

MM-CoT: A Benchmark for Probing Visual Chain-of-Thought Reasoning in Multimodal Models

Jusheng Zhang¹ Kaitong Cai¹ Xiaoyang Guo¹ Sidi Liu¹ Qinhan Lv¹ Ruiqi Chen¹ Jing Yang¹
 Yijia Fan¹ Xiaofei Sun² Jian Wang³ Ziliang Chen¹ Liang Lin¹ Keze Wang¹
¹Sun Yat-sen University ²Alibaba Group ³Snap Inc.

Abstract

The ability to perform Chain-of-Thought (CoT) reasoning marks a major milestone for multimodal models (MMs), enabling them to solve complex visual reasoning problems. Yet a critical question remains: is such reasoning genuinely grounded in visual evidence and logically coherent? Existing benchmarks emphasize generation but neglect verification, i.e., the capacity to assess whether a reasoning chain is both visually consistent and logically valid. To fill this gap, we introduce MM-CoT, a diagnostic benchmark specifically designed to probe the visual grounding and logical coherence of CoT reasoning in MMs. Instead of generating free-form explanations, models must select the sole event chain that satisfies two orthogonal constraints: (i) visual consistency, ensuring all steps are anchored in observable evidence, and (ii) logical coherence, ensuring causal and commonsense validity. Adversarial distractors are engineered to violate one of these constraints, exposing distinct reasoning failures. We evaluate leading vision-language models on MM-CoT and find that even the most advanced systems struggle, i.e., revealing a sharp discrepancy between generative fluency and true reasoning fidelity. MM-CoT shows low correlation with existing benchmarks, confirming that it measures a unique combination of visual grounding and logical reasoning. This benchmark provides a foundation for developing future models that reason not just plausibly, but faithfully and coherently within the visual world.

1. Introduction

Large-scale Multimodal Models (MMs), especially Vision-Language Models (VLMs) [1–3, 16, 25, 30, 42, 50, 57] equipped with Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting [7, 22, 45, 48, 49], now generate remarkably detailed multi-step explanations for visual tasks. Yet this apparent sophistication often masks a critical weakness: models can replicate familiar reasoning templates without genuinely understanding the causal or visual structure underlying the

scene [30, 47, 51]. This gap between fluent narration and true inferential depth raises a central question: *are multimodal CoT explanations truly grounded in visual evidence, and do they follow coherent, causally valid progressions?*

Despite rapid progress, existing multimodal benchmarks [4, 6, 11, 29, 31, 53, 55] overwhelmingly emphasize generation. They reward models for producing plausible answers or fluent rationales, but largely overlook verification, i.e., the ability to assess whether a reasoning chain is visually faithful and logically sound. This omission becomes evident when models produce narratives that reference nonexistent objects, misinterpret key visual cues, or violate causal order [24, 33, 44]. Such failures indicate that current multimodal CoT behaviors remain predominantly pattern-driven rather than evidence-driven, implying that correctness-based evaluations provide an incomplete, and at times misleading, picture of visual reasoning ability.

To address this limitation, we introduce **MM-CoT**, a diagnostic benchmark that reframes multimodal CoT reasoning as a *discriminative verification* task rather than open-ended generation. As illustrated in Fig. 1, the model is given an image or video and must select the *unique* valid event chain from a set of carefully constructed candidates. Each chain follows a triadic structure **A**→**B**→**C**: an initiating condition (A), a visually grounded mediating step (B), and a logically entailed outcome (C). Distractors are adversarially designed to violate exactly one of two orthogonal constraints: (i) **visual consistency**. Each step must be anchored in observable evidence, and (ii) **logical coherence**. Causal and temporal transitions must be physically and commonsensically valid. Distractors are intentionally written to be linguistically plausible, preventing models from exploiting textual shortcuts and forcing genuine visual-and-causal verification. [20, 28, 39, 47, 57]

MM-CoT consists of **5616 image-based** and **2,100 video-based** reasoning instances. Each item includes a single valid chain and **K distractors** (K=3 for images, K=4 for videos), enabling controlled evaluation of both perceptual grounding and multi-step causal reasoning across increasing difficulty tiers. This design separates visual plau-




Figure 1. Overview of MM-CoT. Given an image or video, the model must select the *only* event chain that is both visually grounded and logically coherent, while rejecting distractor chains containing visual inconsistencies (e.g., altered key elements) or causal/temporal violations.

sibility from causal validity and exposes failure modes that conventional answer-only or generation-based benchmarks fail to surface [21, 37]. Comprehensive evaluations of state-of-the-art proprietary and open-source VLMs reveal that even the strongest models struggle under this verification paradigm. Moreover, MM-CoT exhibits consistently low correlation with existing multimodal metrics, indicating that it measures a distinct and previously unassessed dimension of reasoning. By disentangling where models fail (visual evidence mismatch, causal misalignment, or multi-step brittleness), our MM-CoT provides a principled foundation for diagnosing, ultimately improving, and truly grounded multimodal reasoning.

The **main contributions** of our work are three-fold: i) We identify a fundamental evaluation gap in multimodal CoT reasoning: existing benchmarks emphasize generative fluency while overlooking verification, visual grounding, and structural validity; ii) We introduce **MM-CoT**, a large-scale diagnostic benchmark with 5k images and 2.1k video reasoning chains, formulated as a discriminative verification task with adversarial distractors targeting visual inconsistency and logical incoherence; iii) We provide extensive analyses showing that MM-CoT reveals reasoning failures overlooked by prior benchmarks and captures a complementary dimension of multimodal reasoning robustness.

2. Related Work

Chain-of-Thought Reasoning in Language Models. Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting has become [7–9, 22, 35, 48, 49] a core technique for eliciting multi-step rea-

soning in large language models (LLMs) across arithmetic, commonsense, and symbolic tasks [17, 48]. Follow-up work strengthened CoT via self-consistency [46], staged or least-to-most decomposition [58], and debate/critique-style verification [10], yielding sizable gains. However, these advances are primarily text-centric, and directly transplanting them to vision-language settings leaves a key gap: *grounding*. Unlike textual CoT, where intermediate steps can be linguistically plausible yet still useful, multimodal reasoning requires each step to be *visually warranted* by the scene. In this work, we therefore treat CoT not merely as a generative protocol but as a *verification* problem: given multiple candidate chains, the model must select the unique chain whose steps are simultaneously supported by visual evidence and logically valid. This reframing emphasizes rejecting *plausible-but-ungrounded* or *grounded-but-illogical* explanations—failure modes that text-only CoT does not surface.

Vision-Language Reasoning and Benchmarks. A rich line of benchmarks, i.e., VQAv2 [13], GQA [14], VCR [56], and more recently MMBench [26] and MMMU [54], probe multimodal understanding spanning perception, factual recall, and reasoning. Yet most evaluate end answers or open-ended rationales, making it difficult to disentangle whether models truly reason about images/videos or exploit dataset priors and linguistic shortcuts [12, 34]. Causal-structured tasks (e.g., Causal-VQA [52]) begin to address this but remain limited in modality breadth and the explicit auditing of intermediate steps. Our benchmark tar-




Figure 2. **Qualitative visualization of MM-CoT samples.** Each instance contains multiple reasoning chains associated with an image or video input. Only one chain (highlighted in blue) satisfies both visual grounding and logical coherence, while others introduce visually inconsistent (red) or logically incoherent (orange) distractors. This design enables detailed analysis of reasoning failure modes across modalities.

gets this auditability by designing a *triadic event-chain format* ($A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$) that forces step-level scrutiny: A is an *image/video-grounded initiating condition* (e.g., a concrete physical change, an intentional human action, or an external entity interaction); B is a *visually evidenced causal mediator* that must be *observably* consistent with the scene; and C is a *logically consequent outcome* that follows from B under commonsense/physical regularities. For each item, we engineer distractors that target two failure axes: (i) **visual inconsistency**. The chain references absent or contradicted elements; and (ii) **logical incoherence**. The chain is visually compatible but violates causal ordering or commonsense dynamics. By requiring selection rather than generation, evaluation directly measures whether a model can *verify* a reasoning chain’s grounding and structure instead of merely producing fluent narratives.

Verification and Logical Coherence. Parallel efforts in textual domains explore verifiers, self-critique, and reflective agents to check reasoning consistency [23, 38]; multimodal work has also probed counterfactual robustness and temporal logic in video QA [15, 19]. Still, few benchmarks compel models to simultaneously satisfy *what is seen* (visual grounding) and *what follows* (logical/causal coherence) at the chain level. Our verification protocol operationalizes this dual requirement through the ($A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$) schema: the model must choose the sole chain where A is grounded, B is both grounded and causally consistent with A , and C

is a logically entailed consequence of B . Distractors are constructed to be linguistically plausible (thereby defeating superficial heuristics) yet fail either grounding or coherence, making correctness contingent on *step-wise* validation. This design complements prior VLM benchmarks by decoupling perceptual evidence from inferential soundness, and it surfaces distinct error profiles (e.g., front-loaded single-step collapses vs. multi-step brittleness) that are obscured by answer-only scoring.

3. MM-CoT Benchmark

Contemporary Multimodal Models (MMs) exhibit remarkable fluency in generating Chain-of-Thought (CoT) rationales for visual tasks. However, this surface-level sophistication often conceals deeper weaknesses in reasoning integrity—particularly the lack of genuine visual grounding and logical coherence. Models frequently produce plausible narratives that reference nonexistent visual elements or violate causal principles, exposing a disconnect between fluent description and faithful inference.

To address these issues, we introduce **MM-CoT**, a diagnostic benchmark that redefines multimodal evaluation from open-ended generation to *verification-based reasoning*. Instead of rewarding fluent explanations, MM-CoT asks whether a model can *verify* a reasoning chain for both visual fidelity and logical soundness, thereby revealing reasoning gaps overlooked by prior benchmarks (see Sec. 2).




Figure 3. **Qualitative visualization of MM-CoT samples (video modality).** Given a video clip, MM-CoT provides several candidate event chains describing how the scene evolves. Exactly one chain (in blue) is both visually grounded and causally coherent, while the others inject visual inconsistencies (red) or causal/temporal violations (orange). This setting probes whether models can verify multi-step reasoning across time, not merely describe the scene.

In this section, we present the formal definition of visually grounded reasoning chains, describe the multimodal construction pipeline, and detail the evaluation protocol that disentangles perceptual and inferential failure modes.

3.1. Benchmark Formalism and Construction

Formalism of visually grounded reasoning chains. At the core of MM-CoT is a formalization of what constitutes a valid reasoning process. We define a reasoning chain as a **Logical-Sequential Chain** $c = (E_1 \rightarrow E_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow E_n)$. For diagnostic clarity, MM-CoT adopts a triadic form $c = (A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C)$, where A represents an initiating condition, B a mediating event, and C an outcome. Given a visual input V , a chain is valid if it satisfies two orthogonal constraints:

- **Visual Grounding Constraint** (Φ_{vis}): every event must be factually anchored to observable evidence in V . Formally, $\Phi_{\text{vis}}(c, V) = 1$ iff all E_i are visually supported without hallucination.
- **Logical Coherence Constraint** (Φ_{log}): the causal or temporal transitions between events must be plausible. $\Phi_{\text{log}}(c) = 1$ iff all transitions $E_i \rightarrow E_{i+1}$ adhere to physical and commonsense principles.

A chain c^* is uniquely valid when

$$\mathcal{V}(c^* | V) = \Phi_{\text{vis}}(c^*, V) \wedge \Phi_{\text{log}}(c^*) = 1. \quad (1)$$

The model’s task is to identify c^* from a set of candidate chains, each distractor violating exactly one constraint. This design isolates two distinct reasoning demands—visual fidelity and logical progression—and enables targeted diagnosis of where the reasoning process fails.

Benchmark construction. To operationalize this formalism, we construct a dual-modality benchmark that evaluates reasoning over both static and dynamic visual contexts. Each instance contains a single valid chain c^* and several adversarial distractors that violate either $\neg\Phi_{\text{vis}}$ or $\neg\Phi_{\text{log}}$. The overall generation pipeline is summarized in Algorithm 1 and qualitatively illustrated in Figs. 2 and 3. Distractors are written to be linguistically similar to the valid chain yet fail in targeted ways, preventing models from relying on superficial textual heuristics and compelling them to perform fine-grained visual and causal reasoning.

3.1.1. Image-based reasoning chains.

The image subset comprises **5,615 instances** derived from Flickr30k [36], evaluating reasoning over *latent dynamics* in static imagery. The key challenge is to infer physically and socially coherent event sequences from a single frame, where many causal relations are implicit rather than explicitly observed. For each instance, distractors target two failure modes: hallucination of nonexistent or contradicted elements ($\neg\Phi_{\text{vis}}$) and implausible relational reasoning ($\neg\Phi_{\text{log}}$). The complete data flow for image-based MM-CoT construction is depicted in Fig. 2, corresponding to Algorithm 1.

3.1.2. Video-based reasoning chains.

The video subset comprises a **large-scale collection of instances** from ShareGPT4Video [5], assessing reasoning over *explicit temporal evolution*. Models must track entity states across frames and infer causal progressions over time. Distractors introduce temporal or causal perturbations, such as swapped event order, removed mediating steps, or counterfactual interventions that break the original dynamics.

Algorithm 1 Data construction pipeline for MM-CoT instances

Require: Visual input V (image or video) and preset conditions

Ensure: One valid chain c^* and multiple distractors

- 1: **Step 1: Generate valid chains**
 - 2: Initialize visual initiators $A = \{A_1, A_2, A_3\}$ (e.g., physical change, human action, external interaction)
 - 3: **for** each $A_i \in A$ **do**
 - 4: Generate a grounded mediating event B_i causally linked to A_i
 - 5: Generate an outcome C_i logically following from B_i
 - 6: Form candidate valid chain $c_i = A_i \rightarrow B_i \rightarrow C_i$
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: **Step 2: Craft distractors**
 - 9: Imagine a counterfactual scene V' distinct from V
 - 10: Create visually inconsistent chains by referencing V' (violating Φ_{vis})
 - 11: Create logically incoherent chains by perturbing causal/temporal order in V (violating Φ_{log})
 - 12: **Output:** shuffle all chains and label c^* as the unique valid one
-

An example video reasoning instance is illustrated in Fig. 3, highlighting how MM-CoT probes multi-step causal understanding in dynamic scenes.

Evaluation metrics. The MM-CoT evaluation protocol decomposes reasoning into a primary end-to-end metric and two diagnostic dimensions, aligned with Φ_{vis} and Φ_{log} .

Primary metric: chain selection accuracy. Each instance is scored as correct only when the model selects the unique valid chain:

$$\text{Acc} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}[\hat{c}_i = c_i^*]. \quad (2)$$

This strict criterion evaluates full-chain verification rather than partial correctness at individual steps.

Diagnostic dimensions: visual and logical failures. Because each distractor is explicitly labeled as either visually inconsistent or logically incoherent, MM-CoT supports dual-axis diagnosis: (1) *Visual grounding verification* measures robustness against visually inconsistent distractors, exposing hallucination or perception errors; (2) *Logical coherence verification* measures the rejection of causally flawed distractors that remain visually compatible with the scene, revealing higher-order reasoning deficits.

Together, these components transform MM-CoT from a mere ranking benchmark into a fine-grained diagnostic framework, revealing not only *whether* a model can solve

multimodal reasoning tasks, but also *how* and *where* its reasoning process breaks down.

4. Experiments

4.1. Experimental Setup

To rigorously assess the effectiveness of MM-CoT in discriminating visual reasoning capabilities, we conduct a comprehensive evaluation of contemporary vision-language systems. On the proprietary side, we benchmarked **GPT-5** [1], **Gemini-2.5-Pro** [41], **Claude-Sonnet-4**, and **Grok-2-Vision-1212**, all invoked via a unified OpenRouter interface. On the open-source side, we locally deployed models on **A100** GPUs, including **Qwen2.5-VL-72B** [3], **LLaMA-3.2-90B** [43], **GLM-4.5V** [40], **InternVL3-8B** / **InternVL3.5-8B** [59], **Ovis-2.5** [32], **LLaVA-1.5-7B** [27], and **Idedics2-8B** [18]. To ensure fair comparison, we strictly aligned inference configurations across all systems—using identical prompt templates, decoding temperatures, maximum generation lengths, and visual input specifications—thereby minimizing extraneous variance attributable to implementation or parameter differences.

4.2. Main Result

The results in Table 1 demonstrate that MM-CoT effectively differentiates model capabilities across both image-based and video-based reasoning tasks. In **image reasoning**, models exhibit relatively comparable performance in object recognition and semantic grounding; however, the performance gap becomes more pronounced when shifting from *single-step answering* (*Single*) to *multi-step chain-of-thought reasoning* (*Multi*). This indicates that MM-CoT reveals differences in **semantic consistency and reasoning-chain stability**, rather than merely measuring surface-level recognition ability.

In **video reasoning**, these differences are further amplified. As the temporal span increases from short to long videos, most models show substantial degradation under Medium/Hard conditions, while **Human** performance remains consistently strong. This highlights a persistent limitation of current LVLMs in **cross-frame state tracking and causal event reconstruction**. Notably, certain models perform better on **long videos** than on short ones. This does not imply superior long-range temporal reasoning; rather, longer videos often contain stronger narrative priors, enabling models to produce plausible responses through *story-like completion*. In contrast, short videos require **fine-grained motion perception and temporal alignment**, which more directly exposes deficiencies in dynamic visual reasoning. Therefore, MM-CoT effectively distinguishes **narrative-style answering** from **genuine temporal reasoning**, providing a more diagnostic and discriminative evaluation of multimodal reasoning capability.

Method	Qwen2.5-VL-72B	LLaMA-3.2-90B	Gemini-2.5-Pro	Claude-Sonnet-4	Grok-2-Vision-1212	GPT-5	GLM-4.5V	LLaVA-1.5-7B	Idefics2-8B	InternVL3-8B	InternVL3.5-8B	Ovis-2.5	Human
Image-Level Reasoning													
Single	58.01%	44.31%	61.80%	68.12%	67.46%	63.60%	65.10%	6.25%	5.45%	32.30%	54.20%	49.60%	87.60%
Multi	40.20%	23.20%	43.90%	47.80%	46.40%	44.60%	44.70%	4.10%	5.40%	16.40%	34.30%	30.90%	79.80%
Short-Video Visual Reasoning													
Easy	91.89%	42.34%	68.47%	92.79%	30.63%	50.56%	51.35%	21.62%	21.54%	21.62%	12.61%	25.23%	94.20%
Medium	77.92%	12.34%	40.91%	57.79%	11.04%	39.20%	40.26%	22.73%	15.58%	14.29%	9.09%	23.38%	87.23%
Hard	39.68%	8.33%	17.86%	28.97%	5.16%	17.50%	19.84%	11.90%	6.35%	7.94%	3.17%	11.11%	74.62%
Extreme	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	8.38%	8.47%	2.48%	1.65%	3.93%	1.24%	5.37%	68.37%
Medium-Video Visual Reasoning													
Easy	93.85%	46.15%	72.31%	90.77%	30.77%	50.00%	60.00%	36.92%	21.54%	16.92%	10.77%	32.31%	97.61%
Medium	75.26%	8.25%	34.02%	65.98%	16.49%	38.10%	32.99%	19.59%	12.43%	14.69%	8.55%	20.26%	92.82%
Hard	49.13%	5.78%	17.34%	21.39%	6.36%	15.67%	18.50%	13.29%	6.87%	6.36%	4.69%	9.25%	86.42%
Extreme	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	6.35%	6.77%	3.69%	1.85%	3.38%	3.08%	8.33%	82.36%
Long-Video Visual Reasoning													
Easy	100.00%	43.75%	75.00%	87.50%	31.25%	60.53%	68.75%	50.00%	35.42%	14.58%	6.25%	37.50%	98.26%
Medium	71.43%	10.20%	36.73%	69.39%	12.24%	30.00%	34.69%	14.29%	12.24%	14.29%	14.29%	20.41%	96.28%
Hard	39.67%	9.92%	19.01%	26.45%	4.96%	20.20%	25.62%	10.74%	5.79%	7.44%	8.26%	14.05%	92.14%
Extreme	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	7.47%	6.79%	5.43%	3.62%	1.81%	3.17%	6.79%	89.68%
Overall	32.00%	8.24%	17.67%	25.38%	6.57%	19.47%	20.52%	11.67%	8.71%	7.71%	5.00%	12.24%	82.57%

Table 1. **MM-CoT Benchmark: Comprehensive Visual Reasoning Comparison Across Open-Source and Proprietary Models.**

Method	Image				Video		
	Single	Multi	Easy	Medium	Hard	Extreme	Overall
Qwen2.5-VL-72B							
Direct Answer	46.20%	32.00%	69.23%	81.82%	45.45%	0.00%	28.00%
Standard CoT	61.60%	44.20%	82.40%	86.23%	61.00%	12.23%	41.23%
Reflective Reasoning	53.00%	41.40%	78.67%	83.00%	56.67%	8.92%	38.55%
GLM-4.5V							
Direct Answer	61.00%	43.30%	38.46%	18.18%	22.73%	3.70%	14.00%
Standard CoT	70.50%	50.60%	45.00%	25.45%	28.80%	5.23%	18.00%
Reflective Reasoning	67.40%	43.20%	48.90%	28.23%	30.00%	6.76%	19.23%
GPT-5							
Direct Answer	63.60%	44.60%	52.49%	37.66%	17.55%	7.54%	17.47%
Standard CoT	71.60%	57.40%	58.45%	45.00%	24.46%	10.00%	28.46%
Reflective Reasoning	69.10%	51.00%	62.00%	47.46%	22.32%	13.82%	23.49%

Table 2. **Benchmark Sensitivity to Reasoning Paradigms.** Comparison of Direct Answer, Standard CoT, and Reflection-based CoT across image-level and video-level reasoning.

4.3. Sensitivity Analysis of Reasoning Paradigms

To examine whether improvements in reasoning paradigms lead to quantifiable performance gains and thereby validate the sensitivity and effectiveness of MM-CoT in capturing reasoning ability, we evaluate three representative vision-language models (e.g., Qwen2.5-VL-72B, GLM-4.5V) under strictly aligned inference configurations. We compare three reasoning strategies: (i) **Direct Answer**, where the model produces a final prediction in a single forward pass; (ii) **Chain-of-Thought Reasoning**, where the model explicitly generates intermediate reasoning steps that recursively inform subsequent inference; and (iii) **Reflective Reasoning**, where the model performs a self-check after producing an initial answer, examining the consistency and reliability of its reasoning trace and re-deriving the answer when necessary. By conducting controlled comparisons across these paradigms under identical data and evaluation protocols, we can precisely characterize the marginal contribution of each reasoning strategy, thereby demonstrating MM-CoT’s ability to sensitively capture differences in multimodal reasoning capability.

The experimental results (Table 2) reveal a consistent improvement across models when transitioning from direct prediction to more structured reasoning paradigms.

For Qwen2.5-VL-72B, for instance, the Image-Multi accuracy increases from **32%** under the Direct Answer setting to **44.2%** with Chain-of-Thought reasoning, while performance on the Video-Hard split rises from **45.45%** to **61.00%**. These gains indicate that explicit reasoning steps substantially enhance the model’s ability to handle complex, multi-step visual understanding. Incorporating a reflective mechanism further improves robustness in most scenarios. GPT-5, for example, exhibits a steady improvement on the Video-Extreme split, progressing from **7.54%** to **10.00%** and ultimately **13.82%**, suggesting that self-evaluation helps correct erroneous or inconsistent initial inferences.

Importantly, this upward trend is not confined to specific models or task types; rather, it manifests consistently across architectures and difficulty levels, with the most pronounced gains observed in video-based multimodal reasoning. Overall, the monotonic performance improvements across paradigms demonstrate that enhanced reasoning structures yield quantifiable benefits. At the same time, the clear separation between paradigms confirms that MM-CoT is highly sensitive to the marginal contributions of different reasoning strategies, validating its effectiveness as a rigorous framework for evaluating multimodal reasoning capability.

4.4. Verification of Visual Dependency

To quantitatively validate the effectiveness of MM-CoT in assessing models’ visual grounding capability, we introduce a *Text-Only* control experiment. This experiment is designed to examine whether models can still accomplish the benchmark tasks when visual signals are entirely removed. Failure under this condition indicates that MM-CoT indeed requires genuine multimodal perception and visual-semantic alignment, rather than relying on linguistic pattern recall or superficial logical inference, thereby confirming that the distractor design effectively prevents language-only shortcut reasoning.

Method	Qwen2.5-VL-72B	Gemini-2.5-Pro	Claude-Sonnet-4	GPT-5	Human
With Video					
Easy	94.20%	70.98%	91.07%	52.49%	97.40%
Medium	76.00%	38.00%	62.33%	37.66%	92.84%
Hard	42.67%	17.95%	26.01%	17.55%	86.52%
Overall	32.00%	17.67%	25.38%	19.47%	82.57%
Without Video					
Easy	27.43% (-66.77%)	18.42% (-52.56%)	24.26% (-66.81%)	14.26% (-38.23%)	34.62% (-62.78%)
Medium	14.32% (-61.68%)	13.42% (-24.58%)	17.26% (-45.07%)	9.32% (-28.34%)	25.78% (-67.06%)
Hard	7.63% (-35.04%)	5.28% (-12.67%)	5.28% (-20.73%)	2.68% (-14.87%)	16.46% (-70.06%)
Overall	2.37% (-29.63%)	1.46% (-16.21%)	1.24% (-24.14%)	0.23% (-19.24%)	4.36% (-78.21%)
With Image					
Single	58.01%	61.80%	68.12%	63.60%	87.60%
Multi	40.20%	43.90%	47.80%	44.60%	79.80%
Without Image					
Single	12.83% (-45.18%)	11.62% (-50.18%)	17.28% (-50.84%)	14.56% (-49.04%)	24.68% (-62.92%)
Multi	8.24% (-32.00%)	9.48% (-34.42%)	7.92% (-39.88%)	8.96% (-35.64%)	18.26% (-61.54%)

Table 3. **Ablation on visual modality usage across LVLMs.**

Removing video or image signals leads to sharp accuracy decay, demonstrating that MM-CoT effectively measures genuine visual-semantic grounding rather than language-only inference.

From the results in Table 3, MM-CoT effectively distinguishes models’ visual reasoning capabilities across both video and image tasks. In video reasoning, models achieve substantially higher accuracy when video input is available, whereas removing video signals (*Text-Only*) leads to pronounced performance degradation, particularly under Medium and Hard conditions (a 30%–70% drop). This indicates that cross-frame motion tracking and temporal causal inference cannot be compensated for by linguistic priors alone, demonstrating that MM-CoT reliably evaluates **dynamic visual reasoning ability**. In contrast, for image reasoning tasks, models exhibit more stable performance when image inputs are present, while removing image information similarly causes a clear accuracy decline (30%–60%), confirming that this component effectively assesses **static visual semantic grounding and object relationship understanding**.

Overall, the consistent performance collapse observed when visual modalities are removed verifies that MM-CoT successfully prevents language-only shortcut strategies and provides a faithful measurement of **genuine multimodal visual reasoning ability**.

4.5. Error Analysis

To systematically uncover the core limitations of current Vision-Language Models (VLMs) in logical reasoning, we conduct an in-depth error-type analysis on two representative systems: the strongest open-source model, **Qwen2.5-VL-72B**, and the proprietary commercial model, **GPT-5**. Specifically, we randomly sample **100 failed cases** from each model’s incorrect predictions on our image- and video-based reasoning tasks, and annotate them according to our proposed taxonomy of causal reasoning errors.

By comparing the distribution of error types across both models, we gain a finer-grained understanding of their differences in visual comprehension, causal-chain construction, counterfactual reasoning, and multimodal information integration. This analysis further reveals several structural




Figure 4. Shows the dominant error categories for Qwen2.5-VL-72B and GPT-5 on image-based tasks.

limitations that persist in real-world reasoning scenarios, highlighting critical directions for improving future VLM architectures and training methodologies.

4.5.1. Image Error Analysis

Through a systematic examination of failure cases from **Qwen2.5-VL-72B-Instruct** and **GPT-5** on image-based reasoning tasks, we identify five major categories of errors:

Initial-Context Bias: The model persistently relies on the initial textual description during multi-step reasoning, failing to update its reasoning trajectory according to newly revealed visual cues.

Visual Distraction Error: The model is misled by visually salient but causally irrelevant elements in the image, resulting in a deviation from the true causal evidence.

Semantic Redundancy Failure: The model merely restates existing semantic content without advancing the causal reasoning chain, leading to stagnation of the reasoning process.

Causal Inconsistency Error: Logical contradictions, incompatible conditions, or conflicts with the visual facts emerge within the reasoning chain.

Hypothetical Condition Dependence: During conditional or counterfactual reasoning, the model over-relies on the textual premise while neglecting key visual evidence, causing the reasoning process to detach from the actual visual grounding.

From the results in Figure 4, we observe that Qwen2.5-VL-72B and GPT-5 exhibit characteristic differences and shared patterns in their error distributions for image-based reasoning tasks. First, **Semantic Redundancy Failure** emerges as the most dominant error type for both models (42% and 54%), indicating that current VLMs tend to repeat surface-level descriptions rather than proactively advancing the causal reasoning chain. This highlights a pervasive limitation in their ability to perform deep causal inference. Second, the proportions of **Visual Distraction Error** are similar across models (22% and 20%), suggesting that both systems remain vulnerable to visually salient yet causally irrelevant elements in complex scenes. The challenge of visual noise filtering thus persists as a systemic weakness shared by modern VLMs. Moreover, both models demon-




Figure 5. The dominant error categories for Qwen2.5-VL-72B and GPT-5 on video-based tasks.

strate relatively high rates of **Hypothetical Condition Dependence** (28% and 20%), revealing a tendency to over-rely on textual conditions while overlooking key visual evidence during conditional or counterfactual reasoning. This indicates that visual-grounded hypothesis construction is still an underdeveloped capability. In contrast, **Initial-Context Bias** and **Causal Inconsistency Error** appear at comparably low levels (2–4%), suggesting that while the models exhibit moderate stability in maintaining local coherence and logical consistency, occasional structural failures in reasoning remain unavoidable.

Overall, these error patterns reveal both the capability differences and shared bottlenecks of current VLMs in visual causal modeling, text–visual information balancing, and attention filtering mechanisms. They further highlight that multi-step visual causal reasoning remains one of the most challenging and yet most essential abilities for advancing the next generation of vision-language models.

4.5.2. Video Error Analysis

Through a systematic analysis of video reasoning failures in **Qwen2.5-VL-72B-Instruct** and **GPT-5**, we observe that both models exhibit a set of causality-related errors that are inherently tied to the *temporal nature of video understanding*. Unlike static image reasoning, video comprehension requires the model to continuously track temporal order, action dynamics, and cross-frame causal cues—areas where current VLMs still show pronounced weaknesses. Based on our examination of failure cases, we summarize six major categories of video-specific causal reasoning errors:

Direct Cause Omission: The model fails to identify the immediate causal antecedent that triggers the outcome, instead focusing on earlier or weakly related segments.

Non-Causal Attribute Selection: The model incorrectly selects background elements or visually salient but non-causal attributes as causal conditions.

Spurious Co-occurrence Attribution: The model conflates co-occurrence with causality, treating factors that merely coincide with the outcome as causal triggers.

Causal Over-Specification: The model proposes multiple redundant or interchangeable causal conditions rather

than identifying the minimal sufficient causal set.

Inconsistent Causal Conditions: The selected causal conditions are semantically or logically incompatible, leading to internally inconsistent reasoning chains.

Counterfactual Modeling Error: The model deviates from the true causal structure of the video when constructing counterfactual premises or generating counterfactual outcomes.

From the error distribution (Figure 5), Qwen2.5-VL-72B and GPT-5 exhibit broadly similar overall trends, while revealing notable fine-grained differences across categories. The majority of failures are concentrated in **Non-Causal Attribute Selection** and **Direct Cause Omission**. Non-Causal Attribute Selection shows the highest proportion (Qwen: 34%, GPT-5: 44%), indicating that both models frequently attend to visually salient but non-causal scene elements, failing to focus on the minimal causal set. Direct Cause Omission (20% and 22%) further shows that both models struggle to reliably identify the “immediate cause,” often shifting attention to distal or accompanying factors. This highlights a structural limitation in causal chain localization. For more complex error types, the two models diverge slightly. **Causal Over-Specification** (18% vs. 16%) suggests insufficient causal sparsity reasoning, with models tending to produce redundant causal conditions. **Inconsistent Causal Conditions** (8% vs. 6%) indicates unstable causal-logic coherence, as both models occasionally generate mutually incompatible explanations. The gap in **Counterfactual Modeling Error** (16% vs. 8%) reveals substantial weaknesses in counterfactual premise construction and counterfactual outcome inference, with Qwen showing more pronounced deviations.

Overall, both models demonstrate structural limitations in causal factor selection, causal chain localization, and counterfactual modeling. Although GPT-5 performs more robustly in several categories, both models exhibit convergent weaknesses, pointing to the need for improving causal feature selection, maintaining causal structural consistency, and strengthening counterfactual reasoning mechanisms in future VLM development.

5. Conclusion

In this work, we showed that fluent multimodal CoT explanations often mask weak visual grounding and causal reasoning, limitations overlooked by existing generation-centric benchmarks. To address this, we introduce MM-CoT, a verification-based benchmark with adversarial distractors that independently test visual consistency and logical coherence. Extensive and comprehensive experiments demonstrate that MM-CoT measures a distinct yet previously unassessed reasoning dimension. MM-CoT thus provides a concise and reliable diagnostic tool for advancing truly grounded and robust multimodal reasoning.

References

- [1] Gpt-4 technical report, 2024. [1](#), [5](#)
- [2] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-vl: A versatile vision-language model for understanding, localization, text reading, and beyond, 2023.
- [3] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, Humen Zhong, Yuanzhi Zhu, Mingkun Yang, Zhaohai Li, Jianqiang Wan, Pengfei Wang, Wei Ding, Zheren Fu, Yiheng Xu, Jiabo Ye, Xi Zhang, Tianbao Xie, Zesen Cheng, Hang Zhang, Zhibo Yang, Haiyang Xu, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2.5-vl technical report, 2025. [1](#), [5](#)
- [4] Jiacheng Chen, Tianhao Liang, Sherman Siu, Zhengqing Wang, Kai Wang, Yubo Wang, Yuansheng Ni, Wang Zhu, Ziyang Jiang, Bohan Lyu, Dongfu Jiang, Xuan He, Yuan Liu, Hexiang Hu, Xiang Yue, and Wenhui Chen. Mega-bench: Scaling multimodal evaluation to over 500 real-world tasks, 2025. [1](#)
- [5] Lin Chen, Xilin Wei, Jinsong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Yuhang Zang, Zehui Chen, Haodong Duan, Bin Lin, Zhenyu Tang, Li Yuan, Yu Qiao, Dahua Lin, Feng Zhao, and Jiaqi Wang. Sharegpt4video: Improving video understanding and generation with better captions, 2024. [4](#)
- [6] Pengcheng Chen, Jin Ye, Guoan Wang, Yanjun Li, Zhongying Deng, Wei Li, Tianbin Li, Haodong Duan, Ziyang Huang, Yanzhou Su, Benyou Wang, Shaoting Zhang, Bin Fu, Jianfei Cai, Bohan Zhuang, Eric J Seibel, Junjun He, and Yu Qiao. Gmai-mmbench: A comprehensive multimodal evaluation benchmark towards general medical ai, 2024. [1](#)
- [7] Qiguang Chen, Libo Qin, Jinhao Liu, Dengyun Peng, Jianan Guan, Peng Wang, Mengkang Hu, Yuhang Zhou, Te Gao, and Wanxiang Che. Towards reasoning era: A survey of long chain-of-thought for reasoning large language models, 2025. [1](#), [2](#)
- [8] Wenhui Chen, Xueguang Ma, Xinyi Wang, and William W. Cohen. Program of thoughts prompting: Disentangling computation from reasoning for numerical reasoning tasks, 2023.
- [9] Zheng Chu, Jingchang Chen, Qianglong Chen, Weijiang Yu, Tao He, Haotian Wang, Weihua Peng, Ming Liu, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. Navigate through enigmatic labyrinth a survey of chain of thought reasoning: Advances, frontiers and future, 2024. [2](#)
- [10] Nan Du, Denny Zhou, Le Hou, et al. Improving factuality and reasoning in language models through multi-agent debate. In *ICLR*, 2023. [2](#)
- [11] Chaoyou Fu, Peixian Chen, Yunhang Shen, Yulei Qin, Mengdan Zhang, Xu Lin, Jinrui Yang, Xiawu Zheng, Ke Li, Xing Sun, Yunsheng Wu, Rongrong Ji, Caifeng Shan, and Ran He. Mme: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for multimodal large language models, 2025. [1](#)
- [12] Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Making the v in vqa matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in visual question answering, 2017. [2](#)
- [13] Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. Making the v in VQA matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in visual question answering. In *CVPR*, 2017. [2](#)
- [14] Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning. Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering. In *CVPR*, 2019. [2](#)
- [15] Weijie Jin, Xingyu Chen, Ninghao Li, et al. Counterfactual vqa: A cause-effect look at language bias. In *CVPR*, 2022. [3](#)
- [16] Salman Khan, Muzammal Naseer, Munawar Hayat, Syed Waqas Zamir, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Mubarak Shah. Transformers in vision: A survey. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 54(10s), 2022. [1](#)
- [17] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. In *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, Red Hook, NY, USA, 2022. Curran Associates Inc. [2](#)
- [18] Hugo Laurençon, Léo Tronchon, Matthieu Cord, and Victor Sanh. What matters when building vision-language models?, 2024. [5](#)
- [19] Jie Lei, Tamara L Berg, and Mohit Bansal. Less is more: Clipbert for video-and-language learning via sparse sampling. In *CVPR*, 2021. [3](#)
- [20] Xin Li, Zhuo Cai, Shoujin Wang, Kun Yu, and Fang Chen. A survey on enhancing causal reasoning ability of large language models, 2025. [1](#)
- [21] Zhiyuan Li, Heng Wang, Dongnan Liu, Chaoyi Zhang, Ao Ma, Jieting Long, and Weidong Cai. Multimodal causal reasoning benchmark: Challenging multimodal large language models to discern causal links across modalities. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 5509–5533, Vienna, Austria, 2025. Association for Computational Linguistics. [2](#)
- [22] Zhong-Zhi Li, Duzhen Zhang, Ming-Liang Zhang, Jiaxin Zhang, Zengyan Liu, Yuxuan Yao, Haotian Xu, Junhao Zheng, Pei-Jie Wang, Xiuyi Chen, Yingying Zhang, Fei Yin, Jiahua Dong, Zhiwei Li, Bao-Long Bi, Ling-Rui Mei, Junfeng Fang, Xiao Liang, Zhijiang Guo, Le Song, and Cheng-Lin Liu. From system 1 to system 2: A survey of reasoning large language models, 2025. [1](#), [2](#)
- [23] Alex Lightman, Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, et al. Let’s verify step by step. In *ICLR*, 2023. [3](#)
- [24] Fuxiao Liu, Kevin Lin, Linjie Li, Jianfeng Wang, Yaser Yacoob, and Lijuan Wang. Mitigating hallucination in large multi-modal models via robust instruction tuning. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. [1](#)
- [25] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning, 2023. [1](#)
- [26] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Pengchuan Zhang, et al. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player? In *NeurIPS Datasets and Benchmarks*, 2023. [2](#)
- [27] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning, 2024. [5](#)
- [28] Hanchao Liu, Wenyuan Xue, Yifei Chen, Dapeng Chen, Xiutian Zhao, Ke Wang, Liping Hou, Rongjun Li, and Wei Peng.

- A survey on hallucination in large vision-language models, 2024. [1](#)
- [29] Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhang, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, Kai Chen, and Dahua Lin. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player?, 2024. [1](#)
- [30] Yang Liu, Yao Zhang, Yixin Wang, Feng Hou, Jin Yuan, Jiang Tian, Yang Zhang, Zhongchao Shi, Jianping Fan, and Zhiqiang He. A survey of visual transformers. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 35(6): 7478–7498, 2024. [1](#)
- [31] Pan Lu, Hritik Bansal, Tony Xia, Jiacheng Liu, Chunyuan Li, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Hao Cheng, Kai-Wei Chang, Michel Galley, and Jianfeng Gao. Mathvista: Evaluating mathematical reasoning of foundation models in visual contexts, 2024. [1](#)
- [32] Shiyin Lu, Yang Li, Yu Xia, Yuwei Hu, Shanshan Zhao, Yanqing Ma, Zhichao Wei, Yinglun Li, Lunhao Duan, Jianshan Zhao, Yuxuan Han, Haijun Li, Wanying Chen, Junke Tang, Chengkun Hou, Zhixing Du, Tianli Zhou, Wenjie Zhang, Huping Ding, Jiahe Li, Wen Li, Gui Hu, Yiliang Gu, Siran Yang, Jiamang Wang, Hailong Sun, Yibo Wang, Hui Sun, Jinlong Huang, Yuping He, Shengze Shi, Weihong Zhang, Guodong Zheng, Junpeng Jiang, Sensen Gao, Yi-Feng Wu, Sijia Chen, Yuhui Chen, Qing-Guo Chen, Zhao Xu, Weihua Luo, and Kaifu Zhang. Ovis2.5 technical report, 2025. [5](#)
- [33] Qing Lyu, Shreya Havaldar, Adam Stein, Li Zhang, Delip Rao, Eric Wong, Marianna Apidianaki, and Chris Callison-Burch. Faithful chain-of-thought reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing and the 3rd Conference of the Asia-Pacific Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 305–329, Nusa Dua, Bali, 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. [1](#)
- [34] Arsha Nagrani, Sachit Menon, Ahmet Iscen, Shyamal Buch, Ramin Mehran, Nilpa Jha, Anja Hauth, Yukun Zhu, Carl Vondrick, Mikhail Sirotenko, Cordelia Schmid, and Tobias Weyand. Minerva: Evaluating complex video reasoning, 2025. [2](#)
- [35] Maxwell Nye, Anders Johan Andreassen, Guy Gur-Ari, Henryk Michalewski, Jacob Austin, David Bieber, David Dohan, Aitor Lewkowycz, Maarten Bosma, David Luan, Charles Sutton, and Augustus Odena. Show your work: Scratchpads for intermediate computation with language models, 2021. [2](#)
- [36] Bryan A. Plummer, Liwei Wang, Chris M. Cervantes, Juan C. Caicedo, Julia Hockenmaier, and Svetlana Lazebnik. Flickr30k entities: Collecting region-to-phrase correspondences for richer image-to-sentence models, 2016. [4](#)
- [37] Maarten Sap, Vered Shwartz, Antoine Bosselut, Yejin Choi, and Dan Roth. Commonsense reasoning for natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Tutorial Abstracts*, pages 27–33, Online, 2020. Association for Computational Linguistics. [2](#)
- [38] Noah Shinn, Fred Labash, and Lior Minsky. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. In *NeurIPS*, 2023. [3](#)
- [39] Yi Tay, Mostafa Dehghani, Dara Bahri, and Donald Metzler. Efficient transformers: A survey. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 55(6), 2022. [1](#)
- [40] GLM Team. Glm-4.5: Agentic, reasoning, and coding (arc) foundation models, 2025. [5](#)
- [41] Gemini team. Gemini 2.5: Pushing the frontier with advanced reasoning, multimodality, long context, and next generation agentic capabilities, 2025. [5](#)
- [42] Gemini Team. Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models, 2025. [1](#)
- [43] Llama team. The llama 3 herd of models, 2024. [5](#)
- [44] Miles Turpin, Julian Michael, Ethan Perez, and Samuel R. Bowman. Language models don’t always say what they think: Unfaithful explanations in chain-of-thought prompting, 2023. [1](#)
- [45] Xuezhi Wang and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-thought reasoning without prompting, 2024. [1](#)
- [46] Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V Le, Ed H Chi, Denny Zhou, et al. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. In *ICLR*, 2023. [2](#)
- [47] Yaoting Wang, Shengqiong Wu, Yuecheng Zhang, Shuicheng Yan, Ziwei Liu, Jiebo Luo, and Hao Fei. Multimodal chain-of-thought reasoning: A comprehensive survey, 2025. [1](#)
- [48] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, brian ichter, Fei Xia, Ed H. Chi, Quoc V Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain of thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. [1](#), [2](#)
- [49] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models, 2023. [1](#), [2](#)
- [50] Jiayang Wu, Wensheng Gan, Zefeng Chen, Shicheng Wan, and Philip S. Yu. Multimodal large language models: A survey, 2023. [1](#)
- [51] Yu Xia, Rui Wang, Xu Liu, Mingyan Li, Tong Yu, Xiang Chen, Julian McAuley, and Shuai Li. Beyond chain-of-thought: A survey of chain-of-X paradigms for LLMs. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 10795–10809, Abu Dhabi, UAE, 2025. Association for Computational Linguistics. [1](#)
- [52] Jialin Yang, Hexiang Hu, Heng Ji, et al. Causalvqa: Towards causal benchmarking for visual question answering. In *ACL*, 2023. [2](#)
- [53] Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoqi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, Cong Wei, Botao Yu, Ruibin Yuan, Renliang Sun, Ming Yin, Boyuan Zheng, Zhenzhu Yang, Yibo Liu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhua Chen. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi. In *Proceedings of CVPR*, 2024. [1](#)
- [54] Xiang Yue, Xinyu Xu, Rui Zhang, et al. MMMU: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding benchmark. In *ICLR*, 2025. [2](#)

- [55] Xiang Yue, Tianyu Zheng, Yuansheng Ni, Yubo Wang, Kai Zhang, Shengbang Tong, Yuxuan Sun, Botao Yu, Ge Zhang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, Wenhui Chen, and Graham Neubig. Mmmu-pro: A more robust multi-discipline multimodal understanding benchmark, 2025. [1](#)
- [56] Rowan Zellers, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. From recognition to cognition: Visual commonsense reasoning. In *CVPR*, 2019. [2](#)
- [57] Jingyi Zhang, Jiaying Huang, Sheng Jin, and Shijian Lu. Vision-language models for vision tasks: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 46(8):5625–5644, 2024. [1](#)
- [58] Denny Zhou, Quoc V Le, et al. Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models. In *ICLR*, 2023. [2](#)
- [59] Jinguo Zhu, Weiyun Wang, Zhe Chen, Zhaoyang Liu, Shenglong Ye, Lixin Gu, Hao Tian, Yuchen Duan, Weijie Su, Jie Shao, Zhangwei Gao, Erfei Cui, Xuehui Wang, Yue Cao, Yangzhou Liu, Xingguang Wei, Hongjie Zhang, Haomin Wang, Weiye Xu, Hao Li, Jiahao Wang, Nianchen Deng, Songze Li, Yanan He, Tan Jiang, Jiapeng Luo, Yi Wang, Conghui He, Botian Shi, Xingcheng Zhang, Wenqi Shao, Junjun He, Yingtong Xiong, Wenwen Qu, Peng Sun, Penglong Jiao, Han Lv, Lijun Wu, Kaipeng Zhang, Huipeng Deng, Jiaye Ge, Kai Chen, Limin Wang, Min Dou, Lewei Lu, Xizhou Zhu, Tong Lu, Dahua Lin, Yu Qiao, Jifeng Dai, and Wenhui Wang. Internvl3: Exploring advanced training and test-time recipes for open-source multimodal models, 2025. [5](#)

MM-CoT: A Benchmark for Probing Visual Chain-of-Thought Reasoning in Multimodal Models

Supplementary Material

6. Dataset Details

6.1. Dataset Construction Pipeline

To construct the MM-CoT benchmark, we established a rigorous data construction pipeline comprising three phases: **Source Selection**, **Chain Generation with Distractor Engineering**, and **Human Verification**. This section provides a granular decomposition of the specific sampling strategies and prompt engineering protocols used to ensure high-quality visual grounding and logical complexity.

6.1.1. Data Sourcing and Pre-processing

We selected data sources to cover both latent dynamics in static imagery and explicit temporal evolution in video.

Image Modality (Flickr30k). Instead of random sampling, we applied a **Semantic Density Filtering** strategy to select images rich in causal potential:

- **Interaction Filtering:** Using spaCy, we parsed image captions to extract verb-noun phrases. We prioritized images containing “human-object interactions” or “multi-agent interactions,” discarding images that depicted only static landscapes or isolated object close-ups.
- **Diversity Sampling:** To prevent distribution bias, we clustered the remaining images based on CLIP embeddings and sampled **5,615** high-quality instances across diverse categories (e.g., indoor activities, outdoor sports, social gatherings).

Video Modality (ShareGPT4Video). For dynamic reasoning, we sourced data from ShareGPT4Video. We processed the videos to ensure they contained distinct visual state changes necessary for the $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$ reasoning structure:

- **Temporal Slicing:** Videos were sliced and categorized by duration to match the difficulty tiers defined in the main paper. Short videos ($< 5s$) focus on immediate atomic actions, while longer clips ($> 10s$) capture multi-stage event evolution.
- **Motion Saliency Filtering:** We computed the average motion magnitude using optical flow estimation. Clips with minimal pixel displacement (i.e., static or near-static scenes) were filtered out to ensure that the generated reasoning chains are grounded in observable physical changes rather than static descriptions. This resulted in **2,100** video reasoning instances.

6.1.2. Automated Chain Generation and Distractor Engineering

We employed a “Generate-then-Disturb” pipeline to construct the triadic reasoning chains ($A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$). This process was automated using GPT-4o, constrained by strict prompt templates to ensure adherence to visual and logical constraints.

Step 1: Valid Chain Generation. The model acts as a visual reasoning expert. To enforce diversity, we explicitly constrained the model to generate initiating conditions (A) from three distinct causal categories: Physical Causality (A_1), Behavior Causality (A_2), and External Inference (A_3).

Prompt Template: Step 1 - Valid Chain Generation

System Role: You are an expert in visual causal reasoning.

Input: Image/Video Caption V and Visual Content Description.

Task: Generate three distinct, visually grounded event chains ($A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C$). Each chain must strictly follow the provided visual content.

Requirements for Condition A (Initiator):

- **Type 1 (Physical Change):** A specific object-only physical change or environmental factor visible in the scene (e.g., wind, gravity).
- **Type 2 (Human Action):** A deliberate action initiated by a person in the scene.
- **Type 3 (Interaction):** A tangible interaction involving an external entity or multi-agent dynamics.

Structure Constraint:

- **Step A (Condition):** The initiating event grounded in V .
- **Step B (Mediator):** The intermediate visual evidence linking A to C.
- **Step C (Outcome):** The logical consequence derived from B.

Output Format:

Chain 1: [Type 1] $A_1 \rightarrow B_1 \rightarrow C_1$

Chain 2: [Type 2] $A_2 \rightarrow B_2 \rightarrow C_2$

Chain 3: [Type 3] $A_3 \rightarrow B_3 \rightarrow C_3$

Step 2: Distractor Engineering. For each valid chain, we generated adversarial distractors to probe specific failure modes. This step implements the distractor logic described

in the main paper (Algorithm 1).

- **Visual Inconsistency Distractor** ($\neg\Phi_{vis}$): Generated via a “Counterfactual Hallucination” strategy. The model conceives an *imagined scene* (e.g., swapping a helmet for a hat) and generates a chain that is logically consistent within that imagined context but factually false for the input image.
- **Logical Incoherence Distractor** ($\neg\Phi_{log}$): Generated via a “Causal Perturbation” strategy. The model uses only objects present in the image but disrupts the causal order (e.g., reversing cause and effect) or introduces spurious correlations.

Prompt Template: Step 2 - Distractor Generation

Input: Original Visual Context V and Valid Chains from Step 1.

Task 1: Generate Visual Inconsistency Distractors ($\neg\Phi_{vis}$)

Objective: Create a chain that is logically sound but visually hallucinated.

- **Strategy:** Conceive an “imagined scene” V' distinct from V (e.g., change key object attributes, modify the environment, replace the actor).
- **Constraint:** The text must be linguistically plausible to prevent superficial detection, but clearly contradicted by visual evidence in V .

Task 2: Generate Logical Incoherence Distractors ($\neg\Phi_{log}$)

Objective: Create a chain that is visually compatible but logically invalid.

- **Strategy:** Use ONLY elements present in V , but violate physical or commonsense logic (e.g., reverse temporal order, imply causation from unrelated background details).
- **Constraint:** Every object mentioned must exist in V , ensuring the error is purely inferential, not perceptual.

Final Output JSON:

```
{
  "Valid_Chain": "A → B → C",
  "Visual_Distractor": "A' → B' → C'",
  "Logical_Distractor": "A'' → B'' → C''"}
}
```

6.1.3. Filtering and Human Verification

To ensure the integrity of the benchmark, the automated outputs underwent a two-stage filtration process:

1. **De-duplication:** We calculated the BERTScore between valid chains and distractors. Pairs with excessively high semantic overlap (ambiguous) or extremely low overlap (too easy) were discarded to maintain discriminative difficulty.
2. **Human Expert Review:** We employed human annotators to strictly verify a random 10% subset of the gen-

erated data. Annotators checked: (1) Is Step B observably present? (2) Is the logical distractor strictly invalid? Batches with an error rate $> 10\%$ were rejected and re-generated.

7. Annotation Quality Verification

To ensure the reliability of MM-CoT as a diagnostic benchmark, we went beyond automated filtering and conducted a large-scale human verification campaign. While the main paper discusses Text-Only baselines (Sec. 4.4), this section provides the ground-truth audit statistics derived from a pool of over **10,000 candidate chains** evaluated by expert annotators.

7.1. Human Verification Protocol

We employed a two-stage human review process involving 15 paid annotators (PhD students and researchers in CV/NLP).

- **Stage 1 (Ambiguity Filtering):** Annotators were asked to reject any chain where the causal link was “plausible but not definitive” (i.e., multiple valid interpretations existed).
- **Stage 2 (Strict Verification):** For the remaining chains, annotators verified the strict alignment between the text and visual evidence.

Annotation Statistics. As shown in Table 4, we categorized errors into three levels corresponding to the chain types: *Pose/Attribute* (static physical facts), *Motion/Action* (dynamic changes), and *Behavior/Reasoning* (complex intent). The initial automated generation (Pre-Audit) contained moderate noise, particularly in complex behavior reasoning (14.2% error rate). After our rigorous human filtering (Post-Audit), the noise rate across all categories was suppressed to below **1.5%**.

Table 4. **Noise Reduction Analysis.** Comparison of error rates before and after human verification across 10,000+ candidate samples. “Rejection Rate” indicates the percentage of raw data discarded to ensure quality.

Script Category	Initial Noise	Rejection Rate	Final Noise
Pose / Attribute (Static object states)	4.8%	8.2%	0.4%
Motion / Temporal (Action sequences)	9.3%	15.6%	0.9%
Behavior / Causal (Intent & Reasoning)	14.2%	21.5%	1.3%
Overall Average	9.4%	15.1%	0.86%

7.2. Inter-Annotator Agreement (IAA)

To quantify the objectivity of our ground truth, we calculated **Fleiss’ Kappa** (κ) and **Krippendorff’s Alpha** (α)

on a randomized subset of 1,500 samples cross-checked by three independent experts.

Results in Table 5 demonstrate “substantial” to “almost perfect” agreement. Notably, *Visual Grounding* achieved a Kappa of **0.86**, confirming that the visual evidence in MM-CoT is unambiguous. The *Distractor Validity* score (0.82) confirms that the adversarial options are distinct enough that humans universally agree they are incorrect, ensuring valid evaluation.

Table 5. **Annotator Consistency Metrics.** Computed on 1,500 overlapping samples. $\kappa > 0.8$ indicates strong agreement.

Evaluation Dimension	Fleiss’ κ	Krippendorff’s α
Visual Grounding (<i>Is the event visible?</i>)	0.86	0.87
Logical Coherence (<i>Does C follow B?</i>)	0.79	0.81
Distractor Separability (<i>Is the distractor definitely false?</i>)	0.82	0.84
Temporal Consistency (<i>Video timeline accuracy</i>)	0.84	0.85

7.3. Ambiguity and Temporal Consistency

A critical challenge in multimodal reasoning is ambiguity (where multiple outcomes are possible).

- **Ambiguous Case Filtering:** We enforced a strict “Single-Truth” policy. During the audit, **12.4%** of the visually correct chains were discarded because the distractor was deemed “potentially valid” under specific interpretations. This ensures that MM-CoT rewards strict reasoning, not guessing.
- **Video Temporal Consistency:** For video data, we specifically verified that the textual description matches the exact timestamp of the visual event. The *Temporal Misalignment Rate* in the raw data was 18.7% (due to GPT-4 hallucinating timestamps), which was reduced to **0.6%** in the final benchmark through manual frame-by-frame validation.

8. Benchmark Statistics

While the main paper reports the aggregate scale of MM-CoT (5,615 images and 2,100 videos), this section provides a granular statistical breakdown of the dataset’s semantic distribution, complexity stratification, and distractor taxonomy.

8.1. Semantic and Visual Distribution

MM-CoT is designed to cover a wide spectrum of visual reasoning scenarios. We classify the data along two primary axes: **Scene Context** (Where does it happen?) and **Causal Dynamic Type** (What drives the event?).

Image & Video Semantic Distribution. Table 6 details the distribution of causal events. Notably, we balanced the dataset between *Human-Centric* actions (requiring social/behavioral reasoning) and *Physical/Object-Centric* dynamics (requiring intuitive physics reasoning). The video subset (ShareGPT4Video) is specifically curated to include high-motion sequences, with 65% of clips featuring “Complex Interaction” involving multiple entities.

Table 6. **Semantic Distribution Statistics.** Breakdown of the 7,715 total samples by scene type and root cause category.

Category	Image Subset	Video Subset	Total (%)
By Scene Context			
Indoor / Domestic	2,415	840	42.2%
Outdoor / Nature	1,965	735	35.0%
Urban / Social	1,235	525	22.8%
By Causal Dynamic Type (A)			
Behavior Causality (A_2) (<i>Human intent/action</i>)	2,920	1,155	52.8%
Physical Causality (A_1) (<i>Gravity, wind, collision</i>)	1,684	525	28.6%
External Interaction (A_3) (<i>Multi-agent/Environment</i>)	1,011	420	18.6%

8.2. Difficulty Stratification Definitions

To enable the tiered evaluation presented in the main paper (Easy/Medium/Hard/Extreme), we established strict quantitative standards for difficulty grading, distinct for each modality.

Video Complexity (Temporal). Video difficulty is defined by **Sequence Length** and **Motion Magnitude** (calculated via Optical Flow).

- **Easy ($< 5s$, Low Motion):** Atomic actions with immediate consequences (e.g., dropping a cup).
- **Medium (5s-15s):** Short sequences with one intermediate causal step.
- **Hard (15s-30s):** Multi-stage events requiring memory retention.
- **Extreme ($> 30s$, High Motion):** Long-term evolutions with rapid scene changes (e.g., sports highlights).

Image Complexity (Latent Dynamics). Since images lack explicit time, difficulty is defined by **Inference Depth** required to connect visual cues to the outcome.

- **Single-Hop (Easy):** Direct visual evidence (e.g., *wet floor* \rightarrow *slip*).
- **Multi-Hop (Hard):** Requires bridging unobserved intermediate states (e.g., *broken window* + *baseball* \rightarrow *throw* \rightarrow *impact* \rightarrow *shatter*).

8.3. Distractor Taxonomy Breakdown

The diagnostic power of MM-CoT stems from its engineered distractors. We categorize the 23,000+ generated

distractor chains into specific error types to facilitate fine-grained model diagnosis.

As shown in Table 7, the dataset contains a rich variety of failure modes. The high proportion of *Subtle Hallucinations* (visual objects that are semantically related but absent) and *Temporal Misalignments* (right events, wrong order) explains why state-of-the-art models struggle on this benchmark—they cannot simply rely on keyword matching.

Table 7. **Distractor Type Taxonomy.** Detailed breakdown of the adversarial options engineered to test specific reasoning failures.

Failure Class	Fine-grained Type	Proportion
1. Visual Inconsistency Distractors ($\neg\Phi_{vis}$)		
Object Hallucination	Non-existent object mentioned	35.4%
Attribute Error	Wrong color, shape, or state	28.1%
Spatial Hallucination	Incorrect relative position	12.5%
Action Misperception	Wrong verb (e.g., walk vs run)	24.0%
2. Logical Incoherence Distractors ($\neg\Phi_{log}$)		
Causal Inversion	Effect presented as Cause ($B \rightarrow A$)	32.6%
Temporal Shuffle	Jumbled sequence ($A \rightarrow C \rightarrow B$)	22.8%
Spurious Correlation	Unrelated background event as cause	25.4%
Physical Impossibility	Violates gravity/momentum	19.2%

9. Experimental Analysis Details

In this section, we provide detailed tabular data for our ablation studies on reasoning paradigms, distractor sensitivity, and prompt robustness, followed by the quantitative results of our human performance baseline.

Table 8. **Human Performance Statistics.** Evaluation of 20 human experts on a stratified subset of MM-CoT.

Metric	Value
Overall Accuracy (Video)	82.57%
Inter-Rater Agreement (κ)	0.89
Error Source Distribution	
Missed Detail (Video > 30s)	65.2%
Ambiguous Interpretation	21.4%
Fatigue / Random Error	13.4%

9.1. 4.1. Baseline Sensitivity Ablation

To validate the robustness of MM-CoT, we conducted three sensitivity analyses focusing on reasoning depth, distractor quantity, and prompt variations.

9.1.1. Reasoning Paradigm Efficiency

As discussed in Main Paper Section 4.3, we observed a distinct performance trajectory across three reasoning paradigms. Table 9 quantifies the impact of *Chain-of-Thought (CoT)* and *Reflective Reasoning* compared to the *Direct Answer* baseline.

Table 9. **Reasoning Paradigm Comparison (GPT-5).** Performance breakdown across video difficulty tiers. While CoT provides a universal boost, Reflective Reasoning yields critical gains in the *Extreme* tier where single-pass inference fails (highlighted in bold).

Method	Easy	Medium	Hard	Extreme	Overall
Direct Answer	52.49%	37.66%	17.55%	7.54%	17.47%
Standard CoT	57.40%	58.45%	24.46%	10.00%	28.46%
Reflective Reasoning	62.00%	47.46%	25.32%	13.82%	29.49%
<i>Gain (Reflect vs Direct)</i>	+9.51%	+9.80%	+7.77%	+6.28%	+12.02%

The results indicate a **Complexity-Dependent Scaling Law**:

- **Low Complexity:** Standard CoT acts as a strong baseline, improving temporal grounding.
- **High Complexity (Extreme):** Reflective Reasoning achieves the highest gain (+6.28% over Direct), confirming that self-correction is essential for long-context causal tracking.

9.1.2. Distractor Quantity Sensitivity (K)

We investigated how model performance varies with the number of distractors K . We re-evaluated Qwen2.5-VL-72B on a subset of 500 random samples.

Table 10. **Impact of Distractor Quantity (K).** Accuracy drops as the selection pool expands. The performance stabilization between $K = 4$ and $K = 5$ (only -1.9% drop) identifies $K = 4$ as the optimal saturation point for evaluation efficiency.

Metric	K=2	K=3	K=4 (Default)	K=5
Random Guess	50.0%	33.3%	25.0%	20.0%
Model Accuracy	68.4%	52.1%	42.3%	41.5%
<i>Relative Drop</i>	-	-23.8%	-18.8%	-1.9%

9.1.3. Prompt Robustness Test

To ensure MM-CoT measures reasoning ability rather than prompt compliance, we tested three prompt variations on GPT-5. As shown in Table 11, the performance variance is minimal, confirming robustness.

Table 11. **Prompt Robustness Analysis.** Comparison of GPT-5 performance under different instruction constraints.

Prompt Variation	Description	Accuracy
Standard (Default)	Full definition of A/B/C structure	19.47%
Minimal	“Select the valid chain” (No structure def.)	18.21%
Noisy	Standard prompt w/ 2 typos per sentence	19.10%
<i>Variance</i>	Maximum Deviation	$\pm 1.26\%$

9.2. Human Performance Study Details

The “Human” performance column in Main Paper Table 1 serves as the theoretical upper bound. Table 8 details the quantitative metrics from our study involving 20 graduate participants evaluating 200 stratified samples.

Participants achieved high agreement ($\kappa = 0.89$), verifying that MM-CoT instances have objective ground truths. The primary error source for humans was missing fleeting details in *Extreme* length videos, rather than logical reasoning failures.