

A Knowledge Noise Mitigation Framework for Knowledge-based Visual Question Answering

Zhiyue Liu^{1,2*}, Sihang Liu¹, Jinyuan Liu¹, Xinru Zhang¹

¹School of Computer, Electronics and Information, Guangxi University, Nanning, China

²Guangxi Key Laboratory of Multimedia Communications and Network Technology
liuzhy@gxu.edu.cn, {2313301037, 2213394017, 2313301061}@st.gxu.edu.cn

Abstract—Knowledge-based visual question answering (KB-VQA) requires a model to understand images and utilize external knowledge to provide accurate answers. Existing approaches often directly augment models with retrieved information from knowledge sources while ignoring substantial knowledge redundancy, which introduces noise into the answering process. To address this, we propose a training-free framework with knowledge focusing for KB-VQA, that mitigates the impact of noise by enhancing knowledge relevance and reducing redundancy. First, for knowledge retrieval, our framework concludes essential parts from the image-question pairs, creating low-noise queries that enhance the retrieval of highly relevant knowledge. Considering that redundancy still persists in the retrieved knowledge, we then prompt large models to identify and extract answer-beneficial segments from knowledge. In addition, we introduce a selective knowledge integration strategy, allowing the model to incorporate knowledge only when it lacks confidence in answering the question, thereby mitigating the influence of redundant information. Our framework enables the acquisition of accurate and critical knowledge, and extensive experiments demonstrate that it outperforms state-of-the-art methods.

Index Terms—Knowledge-based visual question answering, knowledge redundancy filtering, selective knowledge integration

I. INTRODUCTION

Knowledge-based visual question answering (KB-VQA) [1] is an extension of the traditional VQA task [2] by requiring models to answer questions that cannot be resolved solely from image content, necessitating the integration of external knowledge. Early methods [3], [4] focus on extracting explicit knowledge from multiple open-domain knowledge resources (e.g., ConceptNet [5], Wikipedia [6], and Google Search Corpus [4]) and combining the retrieved knowledge with image questions for answering. However, retrieving knowledge relevant to both images and questions presents challenges, often leading to the introduction of noise. Inspired by the powerful knowledge reasoning capabilities of large language models (LLMs), subsequent studies [7]–[10] prompt LLMs with textual descriptions converted from images to generate answer predictions with no need to retrieve explicit knowledge.

The limited knowledge scope and lack of visual perception challenge LLMs, while visual language models (VLMs) are more suited for vision-centric tasks than knowledge-centric ones [11]. Therefore, another line of work focuses on how to integrate external knowledge bases on smaller LLMs for




Fig. 1. External knowledge retrieved by our method and recent works. In the knowledge texts, words with low relevance to the image-question pair are highlighted in red, while relevant words are highlighted in green.

KB-VQA. [12] translates image content into textual semantics, which consists of an image description, objects with attributes, and OCR characters. Then, a long query containing these texts is built to retrieve knowledge that assists in LLM training. However, their retrieved knowledge often includes a substantial amount of content unrelated to the question, which may limit the model’s performance. Recent work [13] explores training VLMs to pick up relevant knowledge documents from retrieved information, while many question-unrelated segments exist in those documents, as in Fig. 1. Moreover, the lengthy search queries constructed by existing works make it difficult for the retrieval process to focus on key information in image-question pairs, often resulting in a large amount of redundant content. Inaccurate knowledge introduces additional burdens, hindering the answering process.

To mitigate the impact of knowledge noise, we propose a training-free framework with knowledge focusing for KB-VQA (KF-VQA for short), which enhances knowledge relevance and reduces redundancy. Firstly, for knowledge retrieval, we aim to construct low-noise queries, thus increasing the relevance of selected knowledge. Since the image provides key context for identifying relevant knowledge, we leverage the multimodal perception capabilities of VLMs to distill the essential content from the image-question pair. This enables us to obtain precise and low-noise queries, minimizing the impact of irrelevant content in queries for knowledge retrieval. Secondly, considering that there is still redundant information in the retrieved knowledge documents, we refine the knowledge by integrating the VLM’s visual understanding with the LLM’s reasoning capabilities to extract the relevant segments. That is, LLMs combine the question with fine-grained visual details extracted by VLMs to identify the answer-beneficial

*Corresponding author.

content, thereby reducing knowledge redundancy. However, completely filtering out noisy content from external knowledge is impractical [13]. It is intuitive to lower the impact of redundant knowledge by introducing external knowledge only when the model requires it for question answering. Therefore, we introduce a selective knowledge integration strategy. LLMs incorporate external knowledge to enhance the reasoning ability only when they lack confidence in answering a question, further reducing the impact of knowledge noise. Experiments on benchmark datasets show that KF-VQA outperforms baselines and achieves the state-of-the-art performance.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose a training-free framework with knowledge focusing for KB-VQA that mitigates the noise effects by enhancing knowledge relevance and reducing redundancy.
- We introduce a selective knowledge integration strategy which incorporates knowledge to help answer questions when LLMs lack confidence in answering, further reducing the impact of redundant information.
- Experimental results show that our method outperforms competitive baselines, achieving the state-of-the-art results on both OK-VQA [1] and A-OKVQA [14] datasets.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Training-based KB-VQA Methods

Training-based KB-VQA methods require training a model to answer questions. Early studies [3], [4] augment models by retrieving knowledge directly from various open-domain world knowledge sources. Given the powerful knowledge inference capabilities of LLMs, subsequent methods explore how to combine explicit knowledge with LLMs implicit knowledge. For example, [15], [16] generate candidate answers to questions by prompting LLMs and incorporate the retrieved knowledge to enhance model performance, while [12], [17] utilize explicit external knowledge to train LLMs. Since irrelevant information exists in the retrieved knowledge, [13] trains VLMs to identify relevant document-level knowledge. However, within the documents, there is still a large amount of content irrelevant to the questions. Our framework could identify fine-grained knowledge segments related to the image-question pair through the collaboration of VLMs and LLMs, all without the need for training.

B. Training-free KB-VQA Methods

Although training-based methods achieve performance improvement, they often rely heavily on large amounts of labeled data and suffer from poor generalization. With the emergence of knowledge reasoning capabilities in LLMs, a training-free method [7] prompts GPT-3 with in-context examples and image captions to realize KB-VQA, while generic captions may lose image details. [8] assists GPT-3 in understanding images with question-guided captions. [9] selects better in-context examples to maximize the potential of GPT-3. Given the high cost of GPT-3 API calls, [10] constructs a large amount of in-context content to achieve GPT-3-like performance using

smaller and open-source LLMs. Due to the limited knowledge scope of LLMs and the flaw of hallucination, [11] decomposes questions to retrieve knowledge from external knowledge bases, and shows that VLMs fall short in KB-VQA. However, this work still relies on lengthy queries to search for knowledge, which leads to the retrieval of irrelevant content. In contrast, our KF-VQA not only uses essential content from the image-question pair as low-noise queries, but also filters out irrelevant content from retrieved knowledge, thereby enhancing the knowledge relevance.

III. METHODOLOGY

The overall architecture of KF-VQA is illustrated in Fig. 2. Designed to enhance knowledge relevance and reduce redundancy, it comprises three components: knowledge retrieval with low-noise queries, knowledge redundancy filtering, and reasoning with selective knowledge integration. To retrieve highly relevant knowledge, the retrieval module builds low-noise queries based on essential content extracted from image-question pairs. The filtering module then leverages the complementary strengths of LLMs and VLMs to select fine-grained segments from the retrieved information. During LLM reasoning, a selective knowledge integration strategy incorporates knowledge segments only when the model lacks confidence in its answer, thereby minimizing the impact of noise.

A. Knowledge Retrieval with Low-noise Query

KB-VQA typically involves retrieving auxiliary information from knowledge bases. However, the lengthy retrieval queries, containing excessive image details, from existing works [12], [13] always distract the retrieval process, resulting in the selection of irrelevant content. We propose constructing low-noise queries containing only essential content from image-question pairs, guiding the retriever to focus on key information and select highly relevant knowledge. Specifically, we utilize the multimodal perception capability of VLMs to extract keywords that summarize an image-question pair. That is, given an image-question pair (v, q) , we prompt a frozen VLM to generate a set of concise keywords k which represent the pair’s essential content:

$$k = \text{VLM}(\mathcal{P}_1, v, q), \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{P}_1 is the prompt template. Considering the importance of the question in knowledge retrieval, we concatenate the keywords k with the question q to form a low-noise query $q_l = [q; k]$. Then, we use the Google Search Corpus [4] as our knowledge base \mathcal{D} and adopt q_l to find relevant knowledge documents from it. Following [12], [13], we encode q_l and each knowledge document d_i from \mathcal{D} , and calculate the similarity score between q_l and d_i to retrieve the top- r documents with the highest similarity as follows:

$$K_d = \{\hat{d}_1, \dots, \hat{d}_r\} = \text{Top}_r(\text{sim}(q_l, d_1), \text{sim}(q_l, d_2), \dots), \quad (2)$$

where $\text{sim}(q_l, d_i)$ denotes the dot product between the embeddings of q_l and d_i . Since q_l contains only key content, the




Fig. 2. Overview of the proposed framework. KF-VQA constructs low-noise queries by extracting essential content from the image and question to retrieve relevant knowledge documents. Then, a redundancy filtering process extracts fine-grained segments from the retrieved documents. During LLM reasoning, knowledge integration is selectively activated (green line) only when the prediction confidence without knowledge (blue line) is low.

retrieval process would focus on these critical pieces to find relevant documents K_d .

B. Knowledge Redundancy Filtering

Although the retrieval with low-noise queries could enhance the relevance of retrieved knowledge documents to the image-question pair, considerable redundancy remains in these documents, impeding model reasoning. We guide LLMs to filter redundant segments from retrieved documents by leveraging question-relevant visual details, since focusing on the visual aspects of questions helps identify cues for selecting relevant segments. To extract such visual details, we first prompt the frozen LLM to transform the original question q into an image-based question q_v , which focuses exclusively on the content presented in the image v . Then, the VLM leverages its strong visual perception capabilities to answer this visual perception question q_v to obtain required image information as follows:

$$q_v = \text{LLM}(\mathcal{P}_2, q), \quad (3)$$

$$a_v = \text{VLM}(v, q_v), \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{P}_2 is the prompt template for LLMs, and a_v denotes the fine-grained visual details about the question q .

Based on the question q and visual details a_v , we encourage the LLM to identify relevant segments K_s from K_d as follows:

$$K_s = \text{LLM}(\mathcal{P}_3, K_d, q, a_v), \quad (5)$$

where \mathcal{P}_3 is the prompt template. The segments K_s provide more fine-grained, low-redundancy knowledge about the image-question pair compared to the documents K_d , thereby establishing a better reasoning basis for the LLM.

C. Reasoning with Selective Knowledge Integration

During the reasoning process, our knowledge segments K_s would assist the LLM in making predictions. However, despite

our efforts to filter out redundancies, completely eliminating knowledge noise is impractical. For LLMs, there are situations where the model relies on its implicit knowledge to answer a question correctly, while the retrieved knowledge leads to an incorrect answer [13]. Inspired by this, we propose a selective knowledge integration strategy to minimize the impact of residual noise. This strategy aligns with human intuition and enables the model to integrate external knowledge to improve its reasoning only when it is uncertain about its response.

Measuring prediction certainty is central to our strategy. The generation probability assigned to an output sequence reflects the LLM confidence in its prediction. Therefore, we explore the model’s confidence score, derived from probabilities, as a decision metric to assess whether knowledge is needed. Specifically, given the input x and output $y = \{y^1, \dots, y^L\}$, we aggregate the sampling probabilities at each time step to obtain the confidence score as follows:

$$f(y) = \sum_{t=1}^L \log p_{\text{LLM}}(y^t | x, y^{<t}), \quad s = e^{f(y)}, \quad (6)$$

where the confidence score s is defined as the mapping of the aggregated probability $f(y)$ to a value between 0 and 1 using an exponential function. Then, we could achieve selective knowledge integration in LLMs by setting a confidence threshold τ . The LLM would answer the question using its implicit knowledge and obtain a score s . If $s \leq \tau$, the LLM would introduce h segments K_s^h which are sampled from our retrieved knowledge K_s to boost its reasoning.

Besides, in-context examples and generic image captions are essential for training-free methods. Following [10], [11], we use MCAN [18] to select the top- n most similar examples E for each test sample and obtain image captions c_v through a converter [19]. We combine c_v with image details a_v as I

to provide LLMs with visual semantics. Finally, the reasoning process with selective knowledge integration is obtained as:

$$a_f = \begin{cases} \arg \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, m\}} p_{\text{LLM}}(a_j | \mathcal{P}_4, E_j, I, K_s^h, q), & \text{if } s \leq \tau, \\ \arg \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, m\}} p_{\text{LLM}}(a_j | \mathcal{P}_4, E_j, I, q), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where \mathcal{P}_4 is the prompt, and $s = e^{\max_j p_{\text{LLM}}(a_j | \mathcal{P}_4, E_j, I, q)}$. To obtain more robust performance [7], [10], we prompt LLMs m times with various E_j to obtain m predictions, and ensemble them to select the one with the highest probability.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

A. Experimental Setup

Dataset. We conduct experiments on two datasets: OK-VQA [1] and A-OKVQA [14] to evaluate the effectiveness of our method. OK-VQA is a challenging knowledge-based visual question answering dataset including 5K image-question pairs for testing, with most questions requiring external knowledge to answer. A-OKVQA, as an enhanced successor to OK-VQA, contains questions that not only demand a broader range of knowledge but also emphasize the use of knowledge for reasoning. It includes 1K image-question pairs for validation and 6K pairs for testing.

Implementation Details. We evaluate model performance using the standard VQA metric: accuracy [2]. In our framework, we employ Contriever [20] as the retriever, Llama3.2-11B-Vision [21] as the VLM, and Llama3-8B [21] as the LLM. We set the number of retrieved knowledge items r to 20, the number of selected knowledge segments h to 7, and the confidence threshold τ to 0.8. Following previous methods [10], [11], hyper-parameters m and n are set to 5 and 10, respectively.

Baselines. We compare our framework with training-based and training-free methods. Training-based methods include KRISP [3], Vis-DPR [4], REVIVE [16], RA-VQA-v2 [17], and SKSQA [13]. Training-free methods include PICa [7], PromptCap [8], Prophet [9], Simple [10], and DKA [11].

B. Experimental Results

Comparison Results on OK-VQA. Table I compares the performance of our KF-VQA with state-of-the-art baselines on the OK-VQA dataset. The proposed framework consistently outperforms both training-based and training-free methods, showing that our high-quality knowledge benefits LLM in knowledge-centric visual question answering. Training-based baselines select excessive knowledge using verbose queries, which hinders their performance due to knowledge redundancy. Although SKSQA employs document-level knowledge filtering, substantial irrelevant segments still exist within chosen documents. In contrast, without expensive training, our framework leverages low-noise queries and fine-grained knowledge selection to obtain concise and relevant knowledge segments. Compared to the strongest training-free baseline, DKA, KF-VQA could improve accuracy by 1.1%. DKA also utilizes lengthy queries and struggles to retrieve relevant

TABLE I
COMPARISON RESULTS ON THE OK-VQA DATASET. THE BEST RESULT IS IN BOLD.

Method	Model	Knowledge Resource	Acc (%)
Training-based methods			
KRISP [3]	MMBERT	ConceptNet+Wikipedia	38.4
Vis-DPR [4]	LXMERT	Google Search	39.2
REVIVE [16]	T5-large	Wikipedia+GPT-3 (175B)	58.0
RA-VQA-v2 [17]	BLIP2 T5-XL (3B)	Google Search	62.1
SKSQA [13]	BLIP2 T5-XL (3B)	Google Search	62.8
Training-free methods			
PICa [7]	GPT-3 (175B)	-	48.0
PromptCap [8]	GPT-3 (175B)	-	60.4
Prophet [9]	GPT-3 (175B)	-	61.1
Simple [10]	LLaMA 2 (13B)	-	61.2
DKA [11]	LLaMA 2 (13B)	Wikipedia+ChatGPT	62.1
KF-VQA (Ours)	LLaMA 2 (13B)	Google Search	62.8
KF-VQA (Ours)	LLaMA 3 (8B)	Google Search	63.2

TABLE II
COMPARISON RESULTS ON THE A-OKVQA DATASET.

Method	Model	Val Acc	Test Acc
Training-based methods			
KRISP [3]	MMBERT	33.7	27.1
SKSQA [13]	BLIP2 T5-XL (3B)	57.2	56.4
Training-free methods			
PromptCap [8]	GPT-3 (175B)	56.3	59.6
Prophet [9]	GPT-3 (175B)	58.2	55.7
Simple [10]	LLaMA 2 (13B)	58.6	57.5
DKA [11]	LLaMA 2 (13B)	62.1	59.9
KF-VQA	LLaMA 2 (13B)	62.4	60.5
KF-VQA	LLaMA 3 (8B)	62.9	60.9

knowledge. The redundancy in DKA’s knowledge prevents its LLMs from performing well, while our method integrates VLMs and LLMs to refine knowledge, thereby achieving the best performance. Besides, our concise knowledge reduces the length of LLM prompts, which accelerates the inference speed.

Comparison Results on A-OKVQA. Table II presents the results on the validation and test sets of A-OKVQA. Most training-based methods perform worse than training-free ones, while KF-VQA surpasses the best results of training-based methods by a large margin, achieving a 5.7% increase on the validation set and a 4.5% increase on the test set. The trained models focus on patterns within the training set, which may not generalize effectively to other questions of A-OKVQA that require diverse knowledge, and their reasoning ability is also inferior to that of strong LLMs. In contrast, our model encourages the LLM to perform accurate reasoning through concise knowledge. Compared to DKA, our method shows improvements of 0.8% on the validation set and 1% on the test set. That is, LLMs could better derive reasoning insights from our concise knowledge rather than redundant information.

C. Ablation Study

To illustrate the effectiveness of the framework’s key components, we perform an ablation study on OK-VQA, with results shown in Table III. We build a *Baseline* model which directly uses knowledge retrieved through lengthy queries [12],

TABLE III
ABLATION STUDY ON OK-VQA.

Method	Acc
LLM	61.3
Baseline	60.4
Baseline w/ LNQ	61.5
Baseline w/ LNQ & KRF	62.4
Baseline w/ LNQ & KRF & SKI (KF-VQA)	63.2




Fig. 3. Hyper-parameter analysis on OK-VQA.

[13] for reasoning. Baseline is inferior to the LLM without any external knowledge, as redundant and inaccurate knowledge fails to benefit training-free reasoning. We introduce low-noise queries for knowledge retrieval (i.e., w/ LNQ) and improve the performance of LLMs. That is, the queries with key information are beneficial for locating accurate knowledge. We further integrate knowledge redundancy filtering into knowledge processing (i.e., w/ LNQ & KRF), resulting in improved performance that surpasses DKA. It shows that selecting relevant knowledge segments leads to fine-grained knowledge that is more accurate and concise. When the selective knowledge integration strategy (i.e., w/ LNQ & KRF & SKI) is applied, we obtain the complete framework (KF-VQA) which performs best. It shows that using knowledge without considering whether LLMs require it hinders performance, as noise from external information cannot be entirely filtered out. Each component contributes to the reasoning of LLMs.

D. Hyper-parameter Analysis

Effect of Retrieved Knowledge Numbers. Fig. 3(a) shows the effect of the number r of retrieved knowledge documents on model prediction. The performance improves as the document number increases from 1 to 10, illustrating that more knowledge retrieved through our low-noise queries leads to improved reasoning capabilities. The model’s performance stabilizes when $r \geq 15$. This shows that useful knowledge segments may only originate from a small subset of documents, and simply increasing the number of retrieved documents does not result in sustained performance improvement.

Effect of Knowledge Segment Numbers. We evaluate the impact brought by the number h of selected knowledge segments, with results shown in Fig. 3(b). As h increases from 1 to 7, the prediction accuracy improves incrementally, indicating that our knowledge filtering module effectively identifies useful segments from noisy documents, thereby enhancing

TABLE IV
COMPARISON WITH THE VISUAL LANGUAGE MODELS ON OK-VQA.

Model	MiniGPT-4	InstructBLIP	Llama3.2-11B-Vision	KF-VQA
Acc	29.3	47.9	44.2	63.2

the reasoning capabilities of LLMs. The model performance declines when $h > 7$, likely due to the inclusion of less relevant segments, which disrupt the model’s prediction.

Effect of Confidence Thresholds. Fig. 3(c) exhibits the effect of different threshold values of τ . A low threshold τ means that LLMs cannot leverage knowledge even when answering questions with low confidence. As τ increases, the LLM could integrate more knowledge when it is uncertain about the prediction. The performance declines when $\tau > 0.8$. That is, if knowledge is introduced when LLMs could answer a question with high confidence, the irrelevant content from knowledge may degrade the model’s performance, since the noise in knowledge cannot be fully filtered out.

E. Comparison with Visual Language Models

Since VLMs demonstrate strong abilities in visual recognition and language understanding, we compare our framework with VLMs, such as MiniGPT-4 [22], InstructBLIP [23], and Llama3.2-Vision [21]. The results in Table IV show that our method outperforms these VLMs by a large margin. Although VLMs could better understand images, their knowledge reasoning abilities are inferior to that of LLMs. Our framework leverages the collaboration between the VLM and LLM to acquire high-quality knowledge that aids in prediction, providing an effective solution for KB-VQA.

F. Qualitative Analysis

In Fig. 3, we present a case study comparing KF-VQA with DKA. For cases (a) and (b), LLMs require external knowledge to answer the questions, as they could only make predictions with low confidence. The redundant knowledge retrieved by DKA hinders accurate predictions. Its retrieved texts, while abundant in visual information, are not only lengthy but also poorly relevant to the questions. In (a), the date “1845” misleads DKA into an incorrect prediction, whereas our concise knowledge contains essential clues. In (b), DKA fails to retrieve relevant knowledge. Our method focuses on key information, such as “falling leaves” from the image and “season” from the question, enabling the extraction of knowledge segments containing “autumn”. Case (c) illustrates a scenario where LLMs could confidently answer the question without external knowledge. However, the knowledge retrieved by DKA includes noisy content, such as “1830”, leading it to a wrong answer. In contrast, our selective knowledge integration strategy allows LLMs to leverage implicit knowledge for reasoning, thereby mitigating the impact of noisy knowledge.

V. CONCLUSION

This paper presents a training-free framework with knowledge focusing for KB-VQA, that mitigates the impact of

	Image-question pair	LLM Confidence	Method	Knowledge	Answer
(a)	 Q: When was this type of sport invented?	$< \tau$ (low)	DKA	...batter posing player a batting bat at a ph the in philadelphia holding ... a baseball ... rules of modern baseball were formalized in 1845 by the New York ... in equipment and technology. (392 tokens)	A: 1845 ✗
			KF-VQA	...a man from cooperstown, new york who invented baseball in 1839. baseball ... doubleday in 1839 during ... the story that abner doubleday invented baseball in 1839 ... at west point. (160 tokens)	A: 1839 ✓
(b)	 Q: What season is it outside?	$< \tau$ (low)	DKA	...a man and his dog relaxing on a red couch in the sun house. The man is wearing ... and the dog is lying on a blanket. The cat is shedding ... The man is holding ... the month of December. (279 tokens)	A: summer ✗
			KF-VQA	...autumn, season of the year between ... decrease. autumn is one of the four seasons on earth ... autumn marks the transition from summer to winter... halloween are celebrated. (174 tokens)	A: autumn ✓
(c)	 Q: In what year was this mode of transportation created?	$> \tau$ (high)	DKA	...a train boarding on a train station with its ... first steam-powered locomotive was built in 1804 by ... first successful steam built by Peter Cooper in 1830 ... across different regions. (415 tokens)	A: 1830 ✗
			KF-VQA	w/ implicit knowledge	A: 1804 ✓

Fig. 4. Case study on OK-VQA. Retrieved knowledge from different methods is listed along with the corresponding number of knowledge tokens.

knowledge noise by enhancing relevance and reducing redundancy. By identifying essential content from image-question pairs using VLMs, we construct low-noise queries to retrieve highly relevant knowledge. VLMs and LLMs further collaborate to filter out redundant segments from the obtained knowledge. Besides, for LLM reasoning, a selective knowledge integration strategy is designed to incorporate external knowledge only when the model lacks confidence in its answer, minimizing the impact of redundant knowledge on reasoning. Experimental results on benchmark datasets demonstrate that our method outperforms the state-of-the-art baselines.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (62406081), and the Guangxi Natural Science Foundation (No. 2025GXNSFBA069232).

REFERENCES

- [1] Kenneth Marino, Mohammad Rastegari, Ali Farhadi, and Roozbeh Mottaghi, “Ok-vqa: A visual question answering benchmark requiring external knowledge,” in *CVPR*, 2019, pp. 3195–3204.
- [2] Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jiaseen Lu, Margaret Mitchell, Dhruv Batra, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh, “Vqa: Visual question answering,” in *ICCV*, 2015, pp. 2425–2433.
- [3] Kenneth Marino, Xinlei Chen, Devi Parikh, Abhinav Gupta, and Marcus Rohrbach, “Krisp: Integrating implicit and symbolic knowledge for open-domain knowledge-based vqa,” in *CVPR*, 2021, pp. 14111–14121.
- [4] Man Luo, Yankai Zeng, Pratyay Banerjee, and Chitta Baral, “Weakly-supervised visual-retriever-reader for knowledge-based question answering,” in *EMNLP*, 2021.
- [5] Hugo Liu and Push Singh, “Conceptnet—a practical commonsense reasoning tool-kit,” *BT technology journal*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 211–226, 2004.
- [6] Denny Vrandečić and Markus Krötzsch, “Wikidata: a free collaborative knowledgebase,” *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 57, no. 10, pp. 78–85, 2014.
- [7] Zhengyuan Yang, Zhe Gan, Jianfeng Wang, Xiaowei Hu, Yumao Lu, Zicheng Liu, and Lijuan Wang, “An empirical study of gpt-3 for few-shot knowledge-based vqa,” in *AAAI*, 2022, vol. 36, pp. 3081–3089.
- [8] Yushi Hu, Hang Hua, Zhengyuan Yang, Weijia Shi, Noah A Smith, and Jiebo Luo, “Promptcap: Prompt-guided image captioning for vqa with gpt-3,” in *ICCV*, 2023, pp. 2963–2975.
- [9] Zhenwei Shao, Zhou Yu, Meng Wang, and Jun Yu, “Prompting large language models with answer heuristics for knowledge-based visual question answering,” in *CVPR*, 2023, pp. 14974–14983.
- [10] Alexandros Xenos, Themis Stafylakis, Ioannis Patras, and Georgios Tzimiropoulos, “A simple baseline for knowledge-based visual question answering,” in *EMNLP*, 2023, pp. 14871–14877.
- [11] Wenbin An, Feng Tian, Jiahao Nie, Wenkai Shi, Haonan Lin, Yan Chen, Qianying Wang, Yaqiang Wu, Guang Dai, and Ping Chen, “Knowledge acquisition disentanglement for knowledge-based visual question answering with large language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.15346*, 2024.
- [12] Weizhe Lin and Bill Byrne, “Retrieval augmented visual question answering with outside knowledge,” in *EMNLP*, 2022, pp. 11238–11254.
- [13] Dongze Hao, Qunbo Wang, Longteng Guo, Jie Jiang, and Jing Liu, “Self-bootstrapped visual-language model for knowledge selection and question answering,” in *EMNLP*, 2024, pp. 1857–1868.
- [14] Dustin Schwenk, Apoorv Khandelwal, Christopher Clark, Kenneth Marino, and Roozbeh Mottaghi, “A-okvqa: A benchmark for visual question answering using world knowledge,” in *ECCV*, 2022, pp. 146–162.
- [15] Liangke Gui, Borui Wang, Qiuyuan Huang, Alexander G Hauptmann, Yonatan Bisk, and Jianfeng Gao, “Kat: A knowledge augmented transformer for vision-and-language,” in *NAACL*, 2022, pp. 956–968.
- [16] Yuanze Lin, Yujia Xie, Dongdong Chen, Yichong Xu, Chenguang Zhu, and Lu Yuan, “Revive: regional visual representation matters in knowledge-based visual question answering,” in *NeurIPS*, 2022, pp. 10560–10571.
- [17] Weizhe Lin, Jinghong Chen, Jingbiao Mei, Alexandru Coca, and Bill Byrne, “Fine-grained late-interaction multi-modal retrieval for retrieval augmented visual question answering,” in *NeurIPS*, 2023, pp. 22820–22840.
- [18] Zhou Yu, Jun Yu, Yuhao Cui, Dacheng Tao, and Qi Tian, “Deep modular co-attention networks for visual question answering,” in *CVPR*, 2019, pp. 6281–6290.
- [19] Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junnan Li, Boyang Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven CH Hoi, “Plug-and-play vqa: Zero-shot vqa by conjoining large pretrained models with zero training,” in *Findings of EMNLP*, 2022, pp. 951–967.
- [20] Amita Kamath, Christopher Clark, Tanmay Gupta, Eric Kolve, Derek Hoiem, and Aniruddha Kembhavi, “Webly supervised concept expansion for general purpose vision models,” in *ECCV*, 2022, pp. 662–681.
- [21] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al., “The llama 3 herd of models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- [22] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed El-hoseiny, “Minigt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592*, 2023.
- [23] Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale Fung, and Steven Hoi, “Instructblip: towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning,” in *NeurIPS*, 2023, pp. 49250–49267.