

# ToG-Bench: Task-Oriented Spatio-Temporal Grounding in Egocentric Videos

Qi’ao Xu<sup>1</sup>, Tianwen Qian<sup>1†</sup>, Yuqian Fu<sup>2</sup>, Kailing Li<sup>1</sup>, Yang Jiao<sup>3</sup>,  
Jiacheng Zhang<sup>3</sup>, Xiaoling Wang<sup>1†</sup>, Liang He<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Computer Science and Technology, East China Normal University

<sup>2</sup>INSAIT, Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”

<sup>3</sup>Fudan University

## Abstract

A core capability towards general embodied intelligence lies in localizing task-relevant objects from an egocentric perspective, formulated as Spatio-Temporal Video Grounding (STVG). Despite recent progress, existing STVG studies remain largely confined to object-centric and descriptive instructions, neglecting the task-oriented reasoning that is crucial for embodied agents to accomplish goal-directed interactions. To bridge this gap, we introduce **ToG-Bench**, the first task-oriented spatio-temporal video grounding benchmark for egocentric videos. ToG-Bench is characterized by three key features: (1) **Task-oriented Grounding**, which requires identifying and localizing objects based on intended tasks rather than straightforward descriptions; (2) **Explicit-Implicit Dual Grounding**, where target objects can be either explicitly mentioned or implicitly inferred by contextual reasoning; (3) **One-to-Many Grounding**, where a single instruction may correspond to multiple objects involved in task execution. Built upon videos sourced from ScanNet, ToG-Bench comprises 100 annotated clips with 2,704 task-oriented grounding instructions, constructed via a semi-automated pipeline that combines foundation model annotation and human refinement. In addition, we introduce a set of task-level evaluation metrics tailored for multi-object and explicit-implicit object grounding, and systematically benchmark seven state-of-the-art MLLMs. Extensive experiments reveal the intrinsic challenges of task-oriented STVG and substantial performance gaps across explicit-implicit and multi-object grounding, highlighting the difficulty of bridging perception and interaction in embodied scenarios. Data and code will be released at: <https://github.com/qaxuDev/ToG-Bench>.

## 1. Introduction

Unlike traditional AI systems that operate solely in virtual environments, embodied agents leverage egocentric video

<sup>†</sup>Corresponding authors.





	Benchmark	Example	Focus
Exocentric Videos	(a) VidSTG	Description: A child in white clothes touches a cake. 	● Object-centric ● Explicit ● Single-object
	(b) HC-STVG	Description: The woman in black clothes comes to the table, stops, and puts her hand on the table. 	
Egocentric Videos	(c) EgoMask	Description: The pillows stacked on top of bed. 	● Object-centric ● Explicit ● Single-object
	(d) ToG-Bench (Ours)	Instruction: Turn on the water at the sink. Infer faucet 	● Task-oriented ● Explicit-Implicit ● Multi-objects

Figure 1. Illustration and comparison of existing STVG benchmarks and our ToG-Bench. While prior datasets (a–c) focus on object-centric, explicit, single-object grounding in either exocentric or egocentric videos, ToG-Bench (d) introduces a task-driven paradigm that supports **task-oriented** instructions, **explicit-implicit dual grounding**, and **multi-object grounding**, enabling robust evaluation of embodied agents.

as their primary sensory input to perceive and interact with their surroundings [8, 9, 18, 23, 26]. To enable such agents to effectively understand human instructions and interact with their environment, Spatio-Temporal Video Grounding (STVG) [31, 33, 36] emerges as a fundamental capability: it requires models to accurately localize the instruction-referred objects along both the spatial and temporal dimensions of a video.

Despite remarkable progress in STVG driven by the emergence of dedicated benchmarks and powerful multi-modal large language models (MLLMs), existing studies remain limited in its applicability to real-world embodied agents. On one hand, early benchmarks such as STPR [32], VidSTG [36], and HC-STVG [28] are constructed from exocentric videos, where the camera viewpoint is detached from the agent’s embodiment. Such perspective neglect egocentric perceptual dynamics, such as attention shift, and

agent-object interaction that are essential for instructions grounding [12, 24]. On the other hand, although recent efforts, such as EgoMask [20], have begun to explore STVG in egocentric videos, they still formulate the task in an object-centric and descriptive manner. As shown in Fig. 1, their instructions typically focus on identifying or describing visible entities (e.g., *The pillows stacked on top of bed*) rather than conveying some intent (e.g., *Turn on the water at the sink*), which prevents current benchmarks from supporting goal-directed embodied tasks that require grounding objects by their functional roles in a specific action.

To fill the aforementioned gap, we formally define a new task, Task-oriented Spatio-Temporal Video Grounding (T-STVG), which extends traditional STVG toward goal-driven grounding of task-relevant objects. The objective is to identify and localize all objects involved in performing a given task within egocentric video. T-STVG presents three distinctive challenges that go beyond the scope of prior research. Specifically, it involves (1) **Task-driven reasoning**: the agent must infer task-relevant objects from high-level goals rather than relying on direct object description (e.g., *make coffee* requires grounding a *coffee machine*); (2) **Co-existence of explicit and implicit objects**: target entities may be explicitly mentioned in the instruction or implicitly inferred through contextual reasoning (e.g., *turn on the water at the sink* involves an explicit object *sink*, as well as an implicit one, *faucet*, which is not mentioned in the instruction but is essential for completing the task); (3) **Multi-object grounding**: successful task execution often depends on coordinated localization of multiple interrelated objects (e.g., *prepare the whiteboard for the next brainstorming session* involves *whiteboard*, *marker*, and *eraser*).

Following these principles, we construct ToG-Bench, a novel semi-automatically built benchmark through the collaboration between vision-language foundation models and human refinement. ToG-Bench contains 100 video clips (with an average length of 87.88 seconds) sourced from ScanNet [7], annotated with 2,704 task-oriented instructions and 4,194 object instances. Each object is annotated with second-level precise temporal boundaries and frame-level bounding boxes. In addition, to systematically evaluate the performance of T-STVG, we propose a suite of task-level metrics that collectively assess object recognition accuracy (i.e., the ability to correctly identify task-related objects) and spatio-temporal precision (i.e., the ability to localize them precisely in both spatial and temporal dimensions). We benchmark eight state-of-the-art MLLMs on ToG-Bench, revealing that while models perform reasonably well on explicit single-object cases, their performance drops sharply on implicit reasoning and multi-object grounding. These results indicate that ToG-Bench poses substantial challenges, providing a new benchmark for studying task-oriented grounding and promoting progress

toward more capable embodied agents.

Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- We introduce Task-oriented Spatio-Temporal Video Grounding (T-STVG), a novel task that advances traditional STVG toward task-driven grounding in egocentric perspectives, and establish a dedicated benchmark, ToG-Bench, to support systematic evaluation.
- We design task-level evaluation metrics that jointly assess recognition accuracy and spatio-temporal localization precision for task-relevant objects.
- Comprehensive experiments with state-of-the-art MLLMs reveal the intrinsic difficulty of T-STVG, especially in implicit reasoning and multi-object grounding, and highlight its potential in embodied AI.

## 2. Related Work

### 2.1. Spatio-Temporal Video Grounding

Spatio-Temporal Video Grounding (STVG) aims to localize both the temporal span and spatial region within a video according to a language query. Early benchmarks such as Charades-STA [10] and ActivityNet-Captions [16] primarily focus on exocentric videos with descriptive queries, providing only temporal annotations without spatial grounding. Subsequent work extended grounding to include spatial localization, including STPR [32], Vid-Sentence [4], VidSTG [36], HC-STVG [28], DVD-ST [15], and BOSTVG [34]. Recently, egocentric benchmarks such as Ego4D [11] and EgoMask [20] have advanced STVG in first-person settings by enabling temporal and spatial grounding in real-world videos. However, these efforts remain centered on object-centric descriptions and one-to-one alignments, leaving open the challenge of grounding task-oriented instructions that require reasoning about implicit targets and multi-object interactions. To bridge this gap, we introduce ToG-Bench, the first task-oriented STVG benchmark for egocentric videos, shifting the paradigm from object description to reasoning about task-relevant objects.

### 2.2. Multimodal Large Language Models

Current Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs) have demonstrated remarkable advancements in visual-language tasks like captioning, question answering, and reasoning. Early MLLMs focus on unimodal localization. For temporal grounding, VTimeLLM [14] refines timestamps via boundary-aware training, while TRACE [13] uses causal modeling. For spatial grounding, Grounding-GPT [19] enhances alignment through language-guided fusion. Recent efforts like SpaceVLLM [29] and LLaVA-ST [17] enable joint spatio-temporal prediction, yet they remain evaluated on descriptive queries, not task-driven instructions. While general-purpose MLLMs such as GPT-5 [1, 25], Gemini 2.5 Pro [6], and Qwen3VL [2] demon-

strate broad video understanding, their ability to localize task-relevant objects under implicit references or multi-object coordination in egocentric videos remains largely untested, due to the lack of suitable benchmarks. ToG-Bench fills this gap by introducing the first benchmark designed to assess MLLMs on task-oriented spatio-temporal grounding in egocentric videos, revealing critical limitations and guiding future development toward embodied intelligence.

### 3. ToG-Bench

#### 3.1. Task-Oriented Grounding Design Principles

Conventional STVG benchmarks adopt a *descriptive grounding paradigm*, where queries identify objects by visual attributes (e.g., color, shape, location, or state). Such paradigm evaluates appearance-based localization but fails to capture the *functional reasoning* required for embodied intelligence. In contrast, ToG-Bench redefines grounding as a *task-oriented paradigm*, determining which objects enable the completion of a given task rather than what an object looks like, aligning visual grounding with action intent. To implement this paradigm shift, we constructed ToG-Bench following several key design principles:

- **Task-Oriented Instructions:** ToG-Bench formulates instructions as goal-directed actions, emphasizing interaction with the environment (e.g., “*I’m a bit thirsty and want some water.*”). The objects referred to by the instruction are defined by the tools or items available in the agent’s current view associated with the task. For example, “*the water bottle*” can be used for drinking water.
- **Explicit-Implicit Dual Grounding:** ToG-Bench incorporates both explicit and implicit task references. In real-world scenarios, humans may directly mention the target object when giving an instruction (e.g., “*Pick up the pen from the desk.*”), while in other cases, they only convey the intention without specifying any object (e.g., “*take notes during the lecture.*”). The latter requires the agent to infer the appropriate target based on task context and commonsense knowledge.
- **Multi-object Grounding:** ToG-Bench supports one-to-many grounding, where a single instruction may involve multiple objects working together to accomplish a task (e.g., “*Work on your computer.*” requires a *computer*, a *mouse*, and a *keyboard*). Such multi-object coordination better reflects the complexity of real-world embodied interactions.

These three principles are mutually reinforcing, collectively defining the core framework of task-oriented spatio-temporal grounding. The task-oriented formulation naturally induces implicit references and multi-object dependencies, demanding higher-level functional understanding beyond low-level visual perception. Guided by these princi-




Figure 2. Semi-automated Annotation Pipeline. The process consists of three top-down stages: (1) generating task-oriented instructions and corresponding object descriptions with MLLM, (2) grounding and tracking task-relevant objects via Grounding-DINO and SAM2, and (3) performing human verification and filtering.

ples, T-STVG shifts the grounding criterion from perceptual similarity to functional relevance, bridging the gap between perception and intention.

#### 3.2. Semi-automated Annotation Pipeline

We develop a semi-automated annotation pipeline that combines vision language foundation models with human verification to efficiently construct the ToG-Bench dataset. As illustrated in Fig. 2, the pipeline consists of three stages: (1) *Task-Oriented Instruction Generation*. We feed the raw video clips from ScanNet [7] test-set along with their accompanying scene captions into an advanced MLLM (Gemini 2.5 Pro [6]) to generate a set of task-oriented instructions and detailed descriptions of the objects involved in each task, covering both explicit and implicit forms. (2) *Object Grounding and Tracking*. Based on the object descriptions, we apply Grounding-DINO [21] and SAM2 [27] in tandem to perform open-vocabulary spatial grounding and temporal tracking, resulting in spatio-temporal bounding-box tubes for task-relevant objects. (3) *Human Verification and Filtering*. Since foundation models may hallucinate or generate imprecise boundaries, all generated instructions and object annotations undergo rigorous manual validation.

A key characteristic of our annotation pipeline lies in its top-down design philosophy. In contrast to conventional STVG benchmarks, which follow a bottom-up procedure (detecting and tracking all objects first, then associating descriptive instructions), our pipeline starts with instruction generation and only grounds the objects relevant to those instructions. This top-down strategy aligns with the task-oriented nature of T-STVG, as many scene objects (e.g., wall or other static background items) are not actionable for task execution. Detecting and tracking every object beforehand would introduce substantial noise and annotation overhead, whereas our approach ensures efficiency and semantic focus. In the following, we will elaborate on each stage of the annotation pipeline in detail.




Figure 3. Dataset characteristics of ToG-Bench. **Top-left:** Task distribution by type (explicit vs. implicit) and object count; **Top-right:** Object category frequency (top 40 categories); **Bottom:** Example grounding tubes for explicit (blue) and implicit (pink) tasks, highlighting contextual inference and multi-object grounding.

**Task-Oriented Instruction Generation.** We begin by generating a structured caption for each video with Gemini 2.5 Pro, the caption captures the object attributes and their relationships in the scene. Then the generated captions, together with the video frames, are integrated as contextual cues to facilitate the generation of task-oriented instructions. To ensure the quality, we adopt two different prompt strategies for explicit and implicit instruction generation. All generated instructions are subsequently screened through an automatic verification stage to ensure: (1) *Visibility*: all referred objects are present and clearly visible in the video; (2) *Uniqueness*: each target object is unambiguously identifiable given attributes and spatial context; (3) *Feasibility*: unsafe or impractical actions are filtered out. The detailed prompts can be found in the Appendix.

**Object Grounding and Tracking.** For each validated instruction, we extract the target object and contextual cues (e.g., their attributes, states, relations with other objects), and convert these into a detailed object description. Based on this description, we apply Grounding-DINO to local-

ize the object in its first visible frame, detecting an initial bounding box. This box is then used as a visual prompt for SAM2, which propagates the box across video frames to produce a complete spatio-temporal grounding tube (i.e., a sequence of bounding boxes aligned with the task execution timeline). To balance the coverage and computational cost, we perform object tracking at a fixed frame rate of 1 fps.

**Human Verification and Filtering.** We visualize all spatio-temporal grounding tubes and conduct two rounds of human validation: (1) *First-pass filtering*: remove trajectories affected by occlusion, appearance changes, or tracking drift, especially critical for implicitly referred objects; (2) *Second-pass verification*: verify temporal boundaries align with task execution phases and ensure consistency in multi-object interactions. All low-quality annotations failing to meet the standards were filtered out. Through this semi-automated pipeline, we construct ToG-Bench, a high-quality benchmark for task-oriented spatio-temporal video grounding, with precise, diverse, and reliably grounded annotations.

### 3.3. Dataset Statistics

In total, ToG-Bench consists of 100 egocentric videos simulated from first-person trajectories in ScanNet indoor environments, 2,704 task-oriented spatio-temporal grounding instructions, and 4,194 annotated object instances. Fig. 3 provides an overview of the dataset’s detailed distributions across instructions, objects, and video durations.

**Instruction Distribution.** As illustrated in chart of Fig. 3 (top-left), ToG-Bench comprises 2,704 instructions, corresponding to an average of 27.0 tasks per video. Among these, 1,386 (51.26%) are explicit tasks that directly refer the target objects, while 1,318 (48.74%) are implicit tasks that require contextual reasoning to identify the relevant entities. This near-balanced distribution ensures that the benchmark equally challenges models on both direct perception and high-level reasoning capabilities. Regarding one-to-many grounding, 1,361 tasks (50.33%) involve two or more objects, including 124 tasks (4.6%) that reference three or more objects. On average, implicit tasks ground 1.97 objects per instruction, compared to 1.14 objects per explicit task, underscoring the inherently higher semantic complexity and reasoning demands of implicit grounding. The bottom panel of Fig. 3 provides examples of explicit and implicit tasks with time-stamped frames and ground-truth (GT) tubes overlaid, illustrating the task-driven characteristics of our proposed benchmark.

**Object Distribution.** As shown in the chart of Fig. 3 (top-right), ToG-Bench includes 4,194 object instances (mean: 41.94 per video), spanning 177 distinct functional object categories derived through semantic clustering. These categories are widely distributed across explicit and implicit tasks, with 145 categories appearing in explicit tasks and 164 in implicit tasks. This indicates that implicit grounding engages a similarly diverse set of functionally relevant objects as explicit grounding, rather than a narrow subset. The diversity of objects across tasks further highlights the challenge posed by ToG-Bench.

**Video Duration.** The dataset’s total video duration amounts to 8,788 seconds, with individual clips ranging from 13 to 347 seconds (mean: 87.88s), covering both short atomic interactions and extended procedural activities. As illustrated in Fig. 4, most clips fall in the 30-90 s range, while a considerable tail extends to 150–180 seconds or longer. This temporal diversity requires models to perform consistent spatio-temporal reasoning across varying time horizons, from fine-grained actions to long-term task dependencies.

Together, these characteristics make ToG-Bench a comprehensive and challenging benchmark for evaluating task-




Figure 4. Video duration distribution: bars show video count per interval, line shows average duration within each bin.

oriented spatio-temporal grounding in embodied video understanding.

## 4. Experiments

### 4.1. Experimental Setup

**Evaluated Models.** We evaluate two representative categories of multimodal large language models (MLLMs) to assess their zero-shot capabilities on task-oriented spatio-temporal grounding (T-STVG) in egocentric videos: (1) Proprietary MLLMs: GPT-5 [25] and Gemini 2.5 Pro [6]. (2) Open-source general-purpose MLLMs: Qwen3-VL (4B, 8B) [2], Qwen2.5-VL-7B [3], VideoLLaMA3-7B [35], InternVL3-8B [37], and InternVL3.5-8B [30].

**Implementation Details.** All models are assessed under a zero-shot, single-pass inference protocol to evaluate their inherent grounding capabilities without any task-specific fine-tuning. Videos are sampled at 0.25 frames per second, optimizing the trade-off between temporal coverage and computational efficiency, with no restriction on the number of frames to ensure complete contextual understanding. Open-source models are run on NVIDIA A100 40GB GPUs, whereas proprietary models are evaluated through their official APIs.

### 4.2. Evaluation Metrics

Considering the “*recognition-then-grounding*” logic inherent in task-oriented instructions depicted in Sec. 3.1, we implement a decoupled evaluation paradigm. The system prompt employed for inference is shown in Tab. 3, where we first prompt the MLLM to infer the category of the referred object, followed by predicting the time intervals or spatial coordinates. For metric evaluation, we first assess the MLLM’s **reasoning capabilities** in uncovering the target object embedded in task-oriented user queries within

Table 1. Task-level performance comparison of MLLMs on ToG-Bench. The best result is marked in **bold**, while the second is underlined.

Models	T-Acc	Task-level Temporal Video Grounding				Task-level Spatial Video Grounding			
		T-m_tIoU	T-R1@0.3	T-R1@0.5	T-R1@0.7	T-m_vIoU	T-AP@0.3	T-AP@0.5	T-AP@0.7
Proprietary MLLMs									
GPT-5 [25]	<b>89.42</b>	<u>36.64</u>	<u>48.38</u>	<u>40.49</u>	<u>23.92</u>	<u>29.88</u>	<u>47.14</u>	<u>27.97</u>	<u>9.24</u>
Gemini 2.5 Pro [6]	<u>80.14</u>	<b>41.58</b>	<b>52.73</b>	<b>45.46</b>	<b>31.23</b>	<b>38.48</b>	<b>53.70</b>	<b>41.41</b>	<b>26.15</b>
Open-source MLLMs									
Qwen2.5-VL-7B [3]	54.70	14.47	19.14	14.42	8.24	3.40	3.68	0.57	0.11
Qwen3-VL-4B [2]	49.67	2.36	3.90	2.33	0.92	5.29	6.86	1.64	0.37
Qwen3-VL-8B [2]	65.13	23.86	36.57	26.85	8.11	9.69	14.22	5.72	1.62
VideoLLaMA3-7B [35]	28.55	3.55	4.40	2.67	0.87	4.00	5.48	2.54	0.89
InternVL3-8B [37]	61.39	15.42	25.03	16.82	5.58	5.16	5.93	1.82	0.53
InternVL3.5-8B [30]	52.07	13.00	20.40	11.37	4.79	7.37	11.01	3.93	0.60

Table 2. Object-level performance comparison of MLLMs on ToG-Bench.

Models	O-Acc	EAcc	IAcc	Temporal Video Grounding				Spatial Video Grounding			
				O-m.tIoU	O-R1@0.3	O-R1@0.5	O-R1@0.7	O-m.vIoU	O-AP@0.3	O-AP@0.5	O-AP@0.7
Proprietary MLLMs											
GPT-5 [25]	92.82	95.60	86.98	36.06	47.54	39.63	23.37	29.11	45.95	27.01	8.92
Gemini 2.5 Pro [6]	84.55	87.40	78.55	40.37	51.19	44.23	30.02	37.32	52.05	40.15	25.15
Open-source MLLMs											
Qwen2.5-VL-7B [3]	66.09	68.61	60.80	13.57	17.95	13.47	7.75	3.06	3.29	0.48	0.10
Qwen3-VL-4B [2]	61.59	60.34	64.20	2.17	3.53	2.22	0.88	5.04	6.53	1.55	0.31
Qwen3-VL-8B [2]	74.42	76.50	70.04	22.81	35.12	25.27	7.53	9.21	13.57	5.56	1.57
VideoLLaMA3-7B [35]	32.50	36.14	24.85	3.33	4.20	2.48	0.76	3.63	4.91	2.38	0.72
InternVL3-8B [37]	68.88	71.75	62.87	14.67	24.20	15.93	5.15	4.62	5.29	1.57	0.48
InternVL3.5-8B [30]	62.71	63.27	61.54	12.36	19.38	10.71	4.55	6.86	10.44	3.72	0.60

Please carefully analyze the video frames and the given task instruction... Based on your visual understanding of the scene, please first **identify the object category** ... Then provide **temporal intervals** and **spatial coordinates** of ...

Table 3. A concise demonstration of the system prompt utilized for inference.

the embodied context. Following this, with the recognized target objects serving as guidance, we further investigate the MLLM’s **grounding capabilities** in both the spatial and temporal dimensions. (1) For reasoning capability evaluation, we employ accuracy (Acc) as the metric. Concretely, with the predicted object category, we match it with the ground-truth referred object by calculating the cosine similarity between their text embeddings extracted by `all-mpnet-base-v2` [22]. (2) For grounding capability evaluation, we calculate recall (R) for temporal grounding, average precision (AP) for spatial grounding, as well as mIoU for both tasks. Concretely, we apply different  $\tau$  ( $\tau \in \{0.3, 0.5, 0.7\}$ ) as thresholds when calculating the recall and average precision following prior works [5, 34, 36], which are denoted as  $R1@_\tau$  and  $AP@_\tau$ , respectively. Furthermore, to comprehensively evaluate

model performances, we calculate the above metrics from both object-level and task-level perspectives, and the corresponding metrics are denoted as O-Acc, O-R1@ $\tau$ , O-AP@ $\tau$ , and T-Acc, T-R1@ $\tau$ , T-AP@ $\tau$ , respectively. Moreover, we also group objects by task types (i.e, explicit and implicit), and calculate their recognition accuracy, denoted as EAcc and IAcc, respectively.

### 4.3. Main Results

**Overall Performance Comparison.** Table 1 presents the task-level performance of state-of-the-art MLLMs on ToG-Bench, highlighting the significant challenge of task-oriented grounding in egocentric videos. Task accuracy (T-Acc) is highest, followed by temporal grounding (T-m\_tIoU), and then spatial grounding (T-m\_vIoU), revealing a clear hierarchy of difficulty: recognizing intent is easier than locating objects in time and space. GPT-5 achieves the highest task accuracy at 89.42%, outperforming Gemini 2.5 Pro at 80.14%, showing superior ability to infer the complete set of functionally relevant objects even when not explicitly mentioned. However, its temporal and spatial grounding remains limited, with only 36.64% T-m\_tIoU and 29.88% T-m\_vIoU, indicating that correct identification does not guarantee precise localization. In contrast, Gemini

Table 4. Task-level temporal and spatial grounding performance on explicit and implicit tasks.

Models	Explicit Tasks					Implicit Tasks				
	T-EAcc	T-m_EtIoU	T-ER1@0.5	T-m_EvIoU	T-EAP@0.5	T-IAcc	T-m_ItoU	T-IR1@0.5	T-m_IvIoU	T-IAP@0.5
<i>Proprietary MLLMs</i>										
GPT-5 [25]	<b>98.20</b>	<u>40.51</u>	45.23	33.70	32.50	<b>80.20</b>	32.56	35.51	25.86	23.20
Gemini 2.5 Pro [6]	<u>91.49</u>	<b>47.75</b>	<b>52.08</b>	<b>43.22</b>	<b>46.50</b>	<u>68.21</u>	<b>35.10</b>	<b>38.50</b>	<b>33.49</b>	<b>36.06</b>
<i>Open-source MLLMs</i>										
Qwen2.5-VL-7B [3]	75.97	16.89	16.92	4.10	0.76	32.32	11.93	11.80	2.68	0.38
Qwen3-VL-4B [2]	59.96	2.42	2.22	5.83	2.06	38.85	2.30	2.44	4.72	1.21
Qwen3-VL-8B [2]	75.97	26.59	30.64	10.44	5.19	53.72	20.99	22.86	8.91	6.27
VideoLLaMA3-7B [35]	39.68	4.83	3.75	4.84	3.03	16.84	2.21	1.54	3.12	2.02
InternVL3-8B [37]	81.60	18.31	20.48	6.51	2.31	40.14	12.39	12.97	3.74	1.30
InternVL3.5-8B [30]	64.72	14.20	12.66	8.19	4.26	38.77	11.74	10.01	6.50	3.58

Table 5. Task-level performance across tasks with varying numbers of target objects.

Models	1 Object			2 Objects			3+ Objects			Avg.		
	T-Acc	T-m_tIoU	T-m_vIoU	T-Acc	T-m_tIoU	T-m_vIoU	T-Acc	T-m_tIoU	T-m_vIoU	T-Acc	T-m_tIoU	T-m_vIoU
<i>Proprietary MLLMs</i>												
GPT-5 [25]	<b>96.05</b>	<u>38.26</u>	<u>32.06</u>	<b>83.67</b>	<u>35.02</u>	<u>27.67</u>	<b>75.00</b>	<u>35.11</u>	<u>28.17</u>	<b>89.42</b>	<u>36.64</u>	<u>29.88</u>
Gemini 2.5 Pro [6]	<u>90.84</u>	<b>44.82</b>	<b>41.18</b>	<u>70.49</u>	<b>38.64</b>	<b>36.44</b>	<u>60.48</u>	<b>35.91</b>	<b>29.52</b>	<u>80.14</u>	<b>41.58</b>	<b>38.48</b>
<i>Open-source MLLMs</i>												
Qwen2.5-VL-7B [3]	83.40	17.33	4.41	28.05	11.32	2.38	9.68	14.91	2.73	54.70	14.47	3.40
Qwen3-VL-4B [2]	65.30	2.88	5.94	35.81	1.91	4.71	18.55	1.37	4.02	49.67	2.36	5.29
Qwen3-VL-8B [2]	83.40	26.75	10.96	48.91	21.16	8.57	29.03	19.55	7.15	65.13	23.86	9.69
VideoLLaMA3-7B [35]	40.13	4.27	5.04	18.43	2.79	3.02	4.03	3.52	2.54	28.55	3.55	4.00
InternVL3-8B [37]	87.19	17.68	6.60	38.40	13.09	3.84	11.29	14.32	2.69	61.39	15.42	5.16
InternVL3.5-8B [30]	74.39	14.78	8.75	31.61	11.30	6.07	14.52	10.71	5.22	52.07	13.00	7.37

2.5 Pro with lower T-Acc at 80.14%, outperforms GPT-5 in both temporal (41.58% vs. 36.64%) and spatial (38.48% vs. 29.88%) grounding, demonstrating better integration of visual cues for spatio-temporal alignment. The gap is even more pronounced in open-source models: Qwen3-VL-8B reaches 65.13% T-Acc but only 23.86% T-m\_tIoU and 9.69% T-m\_vIoU. The systematic degradation across three metrics shows that current MLLMs struggle to jointly resolve when and where task-relevant objects appear under egocentric viewpoint shifts and hand occlusion, even when they correctly understand the task.

**Object-level Performance Comparison.** Table 2 reports object-level performance of MLLMs on ToG-Bench. (1) Most models achieve high semantic accuracy, with GPT-5 reaching 92.82%, but performance drops sharply on implicit tasks: GPT-5 scores 95.60% in EAcc but only 86.98% in IAcc, and Qwen3-VL-8B falls from 76.50% to 70.04%, revealing a fundamental difficulty in inferring functionally relevant objects through contextual reasoning alone. (2) Task-level accuracy is consistently lower than object-level accuracy because it demands correct recognition of all relevant objects. For instance, GPT-5’s task-level accuracy (89.42% T-Acc) is notably lower than its object-level accuracy (92.82% Acc), and Qwen3-VL-8B’s drop from 74.42%

Acc to 65.13% T-Acc further confirms that further confirms that task-level evaluation imposes a stricter, all-or-nothing constraint. (3) Temporal and spatial grounding remains substantially more challenging than recognition: GPT-5 achieves 36.06% m\_tIoU and 29.11% m\_vIoU, while Qwen3-VL-8B reaches only 22.81% and 9.21%. These values closely match their corresponding task-level metrics (36.64% T-m\_tIoU and 29.88% T-m\_vIoU), confirming that fine-grained spatio-temporal grounding remains unsolved under egocentric motion. (4) Proprietary models significantly outperform open-source ones not merely through improved recognition, but through stronger reasoning and grounding of functional roles and spatial relations. Gemini 2.5 Pro achieves 84.55% Acc, 40.37% m\_tIoU, and 37.32% m\_vIoU, far surpassing Qwen3-VL-8B’s 74.42%, 22.81%, and 9.21%. This substantial gap, especially in spatial grounding, demonstrates that current open-source MLLMs struggle to align language instructions with precise visual structure under egocentric interaction.

#### 4.4. In-Depth Analysis

We evaluate MLLMs on three challenges: grounding mentioned vs. inferred objects, multi-object grounding, and spatio-temporal alignment across video lengths.




Figure 5. Task-level performance of GPT-5 across video duration bins on ToG-Bench. Left: task accuracy (T-Acc). Middle: temporal grounding (T-m\_tIoU). Right: spatial grounding (T-m\_vIoU).

**Temporal and Spatial Grounding Performance: Explicit vs. Implicit Tasks.** Table 4 reveals a consistent and substantial performance gap between explicit and implicit tasks across all models. GPT-5 attains 98.20% T-EAcc on explicit tasks but only 80.20% T-IAcc on implicit tasks, confirming the challenge of inferring unmentioned yet functionally relevant objects. The degradation intensifies in spatial and temporal grounding. GPT-5’s T-m\_IvIoU falls from 33.49% to 25.40%, while Gemini 2.5 Pro maintains superior localization (33.49%) despite lower semantic accuracy, suggesting it leverages visual dynamics and scene understanding beyond language cues. In contrast, open-source models suffer severe degradation. Qwen3-VL shows 53.72% T-IAcc but only 26.56% T-m\_EtIoU and 8.91% T-m\_IvIoU, indicating severe misalignment between semantic recognition and precise grounding. Notably, even when models identify the correct object class or approximate time window, they often fail to precisely ground it. This persistent asymmetry underscores that current MLLMs lack coherent grounding mechanisms that jointly reason about functional roles and dynamic visual context in embodied interaction.

**Performance on Tasks with Different Object Counts.** Table 5 evaluates model performance across tasks requiring grounding of one, two, or three or more objects. Performance consistently degrades as object count increases, but the nature of this degradation reveals deeper limitations. GPT-5 maintains relatively high task accuracy (75.00% for 3+ objects), but its T-m\_vIoU drops from 32.06% to 28.17%, suggesting it identifies the correct object set but fails to localize each accurately. Gemini 2.5 Pro shows superior robustness, achieving 29.52% T-m\_vIoU on 3+ object tasks, only slightly below its single-object performance (41.18%), indicating a more structured representation of multi-object interactions. In contrast, open-source models collapse rapidly. Qwen3-VL-8B’s T-Acc drops from 83.40% to 29.03%, with spatial performance remaining be-

low 11% throughout. This sharp decline demonstrates that current MLLMs lack mechanisms to jointly localize and disambiguate multiple task-relevant objects under egocentric interaction, a critical requirement for real-world embodied reasoning.

**Impact of Video Duration.** We analyze task-level grounding performance of GPT-5 across video duration bins, as shown in Fig. 5. The dataset is predominantly concentrated in the 30–150s range (Fig. 4), where T-Acc remains relatively stable between 0.864 and 0.890, indicating that task completion is primarily governed by the model’s ability to reason from language and visual context, rather than by video length. In contrast, both temporal and spatial grounding exhibit consistent degradation as duration increases: T-m\_tIoU peaks at 0.422 (60–90 s) and falls to 0.217 for videos exceeding 210 s, while T-m\_vIoU drops from 0.324 (30–60 s) to 0.178 (over 210 s). This progressive decline reveal that current MLLMs struggle to maintain accurate spatio-temporal alignment over extended sequences, especially under sparse semantic cues and long-range dependencies in prolonged egocentric tasks.

## 5. Conclusion

In this work, we present ToG-Bench, the first benchmark for task-oriented spatio-temporal video grounding in egocentric videos. Unlike traditional STVG benchmarks, ToG-Bench emphasizes grounding based on task intent, introducing new challenges that involve both explicitly mentioned and implicitly inferred objects, as well as supporting one-to-many object associations within a single instruction. Beyond the construction of the benchmark, we systematically evaluate seven state-of-the-art MLLMs and uncover their limitations. While these models exhibit strong performance in semantic understanding, they consistently struggle with spatial and temporal localization, especially in scenarios involving implicit reasoning and multi-object grounding.

## References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023. 2
- [2] Shuai Bai, Yuxuan Cai, Ruizhe Chen, Keqin Chen, Xionghui Chen, Zesen Cheng, Lianghao Deng, Wei Ding, Chang Gao, Chunjiang Ge, et al. Qwen3-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.21631*, 2025. 2, 5, 6, 7
- [3] 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. 5, 6, 7
- [4] Zhenfang Chen, Lin Ma, Wenhan Luo, and Kwan-Yee Kenneth Wong. Weakly-supervised spatio-temporally grounding natural sentence in video. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 1884–1894, 2019. 2
- [5] Zixu Cheng, Jian Hu, Ziquan Liu, Chenyang Si, Wei Li, and Shaogang Gong. V-star: Benchmarking video-llms on video spatio-temporal reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.11495*, 2025. 6
- [6] Gheorghe Comanici, Eric Bieber, Mike Schaekermann, Ice Pasupat, Naveen Sachdeva, Inderjit Dhillon, Marcel Blisstein, 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, 3, 5, 6, 7
- [7] Angela Dai, Angel X Chang, Manolis Savva, Maciej Halber, Thomas Funkhouser, and Matthias Nießner. Scannet: Richly-annotated 3d reconstructions of indoor scenes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5828–5839, 2017. 2, 3, 11
- [8] Jiafei Duan, Samson Yu, Hui Li Tan, Hongyuan Zhu, and Cheston Tan. A survey of embodied ai: From simulators to research tasks. *IEEE Transactions on Emerging Topics in Computational Intelligence*, 6(2):230–244, 2022. 1
- [9] Yuqian Fu, Runze Wang, Yanwei Fu, Danda Pani Paudel, Xuanjing Huang, and Luc Van Gool. Objectrelator: Enabling cross-view object relation understanding in ego-centric and exo-centric videos. *ICCV*, 2025. 1
- [10] Jiyang Gao, Chen Sun, Zhenheng Yang, and Ram Nevatia. Tall: Temporal activity localization via language query. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 5267–5275, 2017. 2
- [11] Kristen Grauman, Andrew Westbury, Eugene Byrne, Zachary Chavis, Antonino Furnari, Rohit Girdhar, Jackson Hamburger, Hao Jiang, Miao Liu, Xingyu Liu, et al. Ego4d: Around the world in 3,000 hours of egocentric video. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 18995–19012, 2022. 2
- [12] Kristen Grauman, Andrew Westbury, Lorenzo Torresani, Kris Kitani, Jitendra Malik, Triantafyllos Afouras, Kumar Ashutosh, Vijay Baiyya, Siddhant Bansal, Bikram Boote, et al. Ego-exo4d: Understanding skilled human activity from first-and third-person perspectives. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 19383–19400, 2024. 2
- [13] Yongxin Guo, Jingyu Liu, Mingda Li, Qingbin Liu, Xi Chen, and Xiaoying Tang. Trace: Temporal grounding video llm via causal event modeling. *ICLR*, 2025. 2
- [14] Bin Huang, Xin Wang, Hong Chen, Zihan Song, and Wenwu Zhu. Vtimellm: Empower llm to grasp video moments. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14271–14280, 2024. 2
- [15] Wei Ji, Xiangyan Liu, Yingfei Sun, Jiajun Deng, You Qin, Ammar Nuwanna, Mengyao Qiu, Lina Wei, and Roger Zimmermann. Described spatial-temporal video detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.05610*, 2024. 2, 12
- [16] Ranjay Krishna, Kenji Hata, Frederic Ren, Li Fei-Fei, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Dense-captioning events in videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 706–715, 2017. 2
- [17] Hongyu Li, Jinyu Chen, Ziyu Wei, Shaofei Huang, Tianrui Hui, Jialin Gao, Xiaoming Wei, and Si Liu. Llava-st: A multimodal large language model for fine-grained spatial-temporal understanding. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 8592–8603, 2025. 2
- [18] Kailing Li, Qi’ao Xu, Tianwen Qian, Yuqian Fu, Yang Jiao, and Xiaoling Wang. Clivis: Unleashing cognitive map through linguistic-visual synergy for embodied visual reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.17629*, 2025. 1
- [19] Zhaowei Li, Qi Xu, Dong Zhang, Hang Song, Yiqing Cai, Qi Qi, Ran Zhou, Juntong Pan, Zefeng Li, Vu Tu, et al. Groundinggpt: Language enhanced multi-modal grounding model. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6657–6678, 2024. 2
- [20] Shuo Liang, Yiwu Zhong, Zi-Yuan Hu, Yeyao Tao, and Liwei Wang. Fine-grained spatiotemporal grounding on ego-centric videos. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 9385–9395, 2025. 2, 12
- [21] Shilong Liu, Zhaoyang Zeng, Tianhe Ren, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Jie Yang, Qing Jiang, Chunyuan Li, Jianwei Yang, Hang Su, et al. Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for open-set object detection. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 38–55. Springer, 2024. 3
- [22] Kyle Lo, Lucy Lu Wang, Mark Neumann, Rodney Kinney, and Daniel Weld. S2ORC: The semantic scholar open research corpus. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4969–4983, Online, 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. 6
- [23] Xiaoxiao Long, Qingrui Zhao, Kaiwen Zhang, Zihao Zhang, Dingrui Wang, Yumeng Liu, Zhengjie Shu, Yi Lu, Shouzheng Wang, Xinzhe Wei, et al. A survey: Learning embodied intelligence from physical simulators and world models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.00917*, 2025. 1
- [24] Mi Luo, Zihui Xue, Alex Dimakis, and Kristen Grauman. Put myself in your shoes: Lifting the egocentric perspective

- from exocentric videos. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 407–425. Springer, 2024. [2](#)
- [25] OpenAI. Introducing gpt-5, 2025. Accessed: 2025-09-07. [2](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [26] Chiara Plizzari, Gabriele Goletto, Antonino Furnari, Siddhant Bansal, Francesco Ragusa, Giovanni Maria Farinella, Dima Damen, and Tatiana Tommasi. An outlook into the future of egocentric vision. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 132(11):4880–4936, 2024. [1](#)
- [27] Nikhila Ravi, Valentin Gabeur, Yuan-Ting Hu, Ronghang Hu, Chaitanya Ryali, Tengyu Ma, Haitham Khedr, Roman Rädle, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, et al. Sam 2: Segment anything in images and videos. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. [3](#)
- [28] Zongheng Tang, Yue Liao, Si Liu, Guanbin Li, Xiaojie Jin, Hongxu Jiang, Qian Yu, and Dong Xu. Human-centric spatio-temporal video grounding with visual transformers. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 32(12):8238–8249, 2021. [1](#), [2](#), [12](#)
- [29] Jiankang Wang, Zhihan Zhang, Zhihang Liu, Yang Li, Jianan Ge, Hongtao Xie, and Yongdong Zhang. Spacevllm: Endowing multimodal large language model with spatio-temporal video grounding capability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.13983*, 2025. [2](#)
- [30] 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. [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [31] Syed Talal Wasim, Muzammal Naseer, Salman Khan, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Videogrounding-dino: Towards open-vocabulary spatio-temporal video grounding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18909–18918, 2024. [1](#)
- [32] Masataka Yamaguchi, Kuniaki Saito, Yoshitaka Ushiku, and Tatsuya Harada. Spatio-temporal person retrieval via natural language queries. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 1453–1462, 2017. [1](#), [2](#), [12](#)
- [33] Antoine Yang, Antoine Miech, Josef Sivic, Ivan Laptev, and Cordelia Schmid. Tubedetr: Spatio-temporal video grounding with transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 16442–16453, 2022. [1](#)
- [34] Jiali Yao, Xinran Deng, Xin Gu, Mengrui Dai, Bing Fan, Zhipeng Zhang, Yan Huang, Heng Fan, and Libo Zhang. Omnistvg: Toward spatio-temporal omni-object video grounding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.10500*, 2025. [2](#), [6](#)
- [35] Boqiang Zhang, Kehan Li, Zesen Cheng, Zhiqiang Hu, Yuqian Yuan, Guanzheng Chen, Sicong Leng, Yuming Jiang, Hang Zhang, Xin Li, et al. Videollama 3: Frontier multimodal foundation models for image and video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.13106*, 2025. [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [36] Zhu Zhang, Zhou Zhao, Yang Zhao, Qi Wang, Huasheng Liu, and Lianli Gao. Where does it exist: Spatio-temporal video grounding for multi-form sentences. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10668–10677, 2020. [1](#), [2](#), [6](#), [12](#)
- [37] Jinguo Zhu, Weiyun Wang, Zhe Chen, Zhaoyang Liu, Shenglong Ye, Lixin Gu, Hao Tian, Yuchen Duan, Weijie Su, Jie Shao, et al. Internvl3: Exploring advanced training and test-time recipes for open-source multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.10479*, 2025. [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)

# ToG-Bench: Task-Oriented Spatio-Temporal Grounding in Egocentric Videos

## Supplementary Material

In this supplementary material, we provide additional details and analyses to complement the main paper. Sec. 6 presents a comprehensive comparison of ToG-Bench with existing spatio-temporal video grounding (STVG) benchmarks, along with extended data statistics and example visualizations. Sec. 7 describes our experiments, including specific experimental implementations, more quantitative results, and visualizations of model performance. Finally, Sec. 8 further elaborates the construction details of ToG-Bench, focusing on the data annotation and verification pipeline.

### 6. Benchmark Comparison and Statistics

#### 6.1. Comparison with Existing Benchmarks

As summarized in Tab. 6, ToG-Bench complements existing benchmarks by integrating three key dimensions in egocentric video: (1) *task-oriented grounding* driven by functional intent rather than surface-level appearance, (2) *explicit-implicit dual grounding*, enabling evaluation under both directly mentioned and inferred targets, and (3) *multi-object grounding*, supporting one-to-many associations within a single instruction. In addition to its design innovations, ToG-Bench also offers strong data scale advantages: long video durations that better reflect real embodied interactions, a large set of manually verified task instructions, and a broad coverage of functional object categories, surpassing prior STVG datasets in both diversity and annotation depth. Together, these characteristics make ToG-Bench a more challenging and comprehensive benchmark, enabling rigorous evaluation of functional understanding, temporal reasoning, and grounding robustness. These capabilities are essential for developing embodied agents that operate meaningfully in real-world environments.

#### 6.2. More Data Statistics

ToG-Bench is built on 100 egocentric videos from ScanNet [7], covering 18 diverse indoor scenes, and contains 2,704 task-oriented grounding instructions. This subsection provides additional details on object category distributions and scene-specific key objects.

**Object Category Distribution.** Fig. 6 shows the full distribution of all 177 object categories across the 2,704 tasks in ToG-Bench, separated by task type (implicit vs. explicit). While the main paper visualizes only the top 40 most frequent categories, this figure reveals the complete long-tail structure, confirming broad and balanced coverage across diverse indoor objects.

**Key Objects per Indoor Scene.** Table 7 lists the key ob-

jects associated with each of the 18 indoor scenes in ToG-Bench. These objects are chosen based on their task relevance and frequency in egocentric video, capturing their functional role in daily activities. This selection enables robust evaluation of spatial-temporal grounding across diverse real-world environments, including offices and bathrooms.

#### 6.3. More Examples Visualization

Additional annotated examples from ToG-Bench are shown in Fig. 7 and Fig. 8, covering both explicit and implicit task scenarios. These include real first-person video clips with human-verified bounding boxes and temporal intervals, capturing interactions where objects are either directly named or inferred from context and function.

### 7. Extended Experimental Analysis

#### 7.1. Experiment Setup

Our evaluation follows a zero-shot, single-round inference protocol on NVIDIA A100 40GB GPUs. Video frames are sampled at 0.25 fps with no limit on frame count. To ensure deterministic outputs, we set `do_sample=False` for greedy decoding in all experiments. Results are reported under identical settings to enable fair comparison.

#### 7.2. Strict Task-Level Grounding Performance.

To evaluate whether MLLMs truly understand the complete intent of a task, rather than localizing objects in isolation, we introduce a strict task-level evaluation protocol. Under this protocol, a task is counted as success only if the model recognizes all required objects and provides accurate spatio-temporal predictions for each of them. Specifically, if any object (explicit or implicit) is misidentified, the temporal and spatial grounding scores for the entire task are assigned a value of zero. This requirement enforces holistic task understanding, since the model must succeed on every component simultaneously.

We report these strict metrics as  $ST\text{-}m\_tIoU$ ,  $ST\text{-}R1@_\tau$ ,  $ST\text{-}m\_vIoU$ , and  $ST\text{-}AP@_\tau$  ( $\tau \in \{0.3, 0.5, 0.7\}$ ), where “S” denotes strict evaluation. As shown in Tab. 8, these strict scores are significantly lower than the standard task-level results, indicating that current models often fail to maintain consistent reasoning and grounding across multiple object dependencies.

#### 7.3. Qualitative Results for Grounding

We present visual comparisons of spatio-temporal grounding results across video segments, showing the input instruction, ground truth (GT), and predictions from multi-

Table 6. Comparison of STVG benchmarks in terms of open-source availability, task focus (**OC**: object-centric, **TO**: task-oriented), camera perspective (**Ego**: egocentric, **Exo**: exocentric), reference type (**Exp**: explicit, **Imp**: implicit, **Both**: both), objects per instruction (**SO**: single, **MO**: multiple), number of videos, average video duration (s), number of test samples, and object categories.

Benchmark	Open	Focus	Persp.	Ref. Type	Objs. / Instr.	Videos	Dur. (s)	Samples	Categories
STPR [32]	✓	OC	Exo	Exp	SO	283	9.80	1,615	1
VidSTG [36]	✓	OC	Exo	Exp	SO	743	28.01	10,303	79
HC-STVG [28]	✓	OC	Exo	Exp	SO	1,160	20.00	1,160	1
DVD-ST [15]	✗	OC	Exo	Exp	MO	632	-	1,327	163
EgoMask [20]	✓	OC	Ego	Exp	SO	200	12.15	400	200
						100	116.30	200	100
						15	361.32	100	50
<b>ToG-Bench</b>	✓	TO	Ego	Both	MO	100	87.88	2,704	177




Figure 6. The distribution of different types of objects in ToG-Bench.

ple models. Representative examples are shown in Fig. 9, Fig. 11, Fig. 10, and Fig. 12. Each example includes aligned video frames (fps=0.25), GT, annotated temporal intervals, and spatial bounding boxes to illustrate object localization accuracy under implicit and one-to-many conditions.

## 8. Inference and Annotation Prompts

### 8.1. Detailed System Prompt for Inference

All MLLMs utilize the same structured prompt (Fig. 13) to ensure uniform output formatting. The prompt requires the model to:

- Analyze frames and instruction to identify objects with *explicit* or *implicit*.
- Output JSON with four fields: `explicit_object`,

`implicit_object`, `temporal_grounding`, and `spatial_tracking`.

- Normalize spatial coordinates to  $[0, 1]$  and compute temporal intervals in seconds using frame index and FPS. This ensures consistent, parsable outputs for joint evaluation of recognition, temporal, and spatial grounding in a single inference.

### 8.2. Prompts for the Semi-Automated Pipeline

To construct and validate the ToG-Bench, we design a two-stage automated pipeline using structured prompts for a multimodal large language model. The first stage generates task instructions with explicit and implicit grounding, while the second stage filters out unverifiable or non-compliant tasks. Both stages rely on carefully crafted system and user

Table 7. Key objects in each scene of ToG-Bench. Objects are selected based on task relevance and frequency in egocentric videos.

Scene	Key Objects
Bedroom / Hotel	<i>bed, pillow, lamp, duvet, mirror, dresser, telephone, door, nightstand, chair, desk, window</i>
Living Room / Lounge	<i>sofa, coffee table, tv, desk, chair, piano, door, trash can, backpack, heater, window, blinds</i>
Bathroom	<i>toilet, sink, faucet, dresser, soap dispenser, shower, shower curtain, mirror, grab bar, door</i>
Office	<i>desk, chair, computer, computer tower, keyboard, mouse, telephone, laptop, door, printer</i>
Conference Room	<i>table, chair, projector, tv, whiteboard, marker, eraser, door, light switch, remote control</i>
Kitchen	<i>refrigerator, microwave oven, stove, sink, faucet, cutting board, pan, coffee maker, trash can, door</i>
Bookstore / Library	<i>bookshelf, book, lamp, chair, desk, pen, telephone, laptop, door, window, trash can</i>
Lobby	<i>desk, chair, sofa, telephone, fire extinguisher, sign, door, fire alarm, light switch, trash can</i>
Classroom	<i>desk, chair, whiteboard, marker, eraser, telephone, computer, door, trash can</i>
Apartment	<i>door, window, light switch, thermostat, air purifier, vacuum cleaner, trash can</i>
Hallway	<i>door, fire extinguisher, door number sign, vacuum cleaner, trash can, bulletin board</i>
Basement	<i>ladder, cardboard box, circuit breaker, trash can, door</i>
Stairs	<i>handrail, stairs, light, exit sign, door, window, robotic vacuum</i>
Dining Room	<i>dining table, chair, plate, trash can, door, light fixture, wine bottle</i>
Laundry Room	<i>washing machine, dryer, laundry hamper, iron, ironing board, basket, door</i>
Closet	<i>hanger, clothing rod, shelf, basket, shoe rack, mirror, door</i>
Gym	<i>dumbbells, locker, telephone, water bottle, door</i>
Miscellaneous	<i>telephone, laptop, tablet, charger, backpack</i>

Table 8. Task-level performance under **strict evaluation protocol**: a task fails if any target object is misrecognized. The best result is marked in **bold**, while the second is underlined.


Models	Strict Task-level Temporal Video Grounding				Strict Task-level Spatial Video Grounding			
	ST-m.tIoU	ST-R1@0.3	ST-R1@0.5	ST-R1@0.7	ST-m.vIoU	ST-AP@0.3	ST-AP@0.5	ST-AP@0.7
<i>Proprietary MLLMs</i>								
GPT-5	34.78	<u>45.90</u>	38.34	22.78	28.19	44.38	26.49	8.64
Gemini 2.5 Pro	<b>38.94</b>	<b>49.39</b>	<b>42.60</b>	<b>29.42</b>	<b>35.89</b>	<b>50.15</b>	<b>38.77</b>	<b>24.28</b>
<i>Open-source MLLMs</i>								
Qwen2.5-VL-7B	10.91	14.61	10.89	6.00	2.74	3.02	0.50	0.09
Qwen3-VL-4B	1.78	3.01	1.72	0.61	4.43	5.86	1.38	0.31
Qwen3-VL-8B	18.96	28.91	21.25	6.46	7.81	11.33	4.53	1.25
VideoLLaMA3-7B	3.02	3.66	2.30	0.79	3.33	4.52	1.95	0.76
InternVL3-8B	10.67	17.53	11.37	3.47	3.93	4.54	1.39	0.43
InternVL3.5-8B	10.04	15.87	8.73	3.53	5.83	8.54	3.10	0.54

prompts to ensure consistency, visual grounding, and semantic fidelity.

**Task Generation Prompts.** We design two structured prompts to guide a multimodal large language model (MLLM) in generating task instructions grounded in egocentric video content. For explicit grounding, the prompt requires the model to generate direct commands that name the target object. For implicit grounding, it requires the model to describe an action or goal without naming the object, relying instead on contextual inference. Both prompts enforce a structured JSON output, canonical object naming, and adherence to scene-specific object eligibility to ensure high-quality, diverse, and verifiable task generation. Full prompts are provided in Fig. 14, Fig. 15, Fig. 16, and Fig. 17.


**Task Validation Prompts.** To ensure only visually grounded and semantically valid tasks are retained, we apply two dedicated validation prompts explicit and implicit grounding tasks. For explicit tasks, the prompt verifies that each object is clearly visible in the frames, uses a canonical name without modifiers, and is described in one sentence with color, shape, position, and context. For implicit tasks, it checks whether the instruction avoids naming the target object directly and instead relies on functional or spatial cues that allow inference from scene context. The task must also satisfy a dual-dimensional criterion combining semantic intent and reference type. Any task that fails any of these checks is discarded. Full validation prompts are shown in Fig. 18, Fig. 19, Fig. 20, and Fig. 21.

**Instruction:** Open the *door*.



34 | ← GT → 50 (s)

**Instruction:** Read the '*Break Room Rules*' posted on the *refrigerator*.



0 | ← GT → 8 24 | ← GT → 29 (s)



0 | ← GT → 11 24 | ← GT → 32 (s)

**Instruction:** Empty the *trash can* next to the *wall heater*.



0 | ← GT → 3 65 | ← GT → 75 (s)



0 | ← GT → 2 65 | ← GT → 75 (s)


**Instruction:** Move the *iron* from the *ironing board* to the *shelving unit*.



0 | ← GT → 5 26 | ← GT → 28 (s)




0 | ← GT → 6 25 | ← GT → 28 (s)




4 | ← GT → 8 27 | ← GT → 28 (s)

Figure 7. More explicit samples.


**Instruction:** Turn on the water at the *sink*. → *faucet*



**Instruction:** Adjust the amount of daylight entering through the *window*. → *blinds*



**Instruction:** Type text using what's in front of the *computer monitor*. → *keyboard*



**Instruction:** Quickly heat a meal using what's next to the *sink*. → *microwave oven*




Figure 8. More implicit samples.




Figure 9. Explicit spatio-temporal grounding for “Turn off the heater”: model predictions vs. ground truth (GT).




Figure 10. Implicit spatio-temporal grounding for “Get what you need to clean the floor”: model predictions vs. ground truth (GT).





Figure 11. Explicit spatio-temporal grounding for “Use the marker to write on the whiteboard”: model predictions vs. ground truth (GT).

**Instruction:** Turn on what's near the *refrigerator* to improve the air quality.  
→ *air purifier*



**Gemini 2.5 Pro**



**GPT-5**



**Qwen3-VL-8B**



Figure 12. Implicit spatio-temporal grounding for “Turn on what’s near the refrigerator to improve the air quality”: model predictions vs. ground truth (GT).

## Inference Prompt

Please carefully analyze the video frames and the given task instruction.

Task: {task\_title}

Task type: {task\_type}

The input consists of {used\_frames} frames sampled from the video at {frame\_fps} FPS.

Based on your visual understanding of the scene across time, identify the objects involved in performing the task. First, identify the object category, then provide temporal intervals and spatial coordinates (bounding box) for each identified instance.

### Important rules:

- If the task type is 'Explicit', ONLY include objects that are explicitly mentioned in the task. Do NOT include any implicit or inferred objects. The 'implicit\_object' list must be empty.
- If the task type is 'Implicit', you MUST include at least one implicitly required object (not mentioned in the task but necessary to perform it). You MAY also include explicitly mentioned objects if they are visually present and relevant.
- ALL bounding boxes must be normalized to the range [0, 1] relative to the image width and height in the format [x1, y1, x2, y2], where (x1, y1) is the top-left corner and (x2, y2) is the bottom-right corner.

### Respond only in the following JSON format with four fields:

- "explicit\_object": list of object names explicitly mentioned in the task.
- "implicit\_object": list of object names not mentioned but necessary for the task (based on commonsense reasoning).
- "temporal\_grounding": mapping from each object name to a list of time intervals (in **seconds**, inclusive) when the object is visible and task-relevant.
- "spatial\_tracking": mapping from each object name to a dictionary where keys are stringified time in seconds (e.g., 0, 4, 12) and values are normalized bounding boxes [x1, y1, x2, y2] in the range [0, 1].

Note: Time in seconds is computed as frame\_index / FPS. Use exact values (e.g., frame 4 at 0.25 FPS  $\rightarrow 4 / 0.25 = 16$  seconds). Do not include any other text, explanation, or formatting outside this JSON object.

### Example response:

```
```json
{
  "explicit_object": ["computer"],
  "implicit_object": ["chair"],
  "temporal_grounding": {
    "computer": [[4, 8], [12, 20]],
    "chair": [[8, 20]]
  },
  "spatial_tracking": {
    "computer": {
      "4": [0.0772, 0.0517, 0.2315, 0.4132],
      "8": [0.0864, 0.0641, 0.2407, 0.4261],
      "12": [0.0926, 0.0723, 0.2469, 0.4343],
      "16": [0.0941, 0.0744, 0.2485, 0.4364],
      "20": [0.1003, 0.0828, 0.2546, 0.4448]
    },
    "chair": {
      "8": [0.0926, 0.0517, 0.3472, 0.8281],
      "12": [0.1080, 0.0723, 0.3627, 0.8489],
      "16": [0.1235, 0.0929, 0.3781, 0.8697],
      "20": [0.1273, 0.0981, 0.3819, 0.8749]
    }
  }
}
```
```

Figure 13. The complete prompt utilized for inference.

### System Prompt

You are an Expert Visual Reasoning Agent for Guided Explicit Task Generation in Indoor Scenes. Your task is to generate explicit tasks by analyzing the provided `scene\_description` and `image\_frames`. Use the scene description only for contextual framing, and the image frames are your sole source of visual truth.

- scene\_description: A textual summary providing ambient context, object mentions, and functional hints. Use only for room-type inference and contextual framing, not as ground truth.
- image\_frames: One or more static images of the indoor scene. Sole source of truth for object existence, visibility, position, and appearance.

#### Core Capabilities:

1. Indoor Scene Coverage:
  - Support 18 indoor scene types (based on ScanNet): Bedroom / Hotel, Living Room / Lounge, Bathroom, Office, Conference Room, Kitchen, Bookstore / Library, Lobby, Classroom, Apartment, Hallway, Basement, Stairs, Dining Room, Laundry Room, Closet, Gym, Miscellaneous (Misc.).
2. Explicit Task Rules:
  - Definition: Simple, direct actions on objects explicitly mentioned or inferable from the `scene\_description`.
  - Examples: "Wipe the black computer monitor on the desk.", "Place the keyboard directly in front of the monitor".
3. Dynamic Task Scaling:
  - Generate 30-50 tasks based on the richness of the `scene\_description`:
    - If  $\leq 10$  objects are described  $\rightarrow$  20 tasks.
    - If 10-15 objects are described  $\rightarrow$  30 tasks.
    - If  $> 15$  objects are described  $\rightarrow$  40 tasks.
4. Strict Format Adherence: Output structured JSON with `tasks` array, each containing:
  - `task\_id`: Numeric (1-50),
  - `task\_title`: Action + Object(s),
  - `task\_type`: "Explicit",
  - `explicit\_objects`: Array of objects with:
    - `name`: Object name (e.g., "toothbrush").
    - `description`: A sentence integrating color, shape, position, and contextual clues (e.g., "A blue-handled slim cylindrical toothbrush located in the cup beside the sink, closest to the faucet.").
  - `implicit\_objects`: Empty array (`[]`).
5. Physical Feasibility:
  - Ensure object interactions align with real-world logic (e.g., "Place a cup on a shelf" vs. "Place a shelf on a cup").
6. Referential Clarity:
  - For multiple objects of the same type (e.g., multiple "tables"), use descriptive attributes (e.g., "dark wood media chest", "white desk", ).
  - Prioritize precise object names (e.g., "Gray Carpet" instead of generic "floor").
7. Object Reuse Design:
  - Explicit objects should reappear across tasks (e.g., "Black Leather Office Chair" reused 4-7 times).
8. Action-Specific Vocabulary:
  - Use diverse, context-specific verbs to avoid repetition:
    - Adjust, calibrate, modify
    - Organize, sort, categorize
    - Replace, swap, refill, restore
    - Activate/Deactivate, switch on/off, initiate
    - Spatial Manipulation, take, put, move
    - Interaction, retrieve, detach
9. Output Requirements: Output strictly in JSON format with no extra text.

Figure 14. System prompt for explicit task generation.

### User Prompt

Generate 20-40 explicit tasks based on the following inputs 'scene\_description' and 'image\_frames'. Ensure tasks align with indoor scenes and follow strict formatting.

#### INPUT:

- Scene Description: {scene\_description}
- Image Frames: {frame\_count} frames sampled at {sampling\_fps} FPS, static images depicting the indoor scene.

#### Output Requirements:

1. Task Quantity:
  - Generate 20-40 tasks based on the richness of the 'scene description':
    - If  $\leq 10$  objects are described  $\rightarrow$  20 tasks.
    - If 10-15 objects are described  $\rightarrow$  30 tasks.
    - If  $> 15$  objects are described  $\rightarrow$  40 tasks.
2. Explicit Tasks Generation:
  - Simple, direct actions on clearly visible objects (e.g., "Clean the black computer tower", "Place the keyboard directly in front of the monitor").
3. Object Definitions:
  - Explicit Objects:
    - Each object must be represented as an object with 'name' and 'description'.
    - 'name' directly mentioned in 'task\_title' (e.g., "Computer", "Desk").
    - 'description' include color, shape, position, and contextual clues in a single sentence.
  - Implicit Objects: Empty array '[]'.
4. Technical Details:
  - Use diverse, context-specific verbs (e.g., "Adjust, calibrate, modify, Organize, sort, categorize, Replace, swap, refill, restore, Activate/Deactivate, switch on/off, initiate, Spatial Manipulation, take, put, move, Interaction, retrieve, detach")
  - Prioritize precise object names (e.g., "Gray Carpet" instead of "floor")
  - Add descriptive attributes for similar objects (e.g., "the red sofa" vs. "the white desk")
  - Ensure physical feasibility (tool compatibility, spatial constraints)
5. Object Reuse:
  - Explicit objects must reappear across tasks (e.g., "computer" used 4-7 times).

#### Example response:

```
'''json
{
  "tasks": [
    {
      "task_id": 1,
      "task_title": "Wipe dust off the black computer monitor",
      "task_type": "Explicit",
      "explicit_objects": [
        {"name": "black computer monitor", "description": "A black rectangular computer monitor placed on the white desk, adjacent to the keyboard."}
      ],
      "implicit_objects": []
    },
    {
      "task_id": 2
      "task_title": "Sanitize the toothbrush closest to the sink",
      "task_type": "Explicit",
      "explicit_objects": [
        {"name": "sink", "description": "A stainless steel circular basin mounted on the bathroom wall next to the soap dispenser."},
        {"name": "toothbrush", "description": "A blue-handled slim cylindrical toothbrush located in the cup beside the sink, closest to the faucet."}
      ],
      "implicit_objects": []
    }
  ]
}'''
```

Figure 15. User prompt for explicit task generation.

### System Prompt

You are an Expert Visual Reasoning Agent for Guided Implicit Task Generation in Indoor Scenes. Your task is to generate implicit tasks by analyzing the provided 'scene\_description' and 'image\_frames'. Use the scene description only for contextual framing, and the image frames are your sole source of visual truth.

- scene\_description: A textual summary providing ambient context, object mentions, and functional hints. Use only for room-type inference and contextual framing, not as ground truth.
- image\_frames: One or more static images of the indoor scene. Sole source of truth for object existence, visibility, position, and appearance.

#### Core Capabilities:

1. Indoor Scene Coverage:
  - Support 18 indoor scene types (based on ScanNet): Bedroom / Hotel, Living Room / Lounge, Bathroom, Office, Conference Room, Kitchen, Bookstore / Library, Lobby, Classroom, Apartment, Hallway, Basement, Stairs, Dining Room, Laundry Room, Closet, Gym, Miscellaneous (Misc.)

#### 2. Implicit Object Rules:

- Definition: Objects not named, described, or hinted at in the task title, but visually present in image\_frames and uniquely inferable from behavioral intent and/or spatial context.
- Allowed:
  - Objects are clearly visible, unambiguous, and semantically distinct in image\_frames (e.g., "fire extinguisher", "paper towel").
  - Universally implied items that are functionally inseparable from a visible anchor (e.g., "toilet paper" for a paper holder, "faucet" for a sink).
  - Informational or regulatory items (e.g., "notice", "rules poster", "exit sign") if visibly attached to a surface and contextually relevant.
- Strictly Rejected:
  - Any object not unambiguously visible in image\_frames.
  - Abstract, transient, or non-interactive items.
  - Cleaning tools (e.g., "cloth", "wipes", "sponge"), architectural elements (e.g., wall, floor, countertop, ceiling).
  - Micro-components (e.g., "bulb", "screw"), surfaces like "countertop" are NOT objects.

#### 3. Guided Implicit Task Framework (MANDATORY):

Every generated task MUST belong to exactly one category in each dimension:

- Dimension 1: Semantic Intent Type
    - (A) Function-Driven Action Intent: Express a concrete functional goal (e.g., "Dry your hands", "Boil water").
    - (B) Scene-Compliance Intent: Involve rules, safety, or protocols (e.g., "Check the posted guidelines before using...").
    - (C) Behavioral Chain Completion: Represent the natural endpoint of a behavior (e.g., "Discard used paper towels after cleaning...").
  - Dimension 2: Explicit-Implicit Relationship
    - (X) Intent-Driven Relationship: Implicit object inferred from intent; explicit object provides context (e.g., "at the sink").
    - (Y) Spatially-Anchored Relationship: Implicit object located via visible spatial relation (e.g., "under the window"), with an actionable verb compatible with the object (e.g., "adjust").
- Tasks that do not fit one (A/B/C) and one (X/Y) are INVALID.

#### 4. Object Definitions:

- Explicit Objects:
  - MUST be 1 or 2 objects.
  - Must be named directly in the task title using minimal canonical class name (e.g., "sink", "refrigerator").
  - 'name': NO adjectives, colors, materials, or states.
  - 'description': One sentence with visual details (color, shape, position).
- Implicit Objects:
  - Must be visually present, never appear in the title.
  - Must be functionally or spatially necessary to complete the task.
  - 'name': Minimal canonical class (e.g., "faucet", "notice").
  - 'description': One sentence with color, shape, position, and contextual relationship.

#### 5. Verb and Title Guidelines:

- Use strong, context-specific verbs: "dry", "boil", "heat", "check", "adjust", "dispose", "verify", "retrieve", "locate", "use", "identify".
- Title must be an imperative sentence expressing behavioral intent, containing explicit object(s) as anchor(s), and zero reference to implicit object(s).

#### 6. Generation Specifications:

- Reasoning Depth:
  - Single-Hop Tasks (50%): One-step inference (e.g., intent  $\rightarrow$  tool).
  - Dual-Hop Tasks (50%): Combine intent + spatial, or compliance + spatial.

#### 7. Validation Checklist:

- All objects visually confirmed in frames.
- Title contains explicit object(s), no implicit object reference.
- Task fits one (A/B/C) and one (X/Y).
- No prohibited objects or verbs.

Figure 16. System prompt for implicit task generation.

### User Prompt

Generate Guided Implicit Tasks based on the following inputs `scene\_description` and `image\_frames`, strictly following the dual-dimensional framework.

#### INPUT:

- Scene Description: {scene\_description}
- Image Frames: {frame\_count} frames sampled at {sampling\_fps} FPS, static images depicting the indoor scene.

#### Output Requirements:

1. Task Quantity (Dynamic):
  - Generate exactly the following number of tasks:
    - If visible object count  $\leq 10$  OR frame count  $< 30 \rightarrow 20$  tasks.
    - If visible object count  $\geq 10$  AND  $\leq 15$  OR frame count  $\geq 30$  AND  $\leq 60 \rightarrow 30$  tasks.
    - If visible object count  $> 15$  OR frame count  $> 60 \rightarrow 40$  tasks.
  - "Visible object count" = number of unambiguous semantic objects in frames (ignore duplicates, occluded items).
2. Dual-Dimensional Compliance (MANDATORY):
  - Every task MUST belong to one Semantic Intent Type:
    - (A) Function-Driven, (B) Scene-Compliance, or (C) Behavioral Chain.
  - AND one Relationship Type:
    - (X) Intent-Driven or (Y) Spatially-Anchored (with actionable verb).
  - Reject any task that does not clearly fit both dimensions.
3. Object & Title Rules:
  - Every task MUST have 0–2 explicit objects, named in title using canonical names (e.g., "sink", not "stainless steel basin").
  - Title MUST NOT contain: implicit object names, synonyms.
  - Title MUST be an imperative sentence expressing behavioral intent (e.g., "Dry your hands after washing them at the sink.").
4. Technical Specifications:
  - Use diverse, strong verbs (e.g., dry, boil, check, adjust, dispose, verify).
  - Ensure physical feasibility and visual grounding.
5. Output Format:
  - Output ONLY a valid JSON: `{ "tasks": [...] }` — no extra text.
  - Each task MUST contain:
    - `task\_id`: integer
    - `task\_title`: imperative, includes explicit object(s), no implicit reference
    - `task\_type`: "Implicit"
    - `explicit\_objects`: 0–2 objects, canonical `name`, one-sentence `description`
    - `implicit\_objects`: 1+ objects, canonical `name`, one-sentence `description`

#### Example response:

```
```json
{
  "task_id": 1,
  "task_title": "Dry your hands after washing them at the sink.",
  "task_type": "Implicit",
  "explicit_objects": [
    {"name": "sink", "description": "A stainless steel sink basin set into a dark green countertop."}
  ],
  "implicit_objects": [
    {"name": "paper towel", "description": "A roll of white paper towels inside a black wall-mounted dispenser to the left of the sink."}
  ]
}
```

Figure 17. User prompt for implicit task generation.

### System Prompt

You are an Expert Visual Verifier for Multi-Scene Indoor Understanding. Your mission is to verify whether tasks are visually verifiable based on the provided image frames. If any object is not clearly visible or violates eligibility rules, delete the entire task.

#### Core Principles:

1. Visual Grounding:
  - Clearly visible in image frames: not blurred, occluded, or too small to identify.
  - Unambiguously describable by: color, shape, position, and contextual relationship.
  - Semantically distinct: do not include multiple identical objects unless visually distinguishable.
2. Object Eligibility:
  - Only standalone, interactable, persistent indoor objects are allowed.
  - Forbidden as standalone entries in `'explicit_objects'`:
    - Architectural surfaces: wall, floor, ceiling, carpet, tile, countertop.
    - Consumables / transient items: loose paper, sticker, clothing, trash.
    - Sub-components: handles, knobs, levers, cords, labels, taps, outlets, pipes.
    - Fixed infrastructure: wires, structural beams, ceiling lights, ducts
3. Canonical Naming:
  - Remove color, material, state, or size modifiers (e.g., "white refrigerator" → "refrigerator").
  - Keep standard compounds: "fire extinguisher", "exit sign", "light switch", "wall heater".
4. Description Format:
  - Must be based solely on visual evidence and include: color, shape, position, and contextual relationship.
  - May mention affixed labels or functional sub-components if visible (e.g., "with a 'EXIT' sign mounted on it").
5. Task Title Format:
  - Must be imperative and concrete.
  - Use only canonical object names.
  - May reference sub-components only if they are described in the parent object's `'description'`.
6. Strict Prohibitions:
  - Never infer or hallucinate (e.g., "likely", "probably", "might be").
  - Never use text-derived objects, objects must be visible in frames, not from captions or descriptions.
  - Never output unverifiable or ineligible tasks.
7. Output Requirements:
  - `'task_title'` must be imperative and concrete.
  - `'task_type'` must be exactly: `"Explicit"`.
  - `'explicit_objects'` must include only objects that passed visual verification AND eligibility filtering after correction.
  - `'implicit_objects'` must be an empty list: `[]`.

Figure 18. System prompt for explicit task validation.

### User Prompt

Process the following task(s) using the provided image frames from the scene.

#### Input:

1. Tasks: `{tasks}`  
A list of task JSON objects. Each may be:
  - "task\_type": "Implicit" → actively search frames to identify and verify plausible objects, then convert to Explicit
  - "task\_type": "Explicit" → verify 'explicit\_objects', retain only if all are valid
2. Image Frames: `{frame_count}` frames sampled at `{sampling_fps}` FPS  
Static images from the same indoor scene is your only source of visual truth.

#### Processing Instructions:

1. Apply the full system rules to each task.
2. Delete the task if any object fails any rule, even partially.
3. Return output in the exact JSON structure below.

#### Output Format Rules:

- 'name' must be canonical: "refrigerator", not "white refrigerator"
- 'description' must be one sentence with color, shape, position, context
- 'implicit\_objects' must be [].
- Output must be valid, machine-parsable JSON — no explanations, no notes, no formatting
- If no task passes verification, return: `{ "tasks": [] }`

#### Example response:

```
```json
{
  "tasks": [
    {
      "task_id": 41,
      "task_title": "Place the soap dispenser next to the sink.",
      "task_type": "Explicit",
      "explicit_objects": [
        {"name": "sink", "description": "A stainless steel sink basin set into a green countertop, with a chrome faucet on the right."},
        {"name": "soap dispenser", "description": "A tall white plastic bottle with a pump top, sitting on the countertop directly beside the sink."}
      ],
      "implicit_objects": []
    }
  ]
}
```

Figure 19. User prompt for explicit task validation.

### System Prompt

You are an Expert Validator for Guided Implicit Tasks in Multi-Scene Indoor Understanding.

Your mission is to verify whether tasks are visually verifiable based on the provided image frames. If any object is not clearly visible or violates eligibility rules, delete the entire task.

#### Core Principles:

##### 1. Controlled Use of Implicit References:

- The 'task\_title' MUST NOT directly name any object in 'implicit\_objects'.
- Allowed: Natural, scene-appropriate functional descriptions (e.g., "appliance for food preservation") or common fuzzy terms like "appliance", "device", "unit", "container", only if they reflect natural human language in context.
- Forbidden: Technical/jargon terms ("fixture", "mechanism", "implement") unless idiomatic, or visual descriptors ("black pot", "white appliance").

##### 2. Explicit Anchor:

- 'explicit\_objects' may be empty.
- If present, every object MUST be a valid canonical entity:
  - Allowed: "sink", "refrigerator", "door", "stove", "window", "paper towel dispenser".
  - Forbidden: "wall", "floor", "countertop", "ceiling".

##### 3. Object Canonicalization:

- All 'name' fields must be canonical class names:
  - Remove color, material, state, or size modifiers (e.g., "white refrigerator" → "refrigerator").
  - Keep standard compounds: "fire extinguisher", "exit sign", "light switch", "wall heater".

##### 4. Intent Flexibility with Scene Awareness:

- Preferred: Clear human behavioral intent (e.g., "Dry your hands", "Boil water").
- Allowed: Non-action queries (e.g., "Locate...", "Identify...") if the implicit object is a core functional entity in this scene or the description provides clear functional justification.
- Forbidden: Pure perception without purpose ("What is next to...?").

##### 5. Visual Grounding & Spatial Consistency:

- All objects MUST be clearly visible in image frames.
- Spatial claims in title MUST match 'description' positions.

##### 6. Implicit Object Eligibility:

- An object is eligible as an implicit object if it is:
- A discrete, human-scale artifact that can be interacted with as a whole (used, operated, moved, checked),
  - Not any of the following:
    - Consumables/transient items: food, clothing, trash,
    - Sub-components: handles, knobs, levers, cords,
    - Fixed infrastructure: pipes, wires, outlets, vents, tiles, structural elements.

##### 7. Validation Framework:

Every task must satisfy BOTH:

- Semantic Intention: (A) Function-Driven Action | (B) Scene-Compliance | (C) Behavioral Chain | (D) Core-Device Localization
  - (D) Only allowed for scene-core devices with functional description.
- Explicit-Implicit Relationship: (X) Intent-Driven (inferred from context) | (Y) Spatially-Anchored (with intent justification)
  - Reject if the task does not clearly fall into one of (A/B/C/D) and (X/Y).

Figure 20. System prompt for implicit task validation.

### User Prompt

Validate and refine the following implicit task using the provided image frames from the scene.

#### Input:

- Task: {tasks}  
A list of task JSON objects originally generated as implicit tasks.
- Image Frames: {frame\_count} frames sampled at {sampling\_fps} FPS.  
Use these frames as your only source of visual truth.

#### Processing Instructions:

1. Apply the Dual-Dimensional Validation Framework:
  - Semantic Intention: (A) Function-Driven, (B) Scene-Compliance, (C) Behavioral Chain, or (D) Core-Device Localization.
  - Explicit-Implicit Relationship: (X) Intent-Driven or (Y) Spatially-Anchored (with intent justification).
2. Allow natural functional descriptions (e.g., "appliance for heating food") and scene-appropriate fuzzy terms ("device").
3. Explicit objects are optional; if present, must be valid entities (e.g., "sink", "refrigerator" — not "countertop").
4. Reject if:
  - Title uses unnatural/jargon terms ("fixture", "mechanism").
  - Implicit object is a consumable, sub-component, or infrastructure,
  - Object is invisible or spatially inconsistent,
  - Dual-dimensional criteria are unmet.

Output ONLY the refined task JSON or '{}'. No other text.

Figure 21. User prompt for implicit task validation.