



StreamEQA: Towards Streaming Video Understanding for Embodied Scenarios

Yifei Wang¹, Zhenkai Li¹, Tianwen Qian^{1†}, Huanran Zheng¹, Zheng Wang²,
Yuqian Fu³, Xiaoling Wang^{1†}

¹School of Computer Science and Technology, East China Normal University,
²Zhejiang University of Technology, ³INSAT, Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”



Figure 1. A comparative overview of our StreamEQA and existing benchmarks. StreamEQA integrates both embodied and streaming requirements, enabling a more comprehensive evaluation of Video-LLMs in their progression toward real-world embodied applications.

Abstract

As embodied intelligence advances toward real-world deployment, the ability to continuously perceive and reason over streaming visual inputs becomes essential. In such settings, an agent must maintain situational awareness of its environment, comprehend the interactions with surrounding entities, and dynamically plan actions informed by past observations, current contexts, and anticipated future events. To facilitate progress in this direction, we introduce **StreamEQA**, the first benchmark designed for streaming video question answering in embodied scenarios. StreamEQA evaluates existing MLLMs along two orthogonal dimensions: **Embodied** and **Streaming**. Along the embodied dimension, we categorize the questions into three

levels: *perception*, *interaction*, and *planning*, which progressively assess a model’s ability to recognize fine-grained visual details, reason about agent–object interactions, and perform high-level goal-directed reasoning. For the streaming dimension, questions are divided into backward, real-time, and forward reasoning, with each mode relying on a distinct temporal context. Built upon 156 independent long videos, StreamEQA defines 42 tasks and generates approximately 21K question–answer pairs with precise timestamps through a hybrid pipeline combining automated generation and human refinement. Evaluations of 13 state-of-the-art video-LLMs reveal that, despite strong performance on conventional benchmarks, these models still struggle with streaming video understanding in embodied scenarios. We hope StreamEQA will catalyze research on streaming video understanding for embodied applications. Codes and data

[†]Corresponding authors.

1. Introduction

Unlike traditional AI, Embodied AI [10, 15, 20] emphasizes dynamic interaction between an agent and its surrounding environment, achieving perception, cognition, and action within a closed feedback loop. Owing to its rich semantics, portability, and low deployment cost, egocentric videos captured by 2D cameras have become the primary sensory channel for embodied agents to perceive the external world. Consequently, video large language models (Video-LLMs) [31] are emerging as the core component that enables agents to understand and reason about their surroundings.

As embodied intelligence moves toward real-world deployment, the requirements for video understanding systems have become substantially more demanding. Agents must not only be endowed with fine-grained visual perception, but also extend their capabilities to physical-aware agent-object interactions and high-level task planning. These competencies are essential for complex reasoning and decision-making in embodied scenarios. For example, consider an intelligent assistant operating in a kitchen scenario. It must be able to recognize ingredients on the countertop, assess the current stage of recipe preparation, and plan the next cooking steps in alignment with the human’s intention. Meanwhile, sensory input of the agent arrives as continuous video streams, requiring models to maintain ongoing response under contextually limited visual input.

However, existing Video-LLMs [2, 7, 39] are primarily trained on large-scale internet video-text pairs rather than designed for embodied agent, leading to two fundamental limitations. First, current Video-LLMs excel at perceptual tasks such as action recognition or scene description, but fall short in interaction and planning tasks. Second, mainstream models only support offline video processing, where the full video sequence is accessible during inference. This setup fundamentally differs from the streaming constraint in embodied environments, where the model can only access current and past observations. Such limitations currently prevent these Video-LLMs from being directly deployed on embodied agents to follow human instructions in real-world environments.

To bridge the aforementioned gap, we introduce **StreamEQA**, a benchmark specifically designed for streaming video question answering in embodied scenarios. Fig. 1 presents representative examples from StreamEQA, along with the key distinctions between our work and existing benchmarks. The benchmark is structured along two core dimensions, *Embodied* and *Streaming*, to comprehensively

evaluate potential of Video-LLMs for embodied deployment. Along the embodied dimension, StreamEQA organizes tasks into three levels: (1) *Perception*, which assesses the ability to recognize objects, their attributes, spatial relationships within the scene; (2) *Interaction*, which measures the understanding of agent-object interactions and their underlying motivations; and (3) *Planning*, which examines a model’s capacity to reflect upon executed actions, adjust current behaviors, and optimize future plans. This hierarchical design enables progressive evaluation of models, from low-level visual recognition to high-level embodied reasoning. Along the streaming dimension, questions are divided into *Backward*, *Real-time*, and *Forward* reasoning modes, each requiring distinct temporal contexts. Specifically, backward reasoning involves retrospection based on past events, real-time reasoning focuses on immediate perceptual interpretation, and forward reasoning demands the anticipation of future outcomes. Considering the diversity of real-world activities and the availability of existing data, StreamEQA focuses on kitchen scenarios and build upon the HD-EPIC [23] dataset. By leveraging the densely annotated visual metadata of HD-EPIC, we generate question-answer pairs through a hybrid pipeline that combines automated synthesis with human refinement, ensuring both scale and quality. In total, StreamEQA encompasses 156 unique long videos across 42 task types, yielding approximately 21K QA pairs with precise timestamps.

Based on StreamEQA, we conduct a systematic evaluation of 13 representative Video-LLMs, including proprietary models (e.g., GPT-5 [22]), open-source models (e.g., Qwen3-VL [1]), streaming models (e.g., TimeChat-Online [36]), and egocentric models (e.g., EgoGPT [35]). Experimental results reveal a significant performance degradation (1.6 \times ↓) compared to the general-purpose benchmark OVO-Bench [17], highlighting the intrinsic difficulty of streaming video reasoning in embodied scenarios. Moreover, performance analysis shows that interaction and planning tasks are considerably more challenging than basic perception and that the streaming constraint substantially impacts model performance, emphasizing the necessity of developing temporally grounded reasoning mechanisms.

Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose StreamEQA, the first benchmark for streaming VideoQA in embodied scenarios, featuring both embodied and streaming characteristics, and containing around 21K high-quality, time-stamped QA pairs.
- We perform a comprehensive evaluation of 13 state-of-the-art Video-LLMs, quantitatively revealing their limitations in streaming embodied understanding and providing new insights for future research of Video-LLMs.

2. Related Work

Benchmarks for Video Understanding. Early video QA datasets such as MSVD-QA [34], and MSRVT-QA [34] focus on short clips, while later benchmarks like Temporal-Bench [3], and AutoEvalVideo [5] target causal and temporal reasoning. More comprehensive long-duration evaluation is provided by EgoSchema [21] and Video-MME [11], which extend testing to multi-minute or hour-level videos. A variety of benchmarks have been introduced to evaluate video understanding, but most assume offline access to entire videos with the description of explicit video content.

Egocentric and embodied benchmarks [8, 13, 28] primarily examine episodic memory and spatial reasoning. EgoTextVQA [41] targets object-level and text-centric perception, while Nuscenes-QA [26] extends spatial reasoning to driving scenarios. EgoLife [35] introduces ultra-long videos, EgoCross [16] and EgoNight [38] further challenge models with cross-domain and low-light conditions. Recent efforts such as EgoThink [6] and ECBench [9] move toward holistic embodied cognition. Meanwhile, some streaming-oriented datasets, such as MovieChat-1k [29], OVO-Bench [17] and OVBench [14], attempt to model time-aware inference but rarely consider embodied scenarios. However, most existing embodied benchmarks currently conduct evaluations in an offline manner, while streaming benchmarks have limited attention paid to embodied scenarios. In contrast, our work fills this gap by emphasizing the importance of planning targets in real-world and introducing the first comprehensive multi-embodied level testbed for StreamQA.

MLLMs for Stream Video Understanding. With the rapid progress of multimodal large language models, video understanding [12, 19, 30, 32, 42] has become an increasingly prominent direction of research. Most existing video MLLMs follow an offline paradigm in which sampled frames from an entire video are encoded, commonly via CLIP-based [27] vision encoders, and projected into the LLM space for downstream tasks, as seen in models such as Qwen3-VL [1], InternVL3 [43], and Video-LLaMA3 [39]. Although these techniques enhance offline processing, they depend on full video access and thus struggle in real-world applications where frames arrive sequentially and future observations remain unknown. This has motivated the development of online-oriented models. For example, VideoLLM-Online [4] was designed to distinguish key frames and redundant frames, Dispider [25] utilizes three asynchronous models to allow low response latency, and FlashVStream [33] and TimeChatOnline [36] aim to handle continuous video input under real-time constraints. While these models perform well on third-person videos and egocentric videos from common daily scenarios, their ability to plan procedures in embodied scenarios remains largely unexamined. In this work, we systematically

assess how the current state-of-the-art MLLMs perform in interaction and planning targets, revealing their limitations and offering in-depth analysis to facilitate future research in this direction.

3. StreamEQA Benchmark

In this section, we provide a comprehensive introduction to the StreamEQA benchmark. We begin by discussing the design principles and the taxonomy of question-answering tasks, followed by an explanation of the data curation pipeline, and conclude with dataset statistics.

3.1. Design Principles

The construction of StreamEQA is guided by principles designed to ensure that the benchmark accurately reflects the perceptual and cognitive challenges faced by embodied agents in realistic, continuously evolving real-world environments. These principles emphasize comprehensive embodied task coverage, temporal reasoning across long visual horizons, and context-grounded decision-making. Specifically, StreamEQA is built around the following key design principles.

Comprehensive Embodied Task Coverage. Realistic embodied intelligence depends on the coordinated functioning of several cognitive processes. An effective agent must form stable perceptual representations of surroundings, track the progression of actions and interactions, and reason about goals along with the constraints that govern their achievement. StreamEQA incorporates tasks across this entire spectrum, enabling systematic evaluation of whether a model can recognize object semantics, follow procedural structure, interpret causal dependencies, and construct or refine action plans within an extended activity sequence. This design provides coverage of the full perception–interaction–reflection loop that underlies real-world embodied behavior.

Streaming-Oriented Temporal Continuity. In continuous egocentric video, long-range temporal dependencies are key to understanding dynamic activities. To represent these dependencies explicitly, each task in StreamEQA is formulated under three temporal perspectives: (1) *Backward* perspective evaluates the reconstruction of earlier states, actions, and preconditions; (2) *Realtime* perspective measures understanding of the present visual moment, including object states, spatial organization, and procedural context; (3) *Forward* perspective examines anticipatory reasoning, which involves predicting future events, outcomes, or procedural requirements. These perspectives jointly enforce reasoning that remains coherent across the entire temporal stream and is sensitive to the dynamics of unfolding activities.

Situated and Causally Grounded Reasoning. All questions in StreamEQA are anchored to specific temporal seg-




Figure 2. Data construction pipeline of StreamEQA.

ments of the video and require answers supported directly by the visual and functional structure of the ongoing activity. The formulation prevents reliance on global priors or generic patterns by requiring models to identify the purpose of actions, interpret relationships among manipulated objects, and infer consequences grounded in observable evidence. This principle encourages fine-grained causal interpretation and ensures that model performance reflects genuine comprehension of temporally evolving tasks.

Together, these principles establish StreamEQA as a benchmark for evaluating continuous and context-sensitive embodied cognition. Models assessed under this framework must maintain stable perceptual grounding over time, reason coherently about procedural and causal structure, and generate predictions or plans that align with the constraints and objectives characterizing real-world embodied activity.

3.2. Task Taxonomy

Based on the above principles, StreamEQA organizes tasks along two orthogonal dimensions. The **Embodied Dimension** reflects the cognitive stage involved: perception, interaction, and planning. The **Streaming Dimension** reflects the temporal perspective from which the task must be solved. Crossing these dimensions yields a structured taxonomy of **42 fine-grained subtasks** as shown in Fig. 3, covering the full spectrum of streaming embodied video reasoning. Next, we elaborate on the specific taxonomies under these two dimensions.

Embodied Dimension. This dimension characterizes the cognitive level of the agent, ranging from low-level scene perception to mid-level interaction understanding and high-level task planning:

- *Perception* focuses on recognize entities, attributes, and

spatial relations in a continuous egocentric view. For example, the model need to recall the color of the bowl observed earlier (*Attribute Recognition Backward*, ARB) or determine the relative position of a spoon in the next moment (*Spatial Understanding Forward*, SUF).

- *Interaction* tracks actions and object manipulations over time. Typical tasks include recovering the last completed step (*Action Retrieval Backward*, ARB) or counting how many times a repeated action (*Backward Repetition Event Count*, BRC).
- *Planning* evaluates the ability to synthesize or revise plans. Examples include summarizing upcoming steps required to complete the task (*Future Actions*, FAC) or identifying operational risks and proposing prevention strategies (*Risk Prediction*, RPD).

- Streaming Dimension.** To capture the temporal continuity inherent to streaming video, each embodied level is instantiated under three temporal scopes. This temporal structuring ensures that StreamEQA capable of assessing whether models can sustain temporal coherence and causal consistency over continuous first-person video.

- *Backward Reasoning* requires reconstructing earlier states, actions, or causal prerequisites. Tasks under this scope evaluate whether the model can retrieve information no longer visible in the current frame. For example, the model needs to recall objects that appeared in a certain location (*Object Perception Backward*, OPB).

- *Realtime Understanding* focuses on moment-to-moment situational awareness within the ongoing egocentric stream. These tasks require maintaining continuous perceptual grounding and recognizing the current procedural context. A central example is the *Spatial Understanding Realtime* (SUR) task, where the model must determine




Figure 3. Overview of the StreamEQA task taxonomy and statistics. **Top-left:** The overall task taxonomy of the three main embodied levels. **Top-right:** The distributions of questions across embodied levels and temporal dimension. **Bottom:** A selection of representative QA examples for each major capability.

the present relative configuration of objects.

- **Forward Prediction** examines the model’s capacity to anticipate future events, outcomes, or required operations. This temporal scope probes prospective inference, a key component of embodied planning. A representative instance is the *Risk Prediction* (RPD) task, where the model needs to predict potential risks.

This taxonomy provides a principled organization of streaming embodied reasoning. By combining embodied stages (Perception, Interaction, Planning) with temporal scopes (Backward, Realtime, Forward), StreamEQA systematically evaluates whether multimodal models can integrate memory, situational awareness, and foresight in continuous egocentric videos.

3.3. Data Construction

We construct the StreamEQA dataset through a three-stage pipeline to generate temporally grounded question–answer pairs from long egocentric videos. As illustrated in Fig. 2, the process consists of *Meta Information Extraction*, *QA Construction*, and *Quality Control*. This design ensures

that each question is generated from semantically grounded video narrations while maintaining temporal precision.

Meta Information Extraction. The first stage involves extracting detailed meta information from meta annotations, sourced from the HD-EPIC dataset, including dense narrations with precise timestamps, event time range, eye gaze priming, and object spatial track. For each video, a language foundation model (*i.e.*, GPT-5[22]) processes the diverse meta annotations together with the activity annotations to generate structured meta elements, including *objects*, *actions*, *object episoids*, *object relationships*, *action motivations*, and *event durations*. These meta-informations are aligned with timestamps of narrations and associated events, forming representations of what appears, what occurs, why it happens, and how it works. This structured abstraction serves as the foundation for subsequent question synthesis, ensuring that all generated QA items remain grounded in the actual visual and linguistic content.

QA Construction. Building upon the extracted meta-informations, the second stage generates question–answer pairs under a manually defined schema. We design a set of

task-specific question templates based on three embodiment levels: *Perception*, *Interaction*, and *Planning*. Each embodied level is further divided into three temporal dimensions: *Backward*, *Realtime*, and *Forward*. These produce nine major QA categories (3×3), with each category encompassing multiple specific sub-tasks.

For each template, the placeholders are automatically filled with the relevant types of meta-informations. For example, a backward-perception task template “*How are {object1} and {object2} working together just now?*” is expanded into a grounded question by inserting selected objects (e.g., *cup’s content* and *blender*) and actions from the corresponding meta-informations. Meanwhile, the selected meta informations are also composed with the answer template (“*The person is using the {object1} to {action} the {object1}*”) and generate the grounded answer: “*The person is using the blender to mix the cup’s contents*”. Additionally, while retaining the subject and object, we randomly select actions from the meta-information to replace the correct action (e.g., replace *mix* with *wash*), generating extra 3 distractors with the same context but different details, forming a four-choice QA pair. Finally, the query time is set after the timestamp of the event to simulate the scenario of backward tracing. The construction pipeline guarantees that each QA pair is supported by grounded meta annotations.

Quality Control. To enhance the challenges of the QA pairs, we leverage GPT-5[22] to refine the distractor options. Specifically, GPT-5 is tasked with refining only the incorrect options, while ensuring the correct option remains unchanged. Besides, all options must be related to the question and visual context, ensuring the refined incorrect options are logically plausible, but will ultimately be excluded due to contradiction with video content. Finally, we assessed the clarity of the questions and the ambiguity of the options to prevent misinterpretations, and human annotators verified the accuracy of annotations. The final dataset consists of validated QA triplets (questions, options, and correct answers) and precise temporal boundaries.

3.4. Data Statistics

Our StreamEQA benchmark encompasses real-world egocentric videos and corresponding question-answer annotations, organized into three embodied dimensions and three temporal dimensions. It comprises 156 videos and approximately 21K QA pairs, spanning 42 sub-task types grouped into three embodied levels. Table 1 summarizes key statistics of the five datasets, including the number of sub-tasks, QA pairs, and average seconds of video durations (Dur.(s)). More detailed statistical breakdowns and representative examples can be found in Figure 3.

Tasks	Sub-Task	QA Pairs	Duration(s)
Perception	13	6,500	2.43
Interaction	16	7,996	112.67
Planning	13	6,235	91.67
Backward	12	5,736	69.75
Realtime	12	5,996	34.73
Forward	18	8,499	88.25
StreamEQA	42	20,731	67.55

Table 1. Key statistics of StreamEQA benchmark.

4. Experiments

This section presents a set of comprehensive experiments and in-depth analysis of our proposed StreamEQA. We first outline the experimental settings in Section 4.1. The main results of state-of-the-art MLLMs are then presented in Section 4.2. In Section 4.3, we conduct a comparative analysis with previous benchmarks through quantitative experiments to further validate the challenge posed by StreamEQA. Finally, Section 4.4 explores the gap between the offline-online settings.

4.1. Models and Evaluation Settings

Evaluated Models. We select a diverse set of MLLMs spanning three categories to cover major technical paradigms: (1) Proprietary Models, including GPT-5 [22], Gemini-2.5-Pro [7], (2) Offline Video Understanding MLLMs, including Qwen3VL-8B [1], LongVA-7B [40], MiniCPM-V-4.5-8B [37], InternVL3-8B [43] and VideoLLaMA3-7B [39], (2) Online Video Understanding MLLMs, including FlashVStream-7B [33], VideollmOnline-8B [4], Dispider-7B [25] and TimeChatOnline-8B [36], (3) Egocentric MLLMs, including EgoGPT-7B [35], EgoVLPv2 [24].

Evaluation and Implementation Details. Following prior works[16–18], we use the standard accuracy as our evaluation metric, which is calculated as the percentage of correctly answered questions. To ensure a fair comparison of model performance, we adhere to the principle of consistency by maintaining the same number of frames or frames per second (fps) across all models. Considering the input video length limitations for offline Video-LLMs, we adopt specialized video input methods tailored to such models. Specifically, we segment the video into clips based on the time range of the event. For example, for an event starting at timestamp t_e and a question Q_i being posed at timestamp t_q , we extract the video clip $Video[t_e : t_q]$ as visual input. This approach simulates a streaming question-answering scenario in online video understanding while reducing information loss of relative events in related video

Models	OS	Ego	Fre.	Perception				Interaction				Planning				Avg.
				Bac.	Rea.	For.	Avg.	Bac.	Rea.	For.	Avg.	Bac.	Rea.	For.	Avg.	
Offline Video Understanding MLLMs																
Gemini	✗	✗	1fps	71.4	68.2	71.3	70.1	58.7	59.2	52.1	56.4	52.9	54.4	51.8	52.5	60.0
GPT5	✗	✗	1fps	70.1	65.8	73.2	69.3	60.8	62.2	56.9	59.8	67.2	57.4	51.2	55.3	61.3
InternVL3	✓	✗	64	63.5	62.1	65.2	63.5	42.1	42.3	37.3	40.4	50.8	47.7	44.9	46.51	49.5
LongVA	✓	✗	64	58.7	55.8	57.3	57.2	28.5	27.4	24.0	26.5	36.9	39.4	31.5	33.8	38.4
MiniCPM-V	✓	✗	64	64.8	63.0	64.3	63.9	40.4	35.1	47.2	41.0	47.0	39.5	36.5	39.2	47.8
Qwen3VL	✓	✗	64	65.1	58.9	66.0	63.0	53.5	49.2	47.3	49.9	50.0	43.5	39.3	42.0	51.7
VideoLLaMA3	✓	✗	64	59.2	58.0	57.1	58.1	36.3	34.7	29.4	33.2	38.3	37.6	36.1	36.8	42.1
EgoGPT	✓	✓	64	67.4	64.3	67.8	66.3	62.7	64.9	55.1	60.5	67.3	58.3	51.6	55.8	60.9
EgoVLPv2	✓	✓	64	23.6	25.1	23.8	24.2	22.9	25.5	19.3	22.4	23.8	25.1	25.1	24.8	23.7
Online Video Understanding MLLMs																
VideollmOnline	✓	✗	64	36.2	38.4	33.2	36.1	32.8	31.4	26.7	30.2	36.0	35.3	38.1	37.2	34.1
FlashVStream	✓	✗	64	62.0	57.3	60.1	59.6	45.8	40.6	36.4	40.7	49.4	47.3	43.4	45.2	48.0
Dispider	✓	✗	64	57.5	56.2	53.8	55.9	29.2	35.3	24.8	29.5	53.5	46.3	43.5	45.9	42.8
TimeChatOnline	✓	✗	64	46.6	48.7	48.4	47.9	34.0	28.0	25.8	29.1	42.1	40.7	32.4	35.6	36.9

Table 2. **Detailed evaluation results on StreamEQA.** All scores are reported in percentages. The best results are marked in bold, and the second-best are underlined. OS: Open-sourced Models. Ego: Egocentric Models. Fra: Frames. Bac: Backward. Rea: Realtime. For: Forward. Avg: Average.




Figure 4. The performance of Qwen3VL on 42 Online-Embodied tasks which are categorized by the temporal dimension, while sorting tasks by accuracy within the same embodied level.

clips. We also conduct a pilot study of Qwen3-VL-8B [1] and EgoGPT [35]. In this setting, we re-evaluate the two models on the whole event clips to simulate the conventional offline QA, and then plot the change of accuracy on three embodied-level tasks. All experiments are conducted on NVIDIA A6000 GPUs.

4.2. Main Results

Table 2 reports the performance of 13 MLLMs on StreamEQA, covering Perception, Interaction, and Planning, as well as their overall performance. Our evaluation brings several important findings as follows:

Overall Difficulty. All MLLMs evaluated on StreamEQA demonstrate significant challenges across the entire benchmark. The best-performing model, GPT-5, achieves an

overall accuracy of 61.3%, while the lowest-performing model, EgoVLPv2, scores only 23.7%. Most mainstream models fluctuate around 40%, offering no significant advantage over the 25% random guessing accuracy. These results highlight the intrinsic difficulty of the benchmark, indicating that even the state-of-the-art models face considerable challenges in the streaming embodied video understanding tasks posed by StreamEQA.

Embodied-Level Comparison. Across different embodied levels, we observe varying degrees of difficulty: perception is relatively easier, followed by interaction, with planning being the most challenging. Taking Qwen3VL as an example, its performance in perception is 63.0%, in interaction it drops to 49.9%, and in planning it further decreases to 42.0%. This performance decline is consistent across

models, highlighting a notable reduction in accuracy from perception to planning. This outcome aligns with expectations, as the predominant training paradigm for mainstream MLLMs focuses on object and scene perception tasks. In contrast, we were surprised by the superior performance of online Video-LLMs in planning tasks compared to interaction tasks. For instance, FlashVStream achieves 40.7% in interaction, but performs better in planning with 45.2%. This suggests that the training process for online models may better align with the dynamic, task-oriented planning requirements often seen in real-world scenarios.

Model-wise Performance. Despite the two proprietary MLLMs, EgoGpt and Qwen3VL achieve the highest overall average accuracy among offline Video-MLLMs, with EgoGpt (60.9%) significantly exceeding Qwen3VL (51.7%). We assume that, as the embodied-specific model, EgoGPT was explicitly designed and trained on embodied video data, which makes it outperform especially in interaction (60.5%) and planning (55.8%), and even performs close to GPT-5. In addition, online Video-LLMs have relatively lower performance compared with offline Video-LLMs, which indicates that the evaluated online MLLMs are not effective in embodied scenarios though they are well designed for online video understanding.

4.3. Temporal-level Variance

As illustrated in Figure 4, we take Qwen3VL as an example to further analyze the results across different temporal dimensions, including backward, realtime, and forward. Since MLLMs can acquire sufficient past and current information from the video stream, the model naturally achieves higher accuracy in backward and realtime tasks compared to forward tasks. Additionally, we observe that backward scores tend to be more stable, while forward tasks are more sensitive to variations. These findings further suggest that MLLMs face significant challenges in anticipating future events and planning accordingly.

4.4. More In-Depth Analysis

We conduct further studies to explore and quantify the distinct challenges introduced by the streaming and embodied nature of the StreamEQA benchmark.

Embodied Dimension Challenges. To further examine embodied tasks and their challenges, we compare the performance of Qwen3VL on our benchmark and OVO-bench, a typical streaming video dataset for general scenario. Results in Figure 5 reveal a consistent and significant performance drop across all comparable QA types. For instance, performance drops from an impressive 74% on realtime tasks in OVO-bench to just 54.26% on the realtime embodied tasks in StreamEQA. Similarly, the accuracy of forward prediction tasks falls from 51.51% to 41.18%, quantifying the substantial penalty incurred by the embodied tasks.




Figure 5. Online and Online-Embodied performance comparison. The results highlight the gap caused by embodied scenarios.

Method	Settings	Bac.	Rea.	For.	Avg.
EgoGPT	offline	65.7	65.83	57.22	62.03
	online	65.29	63.54	56.4	60.93

Table 3. Comparison between online and offline settings of StreamEQA.

Streaming Dimension Challenges. As shown in Table 3, we further explore the challenges of streaming video inputs setting. Instead of extracting video clips before query timestamps, models in offline settings can get complete clips of events to simulate the conventional evaluation. We evaluate the performance of EgoGPT on StreamEQA in embodied and online-embodied settings separately. The results indicate that EgoGPT, as an embodied video-MLLM trained in offline settings, performs better at embodied settings, while having lower accuracy when inferring on online-embodied settings (nearly 1.10% reduction). The results indicate that streaming video inputs contribute to the challenges in embodied scenarios.

5. Conclusion

In this work, we present StreamEQA, a new benchmark for evaluating the ability of MLLMs in online-embodied video question answering. StreamEQA comprises approximately 21K QA pairs systematically generated based on meta annotations and curated from three embodied levels: perception, interaction, and planning. It spans a wide range of QA types, enabling fine-grained evaluation. Beyond constructing the benchmark, we extensively evaluate current state-of-the-art MLLMs and find that, despite strong performance on perceiving objects in videos, they struggle to conduct interaction and planning in embodied scenarios. Additionally, we further separately explore the challenges of streaming video input and embodied tasks. We believe that StreamEQA, together with our experiments and analysis, offers a valuable foundation for future research on robust and practically applicable embodied streaming video understanding.

References

- [1] 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, 3, 6, 7
- [2] 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. 2
- [3] Mu Cai, Reuben Tan, Jianrui Zhang, Bocheng Zou, Kai Zhang, Feng Yao, Fangrui Zhu, Jing Gu, Yiwu Zhong, Yuzhang Shang, Yao Dou, Jaden Park, Jianfeng Gao, Yong Jae Lee, and Jianwei Yang. Temporalbench: Benchmarking fine-grained temporal understanding for multimodal video models. *ArXiv*, abs/2410.10818, 2024. 3
- [4] Joya Chen, Zhaoyang Lv, Shiwei Wu, Kevin Qinghong Lin, Chenan Song, Difei Gao, Jia-Wei Liu, Ziteng Gao, Dongxing Mao, and Mike Zheng Shou. Videollm-online: Online video large language model for streaming video. *2024 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024. 3, 6
- [5] Xiuyuan Chen, Yuan Lin, Yuchen Zhang, and Weiran Huang. Autoeval-video: An automatic benchmark for assessing large vision language models in open-ended video question answering. *ArXiv*, abs/2311.14906, 2023. 3
- [6] Sijie Cheng, Zhicheng Guo, Jingwen Wu, Kechen Fang, Peng Li, Huaping Liu, and Yang Liu. Egothink: Evaluating first-person perspective thinking capability of vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024. 3, 12, 13
- [7] Gheorghe Comanici, Eric Bieber, Mike Schaekermann, Ice Pasupat, Naveen Sachdeva, Inderjit Dhillon, Marcel Blstein, Ori Ram, Dan Zhang, Evan Rosen, et al. Gemini 2.5: Pushing the frontier with advanced reasoning, multimodality, long context, and next generation agentic capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.06261*, 2025. 2, 6
- [8] Angela Dai, Angel X. Chang, Manolis Savva, Maciej Halber, Thomas A. Funkhouser, and Matthias Nießner. Scannet: Richly-annotated 3d reconstructions of indoor scenes. *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2017. 3
- [9] Ronghao Dang, Yuqian Yuan, Wenqi Zhang, Yifei Xin, Boqiang Zhang, Long Li, Liuyi Wang, Qinyang Zeng, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. Ecbench: Can multi-modal foundation models understand the egocentric world? a holistic embodied cognition benchmark. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 24593–24602, 2025. 3
- [10] 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*, 2022. 2
- [11] Chaoyou Fu, Yuhan Dai, Yondong Luo, Lei Li, Shuhuai Ren, Renrui Zhang, Zihan Wang, Chenyu Zhou, Yunhang Shen, Mengdan Zhang, Peixian Chen, Yanwei Li, Shaohui Lin, Sirui Zhao, Ke Li, Tong Xu, Xiawu Zheng, Enhong Chen, Rongrong Ji, and Xing Sun. Video-mme: The first-ever comprehensive evaluation benchmark of multi-modal llms in video analysis. *2025 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024. 3, 13
- [12] Yuqian Fu, Runze Wang, Bin Ren, Guolei Sun, Biao Gong, Yanwei Fu, Danda Pani Paudel, Xuanjing Huang, and Luc Van Gool. Objectrelator: Enabling cross-view object relation understanding across ego-centric and exo-centric perspectives. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2025. 3
- [13] Kristen Grauman, Andrew Westbury, Eugene Byrne, Zachary Chavis, Antonino Furnari, Rohit Girdhar, Jackson Hamburger, Hao Jiang, Miao Liu, Xingyu Liu, Miguel Martin, Tushar Nagarajan, Ilija Radosavovic, Santhosh K. Ramakrishnan, et al. Ego4d: Around the world in 3,000 hours of egocentric video. In *CVPR*, 2021. 3
- [14] Zhenpeng Huang, Xinhao Li, Jiaqi Li, Jing Wang, Xiangyun Zeng, Cheng Liang, Tao Wu, Xi Chen, Liang Li, and Limin Wang. Online video understanding: Ovbench and videochat-online. *2025 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024. 3
- [15] 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. 2
- [16] Yanjun Li, Yuqian Fu, Tianwen Qian, Qi’ao Xu, Silong Dai, Danda Pani Paudel, Luc Van Gool, and Xiaoling Wang. Egocross: Benchmarking multimodal large language models for cross-domain egocentric video question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.10729*, 2025. 3, 6
- [17] Yifei Li, Junbo Niu, Ziyang Miao, Chunjiang Ge, Yuanhang Zhou, Qihao He, Xiao wen Dong, Haodong Duan, Shuangrui Ding, Rui Qian, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Yuhang Cao, Conghui He, and Jiaqi Wang. Ovo-bench: How far is your video-llms from real-world online video understanding? *2025 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2025. 2, 3, 13
- [18] Junming Lin, Zheng Fang, Chi Chen, Zihao Wan, Fuwen Luo, Peng Li, Yang Liu, and Maosong Sun. Streamingbench: Assessing the gap for mllms to achieve streaming video understanding. *ArXiv*, abs/2411.03628, 2024. 6, 12, 13
- [19] Zengrong Lin, Zheng Wang, Tianwen Qian, Pan Mu, Sixian Chan, and Cong Bai. Neighborretr: Balancing hub centrality in cross-modal retrieval. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 9263–9273, 2025. 3
- [20] 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. 2
- [21] Karttikeya Mangalam, Raiymbek Akshulakov, and Jitendra Malik. Egoschema: A diagnostic benchmark for very long-form video language understanding. *ArXiv*, abs/2308.09126, 2023. 3, 13
- [22] OpenAI. Introducing gpt-5, 2025. Accessed: 2025-09-07. 2, 5, 6

- [23] Toby Perrett, Ahmad Darkhalil, Saptarshi Sinha, Omar Emara, Sam Pollard, Kranti Parida, Kaiting Liu, Prajwal Gatti, Siddhant Bansal, Kevin Flanagan, Jacob Chalk, Zhifan Zhu, Rhodri Guerrier, Fahd Abdelazim, Bin Zhu, Davide Moltisanti, Michael Wray, Hazel Doughty, and Dima Damen. Hd-epic: A highly-detailed egocentric video dataset. *2025 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2025. 2, 13
- [24] Shraman Pramanick, Yale Song, Sayan Nag, Kevin Lin, Hardik Shah, Mike Zheng Shou, Ramalingam Chellappa, and Pengchuan Zhang. Egovlpv2: Egocentric video-language pre-training with fusion in the backbone. *2023 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2023. 6
- [25] Rui Qian, Shuangrui Ding, Xiao wen Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Yuhang Cao, Dahua Lin, and Jiaqi Wang. Dispider: Enabling video llms with active real-time interaction via disentangled perception, decision, and reaction. *2025 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2025. 3, 6
- [26] Tianwen Qian, Jingjing Chen, Linhai Zhuo, Yang Jiao, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Nuscen-q: A multi-modal visual question answering benchmark for autonomous driving scenario. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 4542–4550, 2024. 3
- [27] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021. 3
- [28] Santhosh K. Ramakrishnan, Aaron Gokaslan, Erik Wijmans, Oleksandr Maksymets, Alexander Clegg, John Turner, Eric Undersander, Wojciech Galuba, Andrew Westbury, Angel X. Chang, Manolis Savva, Yili Zhao, and Dhruv Batra. Habitat-matterport 3d dataset (hm3d): 1000 large-scale 3d environments for embodied ai. *ArXiv*, abs/2109.08238, 2021. 3
- [29] Enxin Song, Wenhao Chai, Guanhong Wang, Yucheng Zhang, Haoyang Zhou, Feiyang Wu, Xun Guo, Tianbo Ye, Yang Lu, Jenq-Neng Hwang, and Gaoang Wang. Moviechat: From dense token to sparse memory for long video understanding. *2024 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2023. 3
- [30] Yuedong Tan, Zongwei Wu, Yuqian Fu, Zhuyun Zhou, Guolei Sun, Eduard Zamfir, Chao Ma, Danda Paudel, Luc Van Gool, and Radu Timofte. Xtrack: Multimodal training boosts rgb-x video object trackers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2025. 3
- [31] Yunlong Tang, Jing Bi, Siting Xu, Luchuan Song, Susan Liang, Teng Wang, Daoan Zhang, Jie An, Jingyang Lin, Rongyi Zhu, et al. Video understanding with large language models: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 2025. 2
- [32] Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Ke-Yang Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Yang Fan, Kai Dang, Mengfei Du, Xuancheng Ren, Rui Men, Dayiheng Liu, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *ArXiv*, abs/2409.12191, 2024. 3
- [33] Shiwei Wu, Joya Chen, Kevin Qinghong Lin, Qimeng Wang, Yan Gao, Qianli Xu, Tong Xu, Yao Hu, Enhong Chen, and Mike Zheng Shou. Videollm-mod: Efficient video-language streaming with mixture-of-depths vision computation. *ArXiv*, abs/2408.16730, 2024. 3, 6
- [34] Dejing Xu, Zhou Zhao, Jun Xiao, Fei Wu, Hanwang Zhang, Xiangnan He, and Yueting Zhuang. Video question answering via gradually refined attention over appearance and motion. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, New York, NY, USA, 2017. Association for Computing Machinery. 3
- [35] Jingkan Yang, Shuai Liu, Hongming Guo, Yuhao Dong, Xiamengwei Zhang, Sicheng Zhang, Pengyun Wang, Zitang Zhou, Binzhu Xie, Ziyue Wang, et al. Egolife: Towards egocentric life assistant. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, 2025. 2, 3, 6, 7
- [36] Linli Yao, Yicheng Li, Yuancheng Wei, Lei Li, Shuhuai Ren, Yuanxin Liu, Kun Ouyang, Lean Wang, Shicheng Li, Sida Li, Lingpeng Kong, Qi Liu, Yuanxing Zhang, and Xu Sun. Timechat-online: 80% visual tokens are naturally redundant in streaming videos. *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2025. 2, 3, 6
- [37] Tianyu Yu, Zefan Wang, Chongyi Wang, Fuwei Huang, Wenshuo Ma, Zhihui He, Tianchi Cai, Weize Chen, Yuxiang Huang, Yuanqian Zhao, Bokai Xu, Junbo Cui, Ying Xu, Liqing Ruan, Luoyuan Zhang, Hanyu Liu, Jing Tang, Hongyuan Liu, Qining Guo, Wenhao Hu, Bin Sheng He, Jie Zhou, Jie Cai, Ji Qi, Zonghao Guo, Chi Chen, Guoyang Zeng, Yuxuan Li, Ganqu Cui, Ning Ding, Xu Han, Yuan Yao, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Minicpm-v 4.5: Cooking efficient mllms via architecture, data, and training recipe. *ArXiv*, abs/2509.18154, 2025. 6
- [38] Deheng Zhang, Yuqian Fu, Runyi Yang, Yang Miao, Tianwen Qian, Xu Zheng, Guolei Sun, Ajad Chhatkuli, Xuanjing Huang, Yu-Gang Jiang, et al. Egonight: Towards egocentric vision understanding at night with a challenging benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.06218*, 2025. 3
- [39] Hang Zhang, Xin Li, and Lidong Bing. Video-llama: An instruction-tuned audio-visual language model for video understanding. In *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023. 2, 3, 6
- [40] Peiyuan Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Bo Li, Guangtao Zeng, Jingkan Yang, Yuanhan Zhang, Ziyue Wang, Haoran Tan, Chunyuan Li, and Ziwei Liu. Long context transfer from language to vision. *Trans. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 2025, 2024. 6
- [41] Sheng Zhou, Junbin Xiao, Qingyun Li, Yicong Li, Xun Yang, Dan Guo, Meng Wang, Tat-Seng Chua, and Angela Yao. Egotextvqa: Towards egocentric scene-text aware video question answering. *2025 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2025. 3
- [42] Yuli Zhou, Guolei Sun, Yawei Li, Yuqian Fu, Luca Benini, and Ender Konukoglu. Camsam2: Segment anything accurately in camouflaged videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.19730*, 2025. 3

- [43] Jinguo Zhu, Weiyun Wang, Zhe Chen, Zhaoyang Liu, Shenglong Ye, Lixin Gu, Yuchen Duan, Hao Tian, Weijie Su, Jie Shao, Zhangwei Gao, Erfei Cui, Yue Cao, Yangzhou Liu, Haomin Wang, Weiye Xu, Hao Li, Jiahao Wang, Han Lv, Dengnian Chen, Songze Li, Yinan He, Tan Jiang, Jiapeng Luo, Yi Wang, Cong He, Botian Shi, Xingcheng Zhang, Wenqi Shao, Junjun He, Ying Xiong, Wenwen Qu, Peng Sun, Penglong Jiao, Lijun Wu, Kai Zhang, Hui Deng, Jiaye Ge, Kaiming Chen, Limin Wang, Min Dou, Lewei Lu, Xizhou Zhu, Tong Lu, Dahua Lin, Yu Qiao, Jifeng Dai, and Wenhai Wang. InternV3: Exploring advanced training and test-time recipes for open-source multimodal models. *ArXiv*, abs/2504.10479, 2025. [3](#), [6](#)

StreamEQA: Towards Streaming Video Understanding for Embodied Scenarios

Supplementary Material

In this supplementary material, we provide additional details and analyses to complement the main paper. Section 6 presents a comprehensive comparison of our proposed StreamEQA with existing video understanding benchmarks, along with extended data statistics. Section 7 describes our experiments, including specific experimental implementations and more quantitative results on the performance of the models. Section 8 dives deeper into the construction process of StreamEQA, specifically focusing on the information extraction from meta annotations. Finally, Section 9 shows more data examples of each sub-task.

6. Comparison with Existing Benchmarks

As shown in Table 4, StreamEQA sets itself apart from existing video understanding benchmarks by integrating both streaming and embodied task characteristics. Unlike StreamingBench [18], which only focuses on streaming tasks, or EgoThink [6], which focuses on embodied scenarios, StreamEQA uniquely combines both aspects, providing a more comprehensive challenge for video-LLMs. With an average video length of 67.5 seconds, 42 subtasks categories and 21K QA pairs, it surpasses other benchmarks in terms of task variety and dataset scale, offering a more rigorous and holistic evaluation of model generalization for real-world embodied agent application.

7. More Experiments Results

7.1. Evaluation Protocol

This section supplements the settings from Section 4.1 to ensure full reproducibility of results reported in Section 4.2 and a fair comparison across all models.

Our evaluation is based on a zero-shot, single-round inference paradigm, executed on NVIDIA A6000 GPUs. As previously mentioned, video frames are sampled in fixed 64 frames (GPT-5 and Gemini-2.5-Pro are evaluated at 1 fps). To guarantee deterministic and reproducible outputs, we adhere to the official inference strategies of these MLLMs.

Furthermore, for multiple-choice questions, the prompt illustrated in Figure 6 instructs the model to return its answer selected from A, B, C, or D.

7.2. Sub-tasks Evaluation

This section provides detailed results for all three embodied levels: Perception, Interaction, and Planning, broken down by task capabilities across different levels. The results are presented in Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7.

Tasks of Perception. As illustrated in Table 5, most of-line video-MLLMs perform relatively better in tasks of perception. Gemini-2.5-Pro and GPT-5 achieve the highest average accuracy, followed by EgoGPT. We can observe that Gemini-2.5-Pro performs better in ARB, RRB, ARR, RRR, and SUR, which contribute the most to the overall accuracy, while GPT-5 has the best performance in ARF, RRF, and SUF, indicating that the proprietary model is good at predicting objects and actions that may appear in the future. Notably, in addition to EgoGPT, some other offline open-sourced MLLMs outperform in some specific sub-tasks, such as MiniCPM-V and Qwen3VL, and their average accuracy is similar to proprietary models. This may reveal that the challenges of such tasks are limited.

Tasks of Interaction. Compared to perception tasks, all MLLMs face significant challenges in interaction tasks, with average scores below 61% (Table 6). In the settings, EgoGPT considerably outperforms open-source of-line video-MLLMs. For instance, in the Episodic Memory task, EgoGPT surpasses Qwen3VL, which serves as the baseline for video understanding, by approximately 31% (78.3% vs. 47.6%). Furthermore, EgoGPT also far exceeds GPT-5 in certain realtime and forward tasks, such as OER (73.0% vs. 49.6%), ARC (84.3% vs. 61.2%), ERD (49.5% vs. 39.6%), and ARP (85.7% vs. 84.9%). This indicates that explicitly designed embodied video-MLLMs for embodied scenarios hold significant advantages in interaction tasks.

Tasks of Planning. All offline Video-MLLMs exhibit relatively low performance in tasks of planning, facing challenges in embodied reasoning (Table 7). However, it is noteworthy that online video-MLLMs, such as Dispider and FlashVStream, have shown certain advantages compared with most offline Video-MLLMs, especially in forward tasks. For example, Dispider outperforms Qwen3VL by approximately 11% in Steps Merging and 16% in Moving-up Steps. Ultimately, this granular analysis confirms the primary bottleneck: the key challenge facing video-MLLM practical applications is embodied scenario analysis and temporal reasoning capabilities.

8. Data Construction Details

This section provides a more detailed description of the data construction process to ensure reproducibility, and of-

Dataset	Video Length	# Test	# Categories	Streaming	Embodied
Video-MME [11]	180s	2.7K	12	✗	✗
EgoThink [6]	-	750	12	✗	✓
EgoSchema [21]	3 min	500	-	✗	✓
StreamingBench [18]	(3s, 24 min)	4.5K	18	✓	✗
OVO-Bench [17]	7 min	2.8K	12	✓	✗
StreamEQA	67.5s	21K	42	✓	✓

Table 4. Overview of each dataset’s characteristics, including average video length, number of test examples, number of categories, and question types (Streaming or Embodied).

Models	Frames	Backward				Realtime					Forward				Avg.
		OPB	ARB	RRB	SUB	OPR	ORQ	ARR	RRR	SUR	OPF	ARF	RRF	SUF	
Offline Video Understanding MLLMs															
Gemini	1fps	64.2	76.3	82.8	62.0	67.1	58.7	76.1	82.4	56.4	58.4	79.6	82.6	64.7	70.1
GPT5	1fps	60.4	75.8	83.2	53.6	61.4	58.6	73.4	83.5	52.2	60.3	80.6	84.5	65.7	69.3
InternVL3	64	60.8	71.8	70.2	51.0	63.8	58.8	71.2	70.7	45.8	62.1	73.8	73.3	51.6	63.5
LongVA	64	49.0	58.4	64.8	62.4	48.8	46.6	59.2	67.5	57.0	41.1	63.8	68.5	56.0	57.2
MiniCPM-V	64	63.0	68.6	70.6	56.8	62.8	62.4	67.0	71.9	50.8	61.7	62.8	77.9	54.6	63.9
Qwen3VL	64	56.6	69.2	78.8	55.6	53.2	51.2	62.4	75.7	52.0	47.9	72.0	79.7	64.5	63.0
VideoLLaMA3	64	58.4	65.8	63.8	48.8	58.2	53.8	66.8	63.5	47.6	53.3	56.2	65.7	53.2	58.1
EgoGPT	64	69.0	69.2	69.6	61.6	67.2	61.2	66.0	70.5	56.4	58.7	75.4	72.5	64.5	66.3
EgoVLPv2	64	22.4	22.4	27.2	22.4	25.2	26.6	25.8	25.5	22.4	23.9	21.8	23.5	26.1	24.2
Online Video Understanding MLLMs															
Dispider	64	56.4	66.6	59.6	47.2	59.2	55.6	64.6	61.3	40.2	56.9	58.0	59.8	40.6	55.9
FlashVStream	64	55.8	65.2	69.2	57.8	51.2	50.0	62.6	68.9	53.6	49.7	62.8	71.08	56.6	59.6
TimeChatOnline	64	38.8	46.4	56.8	44.4	40.2	45.4	45.8	63.1	48.8	38.9	53.0	62.9	38.8	47.9
VideollmOnline	64	28.2	43.4	32.6	40.4	25.8	28.4	40.8	39.5	57.4	28.7	20.6	39.0	44.8	36.1

Table 5. Evaluation on Sub-tasks about Perception.

StreamEQA Inference Prompt

You are an advanced video question-answering AI assistant. You have been provided with some frames from the video and a multiple-choice question related to the video. Your task is to carefully analyze the video and provide the best answer to question, choosing from the four options provided. Do not Respond any other words except for the letter (A, B, C, or D).

Question: {}

Options:

{}

Figure 6. Prompt of StreamEQA Inference

fer deeper insight into how StreamEQA is systematically synthesized.

8.1. Extraction of Meta Information

Accurate meta informations is essential for QA construction. We extract such information from the meta annotations sourced from the HD-EPIC dataset [23], which provide dense narrations with precise timestamps, event-level time ranges, eye-gaze priming, and spatial trajectories of objects. Specifically, we determine the temporal boundaries

of each event (comprising multiple actions) within the video based on event time ranges and eye-gaze priming. The spatial relationships of objects are derived from the objects tracks, while meta informations of interaction and planning are inferred from the dense narrations. We will detail each key step of this extraction process in the following.

Object Spatial Relationship. The spatial relationship between two objects is computed directly from their bounding boxes, obtained as top-left and bottom-right coordinates from the objects’ spatial tracks. For each video frame, all co-occurring object pairs are evaluated. If two bounding boxes are identical or one is fully enclosed by the other, the relationship is assigned as “same place”. Otherwise, we calculate the center point of each box (via the average of its diagonal coordinates) and compare their horizontal and vertical offsets to derive directional relations such as “above”, “below”, “left”, or “right”. When both axes indicate displacement, composite relations (e.g., “below-left”) are resolved using a predefined mapping to the closest semantically meaningful descriptor. Finally, unreasonable or visu-

Models	Frames	Backward					Realtime					Forward					Avg.	
		ASR	EMM	ART	AIR	BRC	AR	OER	ARC	AIU	OMP	NAP	EPD	ERD	AIP	ARP		FRC
Offline Video Understanding MLLMs																		
Gemini	1fps	55.2	73.7	51.9	64.6	44.8	63.1	49.7	60.7	61.6	62.2	37.2	60.2	37.7	57.0	73.0	45.5	56.4
GPT5	1fps	62.1	72.4	50.0	71.8	47.8	71.3	49.6	61.2	76.6	52.2	38.0	66.7	39.6	67.9	84.9	44.4	59.8
InternVL3	64	45.5	44.9	39.8	48.0	32.3	60.5	36.6	36.9	44.2	32.9	37.4	36.5	16.8	41.1	65.8	26.2	40.3
LongVA	64	43.1	14.9	23.0	26.1	35.4	58.5	8.6	10.0	27.4	32.9	37.6	15.7	12.3	22.0	41.3	15.2	26.5
MiniCPM-V	64	43.1	41.5	43.8	40.2	55.8	58.6	33.6	30.7	39.4	52.0	34.4	33.3	9.1	31.9	62.6	41.6	39.9
Qwen3VL	64	50.3	47.3	47.6	50.2	72.2	62.7	45.0	50.9	53.8	33.5	44.0	35.3	23.6	44.6	69.2	67.0	49.9
VideoLLaMA3	64	36.9	29.2	30.0	32.2	53.2	60.9	19.6	27.9	35.2	30.0	33.0	17.1	11.9	26.4	42.05	45.8	33.2
EgoGPT	64	43.1	78.3	59.0	72.4	60.8	60.1	73.0	84.3	68.8	37.8	40.6	59.0	49.5	61.7	85.7	34.2	60.5
EgoVLPv2	64	10.7	26.5	26.9	26.6	24.1	28.3	26.2	21.5	26.8	25.1	11.4	25.3	2.4	25.8	26.8	24.2	22.4
Online Video Understanding MLLMs																		
Dispider	64	29.4	26.1	38.8	36.5	15.7	63.4	24.5	27.6	34.8	26.4	28.0	20.2	6.1	30.0	57.4	10.7	29.5
FlashVStream	64	49.1	36.5	33.5	44.2	65.2	64.6	27.4	39.0	44.6	27.3	36.5	19.6	4.2	35.5	63.1	56.4	40.7
TimeChatOnline	64	48.1	18.2	23.6	23.0	56.8	62.5	15.0	17.9	20.4	24.0	40.4	13.1	15.0	17.9	39.7	28.4	29.5
VideoLLmOnline	64	26.7	33.0	17.8	38.2	42.2	57.3	30.2	24.5	37.8	6.9	34.6	22.5	0.2	23.6	50.5	36.6	30.2

Table 6. Evaluation on Sub-tasks about Interaction.

Models	Frames	Backward			Realtime		Forward								Avg.
		PRF	BPO	BPR	RPO	RPR	FPS	FAC	FPA	RPD	SMG	FPR	MUS	FPO	
Offline Video Understanding MLLMs															
Gemini	1fps	65.8	53.6	51.2	54.5	54.3	46.7	47.9	55.3	34.4	53.3	52.7	49.2	60.7	52.5
GPT5	1fps	81.5	64.6	64.6	61.0	53.8	45.4	48.9	62.1	30.7	59.1	46.8	50.0	67.7	55.3
InternVL3	64	73.0	41.6	51.8	47.2	48.2	40.0	43.3	59.6	28.9	54.7	52.4	38.8	43.4	46.5
LongVA	64	53.0	34.01	33.9	42.2	36.5	22.6	27.3	50.1	20.0	29.7	33.5	37.9	33.1	33.8
MiniCPM-V	64	63.5	42.0	47.5	39.8	39.7	33.3	33.8	48.7	26.3	34.9	41.6	35.6	37.6	39.2
Qwen3VL	64	68.7	46.6	46.8	43.4	43.6	34.8	37.1	53.9	26.3	42.7	48.8	32.0	40.2	42.0
VideoLLaMA3	64	55.1	28.8	41.6	34.6	40.6	33.4	35.9	44.3	27.3	39.1	41.4	32.2	35.9	36.7
EgoGPT	64	62.7	67.8	68.4	53.8	62.8	42.0	40.7	59.8	31.1	62.5	74.1	50.4	53.4	55.7
EgoVLPv2	64	27.7	22.4	23.8	23.0	27.1	26.4	20.0	25.5	23.0	28.3	24.5	25.4	27.5	24.8
Online Video Understanding MLLMs															
Dispider	64	59.7	44.1	60.5	37.9	54.5	31.2	34.4	46.5	30.6	53.9	65.1	48.2	35.7	45.9
FlashVStream	64	69.7	39.3	51.8	46.3	48.2	37.3	40.8	59.8	22.1	47.5	52.7	43.5	45.8	45.2
TimeChatOnline	64	55.2	38.4	40.9	44.6	36.8	19.9	23.3	53.7	21.5	32.5	37.3	32.9	41.1	35.6
VideollmOnline	64	53.0	20.8	45.0	22.6	48.0	27.0	28.1	50.7	22.5	38.3	71.5	47.4	20.7	37.2

Table 7. Evaluation on Sub-tasks about Planning.

ally implausible relations are filtered out using cues from narrative annotations, ensuring that the resulting spatial labels remain consistent with the actual scene dynamics.

Object Semantic Relationship. We leverage GPT-5 to extract semantic relationships between objects from the meta annotations, with the prompt shown in Figure 7. Specifically, for each event, we first identify the five most frequent nouns from its dense narrations. We then analyze all pairwise combinations and consider two categories of relationships: functional relationships (e.g., “contains”) and interaction relationships (e.g., “assists”). For each object pair, GPT-5 is instructed to output a hexatuple consisting of the two object names, the actions occurring between them, and the corresponding relationship types.

Actions Motivation. Figure 8 illustrates the prompt for actions motivation extraction. The prompt is provided with the top 5 objects with the highest occurrence frequency within the event, and requires the model to extract the actions related to these objects, as well as analyze the motivations and outcomes of such actions.

Procedure Optimization. The Procedure Optimization Prompt comprises two components. As illustrated in Figure 9, the swap/merge steps analysis prompt instructs GPT-5 to analyze whether two operations described in the context can be merged or swapped to enhance efficiency. Additionally, we have designed a second prompt for single-operation optimization (Figure 10). For a given event, the prompt is designed to identify inefficient operations within the event and propose an optimized procedure for achieving the tar-

Objects Relationships Extraction Prompt

Analyze all pairwise relationships between the top 5 most frequent nouns in the following video description.

Top 5 nouns: `{{top5_noun_names}}`

All noun pairs to analyze (each pair must be evaluated): `{{a} & {b}}`

Focus on these relationship categories:

1. Functional relationships: `{{(RELATIONSHIP_TYPES['functional'])}}`
2. Interaction relationships: `{{(RELATIONSHIP_TYPES['interaction'])}}`

For each valid relationship between every pair, provide:

- noun_pair: list of two related nouns (from the pairs listed above)
- relationship_type: the specific relationship from the above categories
- original_verb: the original verb from the narration describing their interaction

Return results in English according to the following NEW format (6 elements, separated by semicolons):

`{{(Original name of noun A; Original name of noun B; main action related to noun A; main action related to noun B; relationship_type; Original description when the verb happens)}}`

Notes:

- 'relationship_type' must be one of the specified relationship categories
- 'main action related to noun A/B' refers to the main behavior or action that the object participates in.
- 'Original name of noun A'+'main action related to noun A'+'Original name of noun B' must be sentence
- 'Original name of noun B'+'main action related to noun B'+'Original name of noun A' must be sentence
- The generated six elements must be enclosed in curly braces `'{{...; ...; ...; ...; ...; ...}}'`.
- If no valid relationship exists between a pair, you can omit it, but you have to at least analyse 5 pairs.

Video description: `{context}`

Figure 7. Prompt of Object Semantic Relationship Extraction

Swap/Merge Steps Analysis Prompt

Extract five-tuple information for operation pairs from the following video narration.

Five-tuple format (separated by |, enclosed in curly braces):
`{{(Operation A | Operation B | Is it possible to swap_order/merge (swap, merge, No) | how to conduct | impacts of swap or merging)}}`

Element explanations:

- 'Operation A' and 'Operation B': Must be original sentences from the narration, and Operation A appears before Operation B in the narration.
- mergeable operations must not be adjacent but swappable operations can be adjacent.
- 'Is it possible...': Determine if the two operations can be swapped (fill 'swap'), merged (fill 'merge'), or not (fill 'No') without affecting the task goal.
- 'merging' refers to the fact that two actions can be expressed as a single action, rather than the simple concatenation of two ADJACENT narrations.
- Examples of merging include: 'combine cutting onions and cutting green peppers' or 'take out all the eggs needed for the task from the refrigerator at once instead of multiple times'.
- CRITICAL: swapping or merging must increase efficiency. If swapping or merging would REDUCE efficiency, you must output 'No' for this field.
- 'how to conduct': If swap/merge is possible, create a COMPLETE SENTENCE that modifies Operation A to incorporate the swap or merge. This sentence should clearly show how to perform the swap or merge based on Operation A. If not possible, fill 'no need to conduct'.
- 'impacts of swap or merging': If swap/merge is possible, explain the impacts (e.g., efficiency, complexity); if not, explain the reason why they can't be swapped/merged

Requirements:

1. Extract at least 5 operation pairs
2. At least 2 of them must be swappable ('swap') and at least 2 of them must be mergeable ('merge')
3. All elements must be derived from the narration; do not fabricate information
4. Operation pairs must be relevant (adjacent or related steps in the same task flow)

Video narration: `{context}`

Figure 9. Prompt of Swap/Merge Steps Analysis

Actions Motivation Extraction Prompt

Extract Five-tuple information for each high-frequency noun from the following video description.

List of high-frequency nouns (must all be analyzed):

`{{top5_noun_names}}`

Five-tuple format (separated by semicolons, enclosed in curly braces):

`{{(Original name of noun A; main action related to noun A; motivation of the action related to noun A; result of the action related to noun A; Original description when the verb happens)}}`

Element explanations:

- 'Original name of noun A': Must be the original noun from the list
- 'main action related to noun A': Core action involving the noun (from the narration text)
- 'motivation of the action related to noun A': Motivation for the action, must be a complete sentence, must NOT use pronouns like 'it', and be concisely expressed
- 'result of the action related to noun A': the outcome or result of the action related to noun A
- 'Original description when the verb happens': Original text fragment from the narration that describes the action

Requirements:

1. Each high-frequency noun must correspond to one Five-tuple; generate at least 5 Five-tuple
2. The motivation part must not omit the subject (use the noun itself or clear reference)
3. All elements must come from the video description; do not fabricate information

Video description: `{context}`

Figure 8. Prompt of Actions Motivation Extraction

Operation Optimization Analysis Prompt

Extract six-tuple information related to efficiency improvement from the following video narration.

FOCUS EXCLUSIVELY ON THE MOST CRITICAL OPERATIONS THAT REQUIRE OPTIMIZATION. Ignore minor improvements that only slightly reduce steps or time. Prioritize steps where optimization would:

- Result in SIGNIFICANT overall efficiency gains (not marginal improvements)
- Effectively avoid risks or mitigate major drawbacks
- Have a substantial impact on the entire task flow

Six-tuple format (separated by |, enclosed in curly braces):

`{{(Operation A | In which aspect of Operation A can efficiency be improved | How to improve efficiency of Operation A | impacts of improving efficiency | Practices that neither improve nor reduce efficiency | Inefficient practices)}}`

Element explanations:

- 'Operation A': Original sentence from the narration describing a specific operation (focus on critical steps only)
- 'In which aspect of Operation A can efficiency be improved': Specific aspects where optimization would bring substantial gains (not marginal ones)
- 'How to improve efficiency of Operation A': Concrete methods that would result in significant efficiency improvements
- 'impacts of improving efficiency': Significant effects on overall task efficiency, risk reduction, or workflow improvement
- 'Practices that neither improve nor reduce efficiency': Practices that do not increase or decrease efficiency
- 'Inefficient practices': Practices that would reduce efficiency

Requirements:

1. Extract 3-5 most critical six-tuples (quality over quantity)
2. All elements must be derived from the narration; no fabrication
3. Only include operations where optimization would have a meaningful impact on the entire process
4. Exclude trivial improvements (e.g., minor hand movement adjustments, negligible time savings)

Video narration: `{context}`

Figure 10. Prompt of Operation Optimization Analysis

get.

Plan Reflection and Adjustment. To generate QA pairs for evaluating models' capabilities to reflect on past procedures and adjust future plans accordingly, we have designed two prompts. As illustrated in Figure 11, the Plan Reflection

Prompt analyzes an action sequence to identify the most critical actions, assessing their significant impacts if missing, the feasibility of subsequent actions, and practical remedial measures. In addition, we have designed the For-

Plan Reflection Prompt

Please analyze the following action sequence and identify the MOST CRITICAL missing steps and their impacts.

The input contains numbered actions with timestamps in the format: "1.Action description.(timestamp);2.Action description.(timestamp);..." Please keep the numbering and timestamps in your analysis.

IMPORTANT: Focus only on the most meaningful and critical dependencies. Do not analyze every single action - select only the most important ones that would cause significant problems if missing.

For each selected critical action A, please analyze:

1. The next action B that is directly and critically dependent on action A
2. What significant impact would occur if action A is missing (focus on major problems, not minor inconveniences)
3. Whether action B can still be performed normally when action A is missing
4. What practical remedial methods are available if action B cannot be performed

Selection criteria for meaningful actions:

- Actions that are prerequisites for safety (e.g., turning off gas, checking equipment)
- Actions that are essential for the main goal (e.g., key cooking steps, critical preparation)
- Actions that would cause significant delays or failures if missing
- Actions involving dangerous or expensive materials/equipment

Please output the analysis results in the following format:

```
{
  "Action A (with number and timestamp)": {
    "Related Next Action B": "Specific description with number and timestamp",
    "Impact of Missing A": "Detailed impact description focusing on significant problems",
    "Is B Feasible Without A": "Yes/No",
    "Remedial Method": "Specific practical remedial measures"
  }
}
```

Focus on realistic, practical problems that could occur in real-world scenarios. Prioritize quality over quantity - analyze fewer actions but with deeper, more meaningful insights.

Action sequence: {action_sequence}

Figure 11. Prompt of Plan Reflection

Forward Plan Analysis Prompt

You are given a cooking activity with continuous, numbered narrations including timestamps, and a brief recipe hint listing possible ingredients and key steps.

Goal: Identify ingredients that are added or used in the activity. For EACH ingredient, you MUST provide at least one 'add' entry. 'use' entries are optional.

For each entry, provide: narration used (keep original numbering and timestamp), risk (short), prevention (short).

Requirements:

- Output compact JSON only, no extra text.
- Use the exact numbering and timestamps from the input for narration used.
- Prefer 3-6 ingredients when possible.
- Structure by category: for each ingredient, split entries into 'add' and 'use' arrays.

Activity label: {activity_label}

Recipe hint:
{recipe_hint}

Continuous narrations:
{continuous_narration}

Output format example (structure only):

```
{
  "items": [
    {
      "ingredient": "milk",
      "add": [ { "narration used": "4.Open the milk bottle...(25.50)", "risk": "Spilling", "prevention": "Hold bottle steadily" } ],
      "use": [ { "narration used": "7.Pour milk into frother...(32.10)", "risk": "Overfilling", "prevention": "Check max line" } ]
    }
  ]
}
```

Figure 12. Prompt of Forward Plan Analysis

ward Plan Analysis Prompt (Figure 12), which is tailored to cooking activities to identify ingredients incorporated in the cooking process. For each ingredient, the prompt requires GPT-5 to analyze three key aspects in a structured JSON format: when and how to adjust the ingredient usage, the

Refinement Prompt

Please help modify the incorrect options of the following QA to make them more relevant to the context, while keeping the correct option unchanged. The modified options should be confusing but still related to the context. For increasing the difficulty of distinguishing from the correct answer, Ensure modified options are plausible but must not have the same meaning as the correct option.

Requirements:

1. Only modify incorrect options (options that are not the correct answer).
2. The correct option is at index {gt_idx} (0-based), which must remain unchanged.
3. All options must be related to the question and context.
4. Ensure modify incorrect options are not completely illogical, but will ultimately be excluded due to contradiction with video behaviors.
5. Each modify incorrect options must contain a seemingly reasonable optimization action or reason, but actually has hidden flaws or conflicts with video details.
6. Keep the original format: options should be complete sentences.
7. The output must be a JSON object with the same structure as the input QA.

Context (related activities): {context}
QA to modify: {qa_item}

Figure 13. Prompt of QA Refinement

risks associated with relevant operations, and corresponding preventive measures.

8.2. QA Refinement

To ensure StreamEQA can effectively evaluate capabilities about video understanding and reasoning, QA Refinement is introduced to address the limitations of originally generated distractors (incorrect options), such as contextual irrelevance or weak, misleading nature. When conducting QA refinement, several key aspects need to be highlighted. Firstly, only distractors should be modified, while the correct option (gt_idx) remains unchanged. Furthermore, modified incorrect options must be contextually related and plausible but ultimately excluded due to contradictions with video context, and distractors should not share the same meaning as the correct option. In addition to QA pairs (qa_item) that need to be refined, we provide context to supplement the details and relationships of relevant activities, as shown in Figure 13.

9. More Data Examples

As shown in Figure 14 to Figure 18, we provide more examples extracted from our benchmark. We try to cover different tasks to offer a holistic overview of StreamEQA.



Figure 14. Data examples for Attribute Recognition Backward, Attribute Recognition Forward, Attribute Recognition Realtime, Object Perception Backward, Object Perception Forward, Object Perception Realtime, Object Requirement, Relationship Recognition Backward, Relationship Recognition Forward, SpaTial Understanding Forward tasks.



Figure 15. Data examples for SpaTial Understanding Backward, Relationship Recognition Realtime, SpaTial Understanding Realtime, Action Intention Prediction, Action Intention Retrieval, Action Intention Understanding, Action Result Prediction, Event Reminding tasks.




Figure 16. Data examples for Action Retrieval, Action Recognition, Objects Manipulation, Episodic Memory, Episodic Prediction, Object Events Recognition, Backward Repetition Event Count, Forward Repetition Event Count tasks.




Figure 17. Data examples for Actions Relationship, Action Sequence Retrieval, Next Action Prediction, Backward Procedure Optimization, Backward Procedure Replacement, Forward Procedure Optimization, Forward Procedure Replacement, Move up Steps tasks.




Figure 18. Data examples for Real-time Procedure Optimization, Real-time Procedure Replacement, Steps Merging, Forward Plan Adjustment, Future Actions, Plan Reflection, Future Plan Summarization, Risk Prediction tasks.