

Towards Meta-Cognitive Knowledge Editing for Multimodal LLMs

Zhaoyu Fan¹, Kaihang Pan^{1,†}, Mingze Zhou¹, Bosheng Qin¹, Juncheng Li^{1,‡},
Shengyu Zhang¹, Wenqiao Zhang¹, Siliang Tang¹, Fei Wu¹, Yueting Zhuang¹

Zhejiang University¹

{zyfan, kaihangpan, mingze, bsqin, junchengli}@zju.edu.cn
{sy_zhang, wenqiaozhang, siliang, wufei, yzhuang}@zju.edu.cn

Abstract

Knowledge editing enables multimodal large language models (MLLMs) to efficiently update outdated or incorrect information. However, existing benchmarks primarily emphasize cognitive-level modifications while lacking a focus on deeper meta-cognitive processes. To bridge this gap, we introduce **CogEdit**, a novel benchmark designed to evaluate MLLMs’ meta-cognitive knowledge editing abilities across three levels: (1) **Counterfactual-Driven Editing**, assessing self-awareness of knowledge correctness changes; (2) **Boundary Constraint Editing**, ensuring appropriate generalization without unintended interference; and (3) **Noise-Robust Editing**, promoting reflective evaluation of uncertain information. To advance meta-cognitive editing, we propose **MIND** (Meta-cognitive INtegrated Dynamic Knowledge Editing), a framework that constructs a meta-knowledge memory for self-awareness, employs game-theoretic interactions to monitor knowledge activation, and incorporates label refinement for noise-robust updates. Extensive experiments show that **MIND** significantly outperforms existing cognitive editing approaches, achieving strong performance on both traditional and meta-cognitive knowledge editing benchmarks.

1 Introduction

Knowledge Editing (Huang et al., 2023; De Cao et al., 2021; Mitchell et al., 2021; Meng et al., 2022a; Li et al., 2024d; Zheng et al., 2023; Mitchell et al., 2022; Zhong et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024b; Chen et al., 2024a; Wang and Li, 2024; Meng et al., 2022b) offers an efficient way for updating large language models (LLMs) to correct errors or outdated information without negative side effects, which has been further extended to the editing of multimodal large language models (MLLMs),

[†] Project Leader.

[‡] Corresponding Author.




Figure 1: Difference between Cognitive Editing and Meta-cognitive Editing. Meta-cognitive editing requires “thinking about thinking”, additionally involving self-awareness, boundary monitoring, reflective thinking.

known as multimodal editing. Previous research suggests that the process of knowledge editing closely resembles **human cognition** (Pan et al., 2025b; Zhang et al., 2024b). It enables MLLMs to incorporate new knowledge and rectify their previous misconceptions. Three common metrics (Cheng et al., 2023a) are used to evaluate the effectiveness of this cognitive process: **Reliability** (accepting the new knowledge to achieve desired editing outcome); **Generality** (transferring the newly acquired knowledge to similar scenarios); **Locality** (unrelated knowledge remaining unchanged without mistakenly altered).

While cognition is vital for learning and decision-making, it is insufficient alone. Firstly, cognitive editing simply identifies outdated knowledge and replaces it with new information mechanically, without recognizing when the old knowledge is no longer usable. Moreover, it recognizes knowledge only at a surface level, without truly understanding why the new information is correct. Additionally, it lacks reflective thinking about the cognitive process itself—crucial for refining updates, especially in the presence of noisy inputs.

The difference between cognitive and meta-cognitive editing is shown in Figure 1, to address the limitations of cognitive editing, effective knowledge editing should be **META-COGNITIVE** (Georghiades, 2004; Lai, 2011; Veen-




Figure 2: The performance of MIND and SERAC (Mitchell et al., 2022) on traditional cognitive editing benchmark and our proposed CogEdit.

man et al., 2006). Meta-cognition encompasses a model’s ability to assess and modify its own reasoning and learning processes. In contrast to basic cognition, meta-cognition emphasizes the capacity to “think about thinking” and incorporates three additional levels.

- **Level 1: Self-Awareness** (Blakemore and Frith, 2003). The system, while replacing outdated knowledge with new knowledge, is capable of self-awareness regarding the reasons why the old knowledge was incorrect and needed to be replaced in the corresponding context.
- **Level 2: Boundary Monitoring** (Li et al., 2024c). The system is capable of monitoring the utilization boundary of new knowledge, preventing it from being excessively overgeneralized and thereby avoiding the erroneous overshadowing of truly relevant knowledge.
- **Level 3: Reflective Thinking** (Rodgers, 2002). The system evaluates its knowledge update processes and refines its adaptation strategies. It assesses external inputs to determine whether they should be accepted and, if so, which portions are relevant for integration.

Existing knowledge editing datasets primarily evaluate a model’s cognitive capabilities but fail to effectively reflect its meta-cognitive abilities. To address this limitation, we introduce **COGEDIT**. It is a novel benchmark designed to assess the meta-cognitive abilities of MLLMs during the knowledge editing process, which encompasses tasks of varying dimensions across diverse domains. In alignment with the three key levels outlined earlier, our benchmark evaluates models across three essential criteria:

Counterfactual-Driven Editing (Level 1) – When proposing a counterfactual assumption that alters the content of specific knowledge, the model should be **self-aware** that the change in the correct-

ness of the knowledge is attributed to the introduction of the counterfactual condition.

Boundary-Constraint Editing (Level 2) – The model should **monitor the utilization boundary** of the new knowledge to prevent it from being overgeneralized to seemingly similar yet unrelated scenarios and mistakenly suppressing knowledge that should be activated.

Noise-Robust Editing (Level 3) – When confronted with noisy knowledge of uncertain accuracy, the model must critically assess its validity through **reflective thinking**, determining whether it should replace existing ones.

With our newly designed benchmark, we perform a comprehensive evaluation of SOTA multimodal editing methods for meta-cognitive editing. As shown in Figure 2, though existing methods (Mitchell et al., 2022) achieve strong performance on cognitive knowledge editing (Cheng et al., 2023b), they lack meta-cognitive capabilities including self-awareness, boundary monitoring, and reflective thinking.

To address these limitations and advance meta-cognitive knowledge editing, we introduce **MIND** (Meta-cognitive **IN**tegrated **DY**namic Knowledge Editing), a framework that emulates the human knowledge editing process by mimicking how humans learn new information within their minds.

MIND begins by building a meta-knowledge memory, including both meta-declarative and meta-conditional components, to enable self-aware knowledge updates. It then applies game theory to monitor knowledge activation through old-new knowledge interactions and employs a label refiner to filter noisy inputs, enhancing robustness. This enables MLLMs to perform “thinking about thinking” by regulating their own cognitive processes. As shown in Figure 2, MIND achieves strong performance on both standard and newly proposed meta-cognitive editing benchmarks.

Overall, our main contributions are three-fold:

- We introduce CogEdit, a benchmark to evaluate meta-cognitive knowledge editing capabilities for MLLMs.
- We propose MIND, a framework that simulates human-like meta-cognitive learning with self-awareness, boundary monitoring, and reflective thinking.
- MIND achieves strong performance on both traditional cognitive knowledge editing benchmark and our newly developed meta-cognitive benchmark.

2 Related Work

Multimodal Knowledge Editing is the process of modifying, updating, or correcting specific knowledge within MLLMs (Liu et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2023; Pan et al., 2024b; Li et al., 2023b; Dai et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023a; Pan et al., 2025a) while preserving its overall performance across different modalities. Existing multimodal editing benchmarks (Cheng et al., 2023a; Li et al., 2024b; Huang et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024a) evaluate the effectiveness of editing using the Reliability, Generality, and Locality metrics (Huang et al., 2023). These metrics assess the cognitive capability of editing methods, specifically their ability to recognize when old knowledge is replaced by new one. However, they exhibit limited diversity. Considering that knowledge editing is inherently meta-cognitive, we propose **CogEdit**, which introduces diversity as an additional metric to evaluate whether an editing method possesses self-awareness, boundary monitoring, and reflective thinking.

From a methodological perspective (Pan et al., 2025b), existing knowledge editing approaches can be categorized into two types: (1) Intrinsic Knowledge Editing (De Cao et al., 2021; Mitchell et al., 2021; Meng et al., 2022a; Li et al., 2024d), which directly modifies the model’s internal parameterized knowledge, and (2) External Knowledge Resorting (Zheng et al., 2023; Mitchell et al., 2022; Zhong et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024b; Chen et al., 2024a), which preserves the original model parameters while incorporating external knowledge sources through edited samples. However, neither of these approaches exhibits meta-cognitive capabilities. In contrast, we introduce **MIND**, a knowledge editing framework that simulates a human mind’s meta-cognitive learning process.

3 CogEdit Benchmark

In this section, we propose **CogEdit**, a meta-cognitive multimodal editing benchmark that encompasses **multiple capability levels** across **diverse domains**. Corresponding to the three levels of meta-cognition (*i.e.*, self-awareness, boundary monitoring, reflective thinking), CogEdit evaluates multimodal editing across three essential criteria. We give more details of CogEdit in Appendix A.

Task Definition. Assuming we have an MLLM parameterized by θ that map the input (i_e, x_e) to the prediction y_o , where i_e refers to the editing im-

age input, x_e refers to the editing text prompt input and y_o denote as the origin output. Multimodal editing aims to change prediction from y_o to y_e after an updated θ_e . On this basis, we introduce our triple-level editing subtasks, as illustrated in Figure 3. A formal definition of the task and corresponding evaluation metrics can be found in Appendix A.

Level 1: Counterfactual-Driven Editing. The first level of CogEdit focuses on evaluating the model’s ability to demonstrate **self-awareness**. When a counterfactual assumption alters the correctness of specific knowledge, the model should recognize that the change in the correctness of that knowledge is due to the introduction of the counterfactual condition. When these conditions are subsequently removed, the prior knowledge should be reactivated.

The task assesses a model’s capability to incorporate counterfactual knowledge by measuring **Fidelity**—the accuracy under a counterfactual assumption—and **Adaptability**—the ability to recover original knowledge once the assumption is removed.

Level 2: Boundary Constraint Editing. The second level of CogEdit evaluation assesses the model’s ability of **boundary monitoring**, preventing the new knowledge being overgeneralized to seemingly similar yet unrelated scenarios, and avoiding the erroneous suppression of knowledge that should be activated.

This task evaluates a model’s ability to apply edited knowledge appropriately by measuring **Reliability**—its accuracy in the original context after editing—and **Compliance**—its ability to adapt its responses under boundary constraints without overgeneralizing the edited knowledge.

Level 3: Noise-Robust Editing. The third level in CogEdit evaluates whether the model can engage in **reflective thinking**. When confronted with noisy or uncertain knowledge, the model should critically assess its validity and determine whether it should be accepted as a replacement for existing knowledge.

This task measures a model’s ability to extract and retain useful information from noisy updates. Specifically, **Clarity@K** quantifies the model’s robustness by evaluating its accuracy as the level of injected noise increases, with K denoting the number of distracting elements.




Figure 3: (a) Distribution of problem difficulties in **CogEdit**. (b) The transformation process from an original VQA instance to edited instances at different levels.

Data Collection. To ensure diversity in data sources, we curated a total of 1,174 VQA questions from various multimodal QA datasets (Hudson and Manning, 2019; Marino et al., 2019). These questions span various specialized domains, including sports, arts, science, everyday activities and so on. The selection process also considered different capability tiers, categorized from simplest to most complex: **Perception**, **Recognition**, **Understanding**, and **Reasoning**. We use open-source models (Chen et al., 2024b; Grattafiori et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024a; Wang et al., 2024a) to help us generate and refine the data instances.

4 Approach: Meta-Cognitive Editing

We propose a meta-cognitive multimodal editing method, **MIND** (Meta-cognitive INtegrated Dynamic knowledge editing), to overcome the limitations of cognitive-based editing, as shown in Figure 4. **MIND** retains the activation pathways of the original knowledge during the editing process, guiding the editing and updating based on scene features, and extracting relevant information from the editing examples. It integrates a self-aware meta-cognitive memory(4.1), a game-theoretic monitoring mechanism(4.2), and a meta-label refiner(4.3), enabling meta-cognitive knowledge editing in a manner similar to how the human mind learns and adapts.

4.1 Self-Aware Meta Knowledge

Meta-Memory Construction. Feed-forward layers in transformer models, which constitute a significant portion of the model’s parameters, function as key-value memory structures (Geva et al., 2020). Thus make it possible to edit knowledge through editing feed-forward layers.

Since activation and inhibition mappings influence the model’s activation and forwarding logic,

we define a Meta-Memory (Nelson, 1990; Cavanaugh and Perlmutter, 1982) projection matrix $\text{Mem} \in \mathbb{R}^{d' \times d'}$ which consists of the meta-knowledge units m_i , which is a mapping function that extracts new activation values from original activation values. For a feed-forward layer with an inner hidden dimension of d' , the meta-memory Mem can be represented with:

$$q_{\text{output}} = \text{Mem}(q_{\text{input}}) = [m_i(q_{\text{input}_i})]_{i=0}^{d'-1} \quad (1)$$

$$m_i = \text{split}(\text{Mem})_i = \text{Mem}[:, i] \quad \forall i \in \{0, 1, \dots, d'-1\} \quad (2)$$

where q_i and q_o are original and new activation values of dimension d' , respectively.

Meta-knowledge is parameterized and stored in meta-memory, and it can be categorized into different levels, including **meta-declarative knowledge** m_i^{decl} and **meta-conditional knowledge** m_i^{cond} .

Meta-declarative knowledge refers to a language model’s self-awareness of its knowledge, structure, and limitations. It goes beyond storing facts by allowing the model to assess how reliable its responses are and where they come from.

Meta-conditional knowledge refers to a model’s awareness of when and under what conditions specific knowledge should be applied. It helps the model adapt by evaluating the relevance and appropriateness of its knowledge in varying contexts. This meta-knowledge helps the model adapt and make informed decisions by guiding when and how to apply information effectively.

Initially, $m_i^{\text{decl}} = 1$ if i equals the target index, and $m_i^{\text{decl}} = 0$ otherwise; meanwhile, $m_i^{\text{cond}} = \mathbf{0}$ for all i , indicating that the meta-memory retains the original declarative knowledge while no conditional knowledge has been learned yet.

Table 1: Main results on **CogEdit**, including Counterfactual-Driven Editing, Boundary Constraint Editing, and Noise-Robust Editing.

Method	COUNTERFACTUAL		BOUNDARY EDITING		NOISY EDITING		
	Fidelity↑	Adaptability↑	Reliability↑	Compliance↑	Clarity@2↑	Clarity@4↑	
MiniGPT-4							Size: 7.3B
Base Methods	FT (vision block)	55.08	16.72	52.56	23.20	19.29	17.84
	FT (last layer)	67.49	15.85	60.93	24.66	17.66	14.12
Cognitive Editing	T-Patcher	73.16	19.43	62.15	24.72	27.76	25.44
	IKE	99.66	13.67	99.92	15.72	14.98	10.72
	MEND	60.55	20.88	73.92	33.10	10.43	3.50
	SERAC	99.26	29.98	99.68	40.49	30.88	30.83
	WISE	76.29	27.63	79.33	31.00	29.33	29.01
Meta-Cognitive Editing	MIND (Ours)	98.16	34.31	88.41	43.21	34.98	34.87
LLaVA							Size: 7.06B
Base Methods	FT (vision block)	30.97	18.60	24.27	26.47	19.50	18.95
	FT (last layer)	71.66	28.87	45.69	21.98	21.98	18.20
Cognitive Editing	T-Patcher	82.55	33.62	77.64	29.39	30.33	30.69
	IKE	78.44	31.87	76.51	28.26	34.68	39.50
	MEND	85.36	47.44	94.90	44.84	4.98	4.98
	SERAC	98.84	52.03	99.72	53.20	53.42	47.88
	WISE	78.72	37.39	65.67	36.23	47.66	50.28
Meta-Cognitive Editing	MIND (Ours)	99.87	56.47	99.33	59.08	60.86	58.92

Table 2: Main results on cognitive benchmark **MMedit**

Method	EDITING VQA					EDITING IMAGE CAPTION					
	Reliability ↑	T-Generality ↑	M-Generality ↑	T-Locality ↑	M-Locality ↑	Reliability ↑	T-Generality ↑	M-Generality ↑	T-Locality ↑	M-Locality ↑	
MiniGPT-4											Size: 7.3B
Base Methods	FT (vision block)	36.3	0.3	10.9	100.0	9.3	3.1	0.0	2.2	100.0	8.6
	FT (last layer)	70.1	65.7	63.9	72.6	65.8	67.4	65.1	62.8	63.5	52.7
Cognitive Editing	T-Patcher	83.0	68.2	66.0	84.8	82.0	83.8	72.3	67.7	93.9	83.6
	IKE	100.0	94.9	90.5	50.3	3.7	90.9	81.6	88.5	52.2	4.7
	SERAC	87.7	87.6	85.9	97.5	14.2	91.8	91.4	91.0	97.9	7.2
	MEND	98.8	98.6	82.2	98.2	81.1	96.6	96.1	76.3	98.4	75.3
	WISE	91.8	90.4	87.1	99.9	86.3	95.8	91.7	88.8	100.0	81.5
Meta-Cognitive Editing	MIND(Ours)	97.0	95.2	91.7	93.6	72.2	93.2	90.7	81.3	99.6	84.3
LLaVA											Size: 7.06B
Base Methods	FT (vision block)	63.4	58.6	53.7	92.5	66.7	48.3	49.4	45.1	99.8	93.6
	FT (last layer)	62.5	61.9	59.9	64.8	32.9	73.4	72.7	67.9	99.0	91.4
Cognitive Editing	T-Patcher	87.8	81.5	78.3	67.5	47.6	85.3	87.2	81.0	75.4	44.2
	IKE	95.4	86.2	79.1	52.6	17.3	92.5	84.3	76.6	52.5	15.6
	SERAC	96.4	94.3	87.2	91.5	23.5	97.5	96.9	97.6	87.6	29.2
	MEND	93.7	92.3	91.9	91.0	87.2	94.8	92.2	89.6	91.3	90.3
	WISE	87.0	80.3	73.5	100.0	81.5	94.6	87.6	70.9	99.9	78.3
Meta-Cognitive Editing	MIND (Ours)	97.5	96.9	92.5	91.2	76.1	96.9	96.8	92.7	95.6	79.2

Supervised Contrastive Pre-Training. To further improve robustness of reflective-based label refinement, we employ contrastive learning (Khosla et al., 2020; Tian et al., 2020) during refiner pre-training. This process explicitly integrates generated wrong labels as noisy labels. By allowing the model to reflect on its past errors, contrastive learning optimizes the parameters of the prototype bank module, reinforcing its ability to distinguish between useful and misleading knowledge.

5 Experiment

In this section, we first evaluate the editing capability of **MIND** on our meta-cognitive editing benchmark, with results presented in 5.2. We also assess its performance on a traditional cognitive benchmark, as shown in 5.3. These experiments, along with an in-depth analysis 5.4, collectively demonstrate its meta-cognitive ability. Furthermore, we evaluate **MIND** in a lifelong editing scenario in Appendix C.

5.1 Experiment Setup

Datasets. To evaluate the meta-cognitive editing capabilities of the model, we conduct experiments on two benchmarks: CogEdit and MMedit. These experiments aim to demonstrate that our method exhibits both meta-cognitive and standard cognitive abilities. See more details in Appendix B.

Baselines. In this study, we selected several cognitive-based widely adopted multimodal model editing methods as baselines, including Transformer-Patcher (Huang et al., 2023), IKE (Zheng et al., 2023), MEND (Mitchell et al., 2021), SERAC (Mitchell et al., 2022), WISE (Wang et al., 2024b), and standard fine-tuning. Experiments were conducted on two distinct MLLM architectures: MiniGPT-4 (Zhu et al., 2023), representing Qformer-based models (Li et al., 2023c), and LLaVA-v1.5 (Liu et al., 2023), representing projection-based models.

5.2 Results on CogEdit Benchmark

This editing result is shown in Table 1, compared with non-meta-cognitive methods, our meta-cognitive editing method achieves SOTA results on our CogEdit benchmark.

Limitations of Cognitive-Based Editing Methods.

Existing knowledge editing methods primarily focus on ensuring that the model produces the correct output in edited scenarios. However, these methods fail to enhance the model’s understanding of why a particular output is expected in a given context, **indicating a lack of meta-cognitive ability**. As shown in Table 1, we observe the following: **(1) In counterfactual scenarios**, T-Patcher, IKE, and MEND exhibit generally low Adaptability, suggesting that although these methods may acquire knowledge in counterfactual settings, the newly edited knowledge interferes with the application of prior knowledge once the counterfactual condition is removed. This indicates a lack of self-awareness in recognizing when outdated knowledge should be discarded. **(2) In boundary scenarios**, while cognitive-based methods may achieve relatively high Reliability, they generally perform poorly in terms of Compliance. This suggests that these methods fail to determine when the newly edited knowledge should be applied, highlighting a deficiency in boundary monitoring. **(3) In noisy scenarios**, although T-Patcher, IKE, and WISE are able to perform edits on examples containing noise. However, their lower **Clarity** scores suggest that these methods struggle to isolate informative signals from noisy labels, reflecting a deficiency in reflective reasoning capabilities.

Advantages of MIND. Since the cognitive-based editing module struggles to effectively extract useful information from editing samples, MIND demonstrates significantly improved performance under such conditions. **(1) Enhanced self-awareness:** In counterfactual scenarios, MIND achieves higher Adaptability than cognitive-based methods, indicating its ability to better recognize when to discard outdated knowledge, demonstrating its superior capability of self-awareness. **(2) Stronger boundary monitoring:** In boundary-constrained scenarios, MIND attains higher Compliance than cognitive-based methods, showcasing its capability to accurately determine when to apply newly acquired knowledge, demonstrating its boundary monitoring ability. **(3) Improved reflect-**




Figure 5: Effectiveness of MSV-Monitored Update

ive thinking: In noisy editing scenarios, MIND achieves higher Clarity than cognitive-based methods, highlighting its ability to analyze and extract useful information from noisy labels, demonstrating its reflective thinking ability.

5.3 Results on the MMEdit Dataset

In addition to evaluating meta-cognitive editing, we assess our method on the widely used cognitive-based editing dataset, MMEdit (Cheng et al., 2023a), as shown in Table 2. Compared to the reported multimodal knowledge editing results, our method also achieves competitive performance. We observe that: **(1)** Most of the cognitive-based methods can not effectively balance Reliability, Generality, and Locality. **(2)** While cognitive-based methods such as MEND and WISE achieve high Reliability, they often do so at the expense of Generality, leading to a reduction in the generalizability of the edited knowledge. **(3)** For the Locality metric, methods such as In-Context Editing and SERAC tend to perform suboptimally. In contrast, MIND controls the activation of the meta-knowledge unit to regulate when both prior and newly acquired knowledge should be activated, thereby achieving a balance across multiple metrics. This ensures effective meta-cognitive editing while preserving cognitive ability.

5.4 In Depth Analysis

Effect of Individual Components. We evaluate the effectiveness of our approach under different combinations of components. **(1) only MSV monitor module,** we froze the parameters of the meta-memory at their initial values, relying solely on the constraints imposed by the MSV module. As a result, the meta-knowledge contained minimal knowledge-related features, leading to relatively low performance across several scenarios. **(2) using only the meta-memory,** the model was able to redistribute the activation values of the FFN layers, allowing it to learn knowledge relevant to the

Table 3: Ablation study of our method on **CogEdit**

Method	COUNTERFACTUAL		BOUNDARY EDITING		NOISY EDITING	
	Fidelity \uparrow	Adaptability \uparrow	Reliability \uparrow	Compliance \uparrow	Clarity@2 \uparrow	Clarity@4 \uparrow
<i>only</i> MSV monitor module	76.39	39.21	79.52	44.73	31.72	26.90
<i>only</i> inner meta-mem	97.91	47.31	97.89	42.69	54.46	52.27
Meta-mem + MSV module	91.15	50.28	93.44	49.77	56.27	50.88
<i>only</i> label refiner	80.99	48.69	93.66	58.71	36.12	33.63
MIND(Ours)	99.87	56.47	99.33	59.08	60.86	57.40

editing samples. However, it was unable to determine when to utilize new knowledge or suppress outdated information, resulting in poor performance in terms of adaptability and compliance. **(3) meta-memory and the MSV monitor module**, the model effectively updated the parameters of the meta-memory under the guidance of the MSV monitor module. However, due to difficulties in extracting useful features from the labels, the clarity of the learned knowledge was relatively low. **(4) only label refiner**, we removed the meta-memory and its associated components. The results indicate that, without the ability to redistribute the activation values of the FFN layers, merely enhancing the label features during editing was insufficient to control neural activation pathways. This limitation led to a noticeable decline in success rates under counterfactual and boundary scenarios.

Effect of MSV monitor module. We replace our MSV monitor module by **(1) Random distribution**; **(2) Identical distribution**: means each meta-knowledge unit owns the same significance; **(3) Linear Projector**: as the simplified version of our module. Various modules are employed to monitor meta-memory updates and assess the effectiveness. Figure 5 demonstrates that our meta-memory MSV monitor module outperforms other approaches, indicating its effectiveness in monitoring meta-memory and guiding the learning process.

Effect of the Meta-Label Refiner. To better illustrate the information extraction capability of our prototype-based meta-label refiner, we compare the distribution of hidden states with and without the encoder module. We apply t-SNE for dimensionality reduction to visualize the distributions. Figure 6(a) shows that, without meta-label refiner, the model struggles to extract relevant information from noisy labels, causing label-prompt misalignment. In contrast, the encoder improves alignment and prediction accuracy.

We also investigate the impact of the number of prototype classes on the model’s performance, as




Figure 6: Ablation study on meta-label refiner: (a) Alignment Visualization (b) Effect of Prototype Classes shown in Figure 6(b). A greater variety of prototypes allows for the inclusion of more precise contextual information features for classification; however, this comes at the cost of increased computational overhead. On the other hand, when the number of prototypes is small, the contextual encoding information used for shifting may be less accurate, thus contributing less to the editing process. When the number of prototypes is large (e.g., $K = 128$), increasing the number of classes has a negligible impact on the results and may even lead to computational cost. Therefore, we select $K = 64$ as the setting for the balance of computation cost and accuracy.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we identify the limitations of existing cognitive-based knowledge editing datasets and propose **CogEdit**, a benchmark designed to assess the meta-cognitive capabilities of multimodal knowledge editing. We find that though current knowledge editing methods perform well in traditional editing scenarios, they fail to exhibit meta-cognitive abilities. On this basis, we introduce **MIND**, a novel meta-cognitive knowledge editing approach. Extensive Experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of MIND, which achieves superior performance on both cognitive and meta-cognitive multimodal editing benchmarks.

7 Limitations

Despite the promising results demonstrated in our study, several limitations remain that warrant further investigation. First, many existing generative multimodal models (Podell et al., 2023; Ramesh et al., 2021; Pan et al., 2025d; Ramesh et al., 2022; Pan et al., 2025c) excel in tasks like image captioning and visual question answering. In this work, we focus solely on assessing the model’s understanding of edited multimodal knowledge, without considering the impact of such edits on its generative abilities. Future work should explore how these edits affect the quality and consistency of multimodal generation. Second, due to computational constraints, we were unable to conduct experiments on large-scale models, such as the 65B LLaMA Adapter V2 (Gao et al., 2023). Scaling our method to such models poses additional challenges and is left for future exploration.

References

- Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jiasen Lu, Margaret Mitchell, Dhruv Batra, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. 2015. Vqa: Visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, pages 2425–2433.
- Sarah-Jayne Blakemore and Chris Frith. 2003. Self-awareness and action. *Current opinion in neurobiology*, 13(2):219–224.
- John C Cavanaugh and Marion Perlmutter. 1982. Metamemory: A critical examination. *Child development*, pages 11–28.
- Qizhou Chen, Chengyu Wang, Dakan Wang, Taolin Zhang, Wangyue Li, and Xiaofeng He. 2024a. Lifelong knowledge editing for vision language models with low-rank mixture-of-experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15432*.
- Xinlei Chen, Hao Fang, Tsung-Yi Lin, Ramakrishna Vedantam, Saurabh Gupta, Piotr Dollár, and C Lawrence Zitnick. 2015. Microsoft coco captions: Data collection and evaluation server. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.00325*.
- Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Muyan Zhong, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, Bin Li, Ping Luo, Tong Lu, Yu Qiao, and Jifeng Dai. 2024b. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. *Preprint*, arXiv:2312.14238.
- Siyuan Cheng, Bozhong Tian, Qingbin Liu, Xi Chen, Yongheng Wang, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. 2023a. Can we edit multimodal large language models? In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 13877–13888. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Siyuan Cheng, Bozhong Tian, Qingbin Liu, Xi Chen, Yongheng Wang, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. 2023b. Can we edit multimodal large language models? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08475*.
- Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale Fung, and Steven Hoi. 2023. Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning. *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.06500.
- Nicola De Cao, Wilker Aziz, and Ivan Titov. 2021. Editing factual knowledge in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.08164*.
- Peng Gao, Jiaming Han, Renrui Zhang, Ziyi Lin, Shijie Geng, Aojun Zhou, Wei Zhang, Pan Lu, Conghui He, Xiangyu Yue, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Qiao. 2023. Llama-adapter v2: Parameter-efficient visual instruction model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.15010*.
- Petros Georgiades. 2004. From the general to the situated: Three decades of metacognition. *International journal of science education*, 26(3):365–383.
- Mor Geva, Roei Schuster, Jonathan Berant, and Omer Levy. 2020. Transformer feed-forward layers are key-value memories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.14913*.
- Yash Goyal, Tejas Khot, Douglas Summers-Stay, Dhruv Batra, and Devi Parikh. 2017. Making the v in vqa matter: Elevating the role of image understanding in visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6904–6913.
- Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, and 1 others. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*.
- Tom Hartvigsen, Swami Sankaranarayanan, Hamid Palangi, Yoon Kim, and Marzyeh Ghassemi. 2023. Aging with grace: Lifelong model editing with discrete key-value adapters. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:47934–47959.
- Han Huang, Haitian Zhong, Tao Yu, Qiang Liu, Shu Wu, Liang Wang, and Tieniu Tan. 2024. Vlkeb: A large vision-language model knowledge editing benchmark. *Preprint*, arXiv:2403.07350.
- Zeyu Huang, Yikang Shen, Xiaofeng Zhang, Jie Zhou, Wenge Rong, and Zhang Xiong. 2023. Transformer-patcher: One mistake worth one neuron. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.09785*.

- Drew A Hudson and Christopher D Manning. 2019. Gqa: A new dataset for real-world visual reasoning and compositional question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 6700–6709.
- Gautier Izacard, Mathilde Caron, Lucas Hosseini, Sebastian Riedel, Piotr Bojanowski, Armand Joulin, and Edouard Grave. 2021. Unsupervised dense information retrieval with contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.09118*.
- Prannay Khosla, Piotr Teterwak, Chen Wang, Aaron Sarna, Yonglong Tian, Phillip Isola, Aaron Maschiot, Ce Liu, and Dilip Krishnan. 2020. **Supervised contrastive learning**. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 18661–18673. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Emily R Lai. 2011. Metacognition: A literature review.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, and 1 others. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:9459–9474.
- Feng Li, Renrui Zhang, Hao Zhang, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Wei Li, Zejun Ma, and Chunyuan Li. 2024a. Llava-next-interleave: Tackling multi-image, video, and 3d in large multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.07895*.
- Jiaqi Li, Miaozeng Du, Chuanyi Zhang, Yongrui Chen, Nan Hu, Guilin Qi, Haiyun Jiang, Siyuan Cheng, and Bozhong Tian. 2024b. Mike: A new benchmark for fine-grained multimodal entity knowledge editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.14835*.
- Juncheng Li, Kaihang Pan, Zhiqi Ge, Minghe Gao, Wei Ji, Wenqiao Zhang, Tat-Seng Chua, Siliang Tang, Hanwang Zhang, and Yueting Zhuang. 2023a. Fine-tuning multimodal llms to follow zero-shot demonstrative instructions. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. 2023b. **Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models**. *Preprint*, arXiv:2301.12597.
- Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. 2023c. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR.
- Moxin Li, Yong Zhao, Yang Deng, Wenxuan Zhang, Shuaiyi Li, Wenya Xie, See-Kiong Ng, and Tat-Seng Chua. 2024c. Knowledge boundary of large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.12472*.
- Xiang Lisa Li and Percy Liang. 2021. Prefix-tuning: Optimizing continuous prompts for generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.00190*.
- Xiaopeng Li, Shasha Li, Shezheng Song, Jing Yang, Jun Ma, and Jie Yu. 2024d. Pmet: Precise model editing in a transformer. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 18564–18572.
- Tianwei Lin, Jiang Liu, Wenqiao Zhang, Zhaocheng Li, Yang Dai, Haoyuan Li, Zhelun Yu, Wanggui He, Juncheng Li, Hao Jiang, and 1 others. 2024. Teamlora: Boosting low-rank adaptation with expert collaboration and competition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.09856*.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. 2023. Visual instruction tuning.
- Xiao Liu, Kaixuan Ji, Yicheng Fu, Weng Lam Tam, Zhengxiao Du, Zhilin Yang, and Jie Tang. 2021. P-tuning v2: Prompt tuning can be comparable to fine-tuning universally across scales and tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.07602*.
- Kenneth Marino, Mohammad Rastegari, Ali Farhadi, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. 2019. **Ok-vqa: A visual question answering benchmark requiring external knowledge**. *Preprint*, arXiv:1906.00067.
- Kevin Meng, David Bau, Alex Andonian, and Yonatan Belinkov. 2022a. Locating and editing factual associations in gpt. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:17359–17372.
- Kevin Meng, Arnab Sen Sharma, Alex Andonian, Yonatan Belinkov, and David Bau. 2022b. Mass-editing memory in a transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.07229*.
- Eric Mitchell, Charles Lin, Antoine Bosselut, Chelsea Finn, and Christopher D Manning. 2021. Fast model editing at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.11309*.
- Eric Mitchell, Charles Lin, Antoine Bosselut, Christopher D Manning, and Chelsea Finn. 2022. Memory-based model editing at scale. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 15817–15831. PMLR.
- Thomas O Nelson. 1990. Metamemory: A theoretical framework and new findings. In *Psychology of learning and motivation*, volume 26, pages 125–173. Elsevier.
- Kaihang Pan, Wendong Bu, Yuruo Wu, Yang Wu, Kai Shen, Yunfei Li, Hang Zhao, Juncheng Li, Siliang Tang, and Yueting Zhuang. 2025a. Focusdiff: Advancing fine-grained text-image alignment for autoregressive visual generation through rl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.05501*.
- Kaihang Pan, Zhaoyu Fan, Juncheng Li, Qifan Yu, Hao Fei, Siliang Tang, Richang Hong, Hanwang Zhang, and Qianru Sun. 2025b. Towards unified multimodal editing with enhanced knowledge collaboration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:110290–110314.

- Kaihang Pan, Juncheng Li, Hongye Song, Jun Lin, Xiaozhong Liu, and Siliang Tang. 2023. Self-supervised meta-prompt learning with meta-gradient regularization for few-shot generalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.12314*.
- Kaihang Pan, Juncheng Li, Wenjie Wang, Hao Fei, Hongye Song, Wei Ji, Jun Lin, Xiaozhong Liu, Tat-Seng Chua, and Siliang Tang. 2024a. I3: Intent-introspective retrieval conditioned on instructions. In *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 1839–1849.
- Kaihang Pan, Wang Lin, Zhongqi Yue, Tenglong Ao, Liyu Jia, Wei Zhao, Juncheng Li, Siliang Tang, and Hanwang Zhang. 2025c. Generative multimodal pretraining with discrete diffusion timestep tokens. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.14666*.
- Kaihang Pan, Siliang Tang, Juncheng Li, Zhaoyu Fan, Wei Chow, Shuicheng Yan, Tat-Seng Chua, Yuet-ing Zhuang, and Hanwang Zhang. 2024b. Auto-encoding morph-tokens for multimodal llm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.01926*.
- Kaihang Pan, Yang Wu, Wendong Bu, Kai Shen, Juncheng Li, Yingting Wang, Yunfei Li, Siliang Tang, Jun Xiao, Fei Wu, and 1 others. 2025d. Unlocking aha moments via reinforcement learning: Advancing collaborative visual comprehension and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.01480*.
- Dustin Podell, Zion English, Kyle Lacey, Andreas Blattmann, Tim Dockhorn, Jonas Müller, Joe Penna, and Robin Rombach. 2023. *Sdxl: Improving latent diffusion models for high-resolution image synthesis*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2307.01952.
- Aditya Ramesh, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alex Nichol, Casey Chu, and Mark Chen. 2022. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125*, 1(2):3.
- Aditya Ramesh, Mikhail Pavlov, Gabriel Goh, Scott Gray, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. 2021. Zero-shot text-to-image generation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8821–8831. Pmlr.
- Carol Rodgers. 2002. Defining reflection: Another look at john dewey and reflective thinking. *Teachers college record*, 104(4):842–866.
- Alvin E Roth. 1988. Introduction to the shapley value. *The Shapley value*, 1.
- Yonglong Tian, Chen Sun, Ben Poole, Dilip Krishnan, Cordelia Schmid, and Phillip Isola. 2020. What makes for good views for contrastive learning? *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:6827–6839.
- Marcel VJ Veenman, Bernadette HAM Van Hout-Wolters, and Peter Afflerbach. 2006. Metacognition and learning: Conceptual and methodological considerations. *Metacognition and learning*, 1:3–14.
- Haobo Wang, Ruixuan Xiao, Yixuan Li, Lei Feng, Gang Niu, Gang Chen, and Junbo Zhao. 2022. Pico+: Contrastive label disambiguation for robust partial label learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08984*.
- Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, and 1 others. 2024a. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*.
- Peng Wang, Zexi Li, Ningyu Zhang, Ziwen Xu, Yunzhi Yao, Yong Jiang, Pengjun Xie, Fei Huang, and Hua-jun Chen. 2024b. *Wise: Rethinking the knowledge memory for lifelong model editing of large language models*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2405.14768.
- Renzhi Wang and Piji Li. 2024. Lemoe: Advanced mixture of experts adaptor for lifelong model editing of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.20030*.
- Eyal Winter. 2002. The shapley value. *Handbook of game theory with economic applications*, 3:2025–2054.
- Junzhe Zhang, Huixuan Zhang, Xunjian Yin, Baizhou Huang, Xu Zhang, Xinyu Hu, and Xiaojun Wan. 2024a. *Mc-mke: A fine-grained multimodal knowledge editing benchmark emphasizing modality consistency*. *Preprint*, arXiv:2406.13219.
- Ningyu Zhang, Yunzhi Yao, Bozhong Tian, Peng Wang, Shumin Deng, Mengru Wang, Zekun Xi, Shengyu Mao, Jintian Zhang, Yuansheng Ni, and 1 others. 2024b. A comprehensive study of knowledge editing for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01286*.
- Ce Zheng, Lei Li, Qingxiu Dong, Yuxuan Fan, Zhiyong Wu, Jingjing Xu, and Baobao Chang. 2023. Can we edit factual knowledge by in-context learning? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12740*.
- Zexuan Zhong, Zhengxuan Wu, Christopher D Manning, Christopher Potts, and Danqi Chen. 2023. Mquake: Assessing knowledge editing in language models via multi-hop questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14795*.
- Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. 2023. Minigpt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592*.

A Dataset Details

A.1 Capability tiers in CogEdit Benchmark

Data in CogEdit are considered to own different capability tiers, from low to high, the number of instances are shown in Table 4

- **Perception:** Scene understanding, instance identity, attribute recognition, and spatial localization.
- **Multimodal Recognition:** Text recognition, object recognition.
- **Multimodal Understanding:** Visual reasoning and visual referring expressions.
- **Cascading Reasoning:** Logical reasoning, numerical reasoning, and visual mathematics.

To ensure the reliability and accuracy of the curated data, we conducted a two-pass quality control process. For the first pass, we utilized open-source models (Chen et al., 2024b; Grattafiori et al., 2024; Li et al., 2024a; Wang et al., 2024a) to automatically validate and refine the data. In the second pass, a manual review was performed to further ensure correctness in order to remove ambiguous or poorly phrased entries. This combination of automated and manual methods ensured consistency with the intended domain and capability tiers.

Capability	Perception	Recognition	Understanding	Reasoning
Number	530	285	291	68

Table 4: Distribution of Instances Across Capability Tiers

A.2 Formal Task Definitions and Metrics in CogEdit

Level 1: Counterfactual condition-driven editing. For counterfactual condition-driven editing, we evaluate the editing result with two metrics: **Fidelity**, which measures the success rate of editing in counterfactual scenarios, and **Adaptability**, which evaluates the model’s success rate in answering factual questions after the counterfactual edit.

Formally, for a given instance (i_e, x_e) (e.g., i_e is an image of “Solar System”; x_e = “Which is the smallest planet in this galaxy?”) with original correct answer y = “Mercury”, we introduce a counterfactual assumption cf_e = “Assume that Pluto is a planet, rather than a dwarf planet”, which adjusts the correct answer to y_e = “Pluto” with the editing objective as $\mathbb{1}_{f(cf_e, i_e, x_e; \theta_e(cf_e, i_e, x_e))=y_e}$ ¹ (we

¹ $\mathbb{1}$. denotes the indicator function: it returns 1 if the condition is true, 0 otherwise.

use **Fidelity** as the editing success rate). After editing, we remove the counterfactual assumption with y_o restored to the correct answer, assessing whether the edited model can recall its prior correct knowledge when the assumption no longer holds: $\mathbb{1}_{f(i_e, x_e; \theta_e(cf_e, i_e, x_e))=y}$ (where **Adaptability** quantifies the success rate of answering correctly after removing the counterfactual assumption).

Fidelity. Editing fidelity refers to the ability to change the prediction to y_e . Therefore, our goal is to update the model’s original parameters θ_o to θ_e , such that $f(cf_e, i_e, x_e; \theta_e) = y_e$. The success rate of editing in a counterfactual scenario is described as:

$$\mathcal{M}_{fidelity} = \mathbb{E}_{(cf_e, i_e, x_e) \sim \mathcal{C}(i_e, x_e)} \left[\mathbb{1}_{f(cf_e, i_e, x_e; \theta_e(cf_e, i_e, x_e))=y_e} \right] \quad (7)$$

where $\mathcal{C}(i_e, x_e)$ denotes the distribution of counterfactual instances derived from (i_e, x_e) , y_e is the correct answer of the question (cf_e, i_e, x_e) with counterfactual assumptions.

Adaptability. Editing adaptability is used to test whether the model has retained its prior correct knowledge and can revert to the original prediction when the counterfactual assumption is removed. Adaptability is described by the following:

$$\mathcal{M}_{adaptability} = \mathbb{E}_{(i_e, x_e) \sim \mathcal{D}_{base}} \left[\mathbb{1}_{f(i_e, x_e; \theta_e(cf_e, i_e, x_e))=y} \right] \quad (8)$$

where θ_e refers to the edited parameters, y is the correct answer of the question (i_e, x_e) .

Level 2: Boundary-restricted Editing. For boundary-restricted editing, we evaluate the editing performance using two metrics: **Reliability**, which measures the success rate of editing under the original, unaltered context, and **Compliance**, which assesses the model’s ability to appropriately constrain the activation of edited knowledge when additional boundary conditions are introduced. Reliability reflects whether the model has correctly internalized the intended factual update, while Compliance tests whether the model can generalize this knowledge appropriately without overgeneralization or misuse in contextually incompatible settings.

Formally, for the previously given instance (i_e, x_e) with editing target y_e = “Mercury”, we conduct the conventional editing process to let

the model remember the correct answer in the original context, with the editing objective as $\mathbb{1}_{f(i_e, x_e; \theta_e(i_e, x_e))=y_e}$ (we use **Reliability** as the editing success rate). After editing, we construct a new problem instance by introducing boundary constraints b_e ="Considering the five farthest planets from the central star", which limits the available candidate planets and adjusts the correct answer to y'_e ="Mars", in order to assess whether the edited model knows the boundary to utilize the edited knowledge rather than indiscriminately activating it: $\mathbb{1}_{f(b_e, i_e, x_e; \theta_e(i_e, x_e))=y'_e}$ (where **Compliance** quantifies the success rate of answering correctly after adding the boundary constraint assumption).

Reliability Reliability in this context refers to the model’s ability to edit successfully based on the original knowledge when applied in the original scenario. It quantifies the model’s success rate in providing accurate responses using the edited parameters θ_e . The reliability metric can be defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{M}_{reliability} = \mathbb{E}_{(i_e, x_e) \sim \mathcal{D}_{base}} \left[\mathbb{1}_{f(i_e, x_e; \theta_e(i_e, x_e))=y_e} \right] \quad (9)$$

Where y_e is the correct answer of the question (i_e, x_e) .

Compliance Compliance measures the model’s success in correctly identifying when the new knowledge should be applied, ensuring that the modified response aligns with the constraints of the new scenario. This metric evaluates the model’s ability to know when the new knowledge is applicable. The Compliance metric is defined as:

$$\mathcal{M}_{compliance} = \mathbb{E}_{(b_e, i_e, x_e) \sim \mathcal{C}(i_e, x_e)} \left[\mathbb{1}_{f(b_e, i_e, x_e; \theta_e(i_e, x_e))=y'_e} \right] \quad (10)$$

Where y'_e is the correct answer of the boundary restricted question (b_e, i_e, x_e) .

Level 3: Noisy Label Editing. To systematically evaluate the model’s adaptability to noisy inputs, we propose a new evaluation metric, Clarity@K, which quantifies the model’s ability to maintain accuracy as noise increases.

Formally, for a the same instance (i_e, x_e) with originally correct answer y ="Mercury", we introduce a perturbation $noise_e$ ="Nebula, Cosmos.", which are some non-planet labels, to the originally

correct prediction, which adjusts the correct answer to y_e containing noise. After editing, the noisy perturbation is removed to assess whether the edited model can get to know the useful part in edited knowledge: $\mathbb{1}_{f(i_e, x_e; \theta_e(noise_e, i_e, x_e))=y}$ (where **Clarity@K** quantifies the model’s ability to maintain accuracy as noise increases and K denotes the number of noisy elements).

Clarity@K Editing clarity is defined to quantify the editing success rate after editing with the presence of noisy labels. Higher values of Clarity@K indicate the model can clearly discern and edit the target knowledge despite the noise. The Clarity@K metric is defined as:

$$\mathcal{M}_{Clarity@K} = \mathbb{E}_{(i_e, x_e) \sim \mathcal{D}_{base}} \left[\mathbb{1}_{f(i_e, x_e; \theta_e(noise_e, i_e, x_e))=y} \right] \quad (11)$$

Where y is the correct answer of the question (i_e, x_e) .

B Experimental Details

B.1 Cognitive Dataset Details

MMEdit In the context of Multimodal Large Language Models (MLLMs), which have shown great promise in integrating and understanding both visual and textual information, MMEdit (Cheng et al., 2023a) has been selected as the representative of the cognitive-based multimodal knowledge editing benchmark, which comprises two subtasks: Editing VQA (E-VQA) (Antol et al., 2015) and Editing Image Captioning (E-IC), with data selected from VQAv2 (Goyal et al., 2017) and COCO Caption (Chen et al., 2015), respectively. These tasks aim to assess a model’s ability to update its understanding of visual and textual inputs while ensuring stability and generalization across different modalities. MMEdit introduces a suite of metrics to evaluate the reliability, locality, and generality of model edits in multimodal settings. Each edit sample includes five examples that measure the following metrics. Reliability measures the accuracy of editing target inputs, locality evaluates the model’s stability on unrelated knowledge (both textual and multimodal), and generality assesses the model’s ability to generalize to rephrased inputs (textual and visual).

B.2 Baseline Methods

Fine-tune Fine-tuning, in this context, refers to standard fine-tuning, where the model is adapted to

Table 5: Lifelong editing results of LLaVA on **MMEdit** for different values of T (T : Number of Edits.)

		$T = 10$					$T = 100$				
Method		Reliability \uparrow	T-Generality \uparrow	M-Generality \uparrow	T-Locality \uparrow	M-Locality \uparrow	Reliability \uparrow	T-Generality \uparrow	M-Generality \uparrow	T-Locality \uparrow	M-Locality \uparrow
EDITING VQA											
Base Methods	FT (vision block)	49.26	46.01	42.13	100.00	30.42	41.65	42.53	30.41	98.92	26.48
	FT (last layer)	53.84	50.29	45.03	91.61	63.45	39.09	34.06	38.07	92.84	57.04
Cognitive Editing	T-Patcher	82.16	76.45	76.55	71.10	74.50	70.57	63.39	61.12	36.42	48.90
	SERAC	88.09	83.40	83.57	64.91	15.50	88.08	81.53	82.48	62.13	12.90
	MEND	22.58	22.30	21.48	32.40	18.22	11.43	19.66	19.31	8.95	9.37
	WISE	55.04	52.71	70.99	100.0	92.17	27.53	27.54	21.63	100.0	83.48
Meta-Cognitive Editing	MIND(Ours)	84.88	84.44	78.82	91.00	75.23	78.49	70.79	65.60	88.72	73.34
EDITING IMAGE CAPTION											
Base Methods	FT (vision block)	46.12	47.56	43.20	100.00	84.94	45.96	47.50	42.93	99.9	71.05
	FT (last layer)	69.52	68.24	63.47	93.69	74.71	65.14	60.11	56.23	81.05	70.09
Cognitive Editing	T-Patcher	79.94	80.42	74.52	54.92	68.06	59.88	62.81	54.37	26.08	39.99
	SERAC	56.57	56.88	52.62	59.96	14.66	53.35	53.70	49.41	48.04	17.25
	MEND	66.49	64.77	58.72	87.25	86.15	56.83	56.89	53.07	87.63	84.64
	WISE	73.10	71.21	64.79	88.46	91.80	60.56	57.10	54.16	95.61	93.96
Meta-Cognitive Editing	MIND(Ours)	86.12	85.70	79.13	93.43	77.10	75.76	71.82	61.51	90.55	69.54

new knowledge without employing any advanced tuning techniques. This is a straightforward adaptation process, and while more sophisticated methods (Li and Liang, 2021; Pan et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2021) or prompt-based tuning could be explored, we focused on traditional fine-tuning as a baseline for comparison. In our experiments, we conducted fine-tuning on the **last layer** of the MLLM and the **vision block**(vision projector for LLaVA and Qformer for MiniGPT4 respectively) separately.

Transformer-Patcher (Huang et al., 2023) is an editing method that enables continuous correction of mistakes in Transformer-based language models. The method adds and trains a few neurons (patches) in the last Feed-Forward Network (FFN) layer to correct specific errors without affecting overall model performance.

MEND (Model Editor Networks with Gradient Decomposition) (Mitchell et al., 2021) is a scalable method for efficiently editing large pre-trained neural network models using a single input-output pair. By leveraging the low-rank structure of fine-tuning gradients, MEND trains lightweight auxiliary networks to transform these gradients into targeted parameter updates. This approach enables fast, local, and reliable edits to model behavior without significantly affecting unrelated inputs.

SERAC (Semi-Parametric Editing with a Retrieval-Augmented Counterfactual Model) (Mitchell et al., 2022) is a knowledge editing method requiring external memory. SERAC stores edits in an external memory and uses a scope classifier and counterfactual model to determine when and how to apply these edits.

IKE (In-context Knowledge Editing) (Zheng et al., 2023) explores the potential of in-context learning (ICL) for editing factual knowledge in large language models without modifying their pa-

rameters. IKE constructs context demonstrations to inject new facts, update existing knowledge, and retain unrelated facts. IKE draws on relevant methods and concepts from the field of knowledge retrieval (Lewis et al., 2020; Izacard et al., 2021; Pan et al., 2024a).

WISE (Wang et al., 2024b) is designed for lifelong model editing that bridges the gap between long-term and working memory in large language models. WISE proposes a dual parametric memory scheme, comprising a main memory for pre-trained knowledge and a side memory for edited knowledge. WISE also incorporates a knowledge-sharding mechanism to manage multiple edits efficiently and merge them without conflicts.

B.3 Implementation Details

For MIND, we adopt the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of $8e-4$ to update all parameters during the editing stage. Each one-step edit takes approximately 6–8 seconds to complete. During the pre-training phase of the meta-label refiner, we extract 5K labeled data samples for supervision, and the entire pre-training process takes less than one hour. All experiments are conducted on a computing cluster equipped with five NVIDIA RTX A6000 GPUs.

C Results on Lifelong Editing Scenario

Lifelong model editing (Wang et al., 2024b; Hartvigsen et al., 2023) aims to edit the specific model over and over again, which enables large language models to continuously update and adapt their knowledge over time without requiring full retraining.

We also evaluated the effectiveness of our method in a lifelong editing scenario. To ensure fairness and eliminate task-induced biases, experiments were conducted on MMEdit (excluding IKE,

