

Vision to Geometry: 3D Spatial Memory for Sequential Embodied MLLM Reasoning and Exploration

Zhongyi Cai^{1*} Yi Du^{2*} Chen Wang² Yu Kong¹

¹ACTION Lab, Michigan State University ²SAIR Lab, University at Buffalo




Figure 1. **Illustration of 3DSPMR completing a sequential EQA task.** After navigating to the kitchen and answering the first question, the agent receives a second query. Using its spatial memory, it recognizes two previously passed but insufficiently explored bathrooms, revisits them, and answers the question after sufficient exploration. For the third question, the agent locates the study but cannot find a bookshelf; once the study is fully explored and no alternative candidate rooms remain, 3DSPMR correctly identifies the task as infeasible.

Abstract

Existing research on indoor embodied tasks typically requires agents to actively explore unknown environments and reason about the scene to achieve a specific goal. However, when deployed in real life, agents often face sequential tasks, where each new sub-task follows the completion of the previous one, and certain sub-tasks may be infeasible, such as searching for a non-existent object. Compared with the single-task setting, the core challenge lies in reusing spatial knowledge accumulated from previous explorations to support subsequent reasoning and exploration. In this work, we investigate this underexplored yet practically significant embodied AI challenge. To evaluate this challenge, we introduce SEER-Bench, a new Sequential Embodied Exploration and Reasoning Benchmark encompassing encom-

passing two classic embodied tasks: *Embodied Question Answering (EQA)* and *Embodied Multi-modal Navigation (EMN)*. Building on SEER-Bench, we propose 3DSPMR, a 3D SPatial Memory Reasoning approach that exploits relational, visual, and geometric cues from explored regions to augment Multi-Modal Large Language Models (MLLMs) for reasoning and exploration in sequential embodied tasks. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to explicitly incorporate geometric information into MLLM-based spatial understanding and reasoning. Extensive experiments verify that 3DSPMR achieves substantial performance gains on both sequential EQA and EMN tasks.

*Equal contribution.

1. Introduction

Existing embodied tasks [8, 36, 41, 45, 49] require agents to actively explore unknown environments and reason about their surroundings to complete one single task. However, in real-world scenario, agents often face sequential tasks, where each new task follows the completion of the previous one, and certain sub-tasks may even be infeasible, such as searching for a non-existent object or room. The core challenge in this setting lies in enabling agents to effectively reuse spatial information accumulated from prior tasks. When a new task is feasible, the agent should solve it efficiently; when the task is infeasible, the agent should detect its impossibility and clearly communicate this to the user. Building on this motivation, we investigate the underexplored yet realistic challenge of sequential embodied tasks to promote the advancement of embodied agents.

However, for mainstream embodied tasks, such as Embodied Question Answering (EQA) [7, 8, 12, 21, 30] and Embodied Multi-modal Navigation (EMN) [2, 24, 42, 44, 46], existing benchmarks [9, 17, 25, 47] primarily focus on isolated single-task scenarios, and only a few recent EMN studies [18, 32] have begun to consider sequential settings, yet they still overlook infeasible tasks. To systematically study this problem, we construct the Sequential Embodied Exploration and Reasoning Benchmark (SEER-Bench), which covers EQA and EMN in a sequential setting. By integrating both feasible and infeasible sub-tasks, SEER-Bench extends the sequential embodied task formulation, offering a more realistic and comprehensive evaluation for real-world embodied agents.

To tackle the sequential embodied tasks, we turn our attention to Multi-modal Large Language Models (MLLMs) [6, 16] as a unified reasoning backbone for embodied agents. MLLMs are powerful general-purpose models that have been applied to complex embodied AI problems, yet they still struggle with spatial understanding and reasoning [4, 39]. Although recent studies [31, 41, 42] have employed memory-based reasoning frameworks to enhance embodied agents in task reasoning and exploration, these approaches face three major challenges when applied to sequential embodied tasks. First, their memory designs either omit essential cues or store excessive redundant details from previously explored areas during earlier sub-tasks, causing agents to struggle with retrieving relevant information for the new sub-task. Second, MLLMs may overconfidently produce premature results or even hallucinations based on partial memory information, due to incomplete exploration in earlier sub-tasks. Finally, these approaches fail to identify infeasible sub-tasks, leading agents to repeatedly or endlessly explore already well-explored areas.

To address these challenges and enhance MLLMs’ spatial reasoning ability, we propose 3D SPatial Memory Reasoning (3DSPMR). 3DSPMR builds a comprehensive spa-

tial memory by integrating relational cues from 3D scene graphs (*e.g.*, room–object relationships), visual cues from ego-centric observations (*e.g.*, local object surroundings), and geometric cues from Field-of-View (FoV) coverage map coverage maps (*e.g.*, explored vs. unexplored areas). Specifically, FoV coverage is a geometric descriptor that captures the visible portions of the environment from the agent’s perspective over time. It is employed to quantify how extensively each area of the environment has been explored, providing an explicit geometric representation of exploration progress. During memory construction, FoV coverage filters out redundant spatial information to keep the spatial memory compact and representative. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to explicitly incorporate geometric information into MLLM-based spatial understanding and reasoning. Through this novel memory mechanism, 3DSPMR unifies these heterogeneous cues to bridge the 3D scene understanding ability gap in MLLMs.

Building on the spatial memory, 3DSPMR introduces the agentic embodied reasoning framework which consists of an adaptive reasoning module for multi-functional MLLM reasoning, and a geometric examination mechanism that verifies spatial coverage and exploration adequacy before finalizing decisions. The adaptive reasoning module leverages the structured information stored in memory to achieve more comprehensive reasoning. The geometric examination mechanism, guided by FoV coverage, acts as an exploration progress indicator that prevents premature task completion and redundant revisiting of explored regions. This mechanism also mitigates hallucination issues in MLLMs and enables the agent to accurately assess the feasibility of ongoing tasks. When the reasoning module decide to explore, the geo-sem exploration module integrates geometric information and semantic insights to identify optimal unexplored areas, thereby streamlining the selection of future navigation targets. Extensive experiments demonstrate that 3DSPMR substantially enhances both reasoning accuracy and exploration efficiency in previously unseen 3D environments. Our contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose SEER-Bench, a Sequential Embodied Exploration and Reasoning Benchmark that covers EQA and EMN, including both feasible and infeasible sub-tasks to better reflect real-world scenarios.
- We propose a compact and representative multi-cue spatial memory that integrates relational, visual, and geometric information, bridging the 3D scene understanding gap of MLLMs in sequential embodied tasks.
- We develop 3DSPMR, which leverages the proposed spatial memory to enhance embodied agents’ reasoning reliability, task feasibility awareness, and exploration efficiency in sequential embodied tasks.
- Our 3DSPMR approach achieves SOTA performance on both EQA and EMN tasks within the SEER-Bench,

demonstrating its effectiveness and efficiency.

2. Related Work

MLLMs for Embodied and Spatial Reasoning. Recent Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) such as GPT-4o [16], Qwen2-VL [34], and LLaVA-OneVision [20] have shown remarkable progress in general visual–language reasoning. These models have inspired growing efforts toward embodied and spatial reasoning, where agents interpret 3D environments and perform goal-directed behaviors [11, 23, 26]. However, most existing MLLMs rely on 2D image–text supervision and lack explicit 3D spatial awareness [4, 39]. This limitation constrains their ability to reason about geometry, occlusion, and room layouts, which are crucial for embodied perception and navigation. Moreover, their frame-wise visual processing hinders persistent memory formation, leading to fragmented and inconsistent spatial understanding in long-horizon tasks.

3D Representations and Memory in Embodied Agents. Structured spatial representations are central to effective reasoning and interaction within 3D environments. Scene-graph-based methods [13–15, 29, 35] encode object relationships and spatial hierarchies, offering interpretable relational abstractions. However, such symbolic graphs are typically sparse and lack the visual richness needed for perceptual grounding. Complementary approaches that store egocentric visual memories [3, 40, 41] allow retrieval of past observations but often lack geometric or relational awareness. Recent methods [10, 22, 35, 41, 50] have explored constructing 3D semantic maps and global spatial memories, which enhance navigation and question answering yet treat relational, visual, and geometric cues independently. In contrast, our proposed 3DSPMR integrates these complementary modalities into a unified 3D spatial memory, combining relational structure, visual appearance, and geometric coverage for coherent spatial reasoning.

Sequential Embodied Tasks. Traditional embodied research such as Embodied Question Answering (EQA) [8] and Scene-Graph Navigation (SG-Nav) [42] evaluate isolated single-task scenarios where each episode is independent. Recent works have explored sequential and multi-task settings [32, 43, 48], but they typically assume all goals or sub-questions are feasible. In realistic environments, some queries are inherently *infeasible*, such as asking for the color of a non-existent object or navigating to an unreachable area. Addressing such cases requires feasibility awareness in addition to spatial reasoning—an ability largely overlooked in prior benchmarks. Recent extensions of EQA, such as OpenEQA [25], GraphEQA [31], and exploration-aware EQA [17], have begun to tackle more diverse and dynamic settings but still do not explicitly incorporate infeasible task reasoning. Our SEER-Bench extends this paradigm by including both feasible and infeasible sub-

tasks in sequential EQA and EMN episodes. Therefore, SEER-Bench extends the embodied task formulation, offering a more realistic and comprehensive evaluation for real-world embodied agents.

3. SEER Benchmark

Overview. We propose the Sequential Embodied Exploration and Reasoning Benchmark (SEER-Bench) to evaluate agents’ ability to reuse spatial knowledge and recognize infeasible sub-tasks. Unlike conventional single-task benchmarks [9, 25, 30], SEER-Bench introduces multi-task evaluations in an exploration episode, requiring efficient memory usage and feasibility awareness. It covers two core tasks, Embodied Question Answering (EQA) and Embodied Multi-modal Navigation (EMN), where both feasible and infeasible tasks appear, providing a realistic evaluation base for long-horizon embodied reasoning.

Simulator. HM3DSem [37] is a large-scale dataset providing high-fidelity 3D reconstructions of over 3,100 rooms with dense semantic annotations for objects, materials, and room structures. We adopt HM3DSem within the Habitat simulator [33] to construct photorealistic and semantically consistent embodied environments. Habitat supports high-performance egocentric rendering, efficient physics-based navigation, and modular interfaces for defining sensors, agents, and tasks. We leverage these capabilities to create sequential task episodes that maintain consistent spatial layouts across sub-tasks, enabling reproducible evaluation of spatial reasoning, memory reuse, and feasibility awareness in both EQA and EMN settings.

3.1. Embodied Question Answering

As existing HM3DSem-related benchmarks [17, 25] do not provide sequential question–answer pairs for each scenario, we annotate 60 HM3DSem scenarios with QA pairs spanning six normal categories: Object, Location, Spatial Reasoning, Functional Reasoning, Local Counting, and Global Counting. In EQA, infeasible sub-tasks naturally correspond to unanswerable questions. To systematically capture such cases, we introduce four types of unanswerable questions: Incorrect Location (*e.g.*, erroneous room–object associations), Incorrect Attribute (*e.g.*, incorrect color or state of the mentioned object), Object Not Present, and Room Not Present. For each scenario, we construct a balanced QA set by generating one question per category for both answerable and unanswerable types. Data statistics and examples of unanswerable questions are provided in Fig. 2.

To support data annotation, we collect environmental information from each selected scenario. We implement an autonomous exploration policy that, at each step, navigates the agent to the nearest frontier on the occupancy map, enabling systematic acquisition of front-view RGB observations. This exploration procedure is applied to 60 environ-




Figure 2. Unanswerable Question Examples and data statistics of EQA in SEER-Bench.

ments from the HM3DSem [37] dataset using the Habitat simulator [33]. For each environment, the agent is initialized with two random feasible starting positions and camera orientations to increase trajectory diversity and improve spatial coverage.

Using the collected frames, we employ GPT-5 [27] to generate most of the QA annotations, followed by manual filtering and correction to ensure accuracy. For global counting questions, we obtain ground-truth answers by manually inspecting the layout figures or referencing the metadata. For unanswerable questions, GPT-5 is used to annotate cases of Incorrect Location and Incorrect Attribute. For the Object Not Present and Room Not Present categories, we design two additional prompts that guide GPT-5 to generate questions involving objects (*e.g.*, carriage) or rooms (*e.g.*, brewing room) that are rarely found in typical residential environments. Furthermore, we record some unique objects and rooms appearing in each scenario and intentionally reuse them in other environments where they do not exist, enabling controlled comparisons across scenarios. All annotated QA pairs for each environment (10 in total) are evenly split into two episodes, each containing three answerable questions and two unanswerable questions.

3.2. Embodied Multi-model Navigation

The Embodied Multi-modal Navigation (EMN) task in SEER builds upon the GOAT-Bench [18], extending it into a sequential, feasibility-aware formulation. Each episode requires an embodied agent to navigate toward a target object defined by one of three goal modalities: (1) an *object goal*, specified by the target object category; (2) a *language goal*, described by natural language instructions; or (3) an *image goal*, provided as a visual exemplar. Sequential episodes are performed within the same environment, compelling agents to recall previously explored areas and reuse spatial knowledge for efficient planning.

To evaluate feasibility awareness, we introduce three kinds of infeasible goals corresponding to these modalities.

For Object Goals, we follow the strategy used in the EQA setup, where the target object is intentionally absent from the environment. For Language Goals, we modify existing descriptions by altering key attributes or spatial relations, producing instructions that are linguistically valid but contextually impossible. For Image Goals, we introduce visual targets originating from different scenes, *e.g.*, using an image captured in Scene A of HM3DSem [37] for an episode set in Scene B, making the visual reference unmatchable within the environment. Consistent with the configuration in the EQA track, we include 60 scenarios from HM3DSem and assign 40% of the goals as infeasible, ensuring a balanced distribution between feasible and infeasible tasks.

3.3. Evaluation Metrics

Existing single-task benchmarks [17, 25] evaluate performance using Success Rate (SR) and Success-weighted Path Length (SPL), which measure correctness and efficiency for individual goals but fail to capture task interdependencies or the effectiveness of memory reuse across a sequence. Simply averaging SR over subtasks can obscure critical failures within a sequential chain. To address these limitations, we introduce two new metrics that impose strict requirements on long-horizon performance: **Sequential Success Rate (SSR) – Sequential Correctness** and **Sequential SPL (SSPL) – Sequential Efficiency**.

SSR measures the reliability of the agent across the entire execution chain. Unlike average SR, which gives partial credit for completing some steps, SSR is a strict binary metric for the whole episode. It is defined as the proportion of episodes (\mathcal{E}) where **every** subtask is completed successfully:

$$\text{SSR} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}|} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \mathbb{I}[\text{SR}_e = 1] \times 100\% \quad (1)$$

This metric penalizes agents that lack the long-term consistency required for real-world sequential operations. For EQA tasks, requiring agents to produce exact-match answers for all questions in a sequence is overly strict and fails to reflect partial correctness within an episode. Therefore, we replace the binary metric with an LLM-based episodic correctness score, defined as:

$$\text{SSR} = \frac{1}{S} \sum_i^S \frac{\max(0, \sum_j^N (\sigma_j - 3))}{2N} \times 100\%, \quad (2)$$

where $\sigma_i \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$ denotes the LLM-assigned score for the j -th answer following the OpenEQA evaluation protocol [25], N is the number of sub-questions within each sequential episode, and S is the total number of episodes.

SSPL evaluates hows efficiently an agent utilizes its total budget to complete a sequence. Crucially, this metric serves as a proxy for **knowledge reuse**. In sequential tasks,




Figure 3. **The Pipeline of 3DSPMR.** Our approach maintains a unified spatial memory fusing global relational, geometric, and local visual cues. This grounds the Agentic Reasoning Module to verify task feasibility and decide whether to answer or explore, while the Geo-Sem Exploration Module guides the agent toward semantically relevant frontiers when further information is required.

maximizing efficiency requires the agent to recall previously explored areas to accelerate subsequent goals, rather than re-exploring the environment. SSPL rewards agents that achieve complete sequential success ($SR_e = 1$) while conserving the global step budget S_e^{\max} :

$$SSPL = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{E}|} \sum_{e \in \mathcal{E}} \left(\mathbb{I}[SR_e = 1] \times \frac{S_e^{\max} - s_e}{S_e^{\max}} \right) \times 100\% \quad (3)$$

where s_e is the total steps taken in the episode. If an agent fails any subtask in the sequence, its SSPL for that episode is 0. A high SSPL indicates that the agent successfully leverages spatial history from earlier subtasks to minimize navigation cost in later stages. For the EQA task, we likewise replace the complete sequential success requirement with an episodic correctness score for evaluation.

4. Methodology

In this work, we present **3DSPMR** to address the core challenges of long-horizon memory retention and feasibility awareness in sequential embodied tasks through three integrated components, as illustrated in Figure 3.

4.1. Unified Spatial Memory

3DSPMR constructs a unified spatial memory integrating **global relational**, **local visual**, and **geometric** information. These three components operate cooperatively: the global memory provides symbolic structure, the local memory preserves fine-grained perceptual cues, and the geometric memory bridges them through FoV coverage relation.

Global and Local Memory. Globally, we represent the environment as a hierarchical 3D scene graph \mathcal{G} comprising *Apartment*, *Room*, and *Object* levels. Object nodes are maintained via ConceptGraphs [13], while Room nodes are derived from TSDF-based segmentation. Crucially, each room node tracks its FoV coverage (Cov):

$$Cov = \frac{|S_{FoV} \cap S_{Room}|}{|S_{Room}|}. \quad (4)$$

Here S_{Room} denotes room area and S_{FoV} the FoV coverage area. While this graph offers interpretable structure, it lacks detailed visual texture. To address this, we locally maintain a FoV coverage-based keyframe memory. To prevent memory exhaustion from redundant video frames, we employ a *novelty-driven selection strategy*. We evaluate the geometric novelty of each candidate view via raycasting:

$$\tau_{novel} = \frac{|S_{New} - S_{History}|}{|S_{New}|}, \quad \text{save if } \tau_{novel} > \tau_0. \quad (5)$$

An image is added to the memory bank \mathcal{I} only if its unique contribution τ_{novel} exceeds τ_0 (default 0.25). This mechanism ensures the agent retains a comprehensive visual history while maximizing memory efficiency.

Geometric Memory. Serving as the bridge between global and local representations, the geometric memory maintains a volumetric FoV coverage map \mathcal{C} over the TSDF space:

$$\mathcal{C}(x, y, z) = \begin{cases} 1, & (x, y, z) \in \Phi(p_t), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where $\Phi(p_t)$ denotes the visible region at pose p_t . This map accumulates coverage to establish bidirectional links between 2D keyframes and 3D graph nodes. This coupling provides dense perceptual grounding, which enables the MLLM to correct graph errors, perform appearance-aware reasoning, and compute room-level coverage metrics for efficient exploration.

Unified Spatial Memory. Together, these modules form a hierarchical spatial memory: the global graph \mathcal{G}_t encodes symbolic structure, the local keyframes \mathcal{I}_t provide perceptual grounding, and the geometric map \mathcal{C}_t ensures consistency. We summarize the unified memory update as:

$$\mathcal{M}_t = f_{3DSPMR}(\mathcal{G}_t, \mathcal{I}_t, \mathcal{C}_t), \quad (7)$$

where \mathcal{M}_t denotes the integrated 3D spatial memory at time t . Through this novel memory mechanism, 3DSPMR continuously collects, organizes, and fuses these heterogeneous




Figure 4. **Illustration for the Agentic Embodied Reasoning framework in 3DSPMR for the EQA task.** Fig. (a) shows how MLLM-based modules leverage the 3D scene graph and stored visual cues in spatial memory for reasoning, while Fig. (b) illustrates how the geometric examination mechanism utilizes FoV coverage information to determine task completion.

cues from explored regions, enabling MLLMs to reason more effectively about spatial layouts and scene relationships in sequential embodied settings.

4.2. Agentic Embodied Reasoning

In this section, we introduce an Agentic Embodied Reasoning framework that leverages the established 3D spatial memory. As shown in Fig. 4, the proposed framework consists of two components: an adaptive reasoning module for interpreting spatial information and a geometric examination mechanism for assessing task completion.

Adaptive Reasoning Module. MLLMs exhibit strong perception and reasoning abilities with texts and images input, making them highly effective for complex reasoning tasks. However, applying MLLMs to embodied tasks remains challenging due to their insufficient spatial understanding ability on 3D environments. As spatial memory stores complex 3D spatial information in structured contextual and visual forms, the remaining challenge is how to let

MLLM modules comprehensively process and integrate this diverse information for comprehensive and adaptive spatial reasoning. Building on this motivation, 3DSPMR integrates multiple MLLMs that hierarchically retrieve and process information from the spatial memory.

For the EQA task, 3DSPMR leverages four specialized MLLMs, each serving a distinct purpose: Question Analysis, Global Reasoning, Local Reasoning, and Question Answering. Question Analysis decomposes the query into hierarchical semantic levels and identifies the required information. Global Reasoning interprets high-level spatial knowledge such as room–object relationships from the complete 3D scene graph, retrieving relevant cues and missing information. Local Reasoning focuses on fine-grained visual cues within selected sub-scene graphs, examining object-level details and evidence from the selected images. Finally, Question Answering integrates global reasoning, local reasoning, and question analysis to judge answerability, provide the answer, and present evidence from the scene graph and images. Through this hierarchical reasoning process, the agent effectively exploits the spatial memory. However, the MLLM reasoning may produce incorrect answers or even hallucinations when they incorrectly assume the task can be solved with partial information. Moreover, they fail to evaluate task feasibility and decide when to stop, resulting in unnecessary or endless exploration.

Geometric Examination Mechanism To address these two deficiencies of the MLLM modules, we propose a geometric examination mechanism that quantifies the exploration degree, which measures how thoroughly a given area has been explored and further implies how much reliable information has been accumulated in the spatial memory. Compared with model-based confidence measures [30, 31], the geometric examination provides an unbiased and accurate reflection grounded in the actual exploration status. 3DSPMR adopts FoV coverage as an indicator of exploration progress. During agentic reasoning in EQA, the geometric examination mechanism takes the output from the Question Answering MLLM and the FoV coverage map stored in the spatial memory as inputs. If all relevant rooms have been sufficiently explored, the MLLM output is accepted; otherwise, the mechanism rejects it and instructs the agent to continue exploring until adequate information is gathered. For accepted cases, if the question has an answer, the agent outputs it as the final predicted answer. Otherwise, it then examines the exploration degree of irrelevant rooms to detect existence of any potentially unseen but relevant regions. If no potential new room remains, the question is labeled as unanswerable. Through FoV coverage checking, the geometric examination mechanism effectively prevents premature task completion, recognizes inexecutable tasks, and avoids endless revisiting of explored regions.

4.3. Geo-Sem Exploration

In Geo-Sem exploration, the agent leverages cached VLM semantic reasoning, geometric awareness, and frontier analysis to select the next best navigation target and iteratively refine its spatial understanding.

Frontier Detection and Representation. At each step, the TSDF-based occupancy map identifies *frontiers*—boundary regions between explored and unexplored free space. Each frontier node $i \in \mathcal{F}_t$ is characterized by its position x_i , orientation θ_i , and local coverage statistics such as room coverage $\text{Cov}(i)$ and FoV novelty $\tau_{\text{novel}}(i)$ (Eq. 5). These nodes are inserted into the hierarchical scene graph to maintain global consistency.

Multi-factor Frontier Scoring. To select an optimal navigation target, 3DSPMR combines three complementary factors—semantic relevance, geometric proximity, and exploration gain—into a unified composite score. For each frontier i , we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} s_t^{\text{vlm}}(i) &= r_t(i), \\ s_t^{\text{dist}}(i) &= \frac{1}{1 + \|x_i - x_t\|/d_{\max}}, \\ s_t^{\text{exp}}(i) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \text{Cov}(i) + \frac{U_t^{\text{cone}}(i)}{U_{\max}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $r_t(i)$ is the cached VLM semantic score, d_{\max} is the distance normalization constant, and $U_t^{\text{cone}}(i)$ denotes the number of unexplored voxels within a directional cone (computed via raycasting). The final composite score integrates these three factors as:

$$S_t(i) = w_{\text{vlm}} s_t^{\text{vlm}}(i) + w_{\text{dist}} s_t^{\text{dist}}(i) + w_{\text{exp}} s_t^{\text{exp}}(i), \quad (9)$$

with weighting coefficients ($w_{\text{vlm}}, w_{\text{dist}}, w_{\text{exp}}$) normalized to sum to 1. Higher scores correspond to frontiers that are semantically relevant, close in distance, and rich in unexplored regions.

Frontier Selection and Oscillation Prevention. The target frontier is selected by maximizing the composite score:

$$i^* = \arg \max_{i \in \mathcal{F}_t} S_t(i). \quad (10)$$

To prevent oscillation between similar frontiers, we apply a switching threshold δ that preserves the previously selected frontier i_{cur} unless a significantly better candidate appears:

$$\text{switch if } S_t(i^*) - S_t(i_{\text{cur}}) \geq \delta. \quad (11)$$

This stabilizes exploration behavior and avoids redundant back-and-forth movements.

Point Navigation Strategy. Once the frontier F_{i^*} is chosen, the agent navigates toward its location p_{i^*} using a shortest-path planner within the explored region. In practice, we employ the pathfinder from Habitat-Sim to compute such routes and to advance the agent by small steps at

Table 1. **Results on the active Embodied Question Answering (EQA) task.** We report Sequential Success Rate (SSR, %), Sequential SPL (SSPL, %), Success Rate (%), and SPL (%) on the SeqEmb benchmark.

Method	SSR \uparrow	SSPL \uparrow	SR \uparrow	SPL \uparrow
<i>Blind LLMs</i>				
Qwen3	0.9	\	21.4	\
GPT-5	0	\	16.8	\
<i>Open-Sourced Qwen2.5VL Exploration</i>				
3D-Mem	0	0	31.4	22.0
3DSPMR w/o Geo	3.8	3.5	39.4	28.9
3DSPMR (Ours)	5.5	4.9	44.1	35.1
<i>Close-Sourced GPT-5 Exploration</i>				
3D-Mem	4.5	2.0	35.9	32.7
3DSPMR w/o Geo	6.4	3.3	35.5	28.2
3DSPMR (Ours)	28.2	21.0	55.9	42.5

each simulation tick. After each navigation step, the system updates all memory modules: (1) scene graph and occupancy map, (2) frontier images, (3) room-node coverage, and (4) FoV memory analysis. The updated unified memory \mathcal{M}_{t+1} is then used for the next reasoning iteration. The loop continues until the task is deemed complete.

5. Experiment

5.1. Embodied Question Answering

Setup. We evaluate the agent’s ability to perform multi-step reasoning and active exploration to answer natural language questions in a sequential setting using the EQA track of SEER-Bench. Due to the time limit and high computational overhead of sequential simulation, we evaluate a representative subset of 12 out of 60 scenes, comprising 54 tasks in total. This subset preserves the diversity of question types (e.g., existence, counting, spatial relationships) and includes both answerable and unanswerable queries. Further details on the question distribution and scene selection are available in the supplementary material.

Baselines. We benchmark our approach against two distinct categories of methods: (1) **Blind LLMs:** We evaluate **Qwen3-14b** [38] and **GPT-5** [27] in a non-embodied setting, where the model attempts to answer based solely on linguistic priors without navigation. This serves as a lower bound to verify the necessity of exploration. (2) **Active Exploration Baselines:** We compare against **3D-Mem** [41], utilizing both **Qwen2.5-VL** [1] and **GPT-5** [27] as backbones, to assess the advantage of our unified geometric memory over standard visual-memory approaches. The quantitative results are summarized in Table 1.

Table 2. **Results on the Sequential Embodied Multi-modal Navigation (EMN) task.** We report Sequential Success Rate (SSR, %), Sequential SPL (SSPL, %), Success Rate (%), and SPL (%) on the SeqEmb benchmark.

Method	SSR \uparrow	SSPL \uparrow	SR \uparrow	SPL \uparrow
<i>GOAT-Bench Baselines</i>				
Modular GOAT	8.3	4.8	23.5	16.8
SenseAct-NN	0.0	0.0	9.7	7.5
<i>Open-Sourced Qwen2.5VL Exploration</i>				
3D-Mem	8.3	4.1	29.1	17.3
3DSPMR w/o Geo	16.7	5.9	49.5	43.8
3DSPMR (Ours)	33.3	15.6	58.6	49.3
<i>Close-Sourced GPT-5 Exploration</i>				
3D-Mem	16.7	6.2	42.1	30.2
3DSPMR w/o Geo	25.0	16.4	56.4	48.9
3DSPMR (Ours)	41.7	29.2	67.2	56.6

5.2. Embodied Multi-modal Navigation

Setup. We further evaluate the agent’s capability in handling sequential navigation tasks with diverse goal modalities (Object, Language, Image) on the EMN track of SEER-Bench. Using the same subset of 12 scenes as the EQA track, we evaluate 58 sequential tasks. This setup specifically challenges the agent’s robustness in identifying *in-feasible goals* (e.g., missing objects or impossible language descriptions) alongside standard navigation targets.

Baselines. We compare against three baselines: (1) **Modular GOAT [3]**: A zero-shot modular baseline without persistent memory; (2) **SenseAct-NN [18]**: A monolithic RL baseline trained for image-goal navigation; and (3) **3D-Mem [41]**: The state-of-the-art MLLM-based approach with ego-centric image memory. We evaluate MLLM methods using both Qwen2.5-VL [1] and GPT-5 [27] backbones. The quantitative results are presented in Table 2.

5.3. Discussion and Analysis

Analyzing the results across both EQA (Table 1) and EMN (Table 2) tracks reveals consistent trends regarding sequential reliability, geometric importance, and model robustness.

Superiority in Sequential Reasoning. A defining characteristic of SEER-Bench is the difficulty of maintaining performance over long task sequences. Standard baselines struggle significantly here: SenseAct-NN (in EMN) and 3D-Mem (with Qwen in EQA) achieve nearly 0% SSR and SSPL, indicating an inability to complete full episodes without failure. In contrast, 3DSPMR achieves substantial gains in Sequential SPL (e.g., reaching **21.0%** on EQA and **29.2%** on EMN with GPT-5). High SSPL scores directly correlate with **knowledge reuse**; our agent effectively re-

calls the geometric, local, and global memory of the environment from previous subtasks, allowing it to navigate directly to new targets without redundant re-exploration.

Critical Role of Geometric Memory. The ablation study (*3DSPMR w/o Geo*) highlights the necessity of our explicit geometric grounding. Across both tracks, removing the FoV coverage map and geometric examination leads to a sharp decline in sequential efficiency (e.g., SSPL drops by $\sim 13\%$ in EMN and $\sim 18\%$ in EQA). Without the “Geometric Examination” mechanism, MLLMs exhibit two failure modes: (1) **Premature Termination**, where the agent hallucinates an answer/success before fully exploring; and (2) **Endless Exploration**, where the agent moving back and forth in explored area instead of to explore more unknown area exhausts the step budget. 3DSPMR’s geometric awareness effectively curbs both behaviors and boosts both accuracy and efficiency.

Model-Agnostic Effectiveness. Our framework provides structural improvements that are independent of the underlying foundation model. Even when using the smaller, open-sourced Qwen2.5-VL, 3DSPMR consistently outperforms the purely visual 3D-Mem baseline (e.g., **+29.5%** SR in EMN). This confirms that while stronger backbones (like GPT-5) improve absolute performance, the core advantage of 3DSPMR lies in its *unified memory architecture* and *agentic reasoning workflow*, which bridge the spatial understanding gap inherent in current MLLMs.

Memory Efficiency of FoV Image Memory. Beyond reasoning improvements, our FoV coverage-based keyframe selection strategy results in a highly efficient and compact memory system. 3DSPMR stores substantially fewer images than 3D-Mem, which retains all observations indiscriminately. Specifically, our method reduces the image memory cost by **31.41%** for SeqEQA and **16.42%** for SeqEMN. This reduction stems from our novelty-driven selection mechanism, which actively filters out redundant views to ensure the visual memory remains compact without sacrificing information density—a critical attribute for preventing memory exhaustion in long-horizon deployment.

6. Conclusion

We introduced **SEER-Bench** to rigorously and comprehensively evaluate embodied agents on sequential, feasibility-aware tasks. To address these challenges, we proposed **3DSPMR**, an approach that augments MLLMs with a unified 3D spatial memory integrating explicit geometric FoV coverage. This geometric grounding effectively enhances spatial reasoning and optimizes exploration efficiency. Experiments demonstrate that 3DSPMR achieves state-of-the-art performance in sequential embodied tasks, delivering superior correctness and efficiency. Future work will focus on extending this approach to dynamic environments and facilitating sim-to-real transfer.

References

- [1] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, et al. Qwen2. 5-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923*, 2025. 7, 8, 12
- [2] Dhruv Batra, Aaron Gokaslan, Aniruddha Kembhavi, Oleksandr Maksymets, Roozbeh Mottaghi, Manolis Savva, Alexander Toshev, and Erik Wijmans. Objectnav revisited: On evaluation of embodied agents navigating to objects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.13171*, 2020. 2
- [3] Matthew Chang, Theophile Gervet, Mukul Khanna, Sriram Yenamandra, Dhruv Shah, So Yeon Min, Kavitha Shah, Chris Paxton, Saurabh Gupta, Dhruv Batra, et al. Goat: Go to any thing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.06430*, 2023. 3, 8
- [4] Shiqi Chen, Tongyao Zhu, Ruochen Zhou, Jinghan Zhang, Siyang Gao, Juan Carlos Niebles, Mor Geva, Junxian He, Jiajun Wu, and Manling Li. Why is spatial reasoning hard for vlms? an attention mechanism perspective on focus areas. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.01773*, 2025. 2, 3
- [5] Tianheng Cheng, Lin Song, Yixiao Ge, Wenyu Liu, Xingang Wang, and Ying Shan. Yolo-world: Real-time open-vocabulary object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 16901–16911, 2024. 12
- [6] Gheorghe Comanici, Eric Bieber, Mike Schaekermann, Ice Pasupat, Naveen Sachdeva, Inderjit Dhillon, Marcel Blstein, 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
- [7] Ronghao Dang, Yuqian Yuan, Wenqi Zhang, Yifei Xin, Boqiang Zhang, Long Li, Liuyi Wang, Qinyang Zeng, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. Ecbench: Can multi-modal foundation models understand the egocentric world? a holistic embodied cognition benchmark. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 24593–24602, 2025. 2
- [8] Abhishek Das, Samyak Datta, Georgia Gkioxari, Stefan Lee, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. Embodied question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1–10, 2018. 2, 3
- [9] Matt Deitke, Winson Han, Alvaro Herrasti, Aniruddha Kembhavi, Eric Kolve, Roozbeh Mottaghi, Jordi Salvador, Dustin Schwenk, Eli VanderBilt, Matthew Wallingford, et al. Robothor: An open simulation-to-real embodied ai platform. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3164–3174, 2020. 2, 3
- [10] Yi Du, Taimeng Fu, Zhuoqun Chen, Bowen Li, Shaoshu Su, Zhipeng Zhao, and Chen Wang. Vl-nav: Real-time vision-language navigation with spatial reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.00931*, 2025. 3
- [11] Dylan Goetting, Himanshu Gaurav Singh, and Antonio Loquercio. End-to-end navigation with vision-language models: Transforming spatial reasoning into question-answering. In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025. PMLR. 3
- [12] Daniel Gordon, Aniruddha Kembhavi, Mohammad Rastegari, Joseph Redmon, Dieter Fox, and Ali Farhadi. Iqa: Visual question answering in interactive environments. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2018. 2
- [13] Qiao Gu, Ali Kuwajerwala, Sacha Morin, Krishna Murthy Jatavallabhula, Bipasha Sen, Aditya Agarwal, Corban Rivera, William Paul, Kirsty Ellis, Rama Chellappa, et al. Conceptgraphs: Open-vocabulary 3d scene graphs for perception and planning. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 5021–5028. IEEE, 2024. 3, 5, 12
- [14] Nathan Hughes, Yun Chang, and Luca Carlone. Hydra: A real-time spatial perception system for 3d scene graph construction and optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.13360*, 2022.
- [15] Nathan Hughes, Yun Chang, Siyi Hu, Rajat Talak, Rumaia Abdulhai, Jared Strader, and Luca Carlone. Foundations of spatial perception for robotics: Hierarchical representations and real-time systems. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 43(10):1457–1505, 2024. 3
- [16] Aaron Hurst et al. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*, 2024. 2, 3
- [17] Kaixuan Jiang, Yang Liu, Weixing Chen, Jingzhou Luo, Ziliang Chen, Ling Pan, Guanbin Li, and Liang Lin. Beyond the destination: A novel benchmark for exploration-aware embodied question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.11117*, 2025. 2, 3, 4
- [18] Mukul Khanna, Ram Ramrakhya, Gunjan Chhablani, Sriram Yenamandra, Theophile Gervet, Matthew Chang, Zsolt Kira, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Dhruv Batra, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. Goat-bench: A benchmark for multi-modal lifelong navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 16373–16383, 2024. 2, 4, 8, 12
- [19] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, et al. Segment anything. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 4015–4026, 2023. 12
- [20] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Dong Guo, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Yanwei Li, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-onevision: Easy visual task transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03326*, 2024. 3
- [21] Xiongkun Linghu, Jiangyong Huang, Xuesong Niu, Xiaojian Shawn Ma, Baoxiong Jia, and Siyuan Huang. Multi-modal situated reasoning in 3d scenes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:140903–140936, 2024. 2
- [22] R. Liu et al. Volumetric environment representation for vision-language navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024. 3
- [23] Siyuan Liu, Yuhang Wu, Lin Li, et al. Llava-plus: Learning to use tools for creating multimodal agents. In *ECCV*, 2024. 3
- [24] Yuxing Long, Wenzhe Cai, Hongcheng Wang, Guanqi Zhan, and Hao Dong. Instructnav: Zero-shot system for generic

- instruction navigation in unexplored environment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04882*, 2024. 2
- [25] Arjun Majumdar, Karmesh Yadav, Judy Hoffman, Dhruv Batra, Devi Parikh, Abhishek Das, Ayush Jain, Vedanuj Goswami, et al. Openeqa: Embodied question answering in the era of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12086*, 2024. 2, 3, 4
- [26] Yao Mu, Qinglong Zhang, Mengkang Hu, Wenhai Wang, Mingyu Ding, Jun Jin, Bin Wang, Jifeng Dai, Yu Qiao, and Ping Luo. Embodiedgpt: Vision-language pre-training via embodied chain of thought. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15021*, 2023. 3
- [27] OpenAI. Gpt-5 technical overview. <https://openai.com>, 2025. 4, 7, 8, 12, 14
- [28] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, and et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.00020*, 2021. 12
- [29] Krishan Rana, Jesse Haviland, Sourav Garg, Jad Abou-Chakra, Ian Reid, and Niko Suenderhauf. Sayplan: Grounding large language models using 3d scene graphs for scalable robot task planning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.06135*, 2023. 3
- [30] Allen Z Ren, Jaden Clark, Anushri Dixit, Masha Itkina, Anirudha Majumdar, and Dorsa Sadigh. Explore until confident: Efficient exploration for embodied question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15941*, 2024. 2, 3, 6
- [31] Saumya Saxena, Blake Buchanan, Chris Paxton, Bingqing Chen, Narunas Vaskevicius, Luigi Palmieri, Jonathan Francis, and Oliver Kroemer. Grapheqa: Using 3d semantic scene graphs for real-time embodied question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.14480*, 2024. 2, 3, 6
- [32] Xinshuai Song, Weixing Chen, Yang Liu, Vincent Chan, Guanbin Li, and Liang Lin. Towards long-horizon vision-language navigation: Platform, benchmark and method. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2025. 2, 3
- [33] Andrew Szot, Alexander Clegg, Eric Undersander, Erik Wijmans, Yili Zhao, John Turner, Noah Maestre, Mustafa Mukadam, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Oleksandr Maksymets, et al. Habitat 2.0: Training home assistants to rearrange their habitat. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 34:251–266, 2021. 3, 4
- [34] Peng Wang et al. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s visual perception and generative capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*, 2024. 3
- [35] Abdelrhman Werby, Chenguang Huang, Martin Büchner, Abhinav Valada, and Wolfram Burgard. Hierarchical open-vocabulary 3d scene graphs for language-grounded robot navigation. In *Robotics: Science and Systems (RSS)*, 2024. 3
- [36] Erik Wijmans, Samyak Datta, Oleksandr Maksymets, Abhishek Das, Georgia Gkioxari, Stefan Lee, Irfan Essa, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. Embodied question answering in photorealistic environments with point cloud perception. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6659–6668, 2019. 2
- [37] Karmesh Yadav, Ram Ramrakhya, Santhosh Kumar Ramakrishnan, Theo Gervet, John Turner, Aaron Gokaslan, Noah Maestre, Angel Xuan Chang, Dhruv Batra, Manolis Savva, et al. Habitat-matterport 3d semantics dataset. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4927–4936, 2023. 3, 4, 14
- [38] An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, et al. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*, 2025. 7
- [39] Jihan Yang, Shusheng Yang, Anjali W Gupta, Rilyn Han, Li Fei-Fei, and Saining Xie. Thinking in space: How multimodal large language models see, remember, and recall spaces. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 10632–10643, 2025. 2, 3
- [40] Yijun Yang, Tianyi Zhou, Kanxue Li, Dapeng Tao, Lusong Li, Li Shen, Xiaodong He, Jing Jiang, and Yuhui Shi. Embodied multi-modal agent trained by an llm from a parallel textworld. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024. 3
- [41] Yuncong Yang, Han Yang, Jiachen Zhou, Peihao Chen, Hongxin Zhang, Yilun Du, and Chuang Gan. 3d-mem: 3d scene memory for embodied exploration and reasoning. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 17294–17303, 2025. 2, 3, 7, 8, 12
- [42] Hang Yin, Xiuwei Xu, Zhenyu Wu, Jie Zhou, and Jiwen Lu. Sg-nav: Online 3d scene graph prompting for llm-based zero-shot object navigation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 37:5285–5307, 2024. 2, 3
- [43] Hang Yin, Xiuwei Xu, Linqing Zhao, Ziwei Wang, Jie Zhou, and Jiwen Lu. Unigoal: Towards universal zero-shot goal-oriented navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2025. 3
- [44] Naoki Yokoyama, Ram Ramrakhya, Abhishek Das, Dhruv Batra, and Sehoon Ha. Hm3d-ovon: A dataset and benchmark for open-vocabulary object goal navigation. In *2024 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 5543–5550. IEEE, 2024. 2
- [45] Licheng Yu, Xinlei Chen, Georgia Gkioxari, Mohit Bansal, Tamara L Berg, and Dhruv Batra. Multi-target embodied question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6309–6318, 2019. 2
- [46] Jiazhao Zhang, Liu Dai, Fanpeng Meng, Qingnan Fan, Xuelin Chen, Kai Xu, and He Wang. 3d-aware object goal navigation via simultaneous exploration and identification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6672–6682, 2023. 2
- [47] Yong Zhao, Kai Xu, Zhengqiu Zhu, Yue Hu, Zhiheng Zheng, Yingfeng Chen, Yatai Ji, Chen Gao, Yong Li, and Jincai Huang. Cityeqa: A hierarchical llm agent on embodied question answering benchmark in city space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.12532*, 2025. 2
- [48] Duo Zheng, Shijia Huang, Lin Zhao, Yiwu Zhong, and Liwei Wang. Towards learning a generalist model for embodied navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024. 3
- [49] Gengze Zhou, Yicong Hong, and Qi Wu. Navgpt: Explicit reasoning in vision-and-language navigation with large lan-

- guage models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 7641–7649, 2024. [2](#)
- [50] Brianna Zitkovich, Anthony Brohan, Noah Brown, Justice Carbajal, Yevgen Chebotar, Xi Chen, et al. Rt-2: Vision-language-action models transfer web knowledge to robotic control. In *Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*, 2023. PMLR. [3](#)

Vision to Geometry: 3D Spatial Memory for Sequential Embodied MLLM Reasoning and Exploration

Supplementary Material




Figure 5. Data statistics of the EMN track in SEER-Bench and infeasible goal examples.

A. Details of the Benchmark

The Embodied Multi-modal Navigation (EMN) track in SEER-Bench builds upon GOAT-Bench [18], extending it into a sequential and feasibility-aware setting. For each scene, we generate five sequential episodes, each containing 5–10 subtasks (goals). Within an episode, the agent must complete each navigation goal sequentially, reusing spatial knowledge accumulated from previous subtasks.

Each subtask specifies a target using one of three modalities: *object goal*, *language goal*, or *image goal*. To evaluate feasibility awareness, we introduce three corresponding types of infeasible goals:

- **Object-Goal Infeasibility (Incorrect Location).** Following the EQA setup, we designate target object categories that do *not* exist in the scene. The agent must determine that the goal is impossible after sufficient exploration and terminate appropriately.
- **Language-Goal Infeasibility (Incorrect Description).** We modify original GOAT-Bench language instructions by altering key attributes or spatial relations. For example, an instruction such as “the white surfboard near a plant and TV” may be changed to “the black surfboard near a bed and oven,” producing a linguistically coherent but environmentally impossible goal.
- **Image-Goal Infeasibility (Cross-Scene Images).** We use an image query taken from a different HM3DSem scene than the current episode. For instance, an exemplar from Scene A is provided for a navigation task in Scene B, making the visual reference unmatchable within the environment.

As summarized in Figure 5, the EMN track contains a total of 2,669 multi-modal goals. The right side of the figure

illustrates example cases for each of the three infeasible goal types.

B. Implementation Details

B.1. Subtask Step Limit and Episode Step Limit

As discussed in the benchmark description in the main paper, SEER-Bench includes *small*, *large*, and *extra-large* indoor scenes. For the EQA track, we set the subtask step limits for these three scene sizes to 50, 200, and 320 steps, respectively. The *episode step limit* is defined as twice the corresponding subtask limit. These limits approximate the number of steps required to fully explore each scene size using a closest-frontier exploration policy, ensuring adequate spatial coverage while preventing unnecessarily long trajectories. For the EMN track, we extend the step-limit strategy used in GOAT-Bench [18]. Specifically, we use Habitat’s scene-loading utilities to obtain the spatial extent of each environment, assign a size-dependent local step limit, and again set the episode limit to two times the subtask budget. For both the EQA and EMN tracks, exceeding the subtask step limit results in a failure for that subtask. If the episode step limit is exceeded, the current subtask and all remaining subtasks in the episode are marked as failed.

B.2. Models and System Components

We use Qwen2.5-VL (72B) [1] as our open-source VLM backbone and GPT-5 [27] as the closed-source backbone. To construct and maintain object-level nodes in the 3D scene graph, we follow the default initialization pipeline of ConceptGraphs [13], which loads the following perception models: YOLO-World [5] for open-vocabulary object detection, SAM (Segment Anything Model) [19] for instance segmentation, CLIP [28] for visual embedding and category grounding. These components collectively provide reliable open-vocabulary detection, segmentation, and feature embedding, enabling robust and consistent object-node creation and updates throughout exploration.

C. More Results

To further validate the robustness and generalizability of our approach, we additionally evaluate both 3DSPMR and 3D-Mem [41] on another set of 12 more scenarios for both the EQA and EMN tracks. As shown in Tables 3 and 4, the performance trends remain consistent with those reported in the main paper: 3DSPMR continues to outperform 3D-Mem across all sequential metrics, particularly in Sequen-

Table 3. **Results on the active Embodied Question Answering (EQA) task.** We report Sequential Success Rate (SSR, %), Sequential SPL (SSPL, %), Success Rate (%), and SPL (%) on the SeqEmb benchmark.

Method	SSR \uparrow	SSPL \uparrow	SR \uparrow	SPL \uparrow
<i>Blind LLMs</i>				
Qwen3	0	\	18.3	\
GPT-5	0	\	17.5	\
<i>Open-Sourced Qwen2.5VL Exploration</i>				
3D-Mem	0	0	29.6	18.7
3DSPMR (Ours)	5.8	5.4	44.2	37.6

Table 4. **Results on the Sequential Embodied Multi-modal Navigation (EMN) task.** We report Sequential Success Rate (SSR, %), Sequential SPL (SSPL, %), Success Rate (%), and SPL (%) on the SeqEmb benchmark.

Method	SSR \uparrow	SSPL \uparrow	SR \uparrow	SPL \uparrow
<i>GOAT-Bench Baselines</i>				
Modular GOAT	8.3	4.2	21.6	15.8
SenseAct-NN	0.0	0.0	9.5	7.2
<i>Open-Sourced Qwen2.5VL Exploration</i>				
3D-Mem	8.3	5.4	38.9	25.2
3DSPMR (Ours)	33.3	14.9	56.5	46.8

tial Success Rate (SSR) and Sequential SPL (SSPL). These results confirm that our unified spatial memory and geometric reasoning mechanisms reliably extend to new scenes and maintain strong sequential reasoning and exploration efficiency.

D. Examples and Visualizations

D.1. Trajectory Comparison Between 3D-Mem and 3DSPMR on Sequential Tasks

Figures 7 and 8 provide qualitative comparisons of exploration behavior in sequential tasks. In the rightmost columns, the blue regions denote areas covered by FoV keyframes stored in memory, while the green regions correspond to frontier regions explored during the episode (the overlapped area looks like light blue). When trajectories are normalized to the same number of steps, 3DSPMR consistently covers a larger portion of previously unseen space, whereas 3D-Mem frequently revisits already-explored regions and exhibits oscillatory back-and-forth movements. These results highlight the advantages of our unified spatial memory and geometric reasoning in enabling efficient, non-redundant exploration across sequential subtasks.




Figure 6. Image memory cost comparison between our method and 3D-Mem.

D.2. Details of Image Memory Efficiency

Unlike 3D-Mem, which stores all observed frames indiscriminately, 3DSPMR stores only views that provide sufficient geometric novelty. As shown in Figure 6, 3DSPMR reduces image memory usage by 31.41% on SeqEQA and 16.42% on SeqEMN. These values are computed by first calculating a memory ratio for each episode:

$$\text{ratio}_{\text{episode}} = \frac{\# \text{ images stored by 3DSPMR}}{\# \text{ images stored by 3D-Mem}}, \quad (12)$$

and then averaging these per-episode ratios across all episodes. Since 3D-Mem stores every observed frame, its ratio is always 1.0 by definition. This reduction arises from our novelty-driven FoV selection mechanism, which removes redundant observations while retaining essential visual information—an important capability for avoiding memory saturation in long-horizon sequential tasks.

D.3. Comparison of Feasible and Infeasible Sub-Tasks

In real-world scenarios, certain sub-tasks within a sequential embodied task may be inherently infeasible—for example, searching for a non-existent object or answering a question that refers to a room that does not exist. In this section, we examine how the proposed 3DSPMR behaves on infeasible sub-tasks, providing fine-grained comparisons against their corresponding feasible counterparts through several concrete examples. Specifically, we present three pairs of feasible and infeasible tasks from the EQA track of SEER-Bench in Figures 9, 10, and 11, assuming a single sub-task in each example for clarity.

Feasible vs. Infeasible Task: Incorrect Attribute. In Figure 9, we select a single environment and construct a comparison by modifying the object attribute in the question

to an incorrect description. Under the same environment and initial position, 3DSPMR successfully locates the referenced object and answers correctly when the attribute is accurate. When the attribute is incorrect, 3DSPMR identifies the mismatch, determines that the task is infeasible, and terminates further exploration.

Feasible vs. Infeasible Task: Object not Present. In Figure 10, we select two different environments, one containing a Christmas tree and the other not. The proposed 3DSPMR adapts to both settings and responds correctly to the same question in each case. When a Christmas Tree is present, 3DSPMR locates it and answers accurately; when it is absent, 3DSPMR identifies the missing object, determines that the task is infeasible, and terminates further exploration.

Feasible vs. Infeasible Task: Room not Present. In Figure 11, we select two different environments, one containing bedrooms and the other not. We apply the same question to both settings and ensure that the referenced object (a lamp, in this example) exists in both environments. For infeasible tasks caused by the absence of the target room, 3DSPMR still adapts appropriately to each case. In the feasible environment, 3DSPMR locates the referenced lamp within the actual bedroom and answers correctly. In the infeasible environment, although it detects lamps, it realizes that they are located in the living room rather than the target bedroom. After exploring all potentially relevant areas, 3DSPMR concludes that the bedroom is absent, identifies the task as infeasible, and halts further exploration.

E. Prompts for Data Annotation

In this section, we present the prompts used for the Multi-Modal Large Language Models (MLLMs). We introduce the annotation procedure for the EQA track of SEER-Bench, conducted using GPT-5 [27]. For most sequential Question–Answering (QA) annotations, we employ the prompts illustrated in Figure 12 and Figure 13. To enrich the dataset with objects and rooms that do not typically appear in HM3DSem [37], we further use GPT-5 to generate two categories of unanswerable questions (Object Not Present and Room Not Present) using the prompts shown in Figure 14 and Figure 15.

● Start Position
 ● Ours End Position
 ● 3D-Mem End Position
 — Ours Trajectory
 — 3D-Mem Trajectory

Subtask 1:

Question Type: Object not Present, Feasible: False

Q: 'What is the shape of the mirror on the dresser located in the laundry?'

A: 'I don't know, there is no dresser in the hallway; it's inside the bedroom.'

Subtask 2:

Question Type: Global Counting, Feasible: True

Q: 'How many mirrors are in all the bedrooms?'

A: 'One.'

Subtask 3:


Question Type: Object not Present, Feasible: False

Q: 'Along which path would I reach my candle left on the wooden shelf beyond shelving bay two and beside the inspection table in the boxing ring?'

A: 'I don't know, there is no boxing ring in the apartment.'

Subtask ...

Scene-00155



Subtask 1:

Global Counting, Feasible: True

Q: 'How many different colors of rugs are present in all the bathrooms?'

A: '3.'

Subtask 2:

Question Type: Incorrect Attribute, Feasible: False

Q: 'What is behind the pink tissue box on the nightstand in my bedroom with the blue rug??'

A: 'I don't know, there is no pink tissue box on the nightstand, only a beige one.'

Subtask 3:



Question Type: Object not Present, Feasible: False

Q: 'What color is the tank beside the sofa?'

A: 'I don't know, there is no tank in the apartment.'

Subtask ...

Scene-00255



Subtask 1:

Question Type: Functional Reasoning, Feasible: True

Q: 'Is the glass on the back door in my kitchen frosted?'

A: 'Yes, it is frosted.'

Subtask 2:

Question Type: Object not Present, Feasible: False

Q: 'On which side are the dirty bowls placed in the sink next to the fireplace in my living room?'

A: 'I don't know, there is no sink in the living room, only a fireplace.'

Subtask 3:

Question Type: Spatial Reasoning, Feasible: True

Q: 'Where is the radiator in my living room?'

A: 'Directly beneath the bay window ledge.'

Subtask ...

Scene-00848




Figure 7. **Comparative Navigation Trajectories for Sequential EQA Tasks within One Episode.** The figure presents the results for three distinct scenes, with each row corresponding to a different scene and its sequential subtasks (Left). The middle column shows the 3D map of the scene. The right column compares the navigation trajectories (normalized to the same step numbers) generated by our Proposed Method (yellow line) and the 3D-Mem Baseline (red line).

● Start Position
 ● Ours End Position
 ● 3D-Mem End Position
 — Ours Trajectory
 — 3D-Mem Trajectory

Subtask 1: Goal Type: object, Feasible: True

'Can you find the plant?'

Subtask 2: Goal Type: description, Feasible: True


"Could you find the object exactly described as the 'refrigerator located to the left of the cabinet.'?"

Subtask 3: Goal Type: object, Feasible: True

'Can you find the surfboard?'

Subtask ...

Scene-00813



Subtask 1: Goal Type: description, Feasible: False

"Could you find the object exactly described as the 'treadmill'?"

Subtask 2: Goal Type: image, Feasible: True





Subtask 3: Type: object, Feasible: True

'Can you find the picture?'

Subtask ...

Scene-00894



Subtask 1: Goal Type: object, Feasible: False

'Can you find the unicorn statue?'

Subtask 2: Goal Type: description, Feasible: True

"Could you find the object exactly described as the 'microwave on the kitchen shelf, which is located to the left of the kettle and below the coffee machine. the microwave is made of stainless steel.'?"

Subtask 3: Goal Type: image, Feasible: False



Subtask ...

Scene-00891





Figure 8. **Comparative Navigation Trajectories for Sequential EMN Tasks within One Episode.** The figure presents the results for three distinct scenes, with each row corresponding to a different scene and its sequential subtasks (Left). The middle column shows the 3D map of the scene. The right column compares the navigation trajectories (normalized to the same step numbers) generated by our Proposed Method (yellow line) and the 3D-Mem Baseline (red line).

Feasible vs. Infeasible Task Incorrect Attribute

● Start Position ● End Position — Trajectory



Scene-00824



Question:

What object is beside the **red towel** on the rack in the bathroom?

Annotated Answer:

I don't know, there is no red towel on the rack in that bathroom.

Feasible:

No

Question Type:

Incorrect Attribute

Scene-00824

Reasoning:


The **image reasoning** does not provide a clear view of any object beside the turquoise towel on a rack in any bathroom. The **scene graph** lacks confirmation of a turquoise towel or a rack in the bathrooms. **Question can not be answered after sufficient FoV coverage!**

Predicted Answer:

I don't know, there is no mentioned object or area in this apartment. ✓

Feasible:

No



Question:

What object is beside the **turquoise towel** on the rack in the bathroom?

Annotated Answer:

A toilet paper holder.

Feasible:

Yes

Question Type:

Object

Scene-00824

Reasoning:

In bathroom_1, a **turquoise towel** hangs on a wall rack below the window, and immediately to its right on the same wall is a metallic toilet paper holder. The **scene graph** confirms towels are present in this bathroom.

Predicted Answer:

A toilet paper holder. ✓

Feasible:

Yes





Figure 9. **Feasible vs. Infeasible Task: Incorrect Attribute.** This figure illustrates 3DSPMR's reasoning and exploration process on two EQA sub-tasks: one feasible and one infeasible due to an incorrect object attribute. In the feasible case, 3DSPMR locates the referenced object and answers correctly. In the infeasible case, it detects the attribute mismatch, determines the task is infeasible, and halts further exploration.

Feasible vs. Infeasible Task Object not Present

● Start Position ● End Position — Trajectory



Scene-00255



Scene-00848



Question:
Where did I set up my **Christmas tree** in the living room?

Annotated Answer:
I don't know, there is no Christmas tree in the apartment.

Feasible:
No

Question Type:
Object not Present


Scene-00255

Reasoning:
There is **no visible Christmas tree** or any decorations indicating its presence in the combined living room and dining room. The **scene graph** does not provide information about the location of a Christmas tree.

Question can not be answered after sufficient FoV coverage!

Predicted Answer:
I don't know, there is no mentioned object or area in this apartment. ✓

Feasible:
No



Question:
Where did I set up my **Christmas tree** in the living room?

Annotated Answer:
Next to the fireplace by the large window.

Feasible:
Yes

Question Type:
Location

Scene-00848

Reasoning:
The **image reasoning** confirms the presence of a Christmas tree near the fireplace in a room resembling a living room with a sofa, TV, and coffee table. The **scene graph**'s label for this room as 'bathroom_1' is likely a misclassification, as the objects present align with a living room setting.

Predicted Answer:
You set up your Christmas tree near the fireplace in the living room ✓

Feasible:
Yes




Figure 10. **Feasible vs. Infeasible Task: Object not Present.** This figure illustrates 3DSPMR's reasoning and exploration process on two EQA sub-tasks: one feasible and one infeasible due to the absence of the mentioned object *Christmas Tree*. In the feasible case, 3DSPMR locates *Christmas Tree* and answers correctly. In the infeasible case, it identifies the *Christmas Tree*'s absence, determines that the task is infeasible, and terminates further exploration.

Feasible vs. Infeasible Task Room not Present

● Start Position ● End Position — Trajectory



Question:
Where is the lamp in my **bedroom**?

Annotated Answer:
I don't know, there is no bedroom in the apartment.

Feasible:
No


Question Type:
Room not Present

Scene-00164

Reasoning:
The **scene graph** and **image reasoning** do **not** provide any **evidence of a bedroom** or a lamp within a bedroom. The living room contains multiple lamps, but none are confirmed to be in a bedroom.
Question can not be answered after sufficient FoV coverage!

Predicted Answer:
I don't know, there is no mentioned object or area in this apartment. ✓

Feasible:
No



Question:
Where is the lamp in my **bedroom**?

Annotated Answer:
On the nightstand beside the bed, next to the bathroom door.

Feasible:
Yes

Question Type:
Location

Scene-00166

Reasoning:
Bedroom_1 is known to contain two lamps, and the **images** show one on the nightstand beside the bed and another on the dresser by the window.

Predicted Answer:
There are two: one lit table lamp is on the round nightstand to the right of the bed near the door, and another lamp sits on the dresser in front of the window at the far end of the room. ✓

Feasible:
Yes




Figure 11. **Feasible vs. Infeasible Task: Room not Present.** This figure illustrates 3DSPMR’s reasoning and exploration process on two EQA sub-tasks: one feasible and one infeasible due to the absence of the mentioned room *bedroom*. In the feasible case, 3DSPMR locates the referenced lamp within the actual *bedroom* and answers correctly. In the infeasible case, although it detects lamps, it finds that they are located in the living room rather than the targeted *bedroom*. After exploring all potentially relevant areas, 3DSPMR concludes that the *bedroom* is absent, identifies the task as infeasible, and halts further exploration.

System Persona:

You are an **EQA-Generator**, an AI expert in computer vision and embodied robotics. Your task is to generate high-quality, spatially grounded **question-answer (QA)** pairs from a sequence of visual frames and a room layout.

Primary Objective:

Given a **room layout** and **video frame sequence** of a home environment, generate **12 diverse QA pairs** in **valid JSON array** format.

User's Perspective: Frame questions as if a homeowner ("I," "my") is asking their home robot for help.

Question Categories:

Category Coverage (total=12):

- Object Recognition: 1
 - Object Attributes: 1
 - Object Status: 1
 - Object Location: 1
 - Spatial Reasoning: 2
 - Functional Reasoning: 2
 - Local Counting: 1 (cover local counting in each room)
 - Unanswerable: 3 (cover at least two distinct subtypes)
- Generate questions from the following categories.

-Object Recognition: Questions about object identification.

Example Question: "What is the gray object I put on the bed in my bedroom?"

Example Answer: "It's a hat."

-Object Attributes: Questions about object attributes (color, material).

Example Question: "Is the floor in the bedroom wooden?"

Example Answer: "Yes, it is made of wood."

-Object Status: Questions about object status (on/off, open/closed).

Example Question: "Is the light on in the kitchen?"

Example Answer: "No, the kitchen light is off."

-Object Location: Questions about an object's location or its spatial relationship to other objects.

Example Question: "Where did I leave my coffee mug?"

Example Answer: "It's on the small table next to the sofa in the living room."

-Spatial Reasoning: Questions requiring inference about space, capacity.

Example Question: "Is there enough space on the bookshelf for another book?"

Example Answer: "Yes, there is room on the top shelf."

-Functional Reasoning: Questions based on what an object can be used for (its function or affordance).

Example Question: "Where can I hang up my coat?"

Example Answer: "On the hook by the front door."

-Local Counting: Questions that count the object number in one single room.

Example Question: "How many couch pillows are there in the living room?"

Example Answer: "Five."

Figure 12. **Prompt for QA annotation I.**

-Unanswerable: Plausible-sounding questions that are impossible to answer based on the visual evidence.

Subtypes:

Object Not Present:

Example Question: "What color is the rocket?"

Example Answer: "I don't know, there is no rocket."

Incorrect Location:

Example Question: "What is beside the microwave in the bedroom?"

Example Answer: "I don't know, there is no microwave in the bedroom."

Incorrect Attribute:

Example Question: "What is to the left of the blue pillow on the couch in the living room?"

Example Answer: "I don't know, there are no blue pillows on the couch, only red ones."

Room Not Present :

Example Question: "How are the chairs set up in the meeting room?"

Example Answer: "I don't know, there is no meeting room in this apartment."

Hard Constraints:

- 1) Embodiment: Each question must require navigation/exploration or multi-step spatial reasoning (not solvable by a single static close-up with no context).
Do not ask questions that don't require spatial or agent-centric reasoning (e.g., "What is the color of the wall?", "What brand is the laptop?", "What is the distance between the Earth and the Moon?").
- 2) Visual Grounding: Use the layout to anchor rooms/adjacency. For answerable items, the answer **MUST** be verifiable from the provided frames.
- 3) Evidence Frames:
 - "frame_index" must be an integer or a array of provided GLOBAL indices.
 - Only use indices that were explicitly listed with the frames in this request.
- 4) Unambiguous Wording: Avoid vague pronouns and subjective adjectives; anchor locations (e.g., "in the living room").
NO Ambiguous Questions: The question must have one clear, verifiable answer (e.g., AVOID "What's that interesting thing in the corner?").
NO Navigation Question in Spatial Reasoning, (e.g., AVOID "How do I get from the entry hallway console to the dining table?")
- 5) Answer Format:
 - Counting answers must be numeric strings (e.g., "3").
 - Unanswerable answers must start with: "I don't know, ..." and state the reason (not present / wrong location / wrong attribute).
- 6) User's Perspective: homeowner voice ("I", "my"). No agent-relative pose questions (e.g., "to my left").

Subtype Rules:

- If the chosen type has subtypes, set "subtype" accordingly; otherwise repeat the type.

Output Specification

Your output must be a single, valid JSON array. Each object in the array represents one QA pair and must contain exactly four keys:

frame_index: Integer or Array of Integers. The frame number(s) where the answer can be verified.

question: String. The embodied question.

answer: String. A concise and direct answer.

question_type: String. Must be one of: Object Recognition, Object Attributes, Object Status, Object Location, Spatial Reasoning, Functional Reasoning, Local Counting, Unanswerable

subtype: String. If the question type has subtypes, provide the subtype. Otherwise, use question_type.

Now, analyze the provided frames and generate 12 embodied question-answer pairs in the specified JSON format. Do not include any other text or explanations in your response.

Figure 13. **Prompt for QA annotation II.**

You are EQA-Generator, an expert in Embodied Question Answering (EQA) for computer vision and robotics. Your task is to generate high-quality, embodied question-answer (QA) pairs that are unanswerable because the referenced object does not exist in the apartment.

Each QA object must contain exactly four keys, in this order:

```
{ "question": "...",  
  "answer": "...",  
  "question_type": "Unanswerable",  
  "subtype": "Object Not Present in the indoor environment"}
```

Voice & Perspective

- Write from the homeowner's perspective, using "I" or "my." Example: "Where did I leave ...", "Can my robot check ...".
- Do not use agent-relative expressions such as "to my left/right" or "in front of you."

Core Unanswerability

- Every answer must begin exactly with:
"I don't know, there is no {object} in the apartment." where {object} is identical (case-exact) to the noun in the question.
- Each question must be unanswerable solely because the referenced object does not exist in any indoor living area.

Forbidden Question Patterns

1. Hypothetical / Imaginative — forbidden examples:
"If there were a {object}, how would it behave in the apartment?"
2. Formulaic / Geometric — forbidden example:
"In which corner ... in the apartment?"
3. Binary / Weakly Embodied — forbidden examples:
"Can the robot find the submarine in the apartment?"
4. Avoid mentioning specific rooms as the question should refer to the whole apartment.
Use natural, perception-based phrasing starting with What, Where, Which, or How.

Object Selection Principles

Choose objects that cannot realistically exist in a normal apartment but are physically possible in the real world.

ALLOWED OBJECTS (You could extend more)

Vehicles & Machinery: rocket, tank, submarine, helicopter, forklift, airplane, excavator, drone, tractor, hovercraft
Industrial / Construction: crane, turbine, generator, conveyor belt, robotic arm, 3D printer, oil pump
Animals: lion, elephant, horse, cow, dolphin, owl, tiger, penguin, snake, camel, parrot
Scientific / Technical: microscope, centrifuge, medical robot, oxygen tank, X-ray machine, control panel
Entertainment / Sports: treadmill, surfboard, trampoline, billiard table, vending machine, arcade cabinet, ATM, server rack

DISALLOWED OBJECTS

Natural phenomena (rainbow, volcano, tornado, river, waterfall)
Mythical / imaginary (dragon, unicorn, phoenix, mermaid, alien)
Ordinary household items (cup, chair, knife, laptop, book, bed)
Large structures (bridge, castle, stadium, lighthouse, dam, tower, hangar)
Abstract / non-physical (happiness, time, gravity, memory)

Hard Constraints

- Each question implies embodied reasoning or perception-based exploration.
- Use concrete nouns and clear spatial anchors ("behind the sofa," "near the balcony door").
- No Yes/No questions.
- No unsafe, branded, or personal content.
- Every question must be unique.
- The main object should differ whenever possible.
- If an object repeats, its phrasing or relation must differ.

Figure 14. Annotation prompt for generating unanswerable QA pairs where the referenced object is not present.

You are EQA-Generator, an expert in computer vision and robotics. Your sole task is to create high-quality, embodied question-answer (QA) pairs where each question mentions a closed/indoor room that would not realistically exist inside a normal apartment. Every QA must be unanswerable for the same reason: the referenced room does not exist in the apartment.

Each QA object must contain exactly four keys, in this order:

```
{ "question": "...",
  "answer": "...",
  "question_type": "Unanswerable",
  "subtype": "Room Not Present in the indoor environment "}
```

Voice & Perspective

- Write from the homeowner's perspective using "I"/"my" (e.g., "Where did I leave...", "Can my robot check...").
- Do NOT use agent-relative poses (no "to my left/right", no "in front of you").

Core Unanswerability

- Each question must place a COMMON apartment object in, on, or relative to an impossible room
- The answer MUST start EXACTLY with: "I don't know, there is no {room_name} in the apartment." where {room_name} is a case-exact string that matches the room name used in the question.

Rooms (ALLOWED — use these names verbatim)

Medical/Clinical: operating room, MRI suite, X-ray room, dental clinic

Transportation: aircraft hangar, bicycle repair bay, motorcycle workshop bay, racing simulator cockpit, flight simulator cockpit, drone operations desk, portable car lift bay

Sports and recreation: badminton court, table tennis room, basketball court, boxing ring, ice rink, swimming pool lane, climbing gym, bowling alley, curling sheet, squash court, gymnastics practice room, trampoline room, sauna room

Industrial: foundry, assembly line, brewing room, walk-in freezer, server data hall, woodworking room, photo darkroom, printing room, pottery kiln room, sewing room,

Security: surveillance monitoring room, weapons vault, shooting range, home vault, display room Entertainment: home DJ booth, casino room, arcade room

Hobbyist: hydroponics grow room, seedling nursery room Creative: sculpture casting room, paint spray booth room

Household Object Pool (examples only; no brands)

mug, cup, bowl, plate, spoon, fork, knife, cutting board, pan, pot, kettle, sponge, soap dispenser, dish rack, microwave, toaster, trash bin, broom, mop, vacuum, laundry basket, detergent bottle, towel, bedsheet, pillow, blanket, lamp, light switch, power strip, phone charger, laptop, tablet, headphones, remote control, keychain, wallet, book, notebook, pen, scissors, tape, umbrella, shoe rack, sneakers, coat, hanger, mirror, plant pot, picture frame, candle, tissue box, shampoo bottle, conditioner bottle, toothpaste,

Hard Constraints (apply to EVERY question)

- 1) Embodiment: The question must imply navigation/exploration or multi-step spatial reasoning (e.g., multiple landmarks, containers, or path constraints). Avoid trivial single close-ups.
- 2) Unambiguous wording:
 - Use specific nouns; avoid vague terms like "that thing" and subjective adjectives like "interesting".
 - Anchor with clear locations/relations (e.g., "on the metal counter beside the sink in the operating room").
- 3) NO yes/no questions. Each question must seek a concrete fact (identity, attribute, relation, function, count, capacity).
- 4) Safety/Content: No brands, private data, or unsafe/harmful instructions.
- 5) Room consistency: Mention EXACTLY ONE room (from ALLOWED). Repeat the SAME string in the answer template .
- 6) Object plausibility: Use objects common to apartments (see pool). They may be referenced within the impossible room.
- 7) Diversity: Vary objects, prepositions, surfaces, containers, landmarks, paths, and phrasing. Avoid near-duplicates and repeated (object + relation + room) triples.

Figure 15. Annotation prompt for generating unanswerable QA pairs where the referenced room is not present.