当かつ、解答から当該部分の映像が想像できる程度に詳細である必要があります。
(The answers must be appropriate to the questions and detailed enough for the reader to visualize the relevant part of the scene.)

例) Q. What is the person doing with his hands?
A. The person slices an apple using a knife with the right hand while holding the apple with the left hand.

The person loosens the bolt by holding the T-shaped screw tool with his right hand, applying pressure, and rotating it counterclockwise.

[Save New Answer](#)

Other Incorrect Options:

[Regenerate Options from QA](#)

- The person uses pliers to grip the bolt tightly with his left hand, pulling it outwards instead of rotating it. ☒
- ☒ 誤回答として適切 (Appropriate as incorrect answer)
- ☐ 正解と意味が重複 (Overlap with the correct answer)
- ☐ 正解と異なる別解 (Another correct answer)
- ☐ 誤回答として不適 (Not Appropriate as incorrect answer)
- The person holds the bolt with his fingers in the left hand, twisting it back and forth instead of using a tool. ☒

Figure 9. Screenshot of the annotation tool interface. Annotators proceed from top to bottom, sequentially annotating question, correct answer, and distractor options.

Final QA post-processing using LLMs. After human QA annotation, we refined each option, including the correct answer, using LLMs to correct their grammar and ensure a consistent tone across all choices, without changing their meaning. This was especially done for the **Action**, **Process**, and **State** categories, where longer sentences tend to introduce textual biases (e.g., the correct answer being more likely to contain grammatical errors than the distractors). All the prompts used for each question category are shown in Table 23 and Table 24.

You will be given a triplet consisting of a question, a correct answer, and a set of distractors.

First, revise the answer if it includes grammatical errors or is not in a natural tone without changing its meaning. If the answer is already correct, please keep it as is.

Then, rephrase each distractor to make it more plausible and similar in tone to the correct answer, without significantly changing its original meaning, since the distractors are currently written in a biased way, making them too easy to eliminate.

To do this, you may:

- Use words or phrasing that commonly appear in the correct answer, or avoid words frequently used in distractors.
- Tone down any exaggeration to make the distractors sound more natural and believable.
- Remove or rephrase strong negations (such as “without” or “instead”) if they clearly oppose the correct answer, unless they are essential to the meaning.

The answer (rephrased distractors) format should be json:

```
{
  "answer": "<revised_answer>",
  "options": {"1": "<sentence1>", "2": "<sentence2>", "3": "<sentence>", ..., "4": "<sentence4>" }
}
```

Make sure that you only answer json.

Note that all the sentences should start with in the same way as the original sentences (mostly "The person...").

Question: {question}
Correct Answer: {answer}
Distractors: {options}

Table 23. Prompt to refine options for **Action** and **Process** question. We replace {question}, {answer}, {options} with created question, answer, and options respectively

Choice of LLMs. We used gpt-4o-mini-2024-07-18 to generate the

You will be given a triplet consisting of a question, a correct answer, and a set of distractors.

First, revise the answer if it includes grammatical errors or is not in a natural tone without changing its meaning. Note that since the answer is mainly written in the passive voice to focus on the state of the object, please make sure to keep it in passive form. If the answer is already correct, please keep it as is.

Then, rephrase each distractor to make it more plausible and similar in tone to the correct answer, without significantly changing its original meaning, since the distractors are currently written in a biased way, making them too easy to eliminate. Also, it’s better to avoid using adverbs (e.g., "gently") in the distractors, since adverbs typically describe human action rather than the state change of the object.

The answer (rephrased distractors) format should be json:

```
{
  "answer": "<revised_answer>",
  "options": {"1": "<sentence1>", "2": "<sentence2>", "3": "<sentence>", ..., "4": "<sentence4>" }
}
```

Make sure that you only answer json.

Note that all the sentences should start with in the same way as the original sentences (mostly "The person...").

Question: {question}
Correct Answer: {answer}
Distractors: {options}

Table 24. Prompt to refine options for **State** question. We replace {question}, {answer}, {options} with created question, answer, and options respectively

initial QA pairs. For final refinement, we used gpt-4o-2024-08-06. We note that generated questions/options are for reference and all the pairs were thoroughly reviewed and corrected to form the final QA pairs.

Human mask annotation. Egocentric videos often include severe blurring that harms the visual quality of the video clip. To this end, we opted to annotate three representative frames from each 5-second video clip. Annotators manually selected one frame each from the front, middle, and last thirds of the video clip, where the target regions were clearly visible and sampled them from different parts of the video whenever possible. However, the above condition was relaxed when the frames from some of the intervals

Human	Action (Acc)	Process (Acc)	Objects (AP)	Location (Acc)	State (Acc)	Parts (Acc)	Avg. (Acc)
Rater 1	98.9	97.6	96.6	94.2	99.0	99.1	97.7
Rater 2	99.0	98.1	94.2	97.0	91.3	97.4	96.5
Rater 3	97.9	92.0	97.1	98.7	95.7	94.2	95.7
Avg.	98.6	95.9	96.0	96.6	95.3	96.9	96.6
Agreement	95.8	87.8	76.5	90.1	87.0	90.7	90.3

Table 25. **Human evaluation results.** Each rater independently selected correct answer(s) for each question. **Agreement** indicates proportion of questions for which all three raters selected exactly same set of options.

were unusable.

For **Object Parts** questions, clips often involve object state changes, which change the appearance of the components. In such cases, both the frames before and after the state change were selected.

Human Evaluation. We recruited three human raters who each passed the initial screening, achieving over 70% accuracy on a set of 30 questions sampled from the validation split of our dataset. Table 25 reports the performance of the raters and their agreement ratio. Agreement denotes the proportion of questions for which all three raters selected exactly the same set of options. The **Objects** category shows relatively lower agreement because multiple answers may be correct, reducing the likelihood that all raters choose the same set of options. Overall, humans performed over 90% accuracy/AP across all the categories, indicating that our benchmark is solvable by humans and that the current models still have a significant gap between human performance.

Detailed dataset statistics. Figure 10 shows the detailed distribution of the scenarios and the primary verbs included in HanDyVQA. While the scenarios reflect the distribution of the original Ego4D video clips, the verbs are more uniformly selected to ensure diverse HOIs are covered.

Figure 11 shows the spatial and temporal distribution of segmentation mask annotations for **Objects** and **Object Parts** questions. While selected frames are biased towards the beginning and the end of a video, the remaining annotations are evenly distributed throughout the video. Regarding the spatial direction, the segmentation showed a tendency to concentrate in the center of a frame, but also appeared to spread around the center.

Details on compensation. We outsourced the annotation of MCQs and segmentation masks to an agency at a total cost of 3,180,000 JPY (approximately 22,000 USD). For the human evaluation, we commissioned a different company and hired separate personnel as raters, incurring an additional cost of 4,510,585 JPY (approximately 28,600 USD). The company is responsible for managing payments

to annotators, ensuring compliance with the minimum wage regulations in the annotator’s country.

C. Details on experimental settings

C.1. Multi-Choice Questions

Frame sampling strategy. We sample n frames uniformly from a video of length L by dividing it into n equal segments and selecting one frame from the center of each segment. Specifically, the sampling index i_k for the k -th frame ($k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$) is computed as:

$$i_k = \left\lfloor k \cdot \text{gap} + \frac{\text{gap}}{2} \right\rfloor, \quad \text{where } \text{gap} = \frac{L}{n}$$

This approach ensures that the sampled frames are evenly distributed over the entire video, while avoiding bias toward the start or end. By choosing the center of each interval, we obtain a more representative snapshot of the temporal progression.

Prompts for zero-shot evaluation. The textual prompts fed to video-language models with integrated LLMs to solve MCQs are shown in Table 28 and Table 29.

Computational cost. The 7B-size video-language models fit on a single NVIDIA H200 (141GB) GPU and completed inference for each question category in under an hour. The 72B-size models were able to run on a single node with eight H200 GPUs, requiring approximately 1.7 hours per category.

C.2. Referring Video Object Segmentation

Frame sampling strategy. Given a set of annotated frame indices $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [0, n]$ and a target number of samples l , we construct a set \mathcal{S} of l indices that are both representative and temporally balanced.

- We initialize the set \mathcal{S} as the sorted, unique subset of annotated indices \mathcal{A} within their valid range:

$$\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \text{sorted}(\{x \in \mathcal{A} \mid 0 \leq x \leq n\})$$

- While $|\mathcal{S}| < l$, we iteratively identify the largest temporal gap between consecutive elements in \mathcal{S} , including gaps at the start ($[0, \mathcal{S}_1]$) and end ($[\mathcal{S}_{|\mathcal{S}|}, n]$), and insert the midpoint of the largest such gap:

$$\text{midpoint} = \left\lfloor \frac{i+j}{2} \right\rfloor \quad \text{for each gap } [i, j]$$

- This process continues until $|\mathcal{S}| = l$, or no more meaningful midpoints can be added.
- If the final size $|\mathcal{S}| > l$ (e.g., due to duplicate insertions), we resample l indices from \mathcal{S} to evenly cover $[0, n]$. Specifically, we define l ideal positions:

$$t_i = \text{round}\left(\frac{i \cdot n}{l-1}\right), \quad i = 0, 1, \dots, l-1$$




Figure 10. Top-50 scenario distribution (top) and top-100 verb frequency distribution (bottom) of HanDyVQA.




Figure 11. Temporal distribution (right) and spatial distribution (left) of mask annotations per category.

and for each t_i , we select the closest available index in S without duplication.

This strategy ensures that manually annotated indices are

selected while interpolating additional indices to maximize temporal coverage.

Prompts for zero-shot evaluation. The prompt used for the baseline that takes questions as input is provided in Table 30. The prompt that uses the ground-truth option is provided in Table 31.

Grouping for evaluation. We group videos into three size bins—small (S), medium (M), and large (L)—based on the average area of their ground-truth masks, so we can examine performance as a function of target size. The S/M/L thresholds differ between the **Area** and **Object** settings:

- **Area:** S→M at 372, M→L at 2,127 (pixels)
- **Object:** S→M at 3,581, M→L at 13,063 (pixels)

Computational cost. Inference with the VideoLISA-3.8B model was performed on a single NVIDIA H200 GPU and took roughly 1.5 hours per category. Inference with the Sa2VA-8B model on a single NVIDIA H200 GPU required about 2 hours per category for the video baseline and around 1.5 hours for the frame-wise baseline.

C.3. Integration of HOI cues

Implementation details. Figure 12 illustrates the architecture of our model, which integrates multiple modalities: frame-level RGB visual features, hand poses, bounding boxes of manipulated objects, and visual features of the manipulated objects.

Hand poses are extracted using an off-the-shelf 3D hand pose detector [31], resulting in a tensor of shape $[B, T, 21, 3]$ for each hand, where B is the batch size and T is the number of frames in the video. The bounding boxes of manipulated objects for each hand are obtained using AMEGO [14] and represented as $[B, T, N, 4]$, where N is the maximum number of objects per hand. We set $N = 8$ in our experiments. For each detected bounding box, we crop the corresponding image region and extract CLIP features [32].

For each modality, we use separate processing modules for the left and right sides, resulting in seven feature vectors in total. All modality-specific features, except for the global RGB visual feature, have a shape of $[B, 128]$. Before concatenation, we apply a modality-dropout layer in which entire modalities (i.e., both left- and right-hand streams of a modality) may be jointly dropped with a probability of $p = 0.2$, encouraging the model to rely on the remaining modalities. Finally, all features are concatenated and passed through a multi-layer perceptron (MLP) to produce the final fused representation of shape $[B, 512]$.

Training. For each integrated feature \mathbf{v}_i , we associate one positive text feature and B_N negative text features sampled from (i) distractors within the same video and (ii) answer options of other videos in the batch. The contrastive training is summarized in Algorithm 1.




Figure 12. Architecture of additional head used for fine-tuning experiment. Branches are omitted for unused modalities.

Algorithm 1 Contrastive Training for Integrated Features

Require: Integrated feature \mathbf{v}_i , positive text feature \mathbf{p}_i , negative features $\{\mathbf{n}_{i,j}\}_{j=1}^{B_N}$, temperature τ

- 1: $\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i \leftarrow \text{normalize}(\mathbf{v}_i)$
- 2: $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_i \leftarrow \text{normalize}(\mathbf{p}_i)$
- 3: **for** $j = 1$ to B_N **do**
- 4: $\hat{\mathbf{n}}_{i,j} \leftarrow \text{normalize}(\mathbf{n}_{i,j})$
- 5: **end for**
- 6: Compute logits:

$$\mathbf{s}_i = \left[\frac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i^\top \hat{\mathbf{p}}_i}{\tau}, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i^\top \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{i,1}}{\tau}, \dots, \frac{\hat{\mathbf{v}}_i^\top \hat{\mathbf{n}}_{i,B_N}}{\tau} \right]$$

- 7: $\mathbf{y}_i \leftarrow [1, 0, \dots, 0]$
- 8: $\mathcal{L}_i \leftarrow \text{BCEWithLogits}(\mathbf{s}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)$

The total loss is computed by averaging across all samples in the batch:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \mathcal{L}_i.$$

We trained separate models for each category. The batch size was set to 16, the learning rate to 1×10^{-5} , the weight decay to 1×10^{-4} , the number of negative samples B_N to 16, and the temperature τ to 0.07. Each model was trained for 500 epochs, and the best-performing checkpoint was selected based on validation performance.

Computational cost. As shown in Table 26, the additional branches for HOI cues introduce only minor computational overhead. Table 27 further reports the cost of extracting each HOI cue. For training, all the model variants fit on a single

	Extra Params	Extra GFLOPs / video
Hand Pose Branch	0.80M	0.0052
Object BBox Branch	0.92M	0.0351
Object Feat Branch	1.02M	0.0602

Table 26. Computational cost of additional layers for HOI cues.

	Params	GFLOPs / frame
Hand Pose (YOLOv8 det. + WiLoR pose)	26.63M + 693.03M	41.56 + 140.09
Object BBox (Faster R-CNN, ResNet-101)	47.36M	219.57
Object Feats (CLIP)	202.05M	51.90

Table 27. Computational cost of feature extraction for HOI cues.

NVIDIA H200 GPU and finish in roughly 0.05–2.5 hours per category, depending on the number of additional cues.

Carefully watch the first-person view video and pay attention to the cause and sequence of events, the details and movements of objects, and the actions and poses of persons.

Question: {question}

Choose ****only one**** option from the following list.

Options:

- (A) {option1}
- (B) {option2}
- (C) {option3}
- (D) {option4}
- (E) {option5}

Answer format:

(A) <Description of Option A>

Table 28. Prompt for zero-shot evaluation of video-language models integrated with LLMs when there is only one correct answer. {question} is replaced with question and {option n } is replaced with n -th option.

Carefully watch the first-person view video and pay attention to the cause and sequence of events, the detail and movement of objects, and the action and pose of persons.

Question: {question}

Choose ****all**** options that apply from the following list.

Options:

- (A) {option1}
- (B) {option2}
- (C) {option3}
- (D) {option4}
- (E) {option5}
- ...

Answer format:

(A) <Description of Option A>

Table 29. Prompt for zero-shot evaluation of video-language models integrated with LLMs when there are multiple correct answers. {question} is replaced with question and {option n } is replaced with n -th option.

Segment the area that corresponds to the answer to the question.

Question: {question}

Table 30. Prompt for Sa2VA (frame-wise/video) baseline in referring video object segmentation. {question} is replaced with question.

Segment all the mentioned area:

{GT}

Table 31. Prompt for GT + Sa2VA baseline in referring video object segmentation. {GT} is replaced with ground truth.

Models	Action (Acc)	Process (Acc)	Objects (AP)	Location (Acc)	State (Acc)	Parts (Acc)	Avg. (Acc)
Qwen2.5-VL-7B zero-shot	58.6	53.4	53.5	45.5	57.1	47.8	52.5
Qwen2.5-VL-7B fine-tuned	58.2	64.9	57.5	64.8	63.1	50.2	60.2

Table 32. Results of fine-tuning Qwen2.5-VL-7B model on HanDyVQA.

D. Fine-tuning Qwen2.5-VL-7B

We conducted instruction tuning on the training split of HanDyVQA to explore the effectiveness of fine-tuning. Specifically, we used Qwen2.5-VL-7B as the base model and trained LoRA adapters using QLoRA [9].

Implementation details. We trained separate models for each category. We only trained the LoRA parameters injected into the query and value projection layers (q_proj and v_proj) of the attention modules, while keeping all other model weights frozen. The number of input video frames is 16, and the resolution is 224×398 . We set the batch size to 4, learning rate to 1×10^{-4} . Each model was trained for 150 epochs, and the best-performing checkpoint was selected based on the validation performance.

Computational cost. Training can be performed on a single NVIDIA H200 GPU and takes roughly two hours per category.

Results. Table 32 shows the results of fine-tuning the model. The **Process** and **Location** categories show improvements of roughly 10 points, followed by a 6-point gain in the **State** category, while gains in **Objects** and **Parts** remain below 5 points. A slight performance drop is observed for the **Action** category. These results indicate that small-scale instruction tuning offers limited benefits for relatively easier conventional tasks such as **Action** and **Objects**, but yields larger gains for categories that involve longer textual descriptions, likely because LLMs are better at leveraging textual biases.

E. Broader Impacts

The proposed HanDyVQA dataset provides a detailed evaluation of fine-grained hand-object interactions. As such, it serves as a valuable benchmark for systems designed to assist human workers using visual information captured by wearable cameras in diverse real-world scenarios [29]. This enables the development of systems that can better understand subtle interactions and deliver more accurate and context-aware feedback to the users.

Such recognition capabilities are also essential for applications in Augmented Reality (AR) and Virtual Reality (VR), where systems must respond to users actions and changes

in the environment in real time. Unlike previous datasets that focus primarily on action recognition or object detection, HanDyVQA offers a unique benchmark that evaluates a model’s ability to comprehend nuanced hand-object interactions and underlying dynamics, pushing the boundaries beyond conventional video recognition tasks.