

Towards Object-centric Understanding for Instructional Videos

Wenliang Guo
Michigan State University
guowenli@msu.edu

Yu Kong
Michigan State University
yukong@msu.edu

Abstract

Understanding procedural activities is crucial for developing future assistive AI that can reason about complex real-world tasks. Existing action-centric methods struggle with the flexibility of real procedures, where step order varies depending on object states. In this work, we propose to shift the focus to an object-centric paradigm by regarding actions as mechanisms that drive state transitions. To advance this direction, we introduce *Object-IVQA*, a long-form instructional video benchmark with 107 videos and 514 open-ended question-answer pairs annotated with temporally grounded evidence. The benchmark evaluates four dimensions of object-centric reasoning, including state evolution, precondition verification, counterfactual reasoning and mistake recognition. We further propose an agent framework that orchestrates object-centric planning, perception, analysis and generation tools, enabling explicit evidence retrieval and multi-hop reasoning across disjoint segments. Experiments show that existing large vision-language models struggle in object-level recognition and reasoning, whereas our framework achieves substantially improvement.

1. Introduction

Human life consists of procedural activities across diverse domains, such as housework [34], assembly task [31], and surgery [1]. Successfully performing these tasks requires planning, recognizing relevant objects, and reasoning about how actions alter object states. Future assistive AI systems are expected to exhibit comparable capabilities, enabling them to support humans or even autonomously execute complex tasks. To this end, AI needs to first understand the underlying procedure, which raises a fundamental question: What governs the progression of procedural activities?

Most existing approaches attempt to address this question from an action-centric perspective, focusing on modeling action transitions [3], constructing action graphs [16], or implicitly learning temporal structures [27, 45]. While effective for tasks such as action segmentation [45] and next-




Figure 1. Overview of our object-centric video QA task, where the model must track object dynamics over time and produce both an answer and its supporting time spans as temporal evidence.

step prediction [3, 27], these methods often struggle to generalize to real-world scenarios due to the complexity and variability of procedural workflows. In practice, procedural tasks involve action sequences governed by strict preconditions and causal dependencies, yet they also allow flexibility that certain steps may be optional, interchangeable, or executable in different orders without affecting the final outcome. This duality exposes a core limitation of action-centric approaches: they fail to robustly adapt to the dynamic and diverse real-world cases.

In this work, we propose to address this question from a different perspective: the progression of procedural activities is fundamentally driven by object dynamics, i.e., changes in object state, while actions serve primarily as mechanisms that induce those state transitions. Consequently, the execution of any action must be conditioned on the current state of the relevant object. For instance, if a banana has already been peeled, the peeling action should be skipped. This implies that the underlying structure of procedural tasks is causally organized around object states.

Datasets	Ave Dur (Min)	View	Object-centric	QA Type	Evidence	Data Focus
Changelt [32]	4.6	<u>Exo</u>	✓	✗	-	Object-state Change
EgoSchema [25]	3.0	Ego	✗	MCQ	✗	Human Activity
EgoPER [19]	4.3	Ego	✗	✗	-	Action & Mistake
CaptainCook4D [29]	14.8	Ego	✗	✗	-	Action & Mistake
ProMQA [13]	6.8	<u>Exo</u>	✗	Open-ended	✗	Action & Mistake
REXTIME [5]	2.0	<u>Exo</u>	✗	MCQ	✓	Cause-and-effect
MULTIHOP-EGOQA [6]	3.0	Ego	✗	Open-ended	✓	Action & Object
TrackVerse [38]	<0.1	<u>Exo</u>	✓	✗	-	Object Dynamic
<i>Object-IVQA</i> (Ours)	8.9	Ego+ <u>Exo</u>	✓	Open-ended	✓	Object & Mistake

Table 1. Dataset comparison. We introduce object-centric instructional video QA benchmark featuring open-ended answers, temporally grounded evidence spans, and mistake-type questions, which are key aspects in procedures but largely overlooked in prior QA datasets.

Such a perspective shifts procedural understanding from an action-centric paradigm to an object-centric one.

For advancing object-centric procedural understanding, two key challenges must be addressed. First, existing datasets fail to capture how object states evolve throughout a procedure. Souček et al. [32] introduced an instructional video dataset for object state recognition, but its annotations are limited to coarse states (background and initial/final), restricting its value for broader downstream tasks. More recently, Wei et al. [38] proposed a large-scale object-centric dataset targeting general-domain videos, but it lacks the diverse and fine-grained state transitions that appears in procedural contexts.

To mitigate data scarcity, we build an automated video collection and annotation pipeline, followed by manual refinement. Aiming for more natural and flexible human-computer interaction, we formulate object-centric procedural understanding as an open-ended video question-answering (video QA) task [6, 13] in natural language, as illustrated in Figure 1. Leveraging existing instructional datasets [19, 29, 34], we introduce *Object-IVQA*, a long-form object-centric instructional VQA benchmark comprising 107 videos (8.9 minutes on average) and 514 question-answer pairs annotated with supporting temporal evidence. The questions span four dimensions—state evolution, precondition verification, counterfactual reasoning, and mistake recognition, which enables a comprehensive evaluation of the latest large vision-language models (LVLMs) in object understanding and revealing their limitations in temporal and causal reasoning.

The second challenge in object-centric procedural understanding stems from the temporal sparsity and discontinuity of object interactions. Manipulations of the same object often occur across non-consecutive video segments, as commonly seen in real-world workflows, for instance, a banana may be prepared early but stirred later. This requires multi-hop reasoning over temporally disjoint segments. To tackle this challenge, we introduce an agent framework [37]. The framework consists of four agents responsible for planning, video processing, video analyzing, and text generation. Each agent is equipped with multiple callable

tools (e.g., object detection, tracking, captioning). Specifically, we employ LLM-as-planner [8, 12] to first generate a tool-use plan conditioned on the question. The remaining agents then execute this plan to extract supporting temporal evidence and produce the final answer. By modularizing the reasoning process, our framework can explicitly retrieve and link non-contiguous segments involving the same object, enabling the system to uncover the spatial and temporal causal dependencies underlying action-object interactions. In summary, our contributions are threefold:

- We introduce and formalize object-centric procedural understanding as a video QA task that requires recognizing object states and reasoning about their dynamics.
- We present *Object-IVQA*, a dataset of 514 question-answer pairs grounded in 107 long instructional videos, and benchmark both closed- and open-source LVLMs, revealing their limitations in object-level understanding.
- We propose an agent framework for multi-hop reasoning, employing an LLM-as-planner to dynamically invoke a predefined object-centric toolbox of agents.

2. Related Work

Procedural Understanding. In recent years, there has been growing interest in understanding procedural activities. Instructional videos, which comprise action sequences aimed at achieving specific goals such as cooking or assembly, serve as ideal resources to study procedural understanding. Early efforts introduced large-scale datasets by annotating instructional videos with step-wise action labels and temporal segments [26, 34, 46], thereby facilitating research in areas, such as action segmentation [45], grounding [7], anticipation [11], and mistake detection [18, 19, 29, 31]. To understand procedural activities, traditional approaches have primarily focused on modeling interdependencies between actions mainly through temporal modeling using Transformers [27, 45] or by constructing procedural graphs [3, 16]. However, these methods have largely concentrated on transitions between actions, while paying limited attention to the underlying *object dynamics* which is a central focus of this work.

Object Understanding. Some recent work [38, 40] for video understanding have shifted from scene-level semantics to fine-grained object modeling for capturing dynamics and state transitions. In instructional video domain, where goal-directed human-object interactions define the procedural structure, Souček et al. [32] introduced self-supervised learning of state-modifying actions, followed by Souček et al. [33] who proposed a unified framework for jointly learning multiple object-action pairs. Zameni et al. [44] further enabled multi-object state change prediction conditioned on language. Despite this progress, existing methods still rely on task-specific models. Whether general-purpose LVLMs can support object-centric reasoning in instructional videos remains unexplored. To address this, we benchmark state-of-the-art LVLMs using video QA as a proxy task, and further propose an agent framework to tackle this challenge.

Video Question-Answering. Video QA evaluates a model’s ability to reason over temporal visual content and produce grounded answers. Early datasets [15, 43] focused on short and trimmed clips emphasizing event-level perception, while later work expanded to long-form videos requiring multi-step [25] and causal reasoning across temporal spans Chen et al. [5]. In the instructional video domain, ProMQA series [13, 14] introduced multimodal QA benchmarks aligned with structured knowledge of human-object interactions to support goal-directed comprehension. Beyond single-hop reasoning, Chen et al. [6] explored multi-hop temporal reasoning by linking evidence across distant video intervals. Building on these advances, our proposed benchmark extends instructional video QA to fine-grained and multi-hop reasoning centering on object dynamics. It unifies temporal grounding and causal understanding by requiring models not only to recognize and reason over evolving object states, but also to localize supporting visual evidence across temporally dispersed segments.

Agent framework for video understanding. Recent advances in video understanding have enabled agent-based frameworks [17, 37, 42] to coordinate multiple specialized models within a unified system, allowing them to jointly address complex video perception and reasoning tasks. Such modular frameworks typically decompose a task into executable steps and dynamically invoke different agents or tools. Inspired by this paradigm, we develop an agent framework tailored for instructional videos. By translating video QA queries into modular operation sequences, the framework adaptively assembles toolchains to perform object-centric analysis and multi-hop reasoning.

3. Object-centric Video Benchmark

In this section, we introduce an object-centric instructional video question answering (*Object-IVQA*) dataset designed to evaluate large vision-language models (LVLMs) on fine-

grained recognition and multi-hop temporal reasoning. To ensure the reliability of the constructed data, we develop a five-stage semi-automatic data preparation pipeline, as illustrated in Figure 2, which systematically integrates video selection, dense caption generation, question-answer construction, rule-based filtering, and manual refinement. By combining LVLM-based generation with human verification and correction, this pipeline enables scalable dataset expansion while maintaining high data quality.

3.1. Data Preparation

3.1.1. Stage 1: Video Collection

Aiming to evaluate how LVLMs understand action-triggered object dynamics over time, we collect videos with rich human-object interactions from three instructional video datasets: COIN [34], CaptainCook4D [29], and EgoPER [19] datasets. CaptainCook4D contains 384 egocentric videos covering 24 recipes, EgoPER consists of 385 egocentric cooking videos spanning 5 recipe categories, and COIN is a large-scale dataset with 11,827 third-person videos from 180 tasks. From COIN dataset, we only select videos in cooking scenarios, as cooking involves structured procedures suitable for analyzing temporal reasoning.

We establish several criteria for video selection. First, since long-form video understanding remains a major challenge for LVLMs and naturally supports multi-hop reasoning, we retain only videos longer than 6 minutes from CaptainCook4D and EgoPER, and those longer than 3 minutes from COIN because COIN videos are generally much shorter. Second, to ensure diversity in activities and procedures, we filter out highly redundant samples within each activity by measuring the similarity of action sequences across video samples using edit distance and cosine similarity of textual embeddings. Please refer supplementary material for details. After applying these criteria, we obtain a collection of 107 videos with an average duration of 535.0 ± 267.6 seconds from 52 different procedural activities. It contains both egocentric and exocentric videos rather than the single-view setting adopted in previous work [5, 6], allowing a more comprehensive assessment of the LVLM from different points of view.

3.1.2. Stage 2&3: Captioning and QA Generation

To generate object-centric QA pairs, we first prompt Qwen3-VL [4] to produce dense frame-level captions for each video, which textually capture object states, actions, and human-object interactions. We then integrate several multimodal information to construct prompt for GPT-5: a) captions, which provide fine-grained scene descriptions, b) step annotations, which offer full procedural context, c) sparsely sampled video frames that supply video context, d) task descriptions, which introduce the overall goal by indicating a specific QA type. The resulting QA pairs con-




Figure 2. Overview of the data collection pipeline, which combines automatic video sampling and QA generation using LVLMs with human refinement, ensuring both efficiency and high-quality outputs while reducing the expensive purely manual annotation.




Figure 3. QA types in our benchmark dataset. Different from existing instructional datasets focusing on action analysis, our benchmark centers on object-level understanding to capture temporal and spatial dynamics, enabling benchmarking from diverse perspectives.

tain not only questions and answers but also temporally grounded evidence spans that indicate the specific video segments supporting the corresponding answer.

Furthermore, as shown in Figure 3, by using different task descriptions as prompt, the generated QAs contains four distinct types that examine a model’s understanding of object dynamics from multiple perspectives, including:

- *Object preparation*: questions that ask which preceding actions cause the manipulated object to undergo specific state transitions before a given action;
- *State evolution*: questions that investigate how the state of the same object changes between two actions, as influenced by other relevant manipulations;
- *Counterfactual situation*: questions that pose “what if” scenarios and require answers grounded in the object’s actual state appearing in videos;
- *Mistake recognition*: questions that ask to recognize mistakes during the procedure, and explain them based on object-state evidence.

3.1.3. Stage 4&5: Data Quality Control

Even though GPT-5 with carefully designed prompts generates high-quality QA pairs empirically, we apply a multi-stage validation pipeline to further ensure data reliability. First, we use vision–language model (VLM) to measure semantic similarity between QA pairs and remove highly similar ones, thereby reducing redundancy. Next, since we

observed some questions can be answered purely through commonsense reasoning, we query a large language model (LLM) given question but without providing the video. Then we score the answers (will be described in Section 4), and the questions with high scores are discarded. We also remove *Mistake*-type QA pairs with repeated error patterns to preserve diversity. Finally, all QA pairs are manually refined to ensure that answers are strictly grounded in the video, temporal spans are accurately annotated, and language is clear and logically consistent. Through Stage 4 and 5, each QA pair is ensured to be precise, unambiguous and temporally supported, and aligned with the objects and actions depicted in the corresponding video.

3.2. Object-centric Instructional QA

Object-IVQA benchmark dataset consists of 107 long-term videos and 514 QA pairs, covering cooking activities that require complex multi-hop temporal reasoning for object dynamics. We provide a comprehensive analysis below.

Video Statistics. Videos are sourced from three instructional datasets: CaptainCook4D (58.3%), COIN (36.1%), and EgoPER (5.6%). This composition introduces diversity in egocentric and exocentric viewpoints, task complexity, and environmental settings. As shown in Figure 4a, video durations range from 180 to 900 seconds, with an average of 536.0 seconds. More than 75% of the videos exceed six minutes. This long-duration characteristic naturally creates




Figure 4. Dataset statistics of our *Object-IVQA* benchmark dataset.

temporal discontinuities and provides rich contextual information for evaluating long-range multi-hop reasoning over disjoint object interactions.

Activity Distribution. *Object-IVQA* spans 52 cooking activities, each consisting of multiple instances. Compared with other procedural activities such as household tasks, cooking involves more structured and causally linked object-state transitions, making it a suitable testbed for assessing object understanding. As shown in Figure 4b, the most frequent activities include “making coffee,” “preparing spicy tuna avocado rolls,” and “making cucumber-yogurt sauce,” which involves complex and fine-grained human-object interactions. The variety of activities introduces substantial differences in object manipulation patterns, visual conditions, and task structure to make *Object-IVQA* a comprehensive benchmark.

QA Type Distribution. Our dataset contains 514 QA pairs spanning four types, as shown in Figures 3 and 4c. Preparation reasoning (36.8%) and mistake recognition (31.7%) constitute the majority of QAs, requiring models to trace object states back to earlier causal steps and to identify deviations from the correct procedure. Counterfactual reasoning (16.9%) and object-state evolution reasoning (14.6%) further enrich the temporal and causal dependencies required for a comprehensive evaluation.

Error Distribution. 51 videos (47.7%) in our dataset contain procedural mistakes, resulting in diverse error instances across activities. We categorize them into six types, with their sample counts summarized in Figure 4d. Procedural mistakes are typically sparse, short-lived, and embedded within complex visual scenes, making them difficult to detect. This places strong demands on models to understand procedural context in order to infer how an observed action diverges from the correct one.

4. Methodology

In instructional videos, manipulations on the same object often occur with temporal gaps. As illustrated in Figure 3, background frames or unrelated action segments (shown in gray) may intervene between the segments relevant to a given question, creating temporal discontinuities that require multi-hop reasoning over long video horizons. To

address this challenge, we propose an object-centric agent framework that dynamically invokes specialized agents to process, analyze, and reason over videos, ultimately generating answers grounded in inferred evidence. In this section, we will first present an overview of our agent framework, then introduce the function and implementation of each agent, respectively.


4.1. Framework Overview

As shown in Figure 5a, the framework consists of four agents: a Planning Agent, a Video-Processing Agent, a Video-Analyzing Agent, and a Text-Generation Agent. The three video-related agents are each equipped with multiple callable tools, enabling rich and flexible functionality. The LLM-based planning agent first determines the information needed to answer the question, queries the tool-boxes of all video agents, and constructs an ordered sequence of tool calls to extract perceptual evidence and analyze object states. The final answer is obtained by executing these calls in sequence. By leveraging our customized agents for object-centric understanding, the framework not only enables efficient object localization and description but also identifies and selects key video segments through the analyzing agent, thereby supporting robust, object-centric multi-hop reasoning.


4.2. Video-Processing Agent

The Video-Processing Agent converts unstructured video streams into temporally organized units for subsequent reasoning. It is implemented using a set of built-in Python functions and external libraries (e.g., *Decord*¹). Specifically, VIDEO_LOAD tool initializes the input by reading the video file and recording the frame rate, duration, and resolution. FRAME_SAMPLE tool performs frame sampling and returns a time-indexed collection of frames. Each frame is annotated with a precise timestamp, ensuring that evidence can be accurately localized in time during later stages. FRAME_TRIM tool supports queries involving causal or sequential relations (e.g., before or after a reference interval) and filters the retrieved frames based on temporal relationships. Together, these tools transform continuous video

¹An open-source video processing library available on GitHub: <https://github.com/dmlc/decord>.



(a) Overview of the proposed agent framework.



(b) Example of the multi-agent collaboration.

Figure 5. Our agent framework decomposes video QA into planning, processing, analyzing, and generation agents, along with an example showing the generated tool-usage plan, intermediate results, and final answer.

into timestamped structured evidence segments, building the foundation for object-centric reasoning.

4.3. Video-Analyzing Agent

The Video-Processing Agent extracts fine-grained semantic cues that identify action context and track how objects evolve over time. `FRAME_RETRIEVE` tool, built on EVAL-02 CLIP [10], retrieves frames containing the question-relevant object predicted by the Planning Agent, allowing for the localization of an approximate temporal window in which the answer resides. `OBJ_DET` tool applies Grounding DINO [22] for open-vocabulary text-based referring detection, returning bounding boxes, and confidence scores of objects, which are essential for tracking object dynamics and state transitions. `ACTION_REC` tool employs a multimodal LVLm Qwen3-VL [41] to generate temporally aligned descriptions of object-involved actions, enabling the agent to determine when an object is manipulated and in what manner. By adaptively combining these tools, the framework is able to construct rich multimodal object-centric representations that explicitly link each object to the action events it participates in along with their timing and location, thereby establishing the foundations for object-centric procedural understanding.

4.4. Text-generation Agent

Extensive previous research [17, 37, 42] demonstrates that text integration enhances the ability of LVLms to interpret visual cues. Building upon this insight, the Text-generation Agent transforms images and videos into descriptive language, enabling object-centered process comprehension and facilitating open-ended answer generation. `IMG_CAPTION` tool produces fine-grained, object-focused captions using a BLIP-based captioner [20], enriching raw visual inputs with explicit descriptions of object appear-

ance, attributes, and contextual cues. This compensates for the limited structured information in pixel-only representations. `CONTEXT_SUM` tool, implemented with Llama-3.1 [9], fuses action descriptions, captions, and detection results, and summarizes to an interpretable textual context of how objects evolve over time triggered by actions. Based on the context summary, sampled frames and the question, `ANSWER_GEN` tool implemented based on Qwen3-VL [41] performs multi-modal reasoning and finally produces the answer along with the supporting time evidence.

4.5. Multi-agent Collaboration

Each agent contributes complementary semantic and contextual information to address object-centric video QA. Figure 5(b) shows a concrete example of multi-agent collaboration. The process begins with a tool-usage plan generated dynamically by the Planning Agent, which interprets the question and synthesizes a program specifying what evidence to retrieve and in what order. This program encodes object-centric constraints (e.g., focusing on “butter”), temporal logic (e.g., frames preceding the melting event), and the sequence of perception and reasoning operations.

Next, the Video-Processing and Video-Analyzing Agents work together to reduce the long video into a set of temporally and semantically aligned segments. Low-level operations, such as loading, sampling and retrieving reference timestamps, establish the temporal structure, while higher-level perception modules further refine the search to object-relevant intervals. Through this collaboration, the agents progressively convert the raw video into object-centric, temporally localized evidence units.

The Text-Generation Agent integrates the multimodal outputs from previous steps, including detected objects, action cues, and selected timestamps, and produces the final open-ended answer in natural language. Because each in-

Models	Size	Frame	Preparation		Evolution		Counterfact		Mistake		Average	
			Score	mIoU%	Score	mIoU%	Score	mIoU%	Score	mIoU%	Score	mIoU%
<i>Blind LVLMS</i>												
InternVL3.5 [36]	8B	-	0.72	-	0.87	-	0.90	-	0.33	-	0.71	-
Qwen3-VL Instruct [41]	8B	-	0.84	-	0.91	-	0.98	-	0.40	-	0.78	-
<i>LVLMS</i>												
InternVL3.5 [36]	8B	50f	1.70	6.98	2.07	10.65	1.64	6.42	0.71	4.10	1.53	7.04
Qwen3-VL Instruct [41]	8B	50f	2.14	11.39	2.17	11.72	1.90	9.04	0.88	5.80	1.77	9.49
Kimi-VL Instruct [35]	16B	50f	1.31	3.07	1.14	1.44	1.15	1.47	0.40	0.99	1.00	1.74
InternVL3.5 [36]	38B	50f	<u>2.48</u>	<u>14.80</u>	2.49	14.87	1.84	8.43	1.03	7.32	<u>1.96</u>	<u>11.36</u>
Qwen3-VL Instruct [41]	30B	50f	2.66	16.64	<u>2.38</u>	<u>13.75</u>	2.04	10.35	0.80	5.02	1.97	11.44

Table 2. Performance comparison of open-source models on the *Object-IVQA full* dataset.

Models	Size	Frame	Preparation		Evolution		Counterfact		Mistake		Average	
			Score	mIoU%	Score	mIoU%	Score	mIoU%	Score	mIoU%	Score	mIoU%
Open-source LVLMS												
Kimi-VL Instruct [35]	16B	50f	2.05	2.95	2.20	1.49	1.90	1.16	0.75	0.96	1.73	1.64
Qwen3-VL Instruct [41]	30B	50f	2.15	12.83	3.10	10.11	1.95	5.61	0.95	2.51	2.04	7.76
InternVL3.5 [36]	38B	50f	2.60	13.82	3.94	<u>14.42</u>	2.55	8.55	<u>1.15</u>	<u>9.50</u>	2.56	11.57
Close-source LVLMS												
Claude Opus 4 [2]	-	30f	2.52	13.26	2.65	7.40	2.50	7.78	1.10	7.79	2.19	9.06
Gemini 2.5 Pro [23]	-	50f	2.88	19.97	3.40	12.27	3.00	8.89	1.00	5.76	2.57	11.72
GPT-5 [28]	-	30f	2.80	15.10	3.98	17.07	<u>3.44</u>	<u>11.17</u>	1.00	6.55	<u>2.80</u>	<u>12.47</u>
Agent Framework (Ours)												
Qwen3-VL-as-Planner	-	50f	2.78	14.93	3.55	13.58	3.10	10.92	1.30	9.86	2.68	12.32
GPT5-as-Planner	-	30f	<u>2.83</u>	<u>17.08</u>	3.80	14.10	3.52	14.14	1.10	7.91	2.81	13.31

Table 3. Performance comparison of open- and closed-source models and our agent framework on the *Object-IVQA subset*.

intermediate result is explicitly generated, exchanged across agents, and referenced during the final reasoning step, the overall workflow provides transparent, step-by-step reasoning with clear answer traceability. This dynamic collaborative manner enables the system to track object states across discontinuous video segments and ground answers in precise temporal evidence efficiently.

5. Experiments

In this section, we benchmark the latest Large Vision-language model (LVLm) capabilities of fine-grained recognition and multi-hop reasoning on *Object-IVQA* dataset. We also evaluate our proposed agent framework and observe it outperforms even the best LVLMS not only on the quality of answers but also the accuracy of supporting evidence.

5.1. Evaluation Metrics

LLM-based Answer Evaluation. To comprehensively evaluate model performance, we adopt an LLM-as-judge paradigm following previous works [21, 24]. Specifically, we use GPT-5-mini [28] as an evaluator to perform semantic comparisons conditioned on the questions between model-generated answers and ground-truth annotations. The evaluator assigns scores along four complementary dimensions that jointly assess factual correctness, descriptive completeness, narrative coherence, and temporal reasoning:

- Contextual Integration (CI) measures whether the answer faithfully reflects the factual video content while avoiding hallucinations, omissions, or misinterpretations.

- Detail Orientation (DO) evaluates the inclusion and correctness of key fine-grained elements required for a complete and accurate description.
- Contextual Understanding (CU) assesses the alignment of the answer with the overall narrative structure, causal flow, and contextual dependencies present in the video.
- Temporal Understanding (TU) focuses on the correctness of temporal logic, including event ordering, state transitions, and causal relations.

Each dimension is scored on an integer scale from 0 to 5, where 5 denotes a fully correct answer and 0 indicates a completely incorrect one. The final score for each answer is the average across all four dimensions. Leveraging the strong reasoning capabilities of LLMs, this rubric ensures a fine-grained and reliable quantitative evaluation.

Evidence Localization. To measure the alignment between the predicted and ground-truth time spans of the evidence, we calculate their mean Intersection-over-union (mIoU). Given m time spans of the prediction \mathcal{P} and ground-truth \mathcal{G} , the mIoU can be obtained by

$$\text{mIoU} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \text{IoU}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{|P^{(k)} \cap G^{(k)}|}{|P^{(k)} \cup G^{(k)}|}. \quad (1)$$

5.2. Baseline and Settings

We evaluate three state-of-the-art (SOTA) open-source large vision-language models (LVLMS), including Qwen3-VL Instruct (8B and 30B) [41], Kimi-VL Instruct (16B) [35], and InternVL3.5 (8B and 38B) [36], as well as leading

commercial LVLMS including Claude Opus 4 [2], Gemini 2.5 Pro [23], and GPT-5 [28]. For our proposed object-centric agent framework, Qwen3-VL (8B) and GPT-5 were selected as planning agents, respectively. The frames sampled from videos are resized to 224×224 for inference efficiency unless otherwise specified. All experiments are conducted on an NVIDIA H100 GPU. Please refer to the supplementary material for more implementation details, experiments and analysis.

5.3. Experimental Results

By benchmarking different models on the proposed *Object-IVQA* dataset, we aim to answer the following questions: 1) Can SOTA LVLMS accurately answer object-centric questions and localize supporting evidence? 2) Does the proposed agent framework provide performance gains despite calling smaller tool models? 3) Why is mistake recognition particularly challenging?

Performance of existing LVLMS. Table 2 presents benchmark results for open-source LVLMS on the full *Object-IVQA* dataset, and Table 3 reports results on a 100-sample subset created by randomly selecting 25 questions from each QA type. Commercial LVLMS are evaluated on this subset and compared with open-source models and our agent framework.

To examine whether questions can be answered using commonsense alone, we first provide models with only the question. These “blind” LVLMS perform poorly, confirming that *Object-IVQA* requires visual grounding and temporal reasoning. Even with video input, SOTA LVLMS continue to struggle with answer accuracy and evidence localization. Although larger models show improvements, such as Qwen3-VL (30B) and GPT-5, their mIoU scores remain low. This reveals a central limitation: while current LVLMS can produce reasonable answers, they often fail to identify the precise video segments supporting those answers, highlighting persistent challenges in retrieving correct visual cues for temporal and causal reasoning.

Agent framework. Despite calling smaller tool models, our agent framework achieves answer quality comparable to or even surpassing commercial LVLMS. More importantly, it also provides stronger evidence localization. This suggests that for object-centric procedural understanding, a well-designed modular architecture and reasoning workflow are more crucial than model scale itself. Even without large parameter counts, our framework leverages an explicit perceive–analyze–generate pipeline to provide robust grounding and more stable multi-hop reasoning.

Mistake recognition. From Table 2 and 3, we observe that mistake recognition consistently performs the worst among all QA types. This difficulty comes from the nature of procedural mistakes that mistakes lack canonical patterns different from standard operations,

and thus LVLMS have no idea of “what should have happened.” Without procedural priors, they cannot reliably determine whether an observed deviation constitutes an error. To assess whether high-level context helps, we follow prior work [13] and provide DOT-format task graphs as additional input. As shown in Table 4, both methods benefit from these structural hints, achieving consistent gains in answer quality and evidence mIoU. This confirms that mistake recognition requires explicit procedural context to ground the notion of a correct workflow. Despite these improvements, performance remains substantially lower than for other QA types. This indicates that recognizing mistakes in complex object-manipulation scenarios remains challenging, as models must perceive subtle state changes, compare them against an abstract procedural plan, and reason about object-level deviations, which demands stronger contextual understanding and causal reasoning.

Models	w/o Graph		w/ Graph	
	Score	mIoU	Score	mIoU
GPT-5	1.00	6.55	1.32	6.79
Ours	1.10	7.91	1.38	8.67

Table 4. Comparison with and without task graph input.

6. Conclusion and Discussion

In this work, we shift procedural video understanding from an action-centric perspective to an object-centric paradigm. We introduce *Object-IVQA*, a benchmark spanning four complementary reasoning types that jointly evaluate a model’s ability to recognize object states, infer causal dependencies, and identify procedural mistakes. To address the temporal sparsity and discontinuity of object interactions, we propose an agent framework that decomposes video QA task into planning, processing, analysis, and text generation, enabling explicit multi-hop reasoning over disjoint segments. Experiments show that state-of-the-art LVLMS still struggle with fine-grained object reasoning and temporal causal inference, whereas our proposed agent framework substantially improves both answer quality and evidence localization.

Despite this progress, object-centric procedural understanding in complex real-world workflows still remains an open challenge. One promising direction is incorporating self-supervised objectives for object-state learning, such as masked-state modeling Narasimhan et al. [27] which encourages models to recover missing state representation. Another direction is constructing symbolic graphs of object-state inspired by action graphs [3, 30], or temporal-logic formulations [39] to impose interpretable structure and stronger procedural constraints. Finally, our agent-based design also suggests opportunities for richer agentic workflows, including self-reflection loops [37], improved planning strategies, and more expressive toolsets for object-centric perception and reasoning. These directions may help advance AI systems to better understand the inherent nature of procedural activities in the future.

References

- [1] Akgul Ahmet, Kus Gamze, Mustafaoglu Rustem, and Karaborklu Argut Sezen. Is video-based education an effective method in surgical education? a systematic review. *Journal of surgical education*, 75(5):1150–1158, 2018. 1
- [2] Anthropic. Claude 4.1: Advanced reasoning model, 2025. Accessed: 2025-11-13. 7, 8
- [3] Kumar Ashutosh, Santhosh Kumar Ramakrishnan, Triantafyllos Afouras, and Kristen Grauman. Video-mined task graphs for keystep recognition in instructional videos. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:67833–67846, 2023. 1, 2, 8
- [4] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, Humen Zhong, Yuanzhi Zhu, Mingkun Yang, Zhaohai Li, Jianqiang Wan, Pengfei Wang, Wei Ding, Zheren Fu, Yiheng Xu, Jiabo Ye, Xi Zhang, Tianbao Xie, Zesen Cheng, Hang Zhang, Zhibo Yang, Haiyang Xu, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2.5-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923*, 2025. 3
- [5] Jr-Jen Chen, Yu-Chien Liao, Hsi-Che Lin, Yu-Chu Yu, Yen-Chun Chen, and Frank Wang. Rextime: A benchmark suite for reasoning-across-time in videos. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:28662–28673, 2024. 2, 3
- [6] Qirui Chen, Shangzhe Di, and Weidi Xie. Grounded multi-hop videoqa in long-form egocentric videos. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 2159–2167, 2025. 2, 3
- [7] Zixu Cheng, Yujiang Pu, Shaogang Gong, Parisa Kordjamshidi, and Yu Kong. Shine: Saliency-aware hierarchical negative ranking for compositional temporal grounding. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 398–416. Springer, 2024. 2
- [8] Rohan Choudhury, Koichiro Niinuma, Kris M Kitani, and Laszlo A Jeni. Video question answering with procedural programs. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 315–332. Springer, 2024. 2
- [9] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2407, 2024. 6
- [10] Yuxin Fang, Quan Sun, Xinggang Wang, Tiejun Huang, Xinlong Wang, and Yue Cao. Eva-02: A visual representation for neon genesis. *Image and Vision Computing*, 149:105171, 2024. 6
- [11] Dayoung Gong, Joonseok Lee, Manjin Kim, Seong Jong Ha, and Minsu Cho. Future transformer for long-term action anticipation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3052–3061, 2022. 2
- [12] Tanmay Gupta and Aniruddha Kembhavi. Visual programming: Compositional visual reasoning without training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 14953–14962, 2023. 2
- [13] Kimihiro Hasegawa, Wiradee Imrattanaatrat, Zhi-Qi Cheng, Masaki Asada, Susan Holm, Yuran Wang, Ken Fukuda, and Teruko Mitamura. Promqa: Question answering dataset for multimodal procedural activity understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.22211*, 2024. 2, 3, 8
- [14] Kimihiro Hasegawa, Wiradee Imrattanaatrat, Masaki Asada, Susan Holm, Yuran Wang, Vincent Zhou, Ken Fukuda, and Teruko Mitamura. Promqa-assembly: Multimodal procedural qa dataset on assembly. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.02949*, 2025. 3
- [15] Yunseok Jang, Yale Song, Youngjae Yu, Youngjin Kim, and Gunhee Kim. Tgif-qa: Toward spatio-temporal reasoning in visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2758–2766, 2017. 3
- [16] Yunseok Jang, Sungryull Sohn, Lajanugen Logeswaran, Tiange Luo, Moontae Lee, and Honglak Lee. Multimodal subtask graph generation from instructional videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.08672*, 2023. 1, 2
- [17] Noriyuki Kugo, Xiang Li, Zixin Li, Ashish Gupta, Arpan-deep Khatua, Nidhish Jain, Chaitanya Patel, Yuta Kyuragi, Yasunori Ishii, Masamoto Tanabiki, Kazuki Kozuka, and Ehsan Adeli. Videomultiagents: A multi-agent framework for video question answering, 2025. 3, 6
- [18] Shih-Po Lee and Ehsan Elhamifar. Error recognition in procedural videos using generalized task graph. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 10009–10021, 2025. 2
- [19] Shih-Po Lee, Zijia Lu, Zekun Zhang, Minh Hoai, and Ehsan Elhamifar. Error detection in egocentric procedural task videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18655–18666, 2024. 2, 3
- [20] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation, 2022. 6
- [21] Bo Liu, Pengfei Qiao, Minhan Ma, Xuange Zhang, Yinan Tang, Peng Xu, Kun Liu, and Tongtong Yuan. Surveillancevqa-589k: A benchmark for comprehensive surveillance video-language understanding with large models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.12589*, 2025. 7
- [22] Shilong Liu, Zhaoyang Zeng, Tianhe Ren, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Jie Yang, Chunyuan Li, Jianwei Yang, Hang Su, Jun Zhu, et al. Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for open-set object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05499*, 2023. 6
- [23] Google LLC. Gemini 2.5 pro: Multimodal reasoning model, 2025. Accessed: 2025-11-13. 7, 8
- [24] Muhammad Maaz, Hanoona Rasheed, Salman Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Videogpt+: Integrating image and video encoders for enhanced video understanding. *arxiv*, 2024. 7
- [25] Kartikeya 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] Antoine Miech, Dimitri Zhukov, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Makarand Tapaswi, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Howto100m: Learning a text-video embedding by watching hundred million narrated video clips. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 2630–2640, 2019. 2
- [27] Medhini Narasimhan, Licheng Yu, Sean Bell, Ning Zhang, and Trevor Darrell. Learning and verification of task structure in instructional videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13519*, 2023. 1, 2, 8
- [28] OpenAI. Gpt-5: Large language model, 2025. Accessed: 2025-11-13. 7, 8
- [29] Rohith Peddi, Shivvrat Arya, Bharath Challa, Likhitha Pallapothula, Akshay Vyas, Bhavya Gouripeddi, Qifan Zhang, Jikai Wang, Vasundhara Komaragiri, Eric Ragan, et al. Captaincook4d: A dataset for understanding errors in procedural activities. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:135626–135679, 2024. 2, 3
- [30] Ivan Rodin, Antonino Furnari, Kyle Min, Subarna Tripathi, and Giovanni Maria Farinella. Action scene graphs for long-form understanding of egocentric videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18622–18632, 2024. 8
- [31] 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. 1, 2
- [32] Tomáš Souček, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Antoine Miech, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Look for the change: Learning object states and state-modifying actions from untrimmed web videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13956–13966, 2022. 2, 3
- [33] Tomáš Souček, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Antoine Miech, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Multi-task learning of object states and state-modifying actions from web videos. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 46(7): 5114–5130, 2024. 3
- [34] Yansong Tang, Dajun Ding, Yongming Rao, Yu Zheng, Danyang Zhang, Lili Zhao, Jiwen Lu, and Jie Zhou. Coin: A large-scale dataset for comprehensive instructional video analysis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1207–1216, 2019. 1, 2, 3
- [35] Kimi Team, Angang Du, Bohong Yin, Bowei Xing, Bowen Qu, Bowen Wang, Cheng Chen, Chenlin Zhang, Chen-zhuang Du, Chu Wei, et al. Kimi-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.07491*, 2025. 7
- [36] Weiyun Wang, Zhangwei Gao, Lixin Gu, Hengjun Pu, Long Cui, Xingguang Wei, Zhaoyang Liu, Linglin Jing, Shenglong Ye, Jie Shao, et al. Internvl3.5: Advancing open-source multimodal models in versatility, reasoning, and efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.18265*, 2025. 7
- [37] Xiaohan Wang, Yuhui Zhang, Orr Zohar, and Serena Yeung-Levy. Videoagent: Long-form video understanding with large language model as agent. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 58–76. Springer, 2024. 2, 3, 6, 8
- [38] Yibing Wei, Samuel Church, Victor Suci, Jinhong Lin, Cheng-En Wu, and Pedro Morgado. Trackverse: A large-scale object-centric video dataset for image-level representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 11153–11163, 2025. 2, 3
- [39] Ziwei Xu, Yogesh Rawat, Yongkang Wong, Mohan S Kankanhalli, and Mubarak Shah. Don’t pour cereal into coffee: Differentiable temporal logic for temporal action segmentation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:14890–14903, 2022. 8
- [40] 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
- [41] 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. 6, 7
- [42] Zhiwei Yang, Chen Gao, and Mike Zheng Shou. Panda: Towards generalist video anomaly detection via agentic ai engineer. In *NeurIPS*, 2025. 3, 6
- [43] Zhou Yu, Dejing Xu, Jun Yu, Ting Yu, Zhou Zhao, Yuet-ing Zhuang, and Dacheng Tao. Activitynet-qa: A dataset for understanding complex web videos via question answering. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 9127–9134, 2019. 3
- [44] Parnian Zamani, Yuhan 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
- [45] Chen-Lin Zhang, Jianxin Wu, and Yin Li. Actionformer: Localizing moments of actions with transformers. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 492–510. Springer, 2022. 1, 2
- [46] Dimitri Zhukov, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Ramazan Gokberk Cinbis, David Fouhey, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Cross-task weakly supervised learning from instructional videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3537–3545, 2019. 2